

Lexo: Eliminating Stealthy Supply-Chain Attacks via LLM-Assisted Program Regeneration

Evangelos Lamprou
Brown University
vagos@lamprou.xyz

Julian Dai
Brown University
julian_dai@brown.edu

Grigoris Ntousakis
Brown University
gntousakis@brown.edu

Martin C. Rinard
MIT
rinard@csail.mit.edu

Nikos Vasilakis
Brown University
nikos@vasilak.is

Abstract

Software supply-chain attacks are an important and ongoing concern in the open source software ecosystem. These attacks maintain the standard functionality that a component implements, but additionally hide malicious functionality activated only when the component reaches its target environment. LEXO addresses such stealthy attacks by automatically learning and regenerating vulnerability-free versions of potentially malicious components. LEXO first generates a set of input-output pairs to model a component’s full observable behavior, which it then uses to synthesize a new version of the original component. The new component implements the original functionality but avoids stealthy malicious behavior. Throughout this regeneration process, LEXO consults several distinct instances of Large Language Models (LLMs), uses correctness and coverage metrics to shepherd these instances, and guardrails their results. An evaluation on 100+ real-world packages—including high profile stealthy supply-chain attacks—indicates that LEXO scales across multiple domains, regenerates code efficiently (<100s on average), maintains compatibility, and succeeds in eliminating malicious code in several real-world supply-chain attacks—even in cases when a state-of-the-art LLM fails to eliminate malicious code when prompted to do so.

Keywords: supply-chain attacks, large language models, software regeneration, automated code generation

1 Introduction

Supply-chain attacks have been an ongoing issue in the software industry [5, 14, 17, 28, 62, 74, 87, 95], resulting in over \$46B damages in recent years [83]. These attacks target a victim’s supplier, exploiting the fact that the victim software depends on software provided by the supplier. As modern software consists of thousands of dependencies, it is challenging for developers to audit all dependencies—and particularly so for dependencies nested deeply in the dependency chain.

Automated detection of such attacks remains challenging, as malicious components use various evasion techniques. Specifically, in the case of *stealthy* supply-chain attacks (SSCAs), a malicious dependency may remain dormant until multiple conditions are met—for example, specific values of




Fig. 1. Applying LEXO. Top: A typical workflow today might result in an attack. Mid: Applying an LLM to detect or eliminate vulnerabilities might still result in an attack. Bottom: LEXO regenerates a vulnerability-free version of a component (or reports inability to do so).

environment variables, the version of another component, the system’s date and time, the number of times a component has been invoked, or even random activation. This vast space of possible conditions makes detection extremely complex and highly unlikely.

This paper presents LEXO, a system that eliminates SSCAs by combining large language model (LLM)-assisted program inference, transformation, and regeneration. LEXO’s key insight is that a stealthy malicious component still exhibits the advertised component behavior—which LEXO attempts to infer and regenerate. LEXO does not attempt to directly detect, remove, or interpose on vulnerable or malicious code. It instead extracts a model of the component’s intended behavior (in the form of input/output examples), then uses this model to regenerate a new, secure, vulnerability-free version of the component. While earlier research on vulnerability elimination has demonstrated promising results via active learning and regeneration [79], the techniques underlying LEXO are language- and domain-agnostic—hinting at a potential for regenerating substantial parts of entire ecosystems.

Deployment Scenarios: LEXO produces as output either a vulnerability-free version of a software component it takes as input (Fig. 2) or a message that it cannot operate on its input component—for example, because the original component falls outside its regeneration scope. LEXO is distinct from an approach where a developer gives a component directly to the LLM, tasking the LLM to generate a vulnerability-free version of the component (§9.5).

LEXO can be applied at various stages of the software lifecycle. During development, it can regenerate software

Tab. 1. Comparison overview. Approaches directly relevant to LEXO’s supply-chain security approach (§10).

Approach	Generality	Detection	Elimination	Examples
Static Analysis	■	■	□	[10, 43, 90]
Dynamic Analysis	■	■	□	[16, 31, 80]
Pure LLMs	■	■	□	[2, 50, 58]
Programming-by-Example	□	□	■	[12, 21, 34]
Program Inference and Regeneration	□	→	■	[11, 69, 79]
LEXO	■	→	■	(this paper)

dependencies to reduce the risk of developer-targeted attacks. In continuous integration workflows, it can be applied to release checkpoints to ensure that all dependencies are regenerated before deployment to production environments. LEXO can also be applied selectively, only regenerating dependencies with new updates.

Evaluation Overview: Applied to several real-world supply-chain attacks, LEXO regenerates new versions of these components that re-implement the core computation, pass developer tests, support client applications, but—crucially—discard any malicious behavior present in the original component (§9.1). LEXO correctly regenerates 72 out of 155 libraries, confirmed by 100% of developer-provided tests and by manual inspection, and exits early on the remaining 83, after it detects that the source component falls outside its regeneration capabilities (§9.2). On average, LEXO’s library regeneration completes in 148.24s and costs \$0.60.

Paper Outline and Contributions: The paper starts with an example of a stealthy supply-chain attack (§2) and the key challenges involved in detection and mitigation. It then discusses the model of threats LEXO protects against (§3), before presenting an overview of LEXO (§4) outlining LEXO’s key contributions:

- **Program inference:** Given a software library, LEXO uses the component’s source code to generate a series of inputs (§5). It then uses these inputs to create a model that reflects the component’s client-observable behavior. LEXO then uses this model to regenerate a new, secure version of the source component.
- **Language- and domain-agnostic library regeneration:** LEXO introduces an automated, language- and domain-agnostic approach to regenerate safe, functionally equivalent versions of vulnerable libraries, neutralizing malicious behaviors without human intervention (§6).
- **Guardrails, optimizations, and refinements:** LEXO introduces a series of checks for rejecting invalid inputs and incorrectly synthesized programs (§7), and a series of optimizations and refinements targeting the performance and accuracy of its output (§8).

The paper then presents LEXO’s evaluation (§9), related work (§10), and limitations (§11). An additional appendix contains the full set of prompts used (Appendix A).

Availability: LEXO is available as MIT-licensed open source package available for download at:

<https://github.com/atlas-brown/lexo>

2 The Infamous Event-Stream Attack

The event-stream library offers stream manipulation functionality for Node.js [5, 18]. With over 3M weekly downloads, the library became the target of a supply-chain attack, by introducing a Bitcoin-stealing malware dependency called flatmap-stream [51, 72, 73, 75].

The malicious dependency: This malicious dependency extracts account details from Bitcoin wallets. The attack is stealthy: it activates only when the malicious code executes as part of the Copay Bitcoin wallet [7], on specific platforms, and only when the wallet is connected to the live Bitcoin network (ln 3-5). To perform the attack, flatmap-stream (1) loads the user’s wallet credentials, (2) stores the credentials on the side, and (3) sends the credentials to a remote server (code excluded for simplicity), before constructing and returning the *correct* value to the caller method (ln 8-10).

```

1 const Stream = require('stream').Stream;
2 module.exports = function (mapper) {
3   if (env.Copay && env.livenet
4     && env.platform === target) {
5     steal_bitcoin_credentials(); //Attack!
6   }
7   const stream = new Stream();
8   // Construct flatmap stream object...
9   return stream; }

```

This is a SSCA, as it does not interfere with the component’s advertised behavior, even when activated.

Possible elimination approaches: A security-conscious developer might attempt to proactively defend against the attack using static analysis, dynamic analysis, LLMs, or program synthesis. Unfortunately, these techniques fail to successfully defend against the attack.

Static analysis [10, 33, 41, 82] is unable to detect the attack, as the malicious payload is encrypted at rest and only decrypted and evaluated at run-time. Dynamic analysis [16, 31, 80] is also ineffective, since the library’s side-effectful behavior activates under strict conditions.

LLMs [3, 58, 89] also fail at regenerating a functionally equivalent and secure version of flatmap-stream, especially when the attack is concealed through careful token selection. When prompted to eliminate malicious code from the source code of flatmap-stream, a state-of-the-art model fails to re-generate a functional version of the library (§10).

Program synthesis [12, 13, 21, 79] can, in principle, eliminate flatmap-stream’s malicious behavior by regenerating

a functionally equivalent implementation given a set of input-output examples. However, this approach relies on domain expertise to develop a specialized synthesis engine and a domain-specific language for each target domain (e.g., string manipulation, array manipulation, *etc.*), which significantly hinders scalability across domains.

Tab. 1 summarizes the comparison, offering a few additional points in the space of immediately relevant options, and §10 offers additional details.

Applying Lexo: LEXO regenerates a replacement library that offers identical functionality while including no malicious code—and works across domains in a language-agnostic manner. The following line invokes LEXO on flatmap-stream with JavaScript as the output language.

```
$ lexo --out js flatmap-stream
```

LEXO starts by extracting the interface and source code of the flatmap-stream library (step (1) in fig. 2). The system then continues with the *candidate input generation* phase (step (2) in fig. 2), where it instruments an LLM instance to generate a set of inputs that exercise the library’s functionality. An example of a generated candidate input is the JavaScript value `x => x + 1`. These inputs are then provided to the flatmap-stream library, resulting in a set of I/O examples. LEXO iteratively augments the set of inputs until it achieves 100% code coverage on flatmap-stream. It generates a total of 13 I/O pairs after two revisions. An example I/O pair is:

```
{ input: x => x + 1,
  output: { StreamConstructor({ ... }) } }
```

LEXO then moves on to the *program synthesis* phase (step (3) in fig. 2), where it takes the generated set of I/O pairs through a series of static transformations and provides them to the LLM instance. The LLM then synthesizes a JavaScript program that implements flatmap-stream’s functionality. LEXO then performs another revision loop, until the synthesized program aligns with the behavior described by the I/O examples. As LEXO uses a constrained I/O pair format, it regenerates the library without any side-effectful behaviors (e.g., file system or network access). After three revisions LEXO produces the following code (shortened for brevity):

```
1 const Stream = require('stream').Stream;
2 const stream = new Stream();
3 // Construct flatmap stream object...
4 return stream;
```

LEXO performs revisions after the candidate input generation and program synthesis phases. These are driven by a code coverage and correctness metric, respectively. Had code coverage not reached 100%, LEXO would have issued a warning and moved on to the program synthesis phase. If the program synthesis phase were to reach the maximum revision count while still failing on a configurable percentage of I/O examples (10% by default), LEXO would abort the process with an error, stating that it is *unable to regenerate the target library correctly*.

Key result: LEXO eliminates *all* malicious code from the regenerated flatmap-stream library (§9.1), passing 5/5 (100%) tests in the event-stream test suite, with 100% code coverage on the full set of generated inputs. Manual inspection also confirms that the regenerated library is functionally equivalent to the original flatmap-stream library. The entire process takes 120s and costs \$0.80. The initial input generation phase takes 30s and incurs \$0.50 in LLM inference costs, followed by another 90s and \$0.30 for the code generation phase.

3 Threat Model

LEXO protects against adversarial attacks in which the attacker has full control of the target component and can modify its source code arbitrarily. The modified component will maintain benign behavior during its entire lifetime, otherwise a malicious modification could be detected during testing, development, or production—e.g., a crash can occur during the dependent application’s execution. This malicious behavior injected is stealthy, in that it activates only in target environments or under precise conditions, and side-effectful, in that it produces effects beyond just producing the outputs of a function—e.g., file-system access, modification of environment variables, network access, or arbitrary code execution. Since a malicious component can potentially attack the host system during regeneration, LEXO interacts with the library in an isolated environment.

LEXO also protects against software removal from remote repositories. An adversarial developer might either unpublish their library or replace it with a no-op, thus breaking all dependent applications. LEXO can regenerate the library with a functionally equivalent one, replacing the dependency from that point onward.

LEXO assumes that any back-end LLM that it uses and the target language’s runtime environment are all part of the trusted computing base (TCB).

4 System Overview

LEXO takes as input a component’s implementation and attempts to produce an equivalent implementation that exhibits only the component’s advertised functionality. This section explains the subsystems used among different stages of the regeneration process and how they combine together into the end-to-end pipeline.

Prompt anatomy: LEXO uses a set of prompts engineered to improve LLM generation performance [61]. All prompts used in LEXO follow the following structure (full prompts in §A):

1. *Problem statement:* An imperative explanation of the given task. For example:




Fig. 2. LEXO overview. LEXO (1) analyzes a component’s interface to extract its source, (2) generates I/O pairs for the target component, (3) according to quality metrics, (4) extracts a new representation of the functionality informed by the I/O pairs, (5) regenerates the target component, (6) applies revisions to obtain a final version of the component.

Given a NodeJS module, generate a set of inputs that will thoroughly test the module’s behavior.

2. *Problem break-down*: An elaboration over the necessary steps to complete the task. For example:

1) Code Understanding: Explain the code’s purpose and functionality.
...
4) Explore: Include tests that are slight variations of the ones in the test suite.

3. *Task clarifications*: In cases where it was observed that the LLM diverged from the desired output, the prompt includes some additional alignment instructions specifically mentioning the desired (or unwanted) patterns. For example:

...Make sure to test default arguments and optional parameters.

4. *Output format specification*: A short description of the desired output format. This enables parsing and utilization of the generated content by LEXO. For example:

Output one input per line using JavaScript core types
Use this format: [value1, value2] ...

5. *Input data*: Data are provided to the LLM either as input to a transformation or additional context (e.g., the library’s source code, failed examples after program synthesis).

Transformation modules: The transformation subsystems are responsible for translating a representation of the target component from one form to another, while preserving core invariants from the original representation.

To initiate component learning, the *code to I/O pairs* module, given the source component’s implementation, generates test inputs for the source component (step (2) in fig. 2). Each one of these inputs uses constructs and syntax from the source language. To get the corresponding outputs, each generated input is executed on the target component. I/O pairs capture only pure computations between the target component’s input and output. Subsequent transformation modules leverage this property as a firewall, filtering out attacks embedded in the source component as side-effectful computations cannot be represented.

To enhance interlocks between the generated I/O pairs and the target component, the *I/O pairs to algorithm* module utilizes the generated I/O pairs to craft a high-level natural language algorithm. This algorithm outlines a general approach that, if implemented, would adhere to the given examples (step (4) in fig. 2). This stage of the pipeline encourages the LLM to analyze the program synthesis problem, deriving high-level insights from the examples before proceeding to implementation—mimicking the way a human might approach this task.

LEXO’s final transformation is the *I/O pairs and algorithm to code* module. The module takes as input (1) the source component I/O pair examples, (2) the natural language algorithm generated by the I/O pairs to algorithm module, and (3) the source component’s published name. Using these inputs, it regenerates a functionally equivalent implementation of the source component (step (5) in fig. 2).

Correctness module: The outputs of the previous stages are often inaccurate or incomplete. To increase its confidence, LEXO employs a set of metrics that quantify several aspects of the I/O pairs and regenerated implementations of the target component (step 3 and 6 in fig. 2). In the I/O pair generation module, the correctness module targets a code coverage threshold on the source component. In the code regeneration module, the module verifies that the produced library complies with the specifications of the *generated* I/O pair set. Each produced artifact is considered *correct* if it passes all the correctness criteria. However, if the I/O examples fail to achieve 100% code coverage on the original component, LEXO proceeds regardless. This accounts for the scenario of stealthy, malicious code that does not execute during testing.

Revision module: In cases where accuracy or completeness thresholds are not met, LEXO’s *revision* module activates

and attempts to improve the quality of the generated content. The revision module operates in a closed loop, with the LLM’s output from one iteration feeding back as part of the input for the next one. LEXO performs a tune-able number of revisions (three by default), after which, if the correctness module has not marked the output as correct, the system stops and discards the generated content, issuing an error message. Otherwise, the output is saved on disk and LEXO continues execution.

5 Input-Output Generation

Input generation: Given a component implementation C , LEXO generates a set of inputs which is used to construct a model of C ’s observable behavior. The system explores the source component using meta-programming, extracting from it each function f_n and its corresponding source code $\text{src}(f_n)$. It then provides $\text{src}(f_n)$ to an LLM instance, instructing it to generate a set of inputs I that exercise f_n . LEXO’s regeneration happens on a per-function basis. Each input i is a tuple that contains the values to be passed as inputs to f_n . To maintain compatibility with later stages of the pipeline, LEXO uses a constrained input format that resembles the target component’s language syntax. The format is designed to be easy to parse and convert into runtime values of the component’s language. Given a source language \mathcal{L} , the input format is defined as an ordered set of values represented as an array in \mathcal{L} . Each element of this array must be a valid expression in \mathcal{L} and can be of any primitive or non-primitive type in \mathcal{L} , including functions-like constructs. Comments, as defined by the syntax of \mathcal{L} , may accompany the array but are optional. The order of the elements within the array is significant and must be preserved as part of the input specification. Multiple such arrays can be provided, delimited by a character or sequence of characters.

LEXO provides the LLM with the input format’s syntax and semantics for the source language as part of the input generation prompt using three examples (§A). Some examples of generated inputs are shown below:

```
[{a:1,b:2}, "a"] // An input with two arguments
[1,3] // An input with two integer arguments
["hello"] // An input with a string argument
(a,b)=>{a+b} // An input with a function
```

While constrained decoding [55, 86] can be used to guarantee valid JSON in responses, LEXO does not leverage this feature, because of (1) possible generation performance degradation [77], (2) LEXO’s use of prompting techniques like chain-of-thought [85] that require the LLM to freely produce text in a scratchpad-like manner before giving a final answer, and (3) compatibility with most LLM API services.

It’s important that the I/O pairs generated capture the full range of the original library’s benign behavior. LEXO instructs

the LLM to generate nominal inputs that exercise the target component’s typical behavior, and edge-case inputs that test the component’s behavior in unusual or boundary scenarios. LEXO can deduce input argument types even in the absence of developer type annotations. Types can usually be inferred by the LLM based on the operations that get performed on them. Even in cases where only the library’s interface is available (as is the case for native libraries), LEXO can generate quality inputs informed by context such as the function and argument names. Combining the above, LEXO can often reach all of the library’s logic with only a small set of inputs (table 2).

Input filtering: After LEXO instruments the LLM instance to generate a set of inputs I_g for f_n , it parses and splits the generated set into individual inputs i_g . The system then inspects the generated text for syntactic correctness using the source language’s parser.

LEXO rejects any invalid input and keeps a record of all valid inputs between revisions (§7), adding new ones to the set at each iteration.

Output capture: After input generation, each input is serialized back into text form. Then, LEXO creates a program written in the target language that includes a routine which executes each one of the generated inputs I against the original component.

At this point, LEXO takes each input $i \in I$ and provides it to the original function f_n , resulting in a corresponding output o . LEXO dynamically adds serialization logic and records the output of the source library from standard output. Following, the system inspects the output for correctness in the context of the source language and again serializes it. LEXO records the component’s behavior both in cases of valid output returned as well as any exceptions thrown, in which case it records the exception’s type and message. LEXO then adds each I/O pair tuple $\langle i, o \rangle$ into the set of example I/O pairs E .

6 Program Synthesis

After generating a set of input-output pairs that adequately capture the f_n ’s client-observable behavior, LEXO moves on to synthesize a replacement function f'_n .

Natural language algorithm: LEXO starts by inspecting the generated I/O pair set I and instructs an LLM instance to produce an algorithm in natural language that describes at a high level the implementation of a function that would satisfy the I/O pairs (full prompt in §A).

Given this test suite, design an algorithm that describes the function.

- 1) Understand the Test Suite
- 2) Analyze the Problem
- 3) Design the Algorithm
- 4) Handle Edge Cases

A snippet of an algorithm generated for the `flatMap-stream` library is:

1. Check if the input is ‘undefined’. If so, return ‘[]’.
2. Check if the input is ‘null’. If so, return ‘[null]’. ...

LEXO then provides this natural language description together with the E set of I/O examples. Before providing I/O pairs to the LLM, LEXO first converts the intermediate input-output pair format into a form that more closely resembles the syntax of the target language. This helps instruct the LLM to synthesize the target component using I/O pairs, without having to re-state the semantics of the chosen I/O pair format. For example, the I/O pair {input: [3, 4], output: 7} for a library function f that implements addition would be included in the prompt as $f(3, 4) = 7$.

The program synthesis prompt includes all generated I/O pairs. LEXO does not remove examples that include incorrect input types or values that result in exceptions, as input sanitization and error conditions from the original library should be retained after regeneration.

Equality checks: After each synthesis attempt, LEXO verifies that $f'_n(i) = o$ holds for every input-output pair $\langle i, o \rangle \in E$. LEXO uses the language’s *deep-equality* operation, which recursively compares the two values. The operation traverses language values down to their primitive types, where it then checks for literal equality. In the case of function-like values, LEXO performs pointer equality.

7 Guardrails

LEXO applies guardrails to reject both malformed input candidates and incorrect synthesized programs.

During candidate input generation, LEXO checks that the final input set results in 100% code coverage of the original library. If not, it enters a revision loop, in which it improves inputs using code coverage as a metric. During this, the LLM is instructed to focus on edge cases present in the given source code. If the condition of the code coverage threshold fails, the I/O generation part of the implemented pipeline is re-run, now modified, with the failed generation being appended to the instruction prompt, together with a message instructing the LLM to create more diverse inputs to increase coverage. After three revisions, LEXO moves on to the program synthesis part of the implemented pipeline, using the I/O pairs it has generated so far. Reaching 100% code coverage might not be possible, as parts of the code could be intentionally unreachable as part of a sneaky attack.

Furthermore, during program synthesis, LEXO confirms that the produced code conforms to the full set of input/output pairs generated. If the assertion fails, LEXO reruns the program synthesis step, modifying the process by appending the failed code snippet to the instruction prompt. It also includes a message guiding the LLM to revise the code so

that it meets all input-output criteria, along with the specific examples that caused the failure. After three revisions, if the correctness module has not marked the output as correct, LEXO stops and discards the synthesized code, issuing a warning message to the user.

After regeneration completes, LEXO executes the tests created by the original library developers and issues an error if the regenerated component does not achieve 100% correctness.

To avoid malicious code regeneration, the original library implementation is treated as a “tainted” piece of data. This is then turned into a safe representation by generating a set of I/O pairs that capture its behavior. For example, when LEXO uses an LLM to analyze the synthesis problem (§8.1), it does not use the original implementation directly as input, as the LLM might consider the malicious snippet as part of the original library, include it in its analysis, and regenerate it. Thus, subsequent LLM instances LEXO instruments are provided only with the I/O pair representation of the component.




Fig. 3. Before the source component is converted into I/O pairs, LEXO treats it as tainted data.

8 Optimizations and Refinements

This section details additional optimizations that LEXO employs and refinements that have been made to the system.

8.1 Prompting Techniques

LEXO uses a number of prompting techniques to improve generation quality.

Chain-of-Thought: The Chain-of-thought (CoT) [85] prompting explicitly encourages a language model to generate a rationale before it produces a final answer. This approach has been shown to improve the ability of foundation models to perform complex tasks [20, 42, 64, 88]. LEXO uses a CoT stage for each LLM-assisted task.

Deconstruction: During the code regeneration phase, LEXO deconstructs the problem into smaller sub-tasks, a technique that has been shown to improve the ability of foundation models to perform complex reasoning [38]. Before regeneration, LEXO uses the generated set of I/O pairs to instruct the LLM to create a natural language description of the final program’s functionality. This allows the LLM to sketch an initial plan [52], where it pieces together, based on the given examples, what the final module’s functionality should be. Then, LEXO gives this high-level description as part of the regeneration prompt alongside the generated I/O examples,

when LEXO prompts the LLM to regenerate the library. Intuitively, this helps the LLM during synthesis to draw from this high-level description of the program’s functionality alongside concrete inputs and outputs.

8.2 Parallelization

LEXO performs regenerations in an isolated fashion, and is able to regenerate multiple libraries in parallel. The parallelization boundary is a single library. When run with the `--parallel` flag, LEXO begins regenerating the specified set of software components in parallel using half of the system’s available cores. LEXO schedules regeneration using lines-of-code as a priority metric, starting with smaller libraries first.

8.3 Early Exits

LEXO, when invoked with the `-e` flag will inspect the target component to identify if it falls under its model of regeneratable components. During the I/O generation phase, when LEXO exercises the component’s behavior on the set of generated inputs, if LEXO observes that one of the component’s return values are outside of LEXO’s regeneration capabilities, LEXO will abort regeneration and issue an error. Specifically, LEXO aborts when the return value of a component is of type `Function`, as during verification it can not attest function equivalence. In addition, the system will abort in case one of the LLM-generated inputs or component-produced outputs are not serializable. LEXO also discards libraries that read or write to environment variables, access the system’s time, perform file-system modifications or network requests. LEXO includes a predefined list of forbidden language-specific APIs that fall outside of its regeneration model and uses the `mir-sa` tool [81] to statically detect their use. Applying `mir-sa` on a given library results in a map that describes all top-level interactions it performs with global objects with regards to its `RWXI` permission model. LEXO filters this map and inspects all objects marked with the `I` (import) flag. If any objects are within the aforementioned list, regeneration halts and LEXO produces an error.

9 Evaluation

This section discusses the results of applying LEXO to real-world libraries to answer the following questions:

- **Q1:** How effective is LEXO at eliminating vulnerabilities in real-world malicious packages? LEXO successfully eliminates vulnerabilities that enable seven large-scale software supply-chain attacks. (§9.1)
- **Q2:** To what extent can LEXO correctly learn and regenerate the client-observable behavior of libraries? LEXO fully regenerates 72/155 libraries (100% of developer tests passing, followed by manual inspection), with an average correctness of 84.8%, when including both failed and successful regenerations. (§9.2)

- **Q3:** How efficient and scalable is LEXO’s regeneration when applied to real-world libraries? Regenerated libraries have an average performance overhead of 0.5% over the original implementations. (§9.3)
- **Q4:** How does LEXO compare to using a pure LLM to detect eliminate malicious code? LEXO outperforms a pure LLM approach in eliminating malicious code from all libraries implemented as native NodeJS addons, and the synthetic `leetlog` and `pad` supply-chain attacks. (§9.5)
- **Q5:** How does LEXO compare to state-of-the-art program synthesis techniques? Applied to the 17 libraries from the Harp benchmark set [79], Harp’s domain-specific synthesis engine and accompanying DSL outperforms LEXO. LEXO is able to correctly regenerate 5/17 libraries, while Harp regenerates 14/17. (§9.4)

Software and hardware setup: All experiments were conducted on a server with 62GB of memory and 12 physical cores with an 2.20 GHz Intel Core(TM) i7-10710U CPU @ 1.10GHz CPU, running Ubuntu 24.04.1 LTS 6.8.0-41-generic. The setup uses Node.js v18.19.1 and CPython 3.12.3.

Implementation details: The LEXO prototype is developed in 1283 lines of Python code and 93 lines of JavaScript code. LEXO uses the `dspy` library [37], a Python library that provides a high-level interface for interacting with LLMs using a constrained programming model that allows for the specification of prompts and LLM-assisted computations in a structured manner. LEXO’s two stages are implemented as two `dspy Modules`: one for generating inputs and obtaining I/O pairs, and another for synthesizing the component from the I/O pairs.

9.1 Security

To answer **Q1**, we collected seven libraries from publicized supply-chain security incidents [5, 60], the Backstabber’s Knife Collection (BKC) [53], and hand-crafted examples designed to by bypass an LLM’s ability to detect malicious code. To confirm that LEXO successfully eliminates each attack we (1) manually inspected the regenerated libraries to ensure that LEXO produces a secure and vulnerability-free implementation, without introducing new vulnerabilities and (2) applied the `mir-sa` tool [81] to the regenerated libraries and confirmed that no calls to sensitive APIs (*i.e.*, `eval`, `require`, `child_process.exec`, *etc.*) were present. The following paragraphs present the results of applying LEXO to eliminate malicious or vulnerable code.

Event-Stream: The event-stream incident [5] is a supply-chain attack that introduced a malicious dependency into the event-stream library. The setup for the event-stream library includes the original library [78] and a re-implementation of the malicious `flatMap-stream` dependency [32]. The incident is discussed extensively in §2. LEXO successfully regenerates the `flatMap-stream` library, removing the activation conditions checks and the payloads themselves.




Fig. 4. Results of library regeneration correctness across different models. x -axis represents libraries from npm. y -axis measures the percentage of developer-provided tests successfully passed by the regenerated libraries. Shading represents the percentage of I/O pairs that the regenerated library passes. LEXo automatically reports inability to regenerate when correctness is below 100%. The same set of libraries is present in all three plots in descending order of correctness against developer-made tests.

Firefox: The Skia graphics library used by Mozilla Firefox had a buffer overflow vulnerability [25]. The Skia library performed improper buffer offset calculations using 32-bit arithmetic, which led to potential overflow conditions during hardware-accelerated 2D canvas actions. This vulnerability allowed for a potentially exploitable crash that could be leveraged for remote code execution or denial of service attacks. We inject the same vulnerability to a JavaScript character-counting library, implemented as a native Node.js addon, and use LEXo to regenerate it. LEXo successfully regenerates the library, removing the buffer overflow vulnerability, producing memory-safe JavaScript code that does not use memory-unsafe language features.

Left-Pad: The left-pad incident [15] occurred when a popular JavaScript library, used by multiple projects such as React and Babel, affecting production environments such as LinkedIn and Facebook. LEXo is applied to the library built

by npm in response to the incident. LEXo successfully regenerates the library, which when used as a drop-in replacement passes all developer-provided test cases, with a performance overhead of 1.1%.

String-Compare: The string-compare attack involves the coexistence of two versions of a single library within the same codebase [23]. One version is harmless and is used in a sorting function. The other version, used as a dependency of an authentication module, showcases malicious behavior when it receives the specific authentication string gbaWhaRQ, at which point it gains access to the file system of the server on which the program is operating. LEXo successfully regenerates both libraries, removing the malicious code from the second version.

Leetlog: The leetlog library provides functionality to log strings to the console in a variety of different colors. The library contains an actively malicious snippet that appends

Tab. 2. Summary of correctness and performance results from applying LEXO on libraries from the npm ecosystem. Columns t_{gen} and t_{synth} report wall-clock time for the I/O pair generation and code regeneration phases respectively (including revisions); *Revision* columns include the total numbers of revisions LEXO took for I/O pair generation and program synthesis; *Coverage* column shows code coverage of the generated I/O pairs to the original library. Other columns provide characteristics of the regenerated code in comparison to the original implementation. For these results, LEXO uses GPT 4o as the back-end LLM.

Name	Library		I/O Pair Generation				Program Synthesis			
	Domain	Language	t_{gen} (s)	# Rev	# Pairs	Cov/age (%)	t_{synth} (s)	# Rev	Perf. (%)	Correctness (%)
cartesian-product	array	JavaScript	9.44	3	1	81.13	8.10	1	99.19	100.00
bernoulli_distribution	math	JavaScript	9.09	1	10	100.00	64.72	3	95.97	100.00
pluck	collection	JavaScript	7.90	1	13	100.00	7.26	1	94.68	100.00
harp-trim-left	string	JavaScript	10.46	1	8	100.00	25.06	1	85.38	100.00
is-weakref	is	JavaScript	25.78	3	8	90.47	19.11	1	68.95	100.00
character-count	string	C++	12.54	1	9	100.00	23.36	1	104.35	100.00
safe-get	object	JavaScript	30.76	3	12	96.72	33.88	2	99.17	100.00
factorial	math	JavaScript	5.49	1	10	100.00	24.22	1	93.75	100.00
capitalize	string	JavaScript	7.54	1	8	100.00	17.94	2	75.38	100.00
mean	array	JavaScript	10.27	1	12	100.00	5.86	1	99.16	100.00
replace-all	string	JavaScript	7.97	1	13	100.00	9.29	1	99.16	100.00
product	math	JavaScript	12.54	1	9	100.00	23.36	1	104.35	100.00
Min			23.94	0	100	49.14	1.82	0	35.33	0.00
Max			563.78	3	245	100.00	490.29	3	214.36	100.00
Avg			79.18	2	47.06	73.54	23.63	1	101.68	85.41

a predefined SSH key to the authorized keys to a target user of the system [27]. LEXO successfully regenerates the library, removing the malicious code.

Synthetic Pad: The pad library is a string padding function that contains a Remote Code Execution (RCE) vulnerability. The library, apart from its benign functionality, contains a section that fetches a code snippet from a remote server and executes it by converting the fetched code into a JavaScript function object and calling it. LEXO successfully regenerates the library and removes the vulnerability, synthesizing only the padding functionality, as the fetching of the URL constitutes side-effectful behavior.

Synthetic Left-Pad: The synthetic-left-pad library is a modified version of the left-pad library [49, 95]. The library performs its advertised functionality as expected, except for an attack that activates if the PRODUCTION environment variable is set to true. In that case, the library accesses the file system, reading a file specified by the input and logs its contents to the console. The library includes checks for known JavaScript vulnerabilities, such as path traversal, and ostensibly follows best practices by using try-catch blocks and throwing errors when it deems the input to be unsafe. LEXO successfully regenerates the library, regenerating the padding functionality without the file-system access

Benign libraries: LEXO is also applied to 155 benign libraries that feature no known vulnerabilities or malicious behavior. After manually inspecting each regenerated library and applying the mir-sa static analysis tool to extract sensitive API calls, we find that LEXO does not introduce new

vulnerabilities or malicious behavior, even in cases where it does not reach 100% correctness.

9.2 Correctness

For Q2, we apply LEXO on a collection of 155 benign libraries spanning 7 different domains (array, collection, is, math, object, string, stream) from the npm ecosystem. We also include native modules written in C or C++ and loaded into Node.js via require. Libraries used are 4–230 lines of code, averaging 32 lines of code. To confirm correctness of the regenerated components, we (1) use developer-provided test-cases and (2) manual inspection of the regenerated code.

For evaluation, we compared the performance of LEXO across three models of varying sizes and capabilities over 155 libraries: Mistral (7B parameters) [35], GPT-3.5 (175B parameters) [94], and GPT-4o (1T+ parameters) [54].

Results show that with Mistral, LEXO exhibited the weakest performance, with only 14 libraries regenerated correctly and 15 cases of incorrect regeneration that weren’t accompanied by an appropriate error message, as the regenerated libraries succeeded on all I/O pair examples. When using GPT-3.5, LEXO passed 49 developer test suites, with 35 libraries passing both test types, and showed a higher proportion (33 libraries) of cases where libraries that performed correctly against the I/O pairs failed developer-provided tests. Finally, with GPT-4o as its backend LLM, LEXO achieved the highest accuracy, correctly regenerating 96 libraries, with 72 libraries passing both developer-provided tests and conforming fully to the generated I/O examples, and 14 cases of incorrect regeneration. These results demonstrate that LEXO’s techniques scale with model quality.

The synthesized programs reveal several interesting insights and patterns. LEXO-generated code often lacks the optimizations commonly implemented by library developers, such as early exits or caching. For instance, the `left-pad` library, pre-computes padding for strings below a certain length and returns it directly. In contrast, LEXO tends to produce straightforward implementations without attempting similar optimizations. LEXO also omits domain-specific knowledge. For example, in the `is` family of libraries, LEXO-generated code frequently fails to account for all edge cases, and often misses JavaScript-specific patterns, such as checking an object’s string representation to decide if an object is circular, as in the `is-circular` library. LEXO has weak performance on libraries that involve complex string transformations or perform non-trivial math.

9.3 Performance

For **Q3**, we evaluate the performance of LEXO using the GPT-4o model as its backend LLM across the 155 libraries in the evaluation set. We measure how long it takes to regenerate a library and the performance overhead of each regenerated library. We report the wall-clock time difference between the start and end of the regeneration process, split between the I/O pair generation and program synthesis phases. Additionally, to assess the performance overhead of the regenerated code compared to the original implementations, we run the test suite of each library using both versions. We repeat each performance experiment 100 times and report averages.

LEXO takes an average of 147.16 seconds (minimum 42.1s, maximum 445.2s) to fully regenerate a library, with 107.6 seconds on average spent on the generation of input/output pairs and 40.56 seconds on program synthesis. LEXO incurs an average performance overhead of 0.83% for the regenerated libraries, with a minimum of 0% and a maximum of 91%. On 14 instances, the regenerated library outperforms the original implementation, while on 13 instances, the performance overhead exceeds 100%. On one instance (`decamelize`), the regenerated library timed out during test suite execution. Upon inspection, the generated library includes a bug that results in an infinite loop if the input string is empty.

9.4 Comparing against Program Synthesis

For **Q5**, we include Harp’s full benchmark set of libraries [79] to compare LEXO’s performance and compatibility with state-of-the-art program synthesis techniques.

An approach to eliminate vulnerabilities in libraries is to use program synthesis [79]. These tools generate functionally equivalent versions of libraries from a set of input-output pairs. However, despite their effectiveness, they are often restricted in applicability across different domains and require a domain-specific language (DSL) to be defined for each new library domain.

LEXO, in contrast, can automatically regenerate libraries across a broader range of domains while maintaining high

levels of correctness. For instance, Harp is limited to regenerating libraries with string or stream processing components, such as `left-pad` and `trim`. LEXO, on the other hand, is constrained only by the expressiveness of the input-output pairs used to describe the library’s functionality.

9.5 Comparing against a Pure LLM

For **Q4**, we provide the source code of the same malicious components to a state-of-the-art LLM. We use GPT 4o with a prompt that instructs the model to generate a functionally equivalent software component, with any malicious code removed (§B). We evaluate the security and functionality of the produced code in an identical manner as LEXO’s regeneration.

Given libraries with simple functionality like `left-pad`, `trim`, and `string-compare`, GPT 4o generates a functionally equivalent version of the library while removing the malicious behavior. If the malicious behavior is distinct from the core functionality of the library, GPT 4o can easily remove it by copying the core library code and ignoring any clearly malicious lines. In these cases, the generated code passes the developer-provided tests and is free of vulnerabilities, making this approach a viable alternative to LEXO.

In the case of the `pad` supply-chain attack (§9.1), the malicious code snippet fetches unknown source code from a URL. The LLM understands the call to `fetch` as benign, as it is a common operation and there is no context to suggest that the fetched code is malicious. Similarly, if the vulnerability exists in a compiled module that is included using `require`, with only the library interface implemented in JavaScript, as in the native `addon` vulnerabilities, an LLM cannot “see” any vulnerabilities in the compiled artifact and may simply copy the original code, failing to provide a secure version of the library. In both of these cases, LEXO interacts with the library in a black-box manner, generates a set of I/O pairs that adequately exercise the library’s functionality, and uses these pairs to synthesize a new version of the library. For the `pad` library, the regenerated library includes only the padding functionality, as fetching code from a URL is not representable by the intermediate I/O pair format.

Prompt-based adversarial attack: Prompt-based adversarial attacks [91] can also be used to trick an LLM into classifying malicious code as benign, and failing to remove it. We employ this technique on the `synthetic-left-pad` and `leetlog`. The attack involves an adversary (1) creating a library with an actively malicious snippet, (2) providing the library source code to an LLM, (3) prompting the model to “improve” the code using “best practices”, including error handling, and safety checks while not modifying any of the malicious behavior (4) repeating the process until the target model no longer recognizes the malicious code as such. In our setup, we use the Mixtral model [36] to generate the adversarial examples, providing it with the source code of the




Fig. 5. Microbenchmark results. Results on the impact of I/O pairs, an LLM-generated algorithm, and the library name on regenerated library correctness. Base correctness is under the default LEXO configuration. The y -axis shows the percentage of passed developer-provided tests.

malicious libraries and a prompt that instructs the model to `improve the code`, adding error handling and safety checks. In the case of `synthetic-left-pad`, the Mixtral model adds `try-catch` blocks around the malicious code that reads the contents of a file in the host file system and logs it to the console. GPT 4o not only fails to recognize the vulnerabilities and malicious snippets in these libraries, but also does not remove them when prompted. LEXO synthesizes a secure, vulnerability-free version of the library by first generating a set of inputs to test the library’s padding functionality. Based on the resulting I/O pairs, it synthesizes a new version of the library that includes only the padding functionality. File-system access is excluded, as it is (1) not exercised during the I/O pair generation phase (the attack only activates if the `PRODUCTION` environment variable is set to true), and (2) cannot be represented by the I/O pairs.

9.6 Microbenchmarks

Figure 5 summarizes the results of microbenchmarks evaluating the effect of providing the LLM with I/O pairs, the LLM-generated natural-language algorithm, and the library name on the correctness of the regenerated library. In the experiment where the generated I/O pairs are omitted, LEXO omits the natural-language algorithm generation based on them. LEXO achieves an average correctness of 82% when using the default configuration that includes the full prompt pipeline. The most impactful modification is the removal of the I/O pairs extracted from the source component, which reduces the average regeneration correctness to 57%. These results indicate the LEXO’s program synthesis quality relies heavily on the expressiveness of the I/O example set. Additional information such as the function’s name does increase regeneration quality in cases where the library’s function can be trivially derived from its name, but is not instrumental to synthesis performance.

10 Related Work

Existing techniques for supply-chain security are not directly comparable to LEXO, as they often focus on merely detecting

security vulnerabilities, rather than removing them or are limited to narrow domains or types of attacks.

LLMs for security: An emerging field is the application of LLMs for security [2, 3, 50, 58, 89, 93]. While these approaches can have great success, they are still vulnerable in cases where a library’s source code is not available or where malicious code has been constructed in such a way that it appears as intended functionality (§9.5). LEXO avoids these risks using an inference and regeneration pipeline that does not rely on an LLM’s ability to identify malicious code, and provides tunable correctness guarantees.

LLMs for test-case generation: Test generation using LLMs involves prompting an LLM to create unit tests for a software component [26, 65, 67]. Research has also been done on generating tests to uncover software security vulnerabilities [96]. LEXO differs in the way that the generated I/O examples are meant to capture the observable behavior of the library, rather than uncovering vulnerabilities or testing functionality—while its I/O pair format is highly constrained and includes only specific language primitives, avoiding the risk of encoding side-effectful malicious behaviors.

Component isolation: Component isolation techniques involve securing individual components through sandboxing, interposition, wrapping, and access checks [1, 39, 44, 47, 48, 63, 68]. LEXO, instead, replaces the original component with one that exhibits the same client-facing functionality. It does not employ sandboxing or wrapping to enforce security policies on the regenerated component and thus has no runtime overhead during the production execution of a component. LEXO’s sandboxing is used during inference when LEXO interacts with a potentially malicious library.

Program synthesis: Program synthesis, programming by example, and component-based synthesis [4, 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, 34, 45, 57, 59, 70, 71, 79, 92] are methods for automatically generating programs, either from high-level specifications, example inputs and outputs, or reusable components, respectively. They often involve techniques such as constraint solving, refinement types, and interactive feedback. LEXO differs from these approaches in two major ways (1) regeneration leverages an LLM instead of a domain-specific program inference algorithm, and (2) programs produced during the regeneration phase do not have to conform to a domain-specific language (DSL). Lifting these constraints allows LEXO’s inference and regeneration to scale *across* domains without any domain expertise—*e.g.*, string transforms, stream processing, array calculations, math operations, *etc.*

Similar to works that employ active learning for collecting input-output examples [79], LEXO does not require any pre-provided input-output examples. Instead, it generates a set of inputs based on the target library’s source code and subsequently refines this set using code coverage metrics.

Software de-bloating: Software de-bloating [6, 8, 9, 40] is a technique that removes unused or unnecessary code

from software components. This is typically achieved by analyzing their execution under controlled environments or performing reachability analysis to identify and eliminate code that is not invoked or required for the observed functionality. LEXO differs from this approach, as it does not remove specific code segments, but rather regenerates the entire library from scratch. In addition, LEXO removes all potentially malicious library functionality that might run during inference, as long as it doesn't affect the observable behavior of the target library.

Vulnerability detection: Static and dynamic analysis (and their combination) [10, 16, 19, 31, 33, 41, 43, 46, 56, 66, 76, 80, 82, 84, 90] attempt to detect vulnerabilities present in a given software artifact or infer information about the behavior of a program to enforce it at runtime. Instead of attempting to infer malicious or benign behavior, LEXO completely regenerates a component into a vulnerability-free version with equivalent functionality.

11 Discussion & Limitations

LEXO comes with a number of limitations that open up exciting possibilities for future work.

Library operation: The current version of LEXO operates at the function level of individual libraries, regenerating pure functions that they expose. LEXO is able to detect if a library falls outside this scope during regeneration, at which point it will halt and produce an error message. The library's client-visible behavior should be representable by LEXO's intermediate I/O pair format. LEXO focuses on regenerating simple libraries that perform arbitrary computations and are typically around or below 150 lines of code. The current LEXO prototype has been implemented to regenerate libraries written as NodeJS modules or wrapped as a native NodeJS module and implemented in any language.

Attacks on outputs: Consistent with the model of threats it protects against (§3), LEXO does not protect against malicious code present in library outputs. For example, LEXO does not aim to defend against a malicious library that returns incorrect outputs when certain conditions are met—after all, malicious input-output behavior will be modeled as part of LEXO's IO pairs and eventually be regenerated.

Concealing benign behaviors: If a component's source is modified in a way that it conceals or affects its benign behavior, then LEXO's I/O pairs will not be able to encode the intended behavior of the library—resulting in incorrect code generation that fails developer tests. In this case, LEXO will issue an error, indicating inability to regenerate the component. Such overt attacks can be detected and mitigated using conventional analysis and transformation approaches (§10).

Extending LEXO to more languages: Extending LEXO to target a new language requires adding (1) new, slightly modified, prompts to instruct the LLM back-end to generate code in the target language, (2) an appropriate code-coverage

subsystem analyzing and reporting library coverage for the target language, (3) serialization and deserialization support for the I/O pairs in the target language. In our experience, all three can be implemented in about an afternoon for popular languages that offer code-coverage and serialization functionality either built-in or via third-party libraries.

12 Conclusion

Supply-chain attacks on software repositories are an escalating concern in today's digital landscape. This work presented LEXO, a system designed to automatically learn and regenerate potentially malicious libraries into safe, vulnerability-free versions. LEXO instruments multiple LLM instances, reinforced with guardrails to ensure correctness and completeness. LEXO achieves high levels of correctness and performance across domains.

This work is a crucial step towards regenerating safe versions of entire software ecosystems, *i.e.*, ones that minimize the risks of supply-chain incidents in a language- and domain-agnostic fashion.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) through award CNS-2247687, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), through contract HR001120C0191, a Brown Computer Science Faculty Innovators Fund, and a Google ML-and-Systems Junior Faculty Award. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF or DARPA.

References

- [1] Pieter Agten, Steven Van Acker, Yoran Brondsema, Phu H. Phung, Lieven Desmet, and Frank Piessens. 2012. JSand: Complete Client-side Sandboxing of Third-party JavaScript Without Browser Modifications. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference* (Orlando, Florida, USA) (ACSAC '12). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2420950.2420952>
- [2] Vishwanath Akuthota, Raghunandan Kasula, Saba Tasnim Sumona, Masud Mohiuddin, Md Tanzim Reza, and Md Mizanur Rahman. 2023. Vulnerability Detection and Monitoring Using LLM. In *2023 IEEE 9th International Women in Engineering (WIE) Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering (WIECON-ECE)*. IEEE, 309–314.
- [3] Jamal Al-Karaki, Muhammad Al-Zafar Khan, and Marwan Omar. 2024. Exploring LLMs for Malware Detection: Review, Framework Design, and Countermeasure Approaches. arXiv:2409.07587 [cs.CR] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.07587>
- [4] Rajeev Alur, Rastislav Bodik, Garvit Juniwal, Milo MK Martin, Mukund Raghodhan, Sanjit A Seshia, Rishabh Singh, Armando Solar-Lezama, Emina Torlak, and Abhishek Udupa. 2013. Syntax-guided synthesis. In *2013 Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [5] Iosif Arvanitis, Grigoris Ntousakis, Sotiris Ioannidis, and Nikos Vasilakis. 2022. A Systematic Analysis of the Event-Stream Incident. In *15th European Workshop on Systems Security* (Rennes, France) (EuroSec '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3517208.3523753>

- [6] Babak Amin Azad, Pierre Laperdrix, and Nick Nikiforakis. 2019. Less is more: quantifying the security benefits of debloating web applications. In *28th {USENIX} Security Symposium ({USENIX} Security 19)*. 1697–1714.
- [7] BITPAY INC. 2015. *Copay*. <https://github.com/bitpay/copay/> Accessed: 2021-09-09.
- [8] Michael D. Brown, Adam Meily, Brian Fairservice, Akshay Sood, Jonathan Dorn, Eric Kilmer, and Ronald Eytchison. 2024. A Broad Comparative Evaluation of Software Debloating Tools. arXiv:2312.13274
- [9] Michael D. Brown and Santosh Pande. 2019. CARVE: Practical Security-Focused Software Debloating Using Simple Feature Set Mappings. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Workshop on Forming an Ecosystem Around Software Transformation (CCS '19)*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3338502.3359764>
- [10] Stefano Calzavara, Michele Bugliesi, Silvia Crafa, and Enrico Steffanlongo. 2015. Fine-grained detection of privilege escalation attacks on browser extensions. In *Programming Languages and Systems: 24th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2015, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2015, London, UK, April 11-18, 2015, Proceedings 24*. Springer, 510–534.
- [11] José P. Cambronero, Thurston H. Y. Dang, Nikos Vasilakis, Jiasi Shen, Jerry Wu, and Martin C. Rinard. 2019. Active Learning for Software Engineering. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on New Ideas, New Paradigms, and Reflections on Programming and Software* (Athens, Greece) (*Onward! 2019*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 62–78. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3359591.3359732>
- [12] Kevin Chen, Warren He, Devdatta Akhawe, Vijay D 'Silva, Prateek Mittal, and Dawn Song. 2015. ASPIRE: Iterative Specification Synthesis for Security. In *15th Workshop on Hot Topics in Operating Systems (HotOS XV)*. USENIX Association, Kartause Ittingen, Switzerland. https://www.usenix.org/conference/hotos15/workshop-program/presentation/chen_kevin
- [13] Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, and Dawn Song. 2018. Towards Synthesizing Complex Programs from Input-Output Examples. arXiv:1706.01284
- [14] Cloudflare. 2023. SolarWinds Orion Compromise Trend Data. <https://blog.cloudflare.com/solarwinds-orion-compromise-trend-data/> Accessed: 2024-10-30.
- [15] Keith Collins. 2016. *How one programmer broke the internet by deleting a tiny piece of code*. <https://qz.com/646467/how-one-programmer-broke-the-internet-by-deleting-a-tiny-piece-of-code>
- [16] Andreas Dewald, Thorsten Holz, and Felix C Freiling. 2010. ADSandbox: Sandboxing JavaScript to fight malicious websites. In *proceedings of the 2010 ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*. 1859–1864.
- [17] Cybersecurity Dive. 2024. Supply Chain Attack on 3CX Desktop Software Impacts Thousands. <https://www.cybersecuritydive.com/news/supply-chain-attack-3cx-desktop-thousands/646432/> Accessed: 2024-11-05.
- [18] Dominic Tarr. 2011. *Event-Stream*. <https://www.npmjs.com/package/event-stream> Accessed: 2021-09-09.
- [19] Aurore Fass, Michael Backes, and Ben Stock. 2019. Jstap: a static pre-filter for malicious javascript detection. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*. 257–269.
- [20] Guhao Feng, Bohang Zhang, Yuntian Gu, Haotian Ye, Di He, and Liwei Wang. 2024. Towards revealing the mystery behind chain of thought: a theoretical perspective. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [21] Yu Feng, Ruben Martins, Yuepeng Wang, Isil Dillig, and Thomas W Reps. 2017. Component-based synthesis for complex APIs. In *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*. 599–612.
- [22] John K Feser, Swarat Chaudhuri, and Isil Dillig. 2015. Synthesizing data structure transformations from input-output examples. In *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, Vol. 50. ACM, 229–239.
- [23] David Foy. 2019. The Frightening State of Security Around npm Package Management. <https://naildrivin5.com/blog/2019/07/10/the-frightening-state-security-around-npm-package-management.html>.
- [24] Joel Galenson, Philip Reames, Rastislav Bodik, Björn Hartmann, and Koushik Sen. 2014. Codehint: Dynamic and interactive synthesis of code snippets. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 653–663.
- [25] GitHub. 2018. GHSA-hr83-78x9-4cjp. <https://github.com/advisories/GHSA-hr83-78x9-4cjp> Accessed: 2024-06-17.
- [26] GitHub. 2023. About GitHub Copilot Chat in your IDE. <https://docs.github.com/en/copilot/github-copilot-chat/copilot-chat-in-ides/about-github-copilot-chat-in-your-ide> Accessed: 2024-06-22.
- [27] GitHub. 2023. GHSA-gfm8-g3vm-53jh: Cross-Site Scripting in SimpleMDE. <https://github.com/advisories/GHSA-gfm8-g3vm-53jh>. Accessed: 2023-10-31.
- [28] Andy Greenberg. 2019. A Mysterious Hacker Group Is On a Supply Chain Hijacking Spree. *Wired* (May 2019). <https://www.wired.com/story/barium-supply-chain-hackers/> Accessed: 2023-10-20.
- [29] Sumit Gulwani. 2011. Automating string processing in spreadsheets using input-output examples. In *ACM Sigplan Notices*, Vol. 46. ACM, 317–330.
- [30] Shivam Handa and Martin C. Rinard. 2020. Inductive program synthesis over noisy data. *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering* (Nov 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3368089.3409732>
- [31] Xunchao Hu, Yao Cheng, Yue Duan, Andrew Henderson, and Heng Yin. 2018. Jsforce: A forced execution engine for malicious javascript detection. In *Security and Privacy in Communication Networks: 13th International Conference, SecureComm 2017, Niagara Falls, ON, Canada, October 22–25, 2017, Proceedings 13*. Springer, 704–720.
- [32] hugeglass. 2024. flatmap-stream. <https://github.com/hugeglass/flatmap-stream>. Accessed: 2024-06-19.
- [33] Konrad Jamrozik, Philipp von Styp-Rekowsky, and Andreas Zeller. 2016. Mining sandboxes. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2016, Austin, TX, USA, May 14–22, 2016*, Laura K. Dillon, Willem Visser, and Laurie A. Williams (Eds.). ACM, 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2884781.2884782>
- [34] Susmit Jha, Sumit Gulwani, Sanjit A Seshia, and Ashish Tiwari. 2010. Oracle-guided component-based program synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering—Volume 1*. 215–224.
- [35] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. Mistral 7B. arXiv:2310.06825 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06825>
- [36] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, Léo Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Théophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. Mixtral of Experts. arXiv:2401.04088 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.04088>
- [37] Omar Khattab, Arnav Singhvi, Paridhi Maheshwari, Zhiyuan Zhang, Keshav Santhanam, Sri Vardhamanan, Saiful Haq, Ashutosh Sharma, Thomas T. Joshi, Hanna Moazam, Heather Miller, Matei Zaharia, and Christopher Potts. 2023. DSPy: Compiling Declarative Language Model Calls into Self-Improving Pipelines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03714* (2023).

- [38] Tushar Khot, Harsh Trivedi, Matthew Finlayson, Yao Fu, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2023. Decomposed Prompting: A Modular Approach for Solving Complex Tasks. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. https://openreview.net/forum?id=_nGgzQjzaRy
- [39] Yoonseok Ko, Tamara Rezk, and Manuel Serrano. 2021. SecureJS Compiler: Portable Memory Isolation in JavaScript. In *SAC 2021-The 36th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium On Applied Computing*.
- [40] Igbek Koishybayev and Alexandros Kapravelos. 2020. Mininode: Reducing the Attack Surface of Node.js Applications. In *23rd International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses (RAID) 2020*.
- [41] Larry Koved, Marco Pistoia, and Aaron Kershenbaum. 2002. Access rights analysis for Java. In *Proceedings of the 2002 ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Object-Oriented Programming Systems, Languages and Applications, OOPSLA 2002, Seattle, Washington, USA, November 4-8, 2002*, Mamdouh Ibrahim and Satoshi Matsuoka (Eds.). ACM, 359–372. <https://doi.org/10.1145/582419.582452>
- [42] Jia Li, Ge Li, Yongmin Li, and Zhi Jin. 2023. Structured chain-of-thought prompting for code generation. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2023).
- [43] Sergio Maffei and Ankur Taly. 2009. Language-based isolation of untrusted Javascript. In *2009 22nd IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*. IEEE, 77–91.
- [44] Jonas Magazinius, Daniel Hedin, and Andrei Sabelfeld. 2014. Architectures for inlining security monitors in web applications. In *International Symposium on Engineering Secure Software and Systems*. Springer, 141–160.
- [45] David Mandelin, Lin Xu, Rastislav Bodík, and Doug Kimelman. 2005. Jungloid mining: helping to navigate the API jungle. *ACM Sigplan Notices* 40, 6 (2005), 48–61.
- [46] Jian Mao, Jingdong Bian, Guangdong Bai, Ruilong Wang, Yue Chen, Yinhao Xiao, and Zhenkai Liang. 2018. Detecting malicious behaviors in javascript applications. *Ieee Access* 6 (2018), 12284–12294.
- [47] Leo A Meyerovich and Benjamin Livshits. 2010. ConScript: Specifying and enforcing fine-grained security policies for Javascript in the browser. In *2010 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. IEEE, 481–496.
- [48] Marius Musch, Marius Steffens, Sebastian Roth, Ben Stock, and Martin Johns. 2019. ScriptProtect: mitigating unsafe third-party javascript practices. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 391–402.
- [49] Author’s Name. Year of publication. left-pad. <https://www.npmjs.com/package/left-pad>. Accessed: Date of access.
- [50] David Noever. 2023. Can Large Language Models Find And Fix Vulnerable Software? arXiv:2308.10345 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.10345>
- [51] npm, Inc. 2018. *Details about the event-stream incident*. <https://blog.npmjs.org/post/180565383195/details-about-the-event-stream-incident> Accessed: 2018-12-18.
- [52] Maxwell Nye, Anders Johan Andreassen, Guy Gur-Ari, Henryk Michalewski, Jacob Austin, David Bieber, David Dohan, Aitor Lewkowycz, Maarten Bosma, David Luan, Charles Sutton, and Augustus Odena. 2021. Show Your Work: Scratchpads for Intermediate Computation with Language Models. arXiv:2112.00114 [cs.LG]
- [53] Marc Ohm, Henrik Plate, Arnold Sykosch, and Michael Meier. 2020. Backstabber’s Knife Collection: A Review of Open Source Software Supply Chain Attacks. In *International Conference on Detection of Intrusions and Malware, and Vulnerability Assessment*. Springer.
- [54] OpenAI. 2024. GPT-4o System Card. arXiv:2410.21276 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.21276>
- [55] Kanghee Park, Jiayu Wang, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, Nadia Polikarpova, and Loris D’Antoni. 2024. Grammar-Aligned Decoding. arXiv:2405.21047 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.21047>
- [56] Phu H Phung, Allen Varghese, Bojue Wang, Yu Zhao, and Chong Yu. 2024. JSMBBox—A Runtime Monitoring Framework for Analyzing and Classifying Malicious JavaScript. In *International Conference on Software Engineering and Data Engineering*. Springer, 100–122.
- [57] Nadia Polikarpova, Ivan Kuraj, and Armando Solar-Lezama. 2016. Program synthesis from polymorphic refinement types. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 51, 6 (2016), 522–538.
- [58] Moumita Das Purba, Arpita Ghosh, Benjamin J. Radford, and Bill Chu. 2023. Software Vulnerability Detection using Large Language Models. In *2023 IEEE 34th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering Workshops (ISSREW)*. 112–119. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSREW60843.2023.00058>
- [59] Mohammad Raza and Sumit Gulwani. 2018. Disjunctive Program Synthesis: A Robust Approach to Programming by Example. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [60] The Register. 2016. How one developer just broke Node, Babel and thousands of projects in 11 lines of JavaScript. https://www.theregister.com/2016/03/23/npm_left_pad_chaos/
- [61] Pranab Sahoo, Ayush Kumar Singh, Sriparna Saha, Vinija Jain, Samrat Mondal, and Aman Chadha. 2024. A Systematic Survey of Prompt Engineering in Large Language Models: Techniques and Applications. (Feb 2024). arXiv:2402.07927v1 [cs.AI] <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.07927v1>
- [62] Sansec. 2023. Polyfill Supply Chain Attack. <https://sansec.io/research/polyfill-supply-chain-attack> Accessed: 2024-10-30.
- [63] José Fragoso Santos and Tamara Rezk. 2014. An information flow monitor-inlining compiler for securing a core of javascript. In *IFIP International Information Security Conference*. Springer, 278–292.
- [64] Abulhair Saparov and He He. 2022. Language models are greedy reasoners: A systematic formal analysis of chain-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01240* (2022).
- [65] Arkadii Sapozhnikov, Mitchell Olsthoorn, Annibale Panichella, Vladimir Kovalenko, and Pouria Derakhshanfar. 2024. TestSpark: Intellij IDEA’s Ultimate Test Generation Companion. arXiv:2401.06580
- [66] Kristof Schütt, Marius Kloft, Alexander Bikadorov, and Konrad Rieck. 2012. Early detection of malicious behavior in javascript code. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Workshop on Security and Artificial Intelligence*. 15–24.
- [67] Max Schäfer, Sarah Nadi, Aryaz Eghbali, and Frank Tip. 2023. An Empirical Evaluation of Using Large Language Models for Automated Unit Test Generation. arXiv:2302.06527
- [68] R. Sekar, V.N. Venkatakrishnan, Samik Basu, Sandeep Bhatkar, and Daniel C. DuVarney. 2003. Model-Carrying Code: A Practical Approach for Safe Execution of Untrusted Applications. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles* (Bolton Landing, NY, USA) (SOSP ’03). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.1145/945445.945448>
- [69] Jiasi Shen and Martin C. Rinard. 2019. Using Active Learning to Synthesize Models of Applications That Access Databases. In *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation* (Phoenix, AZ, USA) (PLDI 2019). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 269–285. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3314221.3314591>
- [70] Kensen Shi, Jacob Steinhardt, and Percy Liang. 2019. FrAngel: component-based synthesis with control structures. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 3, POPL (2019), 1–29.
- [71] Rishabh Singh. 2016. Blinkfil: Semi-supervised programming by example for syntactic string transformations. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 9, 10 (2016), 816–827.
- [72] Snyk. 2018. SNYK-JS-EVENTSTREAM-72638: Malicious Package in event-stream. <https://security.snyk.io/vuln/SNYK-JS-EVENTSTREAM-72638> Accessed: 2024-06-09.
- [73] Snyk. 2018. SNYK-JS-FLATMAPSTREAM-72637: Malicious Package in flatmap-stream. <https://security.snyk.io/vuln/SNYK-JS-FLATMAPSTREAM-72637> Accessed: 2024-06-09.

- [74] Sonatype. 2024. CVE-2024-3094: The Targeted Backdoor Supply Chain Attack Against xz and liblzma. <https://www.sonatype.com/blog/cve-2024-3094-the-targeted-backdoor-supply-chain-attack-against-xz-and-liblzma> Accessed: 2024-10-30.
- [75] Ayrton Sparling et al. 2018. *Event-Stream*, *GitHub Issue 116: I don't know what to say*. <https://github.com/dominictarr/event-stream/issues/116> Accessed: 2018-12-18.
- [76] Jack W Stokes, Rakshit Agrawal, Geoff McDonald, and Matthew Hausknecht. 2019. Scriptnet: Neural static analysis for malicious javascript detection. In *MILCOM 2019-2019 IEEE Military Communications Conference (MILCOM)*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [77] Zhi Rui Tam, Cheng-Kuang Wu, Yi-Lin Tsai, Chieh-Yen Lin, Hung yi Lee, and Yun-Nung Chen. 2024. Let Me Speak Freely? A Study on the Impact of Format Restrictions on Performance of Large Language Models. arXiv:2408.02442 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.02442>
- [78] Dominic Tarr. 2018. event-stream: Commit e3163361fed01384c986b9b4c18feb1fc42b8285. <https://github.com/dominictarr/event-stream/commit/e3163361fed01384c986b9b4c18feb1fc42b8285>.
- [79] Nikos Vasilakis, Achilles Benetopoulos, Shivam Handa, Alizee Schoen, Jiasi Shen, and Martin C. Rinard. 2021. Supply-Chain Vulnerability Elimination via Active Learning and Regeneration. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (Virtual Event, Republic of Korea) (CCS '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460120.3484736>
- [80] Nikos Vasilakis, Grigoris Ntousakis, Veit Heller, and Martin C. Rinard. 2021. Efficient Module-Level Dynamic Analysis for Dynamic Languages with Module Recontextualization. In *ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE)*. 1202–1213.
- [81] Nikos Vasilakis, Cristian-Alexandru Staicu, Grigoris Ntousakis, Konstantinos Kallas, Ben Karel, André DeHon, and Michael Pradel. 2021. Mir: Automated Quantifiable Privilege Reduction Against Dynamic Library Compromise in JavaScript. arXiv:2011.00253 [cs.CR] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.00253>
- [82] Nikos Vasilakis, Cristian-Alexandru Staicu, Grigoris Ntousakis, Konstantinos Kallas, Ben Karel, André DeHon, and Michael Pradel. 2021. Preventing Dynamic Library Compromise on Node.js via RWX-Based Privilege Reduction. In *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*. 1821–1838.
- [83] Cybersecurity Ventures. 2023. *Software Supply Chain Attacks to Cost the World \$60B in 2025*. <https://cybersecurityventures.com/video-report-software-supply-chain-attacks-to-cost-the-world-60b-in-2025/> Accessed: 2024-11-05.
- [84] Yao Wang, Wandong Cai, Pin Lyu, and Wei Shao. 2018. A combined static and dynamic analysis approach to detect malicious browser extensions. *Security and Communication Networks* 2018, 1 (2018), 7087239.
- [85] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. arXiv:2201.11903 [cs.CL]
- [86] Brandon T. Willard and Rémi Louf. 2023. Efficient Guided Generation for Large Language Models. arXiv:2307.09702 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09702>
- [87] Ryan Daws Williams. 2023. *NPM Supply Chain Attack Targets Ethereum Blockchain*. <https://www.developer-tech.com/news/npm-supply-chain-attack-ethereum-blockchain/> Accessed: 2024-11-05.
- [88] Dingjun Wu, Jing Zhang, and Xinmei Huang. 2023. Chain of thought prompting elicits knowledge augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01640* (2023).
- [89] Hanxiang Xu, Shenao Wang, Ningke Li, Kailong Wang, Yanjie Zhao, Kai Chen, Ting Yu, Yang Liu, and Haoyu Wang. 2024. Large Language Models for Cyber Security: A Systematic Literature Review. arXiv:2405.04760 [cs.CR] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.04760>
- [90] Wei Xu, Fangfang Zhang, and Sencun Zhu. 2013. Jstill: mostly static detection of obfuscated malicious javascript code. In *Proceedings of the third ACM conference on Data and application security and privacy*. 117–128.
- [91] Xilie Xu, Keyi Kong, Ning Liu, Lizhen Cui, Di Wang, Jingfeng Zhang, and Mohan Kankanhalli. 2023. An LLM can Fool Itself: A Prompt-Based Adversarial Attack. (Oct 2023). arXiv:2310.13345v1 [cs.CR] <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.13345v1>
- [92] Navid Yaghmazadeh, Xinyu Wang, and Isil Dillig. 2018. Automated migration of hierarchical data to relational tables using programming-by-example. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 11, 5 (2018), 580–593.
- [93] Yifan Yao, Jinhao Duan, Kaidi Xu, Yuanfang Cai, Zhibo Sun, and Yue Zhang. 2024. A survey on large language model (LLM) security and privacy: The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly. *High-Confidence Computing* 4, 2 (June 2024), 100211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hcc.2024.100211>
- [94] Junjie Ye, Xuanting Chen, Nuo Xu, Can Zu, Zekai Shao, Shichun Liu, Yuhua Cui, Zeyang Zhou, Chao Gong, Yang Shen, Jie Zhou, Siming Chen, Tao Gui, Qi Zhang, and Xuanjing Huang. 2023. A Comprehensive Capability Analysis of GPT-3 and GPT-3.5 Series Models. arXiv:2303.10420 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.10420>
- [95] Serdar Yegulalp. 2016. *How one yanked JavaScript package wreaked havoc*. <http://www.infoworld.com/article/3047177/javascript/how-one-yanked-javascript-package-wreaked-havoc.html>
- [96] Ying Zhang, Wenjia Song, Zhengjie Ji, Danfeng, Yao, and Na Meng. 2023. How well does LLM generate security tests? arXiv:2310.00710

A Prompts used by LEXO

This section presents the prompts used internally by LEXO when targeting JavaScript libraries.

Input Set Generation

Given a NodeJS module, generate a JavaScript input test suite that will test thoroughly the module's behavior. These input/output pairs will then be used to regenerate the module. Make sure to include all edge cases and key behaviors.

- 1) Code Understanding: Explain the code's purpose and functionality. Identify key behaviors that require testing.
- 2) Inputs and Outputs: Brainstorm concise tests that are not repetitive for input/output correctness, including key behaviors as well as edge cases. Make sure to test default arguments and optional parameters. Try and find cases where the function returns a function, and test that function as well.
- 3) Errors: Incorporate test cases triggering errors or exceptions for inputs where the provided module throws errors.
- 4) Explore: Include tests that are slight variations of the ones in the test suite. Modify the inputs slightly to test the function's behavior with different inputs.
- 5) Format: Output one object per line with JavaScript primitives as values. If the expected output is a function, also provide a set of arguments to call that function with. Wrap all these argument objects in an array.

Use this structure:

Code: {Input library source code}

I/O Pair to Natural Language Algorithm

Given this test suite of a function, design an algorithm that describes the function.

- 1) Understand the Test Suite: Familiarize yourself with the requirements, inputs, outputs, and any implicit criteria in the test cases.
- 2) Analyze the Problem: Define the problem based on the test suite, understanding applicable concepts and complexity constraints.
- 3) Design the Algorithm: Develop a step-by-step approach, selecting suitable algorithms and ensuring coverage of test case scenarios.
- 4) Handle Edge Cases: Identify and address any edge cases not explicitly covered in the test suite.

I/O Pairs: {Input I/O pairs}

Code Generation

Generate a NodeJS function given a test suite.

- 1) Understanding Test Specifications: Before writing code, thoroughly understand what each test in the suite is checking. Know the input and output requirements, and what constitutes a pass or fail.
- 2) Functional Correctness: Ensure your code meets the functional requirements outlined in the tests. It should correctly handle all specified cases, including edge cases.
- 3) Code Quality: Write clean, readable, and well-structured code. Use descriptive variable names, avoid hard-coding, and follow best practices.
- 4) Context: You might need to understand the context of the function, such as the purpose of the library it belongs to, to write the function correctly.
- 5) Refactoring: After your code passes the tests, look for opportunities to refactor. Simplify complex parts, remove duplicated code, and improve the overall structure.

Library Name: {Input library name}

I/O Pairs: {Generated I/O examples}

Algorithm: {Input algorithm}

I/O Pair Set to Natural Language Algorithm

Given this test suite of a function, design an algorithm that describes the function.

- 1) Understand the Test Suite: Familiarize yourself with the requirements, inputs, outputs, and any implicit criteria in the test cases.
- 2) Analyze the Problem: Define the problem based on the test suite, understanding applicable concepts and complexity constraints.
- 3) Design the Algorithm: Develop a step-by-step approach, selecting suitable algorithms and ensuring coverage of test case scenarios.

- 4) Handle Edge Cases: Identify and address any edge cases not explicitly covered in the test suite.

Library Name: {Input library name}

Generated Code: {Input generated code}

Failing Tests: {Input failing tests}

B Naive LLM Approach Prompt

This section presents the prompt used to evaluate a naive approach to removing malicious code from a library using a state-of-the-art LLM.

Naive Approach

Given the code for a potentially malicious function, remove any security vulnerabilities without compromising the functionality of the code.

- 1) Identify any potentially malicious snippets or vulnerabilities in the code.
- 2) Modify the code to remove the security vulnerability without compromising the functionality of the code.
- 3) Return the JavaScript code with the security vulnerabilities removed.

{Input source code}