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Abstract

Natural language processing for programming, which aims to use NLP techniques to assist programming, has experienced an explosion in recent years. However, there is no literature that systematically reviews related work from the full spectrum. In this paper, we comprehensively investigate existing work, ranging from early deductive models to the latest competition-level models. Another advantage of this paper is the completeness of the technique category, which provides easy access to locating and comparing future works.

1 Introduction

Natural language processing for programming (NLP4P) is an interdisciplinary field of NLP and software engineering (SE), aiming to use NLP techniques for assisting programming (Lachmy et al., 2021). On one hand, it could relieve programmers from repetitive work, e.g., automatically generating a program from natural language specification is more efficient than manually writing the program from scratch. On the other hand, it is also convenient for users that do not have a professional background but need to improve their efficiency, e.g., searching for a function that synchronizes posts across platforms by describing the functionality with natural language (Liu et al., 2016). Therefore, it is beneficial for improving the productivity of the whole society.

Recently, NLP4P has experienced an explosion of growth, however, there is no work illustrating the whole picture of this area. Niu et al. (2022) has summarized the recent advance, focusing on pre-trained models of source code. In this paper, we conjecture that ideas in conventional approaches are also illuminating for future work. Meanwhile, some nearest approaches have achieved surprising and remarkable performance. We thus include all these works in this paper, aiming to provide a full spectrum of this field up to date.

Distinct from conventional NLP tasks, NLP4P involves an extra modality: programming language (PL). Typically, PL is more structured and rigorous than natural language (NL). The gap between the two highly heterogeneous modalities makes it difficult to directly adapt the conventional NLP algorithm to NLP4P. To this end, much research is devoted to taking the structural information of PL into consideration. In this paper, we regard the modality as the main dimension and introduce related work from the perspective of NL information and PL information, respectively.

The content of this paper is summarized as follows: we first introduce the tasks that NLP4P researches (§ 2); Then we list existing datasets (§ 3) and several commonly used evaluation methods (§ 4). After that, we analyze the concrete techniques in encoding (§ 5) and decoding process (§ 6), respectively. Finally, we report the state-of-the-art performance that NLP4P has achieved (§ 7) and list several potential directions for future work (§ 8).

2 Tasks

As shown in Figure 1, we classify NLP4P tasks according to the scenarios they are applied to, for
Table 1: Categories of NLP4P tasks. Uni and Mul denote uni-modal and multi-modal, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uni</td>
<td>PL =&gt; PL</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL =&gt; TY</td>
<td>CD, BD, VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mul</td>
<td>NL =&gt; PL</td>
<td>CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL =&gt; NL</td>
<td>CG, DG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the purpose of focusing on their functionalities and highlighting subtle differences between similar tasks. At the end of this section, we also summarize the tasks along two more conventional dimensions: modality and understanding/generation.

2.1 Synthesis

The synthesis task automatically generates a program given contextual information (which can be NL, PL, or their mixture), thus can accelerate the development process and can reduce the development cost. According to whether the output is a complete program, it can be further divided into program synthesis and code completion.

**Program synthesis** is also called code generation in some literature. It is the systematic derivation of a program from a given specification (Manna and Waldinger, 1980). Conventional deductive approaches (Manna and Waldinger, 1980; Polozov and Gulwani, 2015) take logical specifications, which are logically complete but difficult to write. Inductive approaches (Lieberman, 2001) list input-output examples as specifications, which are more accessible but incomplete. In contrast, the specification of program synthesis in NLP4P is NL. First, a well-organized NL specification is complete to express the request of a problem. Second, as the most natural communication way for humans, NL specification provides a more accessible programming way for users without a professional background. Therefore, it can take advantage of both the deductive and inductive approaches.

**Code completion** is also called code suggestion in early research (Tu et al., 2014; Hindle et al., 2016). It suggests the next program token given the context and has been widely applied to IDEs (Li et al., 2018). The scenarios of conventional code completion are limited to the completion of method calls, keywords, variables, and arguments. With the bloom of the pre-trained language models, the scenarios are widely extended, including the punctuation, the entire statement, and even the code snippet (Svyatkovskiy et al., 2020), increasingly blurring the line between program synthesis and code completion.

2.2 Retrieval

Retrieval task mainly refers to the code search. It aims to retrieve relevant code given NL query (Husain et al., 2019). It has a similar application scenario and input/output to program synthesis, the difference is that its output program is extracted from existing code, rather than being synthesized from scratch.

2.3 Classification

Classification task detect whether given programs has specific characteristics, e.g., being cloned (clone detection), or being vulnerable (vulnerability identification). They are of great importance in protecting software from the effects of ad-hoc reuse (Svajlenko et al., 2014) and cyber attacks (Zhou et al., 2019), respectively. The granularity of the input ranges from a coarse-grained software repository (Hovsepyan et al., 2012) to a fine-grained function (Hovsepyan et al., 2012) to a fine-grained function (Russell et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2019).

Despite that NL does not explicitly occur in either input or output, we include tasks of such form in this paper for two reasons. First, PL has been demonstrated to contain abundant statistical properties similar to NL (Mou et al., 2016). Second, most of the ways that PL is processed are derived from NLP, such as machine translation and text summarization, which will be introduced in more detail in § 5 and § 6.

2.4 Summarization

Summarization task is intended to summarize a program into a comprehensible description (most in the form of NL). It is crucial for the maintenance of software, especially those involving multiple developers. According to the form of the output, it can be further divided into method naming, comment generation (Nie et al., 2022a), and docstring generation (Clement et al., 2020). Method naming predicts the name of a function given the body. Both comment generation and docstring generation produce an NL description based on the function. The difference is that the latter might contain some structural information, e.g., input and output examples.

2.5 Transcription

Transcription task converts given program to meet a specific purpose. For example, program
translation aims to convert between high-level PL (Roziere et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2022), such as C# and Java. It could accelerate the update of projects written by deprecated PL and the migration of algorithms implemented by various PL. Code refinement aims to convert a buggy program into a correct one (Wang et al., 2021). It is closely related to vulnerability identification but is required to fix the detected bugs at the same time.

Transcription task differs from synthesis task in two ways. First, its input program is complete (input program is None or a header in program synthesis, a partial code snippet in code completion). Second, its output can be strictly aligned with the input in both the format and the content.

### 2.6 Other Dimensions

Despite the application scenario, we also categorize the tasks with two more dimensions. From the perspective of the way that the output is produced, the tasks can be divided into generation tasks and understanding tasks, as shown in Table 1. An exception is code summarization. Similar to the standard text summarization, it can be seen as an understanding task if extractive approaches are employed, and a generation task if abstract approaches are employed.

Regarding NL and PL as two different modalities, the tasks can also be divided into multi-modal and uni-modal. Multi-modal tasks involve both the NL and PL. Uni-modal tasks have a single modality, PL. Since neither the input side nor output side is NL, NLP techniques in this category are mainly employed during the transformation between input and output, e.g., machine translation approaches in the program translation task (Roziere et al., 2020).

### 3 Datasets

Datasets for NLP4P can also be divided into uni-modal and multi-modal according to whether NL and PL are included at the same time. Table 2 shows some statistics of common datasets.

#### 3.1 Uni-Modal Data

Typically, uni-modal data is in the form of PL and has two main application scenarios. First, it can be used for learning uni-modal tasks (see Table 1). Second, it can be applied to the pre-training process of multi-modal tasks, making sure generated PL are grammatically correct and logically valid.
modal NL data is rarely used for programming. A more common way of integrating knowledge entailed in NL data is directly initializing a model with off-the-shelf pre-trained models, e.g., GPT-2.

3.2 Multi-Modal Data

Multi-modal data consists of paired NL description and PL source code, which can support most of the NLP4P tasks. Most of the data are collected from coding-related platforms. For open-source platforms like GitHub,\footnote{https://github.com/} PL can be the source code, and NL can be the paired document, comments, and commit messages. For community-based spaces like Stack Overflow,\footnote{https://stackoverflow.com/} NL and PL are natural language questions and code snippet answers, respectively.

3.3 Data Preprocessing

Automatically collected raw data sometimes is noisy and non-informative, e.g., a commit message like “update” is of little substantial content; code snippet answer might be irrelevant to its question (Iyer et al., 2018). To this end, the data should be first carefully filtered. The filter can be either learning-based (Iyer et al., 2018) or rule-based (e.g., the length of a document and a program. Husain et al., 2019).

4 Evaluations

In this section, we will first list several concrete evaluation approaches from the perspective of modality (NL and PL) and then introduce some general evaluation strategies.

4.1 NL Evaluation

For tasks whose outputs are NL, evaluation approaches can refer to conventional NLP tasks, such as text summarization (Nallapati et al., 2016) and machine translation (Bahdanau et al., 2015).

**Automatic Evaluation** is usually implemented by comparing the n-grams between the predicted output and given references, such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), MENTOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005), and ROUGE (Lin, 2004). The disadvantage of these metrics is that they might not always be consistent with the real quality, since NL can convey the same semantics via various expressions, which cannot be completely covered by limited references. Therefore, it is crucial to conduct a human evaluation at the same time.

**Human Evaluation** typically consists of several independent dimensions, such as naturalness, diversity, and informativeness. Common annotation methods include point-wise mode (Iyer et al., 2016; Shi et al., 2021a) and pair-wise mode (Panthapackel et al., 2020). The former separately annotate samples of different models with scores in a certain range. In pair-wise mode, annotators are asked to select the best one among these samples. Compared with automatic evaluation, human evaluation is more fine-grained, accurate, and comprehensive. However it is also time-consuming and labor-intensive, and thus can only be conducted on a small subset of the test set.

4.2 PL Evaluation

From the perspective of NLP, PL can be seen as a special case of NL and thus be evaluated by the aforementioned reference based evaluation metrics. In contrast, from the perspective of SE, a valid program should pass the unit test that consists of test cases. Therefore, we classify the PL evaluation into the following two categories: reference based and test case based.

**Reference based Evaluation** Regarding a model-generated program as a sequence of tokens and given the ground-truth, PL can also be evaluated by n-gram based NL metrics, such as BLEU (Wang et al., 2021) and exact match (EM, Guo et al., 2022). To further capture the characteristics of PL, Ren et al. (2020) propose the CodeBLEU metric which takes AST and data flow graph into consideration. Similar to NL, PL is also expressive in that a function can be implemented differently. Therefore, the reference-based metrics might not correlate well with the real quality of programs.

**Test Case based Evaluation** Inspired by the process of software development, Hendrycks et al. (2021) propose two metrics based on test cases: Test Case Average and Strict Accuracy. Suppose we generate a single program given a problem, and each problem has a varying number of test cases. Test Case Average computes the averaged test case pass rate over all problems. In contrast, Strict Accuracy is a rather rigorous metric. A program is regarded as accepted if and only if it passes all
its test cases, and Strict Accuracy is the ratio of acceptance.

Actually, we can sample more than one (e.g., $K$) program for each problem to improve the performance. In this way, Strict Accuracy regards a program as accepted if any of the $K$ programs passes all the test cases. Therefore, it is also called $p^@k$ in some literature.

The sampling size could be huge but the number of submissions sometimes is limited, especially for competition scenarios. To highlight the difference between the sampling and submission, Li et al. (2022) further propose the $n^@k$ metric based on $p^@k$. It computes the ratio of acceptance when sampling $k$ programs and submitting $n$ of them for each problem.

### 4.3 Evaluation Strategy

There are also some works that study the strategy of evaluation, e.g., the division of training, validation, and test set (Nie et al., 2022b; Li et al., 2022). Intuitively, the test set aims to simulate realistic scenarios that occur after the training process. Therefore, it may not be independent and identically distributed with the training and validation set, splitting them following a strict temporal relationship could better reflect the real performance of a model.

### 5 Encoding Technologies

Technologies can be roughly divided into two categories: encoding and decoding. The former turns an NL or PL input into an internal representation for downstream tasks. The decoding technology learns the distribution of a given dataset and subsequently generates samples following the distribution. In this section, we focus on the encoding part. We will first introduce the general sequential information encoding derived from NLP and then introduce structural information encoding dedicated to PL. Decoding technologies will be introduced in the next section (§ 6).

#### 5.1 Sequential Information Encoding

Technologies of this category process sequential information and can be applied to both NL and PL. Since the sequence format is rather simple and unified, here we categorize related work according to the models they employed, rather than the concrete data structure.

**Recurrent Neural Network** (RNN, Mikolov et al., 2010) and its variants LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997) and GRU (Cho et al., 2014) maintain a hidden state, which is updated as the reading of input tokens. Therefore, they are well-suited for processing sequential inputs that have varying lengths. Concretely, the input can be an NL description (Liu et al., 2016; Weigelt et al., 2020), a program (Wei et al., 2019), and other information represented as a sequence (e.g., traversal of AST, Hu et al., 2018, see § 5.2 for detail). The output is hidden states of the input tokens and will be further integrated by the attention (Bahdanau et al., 2015) or other mechanisms for downstream modules.

**Convolutional Neural Network** (CNN) (LeCun, 1989) extracts features by scanning the input with a sliding window and applying stacked convolution and pooling operations on the window. Both two operations can be parallelized, making CNN more time-efficient than RNN. CNN in NLP4P usually takes input as execution traces (Gupta et al., 2020), input-output pairs (Bunel et al., 2018), and encodes them into an embedding as the output.

**Transformer** (Vaswani et al., 2017) has a similar input and output format to RNN, the difference lies in the following two aspects. First, it represents the temporal relation with positional embeddings and solely depends on the attention mechanism. In this way, the encoding can be processed parallel across tokens and significantly accelerated. Second, it can better capture long-term dependencies, which is essential for PL encoding since programs can be quite long (Ahmad et al., 2020). Despite the conventional auto-regressive paradigm, the transformer can also be trained with masked language modeling (MLM, Devlin et al., 2019), denoising auto-encoding (DAE, Lewis et al., 2020) and other pre-training objectives.

**Others** Despite these approaches, there are also some works that explore the usage of feed-forward neural network (Iyer et al., 2016; Loyola et al., 2017), recursive neural network (Liang and Zhu, 2018), and graph neural network (Liu et al., 2020a), which provide extra choices for the encoding process.
5.2 Structural Information Encoding

NL and PL are highly heterogeneous (Hu et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2020a; Chen et al., 2021b). NL is less structured, and the semantics it expresses will become confusing if a complex syntax is employed. In contrast, PL is highly structured. It has recursions, nested loops, and other sophisticated structures. Despite that, it is always unambiguous. Generally, for tasks whose PL structural information is available, it would be beneficial to enhance the model with such information, such as abstract syntax tree (AST), code graph, and relative distance between tokens.

AST carries the syntax and structural information of a program (Shi et al., 2021b), however, it is represented as a tree, and thus cannot be directly utilized by traditional models which take sequence inputs. A straightforward approach is to flatten the AST into a sequence, such as traversing in a specific order (e.g., the pre-order traversal) and sampling paths from the root to leaves (Alon et al., 2018). However, these transforms are lossy in that the AST cannot be recovered, which will lose some structural information. To this end, Hu et al. (2018) propose a structure-based traversal (SBT) approach, adding brackets into the sequence to mark hierarchical relationships.

SBT is an approach that turns AST into a sequence to adapt traditional models. There are also approaches that adapt models to taking input as AST. Considering AST is a tree whose node has arbitrary number of children organized in a specific order, the key of this category is modeling the two aspects simultaneously. Shido et al. (2019) propose a Multi-way Tree-LSTM. It first encodes the children of a node with a standard LSTM and subsequently integrates the results into the node with a Tree-LSTM. Similarly, Mou et al. (2016) propose a tree-based convolutional neural network (TBCNN), encoding AST by a weight base and positional features.

Introducing AST provides a model with access to structural information, but decreases the time efficiency. Some AST can be complex with a deep hierarchy (Guo et al., 2020), delaying the parsing time and increasing the input length (up to 70%) (Guo et al., 2022). This gives rise to the exploration of other structural information.

Code Graph Control Flow Graph (CFG) represents a program as a graph whose node (also called a basic block) consists of a sequence of successive statements that can be executed together. Edges between nodes are directed, denoting the order of execution. CFG makes it convenient to locate redundant statements and specific syntactic structures (such as loops and conditional statements).

Program Dependence Graph (PDG) is another graphical representation of a program. Nodes in PDG are statements and predicate expressions, and edges denote both data dependencies and control dependencies (Ferrante et al., 1987). The data dependencies describe the partial order between definitions and usages of variables and have been demonstrated to be beneficial for improving the performance of program understanding (Krinke, 2001; Allamanis and Brockschmidt, 2017; Allamanis et al., 2018; Guo et al., 2020). Similar to CFG, control dependencies also model the execution order, but it highlights a statement or predicate itself by determining the edges according to the value of the statement or predicate (Liu et al., 2020a).

To combine the advantages of the aforementioned representations, Yamaguchi et al. (2014) propose the Code Property Graph (CPG). It is a joint graph merging the AST, CFG, and PDG, and thus can comprehensively represent a program, and effectively benefits vulnerability identification (Zhou et al., 2019) and code summarization (Liu et al., 2020a).

Relative Distance typically refers to the distance between two tokens in the source code sequence. In this way, it can be easily combined into token representations as a feature. Ahmad et al. (2020) represent the relative distance as a learnable embedding and introduce it into transformer models by biasing the attention mechanism. Results show that the relative distance is an effective alternative to AST to capture the structural information. Based on that, Zugner et al. (2021) further extend the concept of relative distance from context to AST. And jointly training the model with the two types of relative distance achieves further improvement.

6 Decoding Technologies

Most of the decoding technologies in NLP4P are directly derived from NLP. Here we only focus on the strategies that are specifically designed for PL. PL has two distinct characteristics that the decoding

4https://cseweb.ucsd.edu/classes/faf03/cse231/lec2seq.pdf
Table 3: The results of understanding models and unified models on CodeXGLUE (PS, CC, CG, CR, PT, DD, CD) and CodeSearchNet (CS). Abbreviations in upper case and lower case denote tasks (Figure 1) and data sets (Table 2), respectively. ES denotes Levenshtein edit similarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>PS BLEU</th>
<th>CC ES</th>
<th>CG BLEU</th>
<th>CR BLEU</th>
<th>PT BLEU</th>
<th>CS MRR</th>
<th>DD ACC</th>
<th>CD F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CodeBERT (2020)</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>125M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>91.07</td>
<td>79.92</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>62.08</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphCodeBERT (2020)</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91.31</td>
<td>80.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UniXcoder (2022)</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLBART (2021)</td>
<td>pb</td>
<td>140M</td>
<td>36.69</td>
<td>68.46</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>83.02</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>63.18</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodeT5 (2021)</td>
<td>cs,bq</td>
<td>770M</td>
<td>40.73</td>
<td>67.12</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>87.64</td>
<td>84.03</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>65.78</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The results of generation models on HumanEval benchmark. Results of CodeRL are obtained by its released checkpoint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>p@1</th>
<th>p@100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CodeX (2021a)</td>
<td>cx</td>
<td>300M</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>36.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5B</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>59.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12B</td>
<td>28.81</td>
<td>72.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodeGen (2022)</td>
<td>tp, bp, bq</td>
<td>350M</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>35.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7B</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>57.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1B</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td>65.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1B</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlphaCode (2022)</td>
<td>ac,cc, ap</td>
<td>302M</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>31.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1B</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>45.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANGU-CODER (2022)</td>
<td>pc</td>
<td>317 M</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>34.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoder (2022)</td>
<td>ic</td>
<td>6.7B</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodeRL (2022)</td>
<td>gp,ap</td>
<td>770M</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>45.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section, we will introduce some representative models according to down-stream tasks that they are applied.

7.1 Generation Models

Recently, with the proposal of test case based benchmarks, a series of generation models have been developed targeting functional correctness. Table 4 shows some statics of these models and their p@k results on HumanEval.

**CodeX** is developed by OpenAI. It is a GPT fine-tuned on code. By repeatedly sampling, it achieves a good functional correctness result (Chen et al., 2021a).

**AlphaCode** is a transformer-based model developed by DeepMind. Using a large-scale sampling and a filtering strategy, it outperforms 54.3% human programmers (Li et al., 2022).

**CodeGen** is developed by Salesforce. It is trained on a multi-turn programming corpus and thus can support interactive programming via conversation (Nijkamp et al., 2022).

**InCoder** is developed by Facebook. It unifies the synthesis and transcription tasks by learning to predict masked spans at the end of the input sequence (Fried et al., 2022).

**PANGU-CODER** is a decoder-only LM from Huawei. It is trained on a coarse-to-fine two-
stage strategy to gradually adapt to downstream tasks (Christopoulou et al., 2022).

**CodeRL** is another model from Salesforce. It is fine-tuned on the CodeT5 under the reinforcement learning framework. In this way, a model can be trained targeting the extract metric of the inference process, filling the gap between the two processes (Le et al., 2022).

### 7.2 Understanding Models
Models of this category focus on understanding tasks, which can be evaluated by the CodeXGLUE benchmark (Lu et al., 2021). The results are shown in Table 3.

**CodeBERT** is the first NL-PL pre-trained model which supports multiple PL. It is a variant of BERT equipped with a replaced token detection objective (Feng et al., 2020).

**GraphCodeBERT** introduces the data flow graph into the pre-training stage to enhance the code understanding process (Guo et al., 2020).

### 7.3 Unified Models
Unified models complete both understanding and generation tasks by a single model. However, in our experiments, the program synthesis performance evaluated by $\text{p@k}$ of unified models is not as good as that of generation models.

**CodeT5** is an encoder-decoder based model developed by Salesforce. It is trained under the multi-task learning framework (Wang et al., 2021).

**PLBART** is also an encoder-decoder based model and is developed by UCLA. It follows the denoising auto-encoding framework of BART during the pre-training process (Ahmad et al., 2021).

**UniXCoder** is developed by Microsoft. Distinct from CodeT5 and PLBART, it employs a unified model, rather than an encoder-decoder. The key is controlling the visibility of different positions in the context via a mask matrix (Guo et al., 2022).

### 8 Future Directions
Taking advantage of both SE and NLP, NLP4P has achieved remarkable performance. However, some features of the two fields (such as the iterations of SE and multilingual learning in NLP) have not been sufficiently explored. Incorporating them into NLP4P is expected to further improve the performance.

#### 8.1 Iterative NLP4P
Generally, programming is an evolutionary process involving multiple iterations, rather than writing from scratch at one time. For an instance, it is difficult to solve a problem with a single submission despite programmers being experienced. As a reference, the average accept rate of Codeforces, a competitive programming website, is only 50.03%.

Nevertheless, most of the existing models are trained to accomplish their tasks regardless of historical context information. Taking the program synthesis as an instance, once a program fails to satisfy its requirements, it will be re-generated from scratch. In this way, the error message and previous version are not taken into account and efficiently utilized.

Iterative NLP4P, a progressive programming paradigm with a natural language interface may shed light on this problem. It has an access to the complete historical context and thus can pay more attention to fixing existing problems and avoid introducing new ones.

#### 8.2 Multilingual NLP4P
As the bloom of the open source software platform, e.g., GitHub, source code along with their NL descriptions have accumulated to a considerable amount, making it possible to learn a data-driven NLP4P model. However, the distribution of these data is highly unbalanced. Most of the NL part is English and the PL part is Java and Python. As a result, the performance of low-resource NL and PL is much worse than the average performance. For example, Ruby takes the smallest proportion in CodeSearchNet corpus and is inferior to other PL in both code search and code summarization tasks (Feng et al., 2020).

To bridge the gap between different languages, the simplest way is to translate a low-resource language into its high-resource counterpart. For tasks whose input is low-resource NL, we can translate it into English before sending it to the model. For a task whose output is low-resource PL, we can first generate a Java program and subsequently translate it into the desired PL. However, it introduces extra effort and cascading errors during the translation.

Multilingual learning approaches (Conneau et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020b; Xue et al., 2021) provide an access to address the issue. It can efficiently utilize the data presented in various lan-

---

5http://codeforces.com/
guages, representing them in a unified semantic space and avoiding cascading error.

8.3 Multi-modal NLP4P

NL specification may refer to other modalities (e.g., figures) for better understanding. For an instance, the “Seven Bridge Problem”, which is a classical graph problem, cannot be easily understood by plain NL descriptions only.

At the heart of the multi-modal approaches is the alignment of various modalities. However, there is no such data set in the area of NLP4P, and annotating a new one is costly. Therefore, it would be crucial to utilize the knowledge entailed in the existing multi-modal data sets (e.g., COCO Lin et al., 2014) and the language-vision pre-trained models (e.g., CLIP Radford et al., 2021 and Flamingo Alayrac et al., 2022).

9 Conclusion

In this paper, we review a broad spectrum of NLP4P works. We comprehensively analyze and compare these works from multiple dimensions, including tasks for different scenarios, data sets for different modalities, and technologies for different processes. Based on the analysis, we list several topics that have not been fully considered and might be worth researching in the future.
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