

Programming Not Only by Example

Hila Peleg
Technion
hilap@cs.technion.ac.il

Sharon Shoham
Tel Aviv University
sharon.shoham@gmail.com

Eran Yahav
Technion
yahave@cs.technion.ac.il

Abstract

In recent years, there has been tremendous progress in automated synthesis techniques that are able to automatically generate code based on some intent expressed by the programmer. A major challenge for the adoption of synthesis remains in having the programmer communicate their intent. When the expressed intent is coarse-grained (for example, restriction on the expected type of an expression), the synthesizer often produces a long list of results for the programmer to choose from, shifting the heavy-lifting to the user. An alternative approach, successfully used in end-user synthesis is programming by example (PBE), where the user leverages examples to interactively and iteratively refine the intent. However, using only examples is not expressive enough for programmers, who can observe the generated program and refine the intent by directly relating to parts of the generated program.

We present a novel approach to interacting with a synthesizer using a granular interaction model. Our approach employs a rich interaction model where (i) the synthesizer decorates a candidate program with debug information that assists in understanding the program and identifying good or bad parts, and (ii) the user is allowed to provide feedback not only on the expected output of a program, but also on the underlying program itself. That is, when the user identifies a program as (partially) correct or incorrect, they can also explicitly indicate the good or bad parts, to allow the synthesizer to accept or discard parts of the program instead of discarding the program as a whole.

We show the value of our approach in a controlled user study. Our study shows that participants have strong preference to using granular feedback instead of examples, and are able to provide granular feedback much faster.

1 Introduction

In a development ecosystem where programmers are frequently asked to take on tasks involving unfamiliar APIs and complex data transformations, program synthesis is both a tool to shorten development times and an aid to small tasks of API programming.

Synthesis tools for end-users are available for a wide variety of purposes from creating formulae in Microsoft Excel [13] to formulating SQL queries [39]. Tools for expert users who can encode full specifications have also matured enough to be practical [23, 32, 36].

Expressing Intent Despite significant progress in synthesis, expressing the user’s intent remains a major challenge. An expert user can write full specifications and express their intent fully [7, 9, 16–18, 23, 26, 36–38], but end-users and programmers trying to solve small tasks often use *partial specifications*. Partial specifications are available in different forms, depending on the synthesizer: source and target types, input-output pairs, tests, and logical specifications.

Coarse-grained models such as type-driven synthesis present the user with all possible results that satisfy the coarse-grained criteria

(e.g., [12, 15]). This leads to a challenging task: the user must compare a large number of similar programs to select a solution.

Expressing Intent with Examples An alternative that has proven itself extremely useful for end-users is to use examples as a way to express intent. Programming by Example (PBE) is a form of program synthesis where the desired behavior is generalized from specific instances of behavior, most often input-output example pairs. This allows an iterative process where, if the synthesized program is not acceptable, additional examples are provided until the target program is reached. This technique is often used either on its own in synthesizers such as [5, 13, 20–22, 24, 39–41] or as a way to refine the results of type-driven synthesis [11, 25].

Insufficiency of Examples for Programmers PBE is geared towards end-users, but is also useful for more advanced users when the behavior is more difficult to describe than its effect. However, in this interaction model, a user can only do one of two things: accept the program after inspection, or reject it with a *differentiating example* which will rule it out in the next iteration of synthesis. There is wasted knowledge in forcing a programmer to work within this interaction model, as some synthesized programs are not *all bad* – they may have a part of the program that is overfitted to the examples, while another will be on the right track. Allowing only a full accept or full reject ignores the ability of a programmer to read and understand the program, and to express a more directed, *granular* feedback, deeming parts of it as desirable or undesirable, rather than the program as a whole.

In fact, we hypothesize that, in some cases, it is *easier* for a programmer to explicitly indicate what is good or bad in a candidate program, instead of implicitly trying to express this information through input-output examples. Moreover, we prove that it is sometimes *impossible* to express such information through examples.

Programming Not Only by Example Motivated by the insufficiency of examples, we present a new, *granular interaction model* that allows a programmer to interact with the synthesizer *not only by example* but also provide feedback on parts of the synthesized program. Our interaction model is granular in both directions, from the programmer to the synthesizer, and back:

Synthesizer → Programmer: A candidate program is presented together with debug information, showing execution values at different program points. This helps the programmer understand whether the candidate program behaves as expected at *intermediate states*, instead of relying only on its final output.

Programmer → Synthesizer: A programmer can provide: (i) input-output examples (as in PBE), and (ii) *granular* feedback on the candidate program by explicitly accepting/rejecting *parts* of its code.

We tested the granular interaction model by a controlled user-study with 32 developers from both academia and industry. To conduct this study, we developed a synthesizer that interacts with the user in three different ways: holistic (PBE), granular, or both.

Our synthesizer also measures interaction times, and records the user-interaction so we can later analyze it.

Our implementation synthesizes functional programs in Scala. Scala is a popular functional and object-oriented programming language, used in many big-data processing frameworks (e.g., Spark, Akka). Functional compositions are considered “the Scala way” to approach coding tasks, and so we aim to synthesize them.

Advantages of granular interaction The user study strongly supports the hypothesis that it is beneficial to let programmers communicate their understanding of the program *explicitly* to the synthesizer (by marking parts of it as desirable or undesirable) rather than *implicitly* (through examples). Several participants in our user study, faced with the inability to rule out an undesired operation in the program using only examples, expressed extreme frustration. As we show in our user-study, this is more common than one would imagine, due to the introduction of redundant or superfluous operations by the synthesizer. As a result, an undesirable operation may be part of several candidate programs along the process, but the holistic PBE model does not allow ruling it out.

Our study shows that our granular interaction model (GIM) is easier to use, as supported by: (i) a strong preference of participants for granular feedback over examples, and (ii) a significantly shorter iteration time when using granular feedback. It is important to note that granular feedback does not completely replace examples. Participants that were restricted to granular feedback were sometimes forced to use a larger number of iterations, and were more prone to error when accepting the program. We therefore conclude that future synthesizers should integrate both interaction models.

Main Contributions The contributions of this paper are:

- A synthesis framework for programmers with a granular interaction model (GIM), which allows the user to approve or disapprove of specific parts of the code of the candidate program, rather than just respond to it as a whole; and allows a synthesizer to present candidate programs with debug information.
- A theoretical result that shows that examples are sometimes insufficient for reaching the desired program. We further show that this insufficiency occurs in practice throughout real PBE sessions.
- A controlled user study showing that programmers have strong preference for granular feedback instead of examples, and are able to provide granular feedback much faster.

Outline Section 4 shows why examples are not only inconvenient but insufficient to communicate the intent of the programmer. To allow more expressive power, we introduce three additional granular operations in Section 5. Our full interaction model consists of the granular operations as well as examples. In addition, we also introduce debug information for every example provided by the user in Section 5.2.

In Section 6 we detail our experiments on the number of iterations necessary to solve a set of benchmarks with different interaction models. We also detail a controlled user study of 32 programmers from academia and industry. The study shows an advantage of granular predicates over examples in both iteration time and preference, and we discuss the need for both the granular predicates and examples in order to help the user reach the (correct) target program.

Task: find the most frequent bigram in a string

Initial example (σ_0) "abdfibfcfdebdfebdihgfkjfdabd" \mapsto "bd"

Question q_1 1 input
2 .takeRight(2)

Problem: takeRight will just take the right of a given string

Idea: the frequent bigram needs to be placed in the middle

Answer σ_1 "cababc" \mapsto "ab"

Question q_2 1 input
2 .drop(1)
3 .take(2)

Problem: this program crops a given input at a constant position

Idea: vary the position of the frequent bigram between examples

Answer σ_2 "bcaaab" \mapsto "aa"

Question q_3 1 input
2 .zip(input.tail)
3 .drop(1)
4 .map(p => p._1.toString + p._2)
5 .min

Problem: in all examples the output is the lexicographical minimum of all bigrams in the string (e.g., "aa" < "bc", "aa" < "ca", "aa" < "ab")

Idea: have a frequent bigram that is large in lexicographic order

Answer σ_3 "xyzzzy" \mapsto "zz"

Table 1: The difficulty of finding a differentiating example.

2 Overview

In this section we provide an overview of our Granular Interaction Model (GIM) for synthesis on a simple example. We start by showing the interaction model of Programming by Example (PBE) and its shortcomings, and then describe how GIM overcomes these shortcomings by using a richer interaction model.

Motivating example Consider the task of writing a program that *finds the most frequent character-bigram in a string*. Assume that the program is constructed by combining operations from a predefined set of operations we refer to as the vocabulary \mathcal{V} . For now, assume that the vocabulary contains standard operations on strings, characters, and lists. In addition, assume that you provide an initial *partial specification* in the form of an input-output example:

$$\sigma_0 = \text{"abdfibfcfdebdfebdihgfkjfdabd"} \mapsto \text{"bd"}$$

In this example, the bigram “bd” is the most frequent (appears 4 times), and is thus the expected output of the synthesized program.

2.1 Interaction with a classical PBE synthesizer

Table 1 shows the interaction of a programmer with a PBE synthesizer to complete our task. The synthesizer poses a question to the programmer: *a candidate program that is consistent with all examples*. The programmer provides an answer in the form of an *accept*, or additional *input-output examples* to refine the result.

Based on the initial example, the synthesizer offers the candidate program q_1 , which consists of a single method from the vocabulary – `takeRight(2)`, which returns the 2 rightmost characters – applied to the input. The programmer then responds by providing the example σ_1 which is inconsistent with the candidate program, and therefore *differentiates* it from the target program.

At this point, the synthesizer offers a new candidate program q_2 that is consistent with both σ_0 and σ_1 .

The interaction proceeds in a similar manner. Each additional example may reduce the number of candidate programs (as they are

Task: find the most frequent bigram in a string	
Initial specifications	"abdfibfcfdebdfdebdihgfkjfdabd" → "bd"
Question q_1	1 input // "abdfibfcfdebdfdebdihgfkjfdabd" 2 .takeRight (2) // bd
Problem: takeRight will just take the right of a given string Idea: takeRight will never be useful since we always want to consider every element. Remove takeRight from the result program.	
Answer	Remove(takeRight (2))
Question q_2	1 input // "abdfibfcfdebdfdebdihgfkjfdabd" 2 .drop (1) // "bdfibfcfdebdfdebdihgfkjfdabd" 3 .take (2) // "bd"
Problem: this program crops a given input at a constant position Idea: we don't want to crop anything out, so these functions have no place in the result program.	
Answer	Remove(drop (1) .take (2))
Question q_3	1 input // "abdfibfcfdebdfdebdihgfkjfdabd" 2 .zip (input.tail) // List ((a,b), (b,d), (d,f), (f,i), (i,b), (b,f), ...) 3 .take (2) // List ((a,b), (b,d)) 4 .map (p => p._1.toString + p._2) // List ("ab", "bd") 5 .max // "bd"
Problem: while the beginning of this program is actually good (dividing the program into bigrams) and so is the mapping of a 2-tuple to a string, take (2) truncates the bigram list. Idea: preserve what is good in the program and remove take (2) on its own and not just as part of a sequence.	
Answer	Affix(zip (input.tail)) Remove(take (2)) Retain(map (p => p._1.toString + p._2))

Table 2: Providing granular, syntactic feedback.

required to satisfy all examples). With a careful choice of examples by the user, the process terminates after a total of 4 examples.

Finding differentiating examples may be hard Consider the candidate program q_3 . To make progress, the user has to provide an example that differentiates q_3 from the behavior of the desired program. To find a differentiating example, the user must (i) understand the program q_3 and why it is wrong, and (ii) provide input-output examples that overrule q_3 , and preferably also similar programs.

By examining the code of q_3 , it is easy to see that `min` is a problem: calculating a minimum should not be part of finding a most frequent bigram. Even after the programmer understands the problem, they still need to find a differentiating example that rules out q_3 . Because the use of `min` in q_3 is a minimum over a list of the bigrams in the input, the programmer comes up with an example where the desired bigram is the *largest* one (lexicographically), as in σ_3 .

In this interaction, the programmer had to express the explicit knowledge (“do not use `min`”) implicitly through examples. Coming up with examples that avoid `min` requires deep understanding of the program, which is then only leveraged implicitly (through examples). Even then, there is no guarantee `min` will not recur – as we will show in Section 4, it is impossible to completely remove it in this model. In this case, since the programmer already knows that they want to avoid programs using `min`, it is beneficial to let them communicate this information explicitly to the synthesizer.

2.2 Interaction through a granular interaction model

GIM improves PBE by employing a richer, *granular* interaction model. On the one hand, the synthesizer supplements the candidate

programs by debug information that assists the programmer in understanding the programs, and identifying good and bad parts in them. On the other hand, the user is not restricted to providing semantic input-output examples, but can also mark parts of the program code itself as parts that must or must not appear in any future candidate program. This allows the user to provide explicit, syntactic, feedback on the program code, which is more expressive, and in some cases allows the synthesizer to more aggressively prune the search space.

The GIM interaction model for the same task of finding the most frequent bigram is demonstrated in Table 2. Question 1 is as before: the synthesizer produces the candidate program `input.takeRight (2)`. In contrast to classical PBE, the granular interaction model provides additional debug information to the user, showing intermediate values of the program on the examples. This is shown as comments next to the lines of the synthesized program. For q_1 , this is just the input and output values of the initial example. In the next steps this information would be far more valuable.

Given q_1 , the programmer responds by providing *granular feedback*. Using GIM it is possible to narrow the space of programs using syntactic operations. Presented with `input.takeRight (2)`, the user can *exclude* a sequence of operations from the vocabulary, in this instance `takeRight (2)`, ruling out *any program* where `takeRight (2)` appears. This also significantly reduces the space of candidate programs considered by the synthesizer.

The synthesizer responds with q_2 . Note that in such cases the debug information assists the programmer in understanding the program, determining whether it is correct, or, as in this case, identifying why it is incorrect. To rule out q_2 , the user rules out the sequence `drop (1) .take (2)`, as the debug information shows the effect (“take the second and third character of the string”), and the user deems it undesirable at any point in the computation to truncate the string, as all characters should be considered.

The synthesizer responds with q_3 . This candidate program contains something the programmer would like to preserve: using the debug information, they can see that the prefix `input.zip (input.tail)` creates all bigrams in the string. The user can mark this prefix to *affix*, or to make sure all candidate programs displayed from now on begin with this prefix. This removes all programs that start with any other function in \mathcal{V} , effectively slicing the size of the search space by $|\mathcal{V}|$. Another option available to the user (multiple operations stemming from the same program are not only allowed but encouraged) is to exclude `take (2)` since the resulting truncation of the list is undesirable.

Eventually, the synthesizer produces the following program:

```
1 input // "abdfibfcfdebdfdebdihgfkjfdabd"
2 .zip (input.tail) // List ((a,b), (b,d), (d,f), (f,i), (i,b), (b,f), ...)
3 .map (p => p._1.toString + p._2) // List ("ab", "bd", "df", "fi", "ib", ...)
4 .groupBy (x => x) // Map ("bf" -> List ("bf"), "ib" -> List ("ib"), ...)
5 .map (kv => kv._1 -> kv._2.length) // Map ("bf" -> 1, "ib" -> 1, "gf" -> 1, ...)
6 .maxBy (_._2) // ("bd", 4)
7 ._1 // "bd"
```

which does not discard any bigram, counts the number of occurrences, and retrieves the maximum. This program is accepted.

Below we summarize the key aspects of GIM, as demonstrated by the above example.

Key Aspects

- **Interaction Model:** granular interaction in both directions: the synthesizer provides debug information on intermediate states of the program, the programmer can provide feedback (keep/discard) on parts of the program, in addition to input-output examples.
- **Assisting the User:** our approach assists the user in two ways. First, the synthesizer supplements candidate programs with debug information that helps the programmer understand the good and bad parts of a candidate program. Second, the ability to give explicit feedback on the code itself provides an alternative (and complementary) way to interact with the system without crafting potentially complicated differentiating examples.
- **Insufficiency of Examples:** examples are both inconvenient and insufficient to communicate a programmer's intent. Other operations are needed to allow a programmer to filter programs not only according to semantic equivalence but also according to additional criteria such as readability, best practices and performance.

3 Background

In this work we address synthesis of functional programs. Below we provide the necessary background.

Notation of functions We interchangeably use the mathematical notation $h(g(f(x)))$ for the functional composition called on object x and the Scala notation $x.f.g.h$ (in Scala, a function application with no arguments does not require parentheses).

For a functional program m , we denote $\llbracket m \rrbracket$ as the function that the program computes. Formally, $\llbracket m \rrbracket : D \rightarrow D \cup \{\perp\}$ maps every element i in the domain, D , either to the element in D that the program outputs on i , or to an error (compilation or runtime) $\perp \notin D$.

Vocabulary and the candidate program space The candidate program space consists of programs of the form `input.f1...fn-1.fn` (in Scala notation), or $f_n(f_{n-1}(\dots f_1(input)\dots))$ (in mathematical notation), where each f_i is a method from a predefined vocabulary \mathcal{V} . Object methods that accept arguments are handled by partially applying them with predefined arguments, such as constants, lambda functions or variables in the context, leaving only the self reference as an argument. Generally, the candidate program space includes every program in \mathcal{V}^* , but we notice that for some programs there are compilation errors as not all $f \in \mathcal{V}$ is applicable to all objects.

Programming by Example (PBE) Programming by Example is a sub-class of program synthesis where all communication with the synthesizer is done using examples. The classic PBE problem is defined as a pair $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{L})$ of initial examples \mathcal{E} and target language \mathcal{L} , where each example in \mathcal{E} is a pair (i, o) of input $i \in D$ and expected output $o \in D$. The result of the PBE problem $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{L})$ is a program m , which is a valid program in \mathcal{L} , that satisfies every example in \mathcal{E} , i.e., $\llbracket m \rrbracket(i) = o$ for every $(i, o) \in \mathcal{E}$. Since there might be more than one program m in the language \mathcal{L} that matches all specifications, the iterative PBE problem was introduced. In the iterative model, each candidate program m_i is presented to the user, which may then accept m_i and terminate the run, or answer the synthesizer with additional examples \mathcal{E}_i which direct it in continuing the search.

4 The Insufficiency of Examples

In this section, we show the importance of extending the user's answer model beyond input-output examples. We examine in more formal details the scenario described in Section 2.1, where the user has seen an undesirable program component and would like to exclude it specifically. We will show that this is not always possible, i.e., that examples are insufficient to communicate the user's intent.

As seen in Section 2.1, the user wishes to rule out the function `min`, but simply providing an example to rule out the current program might not be enough to remove `min` from *all* candidates to ensure it never recurs. We now formally prove it is *impossible* to completely remove methods like `min` from the search space using examples.

We recall the definition of equivalence between programs. Programs m_1 and m_2 are *equivalent* if $\llbracket m_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket m_2 \rrbracket$. Using this we prove the following claim:

CLAIM 4.1. *Let $v \in \mathcal{V}$ be a letter such that there exists a program m that is equivalent to m^* and contains v . Then examples alone cannot rule out the letter $v \in \mathcal{V}$ from candidate programs.*

The proof follows since examples can only distinguish between programs that compute different functions.

Next we show that Claim 4.1 is applicable to methods that are prevalent in programming languages and extremely useful in some contexts, and therefore are likely to find their way into the vocabularies used in synthesis. We consider two classes of methods: invertible methods and nullipotent methods.

Invertible methods are methods for which there exists an inverse method such that applying the two in a pair (in some order) leads back to the initial input. For instance, `reverse` on a list or iterator is invertible and its own inverse, as `in.reverse.reverse` will be identical to `in`, i.e. `reverse` is its own inverse method. Another example includes `zipWithIndex` and `map(_._1)`, which cancel each other out. An invertible method can always be added to the target program along with its inverse, resulting in an equivalent program. Hence, it will never be ruled out by examples.

Nullipotent methods are methods that, when applied, lead to the same result as not being applied. While this is often context-sensitive, e.g. calling `toList` on a list or `mkString` on a string, there are calls that will always be nullipotent, such as `takeWhile(true)`. Because some methods are nullipotent only in a certain context, they may be in a synthesizer's vocabulary, and end up in the program space in contexts where they are nullipotent. It is easy to construct a program that contains nullipotent methods and is equivalent to the target program. Hence, similarly to invertible methods, these methods cannot be eliminated by examples.

Returning to our example, for the target program in Section 2, `input.zip(input.tail).map(p => p._1.toString + p._2).groupBy(x => x).map(kv => kv._1 -> kv._2.length).maxBy(_._2)._1`, let us now construct an equivalent program by appending to it an invertible pair of functions in sequence: `sliding(2).min`. The function `sliding(2)`, when applied to a string of length 2 will return `List("dc")`, and `min` when applied to list of size 1 will return the only member of the list. This means there is a program that is equivalent to m^* on every input, and contains `min`. As such, given any number of examples applied `min`, a letter from \mathcal{V} , will not be ruled out entirely.

This construction is possible for many target programs, showing that it is often impossible to discard an undesirable member of the alphabet or an undesired sequence using examples alone.

Furthermore, since many existing PBE synthesizers prune very aggressively based on *observational equivalence*, or equivalence based only on the given examples, programs that do not include the undesired component may not be available anymore as they've been removed from the space.

These properties leave us with the need to define a more expressive, more granular model.

The practical implications of claim 4.1 are discussed in section 6.4, which examines the existence of method sequences deemed undesirable by users in candidate programs. The data as well as opinions collected from users show that the inability to remove an undesirable letter from the alphabet has real-world consequences, which affect the user's frustration with the synthesizer (see table 6).

5 The Granular Interaction Model

In this section, we describe the Granular Interaction Model (GIM) mechanism, which extends the PBE model with additional predicates. Namely, predicates in GIM include examples, but also additional predicates. The key idea is to add a broader form of feedback from the user to the synthesizer than has been available in PBE. We begin by describing the operations and the type of feedback that each one of them allows the user to provide the synthesizer with, and discuss the observed uses of each.

5.1 Granular predicates

In the setting of functional compositions, we choose to present GIM with three syntactic predicates. We refer to these predicates as granular since they impose constraints on *parts* of the program, rather than on its full behavior, as captured by the function it computes or its input and output types. We will also discuss other, possible predicates.

Given a candidate program $m = f_n(f_{n-1}(\dots input \dots))$ we introduce the following predicates, to be tested against other programs $m' = f'_m(f'_{m-1}(\dots input \dots))$

- (1) *remove*(f_i, \dots, f_j) where $i \leq j$: will hold only for programs m' where $\exists k. f'_k = f_i \wedge \dots \wedge f'_{k+i-j} = f_j$
- (2) *retain*(f_i, \dots, f_j) where $i \leq j$: will hold only for programs m' where $\exists k. f'_k = f_i \wedge \dots \wedge f'_{k+i-j} = f_j$
- (3) *affix*(f_0, \dots, f_i): will hold only for programs m' where $\forall j \leq i. f_j = f'_j$.

The *remove* operation rules out a sequence of one or more method calls as undesirable. For the example in Section 2, to rule out `min` the user would simply add the predicate *remove*(`min`). However, should the user rule out a sequence longer than a single method, this would apply to the sequence as a whole: the predicate *remove*(`reverse, reverse`) does not exclude the `reverse` method, only two consecutive invocations of it that cancel out.

The *retain* operation defines a sequence that must appear in the target program. It is similarly defined for sequences: when applied to a single method, it forces the method, and when applied to a sequence it forces the sequence, in-order. It can be seen, essentially, as creating a procedure and then deeming that procedure as desirable.

However, since the *retain* is not dependent on the location of the procedure in the program, we add an additional predicate for not only setting a procedure, but forcing its location to the beginning of the program. The *affix* predicate will essentially narrow the search space to sub-programs that come after the desired prefix.

Additional predicates As these three operations are highly expressive and easy to understand, we have centered the experiments in this paper around them, but they are, by no means, the only possible predicates. Many other granular operations exist. For instance, the user can reason about intermediate states of the program by demanding or excluding certain intermediate states for a given input. A user can also require an error, or an error of a certain kind, for a given input. Section 5.4 will expand on the reasons to select certain expansions to the interaction model over others.

5.2 Adding a debugging view of the code

GIM assumes an interaction with users that are comfortable with reading code. This means not only that more can be expected from them, but that they can be assisted in ways not generally offered by a regular synthesizer. In the same way the interaction from the user to the synthesizer can be granulated, so can the interaction from the synthesizer to the user.

PBE tools like FlashFill only show the user the output of running the program on an input. Other tools that do show code show the program while guaranteeing it satisfies all examples in \mathcal{E} . In a functional concatenation, it is possible to show the user the result of each subprogram, on each $e \in \mathcal{E}$. This means that even if some $f \in \mathcal{V}$ is not familiar to the user, they can still gauge its effect and determine whether or not that effect is desired by *example*.

EXAMPLE 1. *Let us consider the case where input is a list of strings, and the user is presented with the candidate program `input.sliding(3).map(l => l.mkString)`. While they are familiar with the `mkString` method, which formats a list into a string, and with mapping a list, they have never encountered `sliding`.*

The user could look up the method and read up on its behavior. However, oftentimes its behavior will be simple enough to understand by its operation within the program. Therefore, if the user is provided with the intermediate states of the program like so:

```
1 input //List("aa", "bb", "cc", "dd", "ee")
2 .sliding(3) //List(List("aa", "bb", "cc"), List("bb", "cc", "dd"), ...)
3 .map(s => s.mkString) //List("aabbcc", "bbccdd", "ccdde")
```

they can understand that `sliding` returns a list of sublists of length n beginning at each position in the list – a sliding window of size n .

5.3 Enabling the User

After we have introduced the formal framework for predicates, we now wish to leverage it to create a user interaction model. We suggest the following iterative process, which we have implemented for the user study in section 6.3.

A candidate program is displayed to the user alongside the debug information. The top image in fig. 1 shows this in our UI. The user is now able to study the program and accept or reject it.

If the user is dissatisfied with the program, and would like to reject it, the goal is to allow them to directly express the source of dissatisfaction as predicates as easily as possible. Towards this end, we let the user point out a portion of the program (e.g. by

code	Debug information (example 1)
input	"abdfibfcfdebbdfdebdihgfkjfdbebd"
zip(input.tail)	List((a,b), (b,d), (d,f), (f,i), (i,b), (b,f), (f,c), (c,f), (f,d),
drop(l)	List((b,d), (d,f), (f,i), (i,b), (b,f), (f,c), (c,f), (f,d), (d,e),
map(p => p._1.toString + p._2)	List("bd", "df", "fi", "ib", "bf", "fc", "cf", "fd", "de", "eb", "bd"
min	"bd"

code	Debug information (example 1)
input	"abdfibfcfdebbdfdebdihgfkjfdbebd"
zip(input.tail)	List((a,b), (b,d), (d,f), (f,i), (i,b), (b,f), (f,c), (c,f), (f,d),
drop(l)	List((b,d), (d,f), (f,i), (i,b), (b,f), (f,c), (c,f), (f,d), (d,e),
map(p => p._1.toString +	List("bd", "df", "fi", "ib", "bf", "fc", "cf", "fd", "de", "eb", "bd"
min	"bd"

Figure 1: Program with debug information, a sequence selected for removal

right-clicking it) and mark it as desirable or undesirable, as seen in the bottom image in fig. 1.

This process of easily providing feedback on the program turns predicates into a convenient tool for feedback to the synthesizer.

5.4 Enabling the synthesizer

As we have seen, the choice of predicates is crucial from the user’s perspective. However, it is also important for the synthesizer to be able to use them in maintaining and updating a representation of the search space. To complete this section, we show how the predicates described in section 5.1 are naturally utilized by a synthesizer for the domain of linear functional concatenations.

Enumerating synthesizer The state of the art in program synthesis hinges on enumerating the program space in a bottom-up fashion [3, 4, 11]. For the domain considered in this paper, bottom-up enumeration consists of concatenating method calls to prefixes already enumerated, starting with the program of length 0, *input*. This enumeration is restricted by types, i.e. by compilation. The search space in this synthesizer can be represented as an edge-labeled tree where the root is the program *input* and each edge is labeled by a method name from \mathcal{V} . Each finite-length path in the tree represents the program that is the concatenation of every label along the path. The tree is initially pruned by compilation errors (i.e., if $f \in \mathcal{V}$ does not exist for the return type of m , it will be pruned from the children of the node representing m). It now represents the candidate program space for an unconstrained synthesizer state.

We can see that every program deemed undesirable by the operations *affix* and *remove* cannot be extended into a desirable program. Therefore these extensions can be discarded and the tree representing the candidate space can be pruned at the nodes of these programs.

This is an example of predicates that are *well suited* to the representation of the state of the synthesizer, in that they not only aid the user but also help guide the search of the space. Since the combination of the enumeration and these predicates is monotone, a program that was pruned from the search space will never need to be looked at in a future, more constrained iteration. This means that the synthesizer does not need to be restarted across iterations – however, even if it is, these predicates will allow it to construct a much smaller search space to begin with.

6 Evaluation

To evaluate our approach, we compared three interaction models:

- (1) PBE: replicating the state of the art in synthesis, the user can communicate with the synthesizer via input-output pairs.

- (2) Syntax: testing the new operation set proposed in Section 5, the user can communicate with the synthesizer via syntactic predicates on the program.
- (3) GIM: testing the full model, the user can communicate via both sets of predicates.

We limit the test of the granular interaction model to three operations that are relevant to functional compositions and are easy to understand. Therefore, we select the operations detailed in section 5.1 as our basic set of granular operations.

We have conducted two studies:

- (1) A study of ideal sessions with different operations (i.e., families of predicates) for a set of benchmarks.
- (2) A controlled user study which tests the usability of a GIM synthesizer for programmers and the benefits when measured against a control group using PBE.

Synthesizer We implemented a simple enumerating synthesizer described in section 5.4 in Scala, using the *nsc* interpreter (used to implement the Scala REPL). The vocabulary \mathcal{V} is provided to the algorithm, and programs are compiled and evaluated on the inputs.

In order to support the study in section 6.2, the synthesizer accepts input of additional examples, rejection of the current program, or of *affix*, *remove* and *retain* predicates. In order to support the user study in section 6.3, it also precomputes the space of valid programs.

6.1 Problem set

We performed the studies using a set of functional programming exercises from three different domains: strings, lists and streams. The exercises were collected from Scala tutorial sites and examples for using MapReduce. The tasks, described in Tab. 3, were each paired with a vocabulary and an initial set of examples.

Discussion As seen in Tab. 3, the set of valid programs is significantly smaller than $|\mathcal{V}|^{|m^*|}$, but in many cases the space still contains thousands or tens of thousands of programs. There is also fair amount of inherent ambiguity over the initial example set \mathcal{E}_{init} , as can be seen in the “reject only” column, representing the set of all programs up to length $|m^*|$ that match \mathcal{E}_{init} . This means that, even limiting the search space to the known length of the target program we would start with hundreds or thousands of matching programs that need to be filtered by the user.

6.2 Ideal synthesis sessions

Experimental questions For each task in the problem set we answer the following question: under the ideal conditions of an expert user and knowledge of the target program, how many questions (i.e. candidate programs) are posed to the user for each predicate family?

Test setup In order to test these questions, each task in the problem set was run in four settings:

- **Reject only**: no operations other than rejecting the current example. This is an enumeration of the programs that match the initial example set.
- **PBE, Syntax, and GIM**: as described above, all with the addition of a reject operation.

Examples and other predicates were selected by an expert user (author of this paper) making an effort to create a run with fewer iterations and more aggressive pruning of the space in each iteration.

	Benchmark		$ \mathcal{V} $	$ \mathcal{E}_{init} $	$ m^* $	candidate space size	Number of Candidates			
							reject only	PBE	Syntax	GIM
strings	dropnthletter	Drop every 5th letter in a string	20	1	3	280	4	2	3	2 (1)
	freqbigram	Most frequent bigram in a string	19	1	6	118261	674	4	8	6 (0)
	frequword	Most frequent word in a string	25	1	4	4853	126	5	8	6 (1)
	linesinfile	Number of lines in file	20	1	2	47	4	3	4	3 (1)
	nonemptylines	Number of non-empty lines in file	21	1	3	1664	29	2	3	3 (1)
lists	anagrams	Group words that are anagrams	17	1	6	13554	12	3	3	3 (0)
	histogram	Create a histogram of number list	12	1	5	4208	37	3	9	3 (1)
	median	Find the median of a list of numbers	20	1	4	71211	1663	6	14	9 (1)
	posinlist	Get all positive numbers from list	20	1	2	190	17	3	4	4 (1)
	sudokusquare	Validate a square in sudoku	17	1	5	1602	118	3	7	4 (0)
	sumsquares	Sum of squares of a list of numbers	20	1	2	120	2	2	2	2 (0)
streams	bitstream	Next integer from a stream of bits	17	2	4	3717	101	2	8	5 (1)
	numhashtags	Count hashtags in a stream of tweets	15	1	7	11527	2	2	2	2 (0)
	slidingavg	Average next three values from every index	25	1	4	60479	125	2	2	2 (0)

Table 3: The test setup of 14 synthesis experiments, showing the ambiguity inherent in \mathcal{E}_{init} , and the number of iterations to the target program in an ideal synthesis session with each available set of operations. Parentheses indicate examples used.

Results Tab. 3 shows the results for each of the programming tasks. As can be seen from the table, in ideal (i.e. thoroughly optimized, expert user) runs, the number of questions produced by the synthesizer for a PBE run was lowest. This was not unexpected: carefully selected examples are a fast way to differentiate between programs. The subject of examples selected in less ideal conditions is left to the following section. But we also see that in a run allowing all predicates the number of questions asked was lowered substantially compared to syntax only, without involving more than one example.

6.3 User study

To test the interaction between programmer and synthesizer, we conducted a user study, where we compared the interaction of programmers with the synthesizer using the three families of operations: **PBE** (control), **Syntax**, and **GIM**.

Research questions We examine the following questions:

- (1) *Are answers consisting of syntactic predicates easier or faster to generate than example predicates?* This question is examined in two different ways: first, for each task the average and median iteration times with the synthesizer are compared between the control group (PBE) and the Syntax group. Second, when users are allowed both (GIM), the time spent on iterations where they provided examples is measured against their average time.
- (2) *Is the total time to solution improved by adding or exchanging the available predicates?*
- (3) *Are users able to reach a correct program using each of the predicate sets?*
- (4) *Do users prefer examples?* This question examines the choices made by the participants in the GIM group, which had a choice between all possible predicates. We test how often examples were chosen, and whether the task being solved had an effect on this preference.
- (5) *Are users in PBE sessions distracted by undesirable sequences that cannot be removed?* We check the recurrence in the PBE group of sequences that were deemed undesirable by users in the Syntax and GIM groups, and try to determine whether these repeat enough to distract the user. We also check for the acceptance of equivalent programs with superfluous elements as mentioned in claim 4.1. In addition, we bring some anecdotal opinions volunteered by participants.

Most questions are examined on all participants. We show data for the small set of users experienced in Scala against those new to Scala when the difference is of interest.

Test setup 32 developers participated in the study. They consist of 7 undergraduates in their final year of a CS degree, 9 graduate students in CS, most with a history as developers outside academia, and 16 industry developers employed by four different companies. Of the 32, 8 had prior experience with the Scala programming language.

The participants in the study were evenly distributed between three test groups: PBE, Syntax and GIM. Each participant was randomly assigned to one of the test groups. Not all participants performed all tasks (scheduling constraints were cited for the most part). The order of the tasks was randomized for each user.

The reject operation was not allowed in any group, forcing users to provide the process with new information as they would in any state of the art synthesizer, rather than just iterate the program space.

Each participant was asked to use the synthesizer to solve three programming questions. The three problems—frequword, nonemptylines, and histogram—were selected from the tasks tested in section 6.2 because of their high level of ambiguity based on the initial example, and not requiring any additional libraries or definitions outside the Scala standard library to solve (i.e., the programs could be run in a Scala console with no imports or definitions).

Participants were given a short introduction to Scala, if they were not already familiar with it, and aided themselves with a Scala REPL, but no online sources or documentation.

Implementation Participants performed the tasks using the UI shown in fig. 1. The space of programs was precomputed by the enumerating synthesizer detailed in section 6.1 and over the same initial inputs, up to a program length of 6. In each iteration a program that uphold every predicate given by the user was selected from the set of programs. Selection used a hash-based criterion to prevent lexicographical ordering and favoring of short programs, in order to also show the user complex programs. At the end of every iteration the user’s answers are added to the synthesizer’s state and the programs are filtered accordingly. If the precomputed set is exhausted, the user is given the option of starting over or abandoning the current task.

6.4 User study results

We address each question individually.

task	group	no. of sessions	iteration time (sec)		number of iterations		correct		
			avg	med	avg	med	finished	target	equiv.
histogram	PBE	11	163.34	131.97	2.45	2.0	11	1	10
	Syntax	9	86.27	59.97	12.11	8.0	9	3	4
	GIM	10	98.78	96.18	8.90	7.5	10	5	4
no. lines with text	PBE	11	170.13	168.17	2.73	2.0	11	0	8
	Syntax	8	82.16	60.56	10.50	9.5	7	3	1
	GIM	11	78.26	65.78	8.82	8.0	9	4	3
most frequent word	PBE	11	114.52	71.27	4.45	4.0	10	9	0
	Syntax	10	58.28	50.34	22.10	15.0	8	7	0
	GIM	11	79.87	53.84	8.82	8.0	10	8	0

Table 4: Summary of the three tasks performed in the user study (all users).

Question 1: The average and median times per iteration are shown in table 4. Medians are also shown in Fig. 2.

We examined the distributions of data using the Mann-Whitney test. The threshold for statistical significance selected was $p < 0.05$. A significant difference was found in the time per iteration between the control (PBE) group and the syntax-only group for all tests: histogram (131.97s, 59.97s, $p=0.03$), nonemptylines (168.17s, 60.56s, $p=0.03$) and frequword (71.27s, 50.34s, $p=0.04$). A significant difference was found between the control group and the GIM group for two of the three tests: histogram (131.97s, 96.18s, $p=0.03$), nonemptylines (168.17s, 65.78 s, $p=0.03$), but not for frequword (71.27s, 53.84s, $p=0.058$). Additionally, a significant difference was found between the syntax-only group and the GIM group for one test: histogram (59.97s, 96.18s, $p=0.047$), and not for nonemptylines (60.56s, 65.78s, $p=0.33$) or frequword (50.34s, 53.84s, $p=0.19$).

These results imply that, with the exception of the frequword test for the GIM group, using either a syntax-only or both syntax and example predicates, there is a speedup in iteration time from solving the same problem in PBE alone. Additionally, with the exception of the histogram task, the slowdown in iteration time between syntax-only and GIM seems to be coincidental.

In addition, we looked only at the session for users in the GIM group and within each session examined the time to create an example against the average iteration time. There is a slowdown of 19.5% in iteration time with an example, and we see that this difference is statistically significant (75.03s, 90.11s, $p=0.049$).

We can therefore answer question 1 in the affirmative on both counts: syntactic predicates are faster to generate than examples, both when examining the test groups against the PBE group, and when examining the users with access to both against themselves.

Question 2: We noticed a change in the median total time between the control (PBE) and the other groups (Syntax and GIM) indicating a possible slowdown. However, for none of the individual tests, as well as for a unification of all tests, was this change statistically significant ($p > 0.25$ for all). Therefore, while we do not answer question 2 in the affirmative – as the total time was not improved in either of the test groups – we can also say that the evidence of a slowdown may be coincidental.

Question 3: The correctness results in table 4 are visualized in Fig. 4. Aside from the histogram task, completed by all users, all other tasks had some users stopping without accepting a program. The success percentage in reaching any functionally-correct response, is highest for PBE (100%, 73%, 90%), lowest for Syntax (78%, 57%, 87%), and

task	group	no. of sessions	sessions used		percent examples per user			
			no. of examples	used	avg	med	min	max
all users	histogram	10	9	37.6%	35.0%	0.0%	85.7%	
	nonemptylines	11	8	29.7%	31.0%	0.0%	66.7%	
	frequword	11	10	36.1%	37.5%	0.0%	85.7%	
users familiar with Scala	histogram	2	2	74.1%	74.1%	62.5%	85.7%	
	nonemptylines	2	2	46.7%	46.7%	33.3%	60.0%	
	frequword	2	2	29.9%	29.9%	22.2%	37.5%	
users unfamiliar with Scala	histogram	8	7	28.5%	17.7%	0.0%	66.7%	
	nonemptylines	9	6	25.9%	30.0%	0.0%	66.7%	
	frequword	9	8	37.5%	37.5%	0.0%	85.7%	

Table 5: Proportional part (%) of examples in the predicates provided by GIM group users. Some used no examples at all, none used only examples.

removed sequence	GIM/Syntax users saw and removed	PBE			
		times seen in session	distracting occurrences	users	distracted
tail	84.2% (16)	1	4	2.8	45.5% (5)
takeWhile(c => c != "\n")	73.7% (14)	1	4	2.7	54.5% (6)
filterNot(c => c == '\r' c == '\n')	57.9% (11)	0	3	2.3	27.3% (3)
filter(!_isEmpty)	27.3% (3)	0	3	2.3	27.3% (3)
tail.takeWhile(c => c != "\n")	15.8% (3)	1	4	2.8	45.5% (5)
takeRight(1)	100.0% (12)	0	1	0	0.0% (0)
drop(10)	84.6% (11)	0	1	0	0.0% (0)
drop(1)	76.5% (13)	0	3	2.5	16.7% (2)
takeRight(6)	76.2% (16)	1	3	2.4	58.3% (7)
dropRight(1)	71.4% (15)	0	7	3.3	33.3% (4)
take(5)	57.1% (12)	1	5	2.8	66.7% (8)
last	42.9% (6)	0	3	3	16.7% (2)
drop(10).drop(1)	41.7% (5)	0	1	0	0.0% (0)
takeRight(6).takeRight(6)	38.1% (8)	1	2	2	8.3% (1)
toMap	57.9% (11)	1	1	0	0.0% (0)
map(_._1 -> 1)	42.1% (8)	1	1	0	0.0% (0)
zipWithIndex	26.3% (5)	1	1	0	0.0% (0)
map(_._1.toInt)	15.8% (3)	1	1	0	0.0% (0)

Table 6: Frequently-removed method sequences in the Syntax and GIM groups and their occurrence in the PBE group.

rebounds with GIM (90%, 77%, 80%) to levels close to the control, even overtaking it for the nonemptylines task.

Question 4: A summary of how often users chose examples appears in table 5 and fig. 3. We can see a distinction between users familiar with Scala and users who are not. While users familiar with Scala used examples in every task, for users unfamiliar with Scala every task included at least one user avoiding examples – sometimes as many as 1/3 of the users. The proportional part of examples out of the total predicates used in the task is fairly low for the entire test group, ranging from 31% to 37.5% (median).

Looking at the data by familiarity with Scala we see that the preference for examples is inverse between the two groups: users familiar with Scala preferred more examples overwhelmingly (over 60% examples for both users) for the histogram task and preferred other predicates for the frequword (most frequent word) task. Conversely, users unfamiliar with Scala preferred examples (but not as overwhelmingly, half the participants over 30%) for the frequword task and favored other predicates (half the participants under 20% examples) when solving the histogram task. This seems to suggest a relationship with the difficulty of the task – histogram is a less trivial problem than frequword. Despite this, even in cases where examples were favored, they were not the only tool used.

Question 5: To test whether users were distracted by undesirable sequences that cannot be removed we first located undesirable sequences by how many users who had the ability (i.e. access to a *remove* predicate) removed them, then counted their appearance in the sessions of users from the PBE group. Table 6 shows the results. It is important to note that not all sequences that were commonly removed appeared in the PBE group at all, itself an indicator of how syntax operations vastly change the traversal of the search space.

These undesirable sequences appeared in user sessions up to 7 times in a single session. Some of these sequences distracted (i.e. kept reappearing) up to $\frac{2}{3}$ of the users performing a task, and on average 22.2% of the users. Furthermore, a distracting sequence appeared, on average, around 3 times in each session. This shows that the inability to remove a letter or sequence discussed in claim 4.1 is not only a theoretical problem, nor is it only a problem at the end of the process as seen in table 4, but a real distraction from the ability to synthesize over an expressive vocabulary.

When examining the presence of distracting elements in the final program accepted by participants, we can see in fig. 4 that in two of the tasks (histogram and nonemptylines) most or all PBE users ended up accepting a program with superfluous elements. For example, many histogram sessions accepted a program with a call of `toMap` on a map, and many nonemptylines sessions accepted a program that called `filterNot(c => c == '\r' || c == '\n')` on a list of strings. Both of these are nullipotent elements: `toMap` creates a map from a map, and `filterNot(c => c == '\r' || c == '\n')` compares strings to characters and so always filters nothing.

In addition, in these cases where PBE users stopped at an equivalent program rather than the target program, we tested the number of iterations spent in the same equivalence class (i.e. presented with the same candidate program) before accepting the program. While most users accepted an equivalent program immediately, one user performing the histogram task tried an additional iteration and one user tried two additional iterations. For nonemptylines, two users tried an additional iteration and one user tried two additional iterations. Altogether, these are 22% of the sessions where users tried unsuccessfully to improve upon the program they already had, either trying to get rid of a nullipotent element or not realizing it has no influence, before finally accepting it.

We chose not to tackle the questions of user preference and measures of distraction with a questionnaire asking the users to approximate their preference, sticking only to empirical results. Despite that, we wish to bring several anecdotes from the course of the experiment that may help shed light on the behavior observed. Users in the PBE test group expressed very specific frustration on several occasions such as “*it insists on using take(5) no matter what I do*” while solving the most frequent word task, or “*I couldn’t get rid of these nonsense functions, I just wanted to shake it*” after solving the non-empty lines task.

6.5 Discussion and conclusions

In this section we discuss the results of the study.

Speed and ease of use We see a speedup of iteration time between examples and other predicates. The change is largest between the PBE and Syntax groups, and a smaller speedup when examining the GIM group against itself. We may attribute this difference between the two tests to the fact that the users in the GIM group resort to

examples only when they are convenient or readily apparent and therefore take a shorter amount of time to create.

When combined with a low preference for examples, we conclude that syntax predicates are *easier* for the user to use in general.

In addition, when we combine the improvement in iteration time, the change in number of iterations (itself statistically significant) and the lack of significance in the change in total time, we conclude that changing the type of predicates simply leads to the same time spent on the synthesis task *using more, but shorter and easier, iterations*.

Distracting elements and user frustration Much of the frustration users in the PBE group expressed had to do with recurring program elements they thought were useless. Recurring undesirable sequences showed up in up to $\frac{2}{3}$ of the users and recurred on average 3 times during the session, which is definitely a reason for frustration. In addition, some PBE users wasted time and effort trying to remove elements that cannot be removed. We therefore conclude that avoiding this distraction by giving users more tools would, at the very least, make for more content users.

Helpfulness of debug information We attribute the success rate and relatively short use times of a set of developers who have never before seen Scala to the guidance offered by debug information. We did not target this specifically in the experiment, but 9 separate users volunteered to us after the experiment that it was anywhere from “helpful” to “lifesaving” in understanding unfamiliar methods and keeping track of examples. This approval included people who were familiar with Scala and developers who develop in Scala.

Correctness with syntax operations There is a dip in correctness (a functionally correct program was not reached) from the PBE group to the Syntax group, but an improvement in GIM. We attribute this to the helpfulness of debug information: it seems to be easier to make a correct decision about a program when presented with its breakdown over several examples, rather than just the single initial example available to the Syntax group.

Preferred operations There is a very strong preference of all users for syntactic predicates over examples. However, there may be a subordinate trend within this preference: separating the users into those familiar with Scala and those who are not, the preference reverses. Users familiar with Scala preferred more examples than the rest, and preferred examples over other predicates in the harder task, histogram, and predicates over examples in the easier task, frequword. This may have to do with their ability to better understand a candidate program: more savvy programmers could more easily read the programs and so preferred to break the observed behavior with examples, whereas programmers that have a harder time reading the code focus on individual program elements. This remains a conjecture as the set of users familiar with Scala within the GIM group is only 2.

7 Threats to Validity

Cross validation The study was not cross-validated (i.e. each user performing tasks in several groups). Because the predicate families include each other, we felt it would create a bias toward some operations based on order. As cross validation should not be used when it creates bias, we decided against it. We tried to negate some of the differences between individual programmers tested by drawing




Figure 2: Median iteration time per task in each test group. Significant change from PBE indicated by *.




Figure 3: Examples used (med, min, max) by GIM users (all operations). None used 100% examples.




Figure 4: No. users that reached the target program or an equivalent (non-functional differences) result.

participants from similar backgrounds – same year in university, developers in the same department – and then dividing them evenly.

Sampling of population An external validity issue mentioned in section 6.5 is the relatively small percentage of participants familiar with Scala – only 25% of the participants of the study, and, due to random assignment to groups, in some of the groups as few as 20%. As we have already pointed out, this does not allow us to make general claims about differences between Scala-savvy programmers and those who are new to the language. However, we can still generalize our claims with regards to programmers working in a language they have not encountered before – the majority of the participants. Additionally, our sample of undergraduates is not random, but rather of students who felt familiar enough with functional programming to agree to participate. This may skew the ability to generalize. This is hopefully not significant in the compiled results as undergraduates are not a very large percentage of the participants – less than 22%.

8 Related Work

Syntax-based synthesis [2] is the domain of program synthesis where the target program is derived from a target programming language according to the syntax rules. [19, 21, 30, 35] all fall within this scope. The implementation of GIM presented in this paper is syntax-based, where the target language is a functional subset of Scala as specified by \mathcal{V} . Syntax-based synthesis algorithms often use a *user-driven interaction model* [14] which GIM extends.

Programming by Example In PBE the interaction between user and synthesizer for demonstrating the desired behavior is restricted to examples, both in initial specifications and any refinement. Flash-Fill [13, 29] is a PBE tool for automating transformations on an Excel data set, and is included in Microsoft Excel. It does not show its users the program, only its application on the data set. Because the resulting program is never inspected, it might still suffer from overfitting to the examples and is not reusable. Escher [1] is a PBE tool for synthesizing recursive functions. Like FlashFill, Escher decomposes the synthesis task based on the examples, searching for programs that could be used as sub-programs in condition blocks. Escher is parameterized by the set of operations used in synthesis, and like FlashFill, allows refinement only by re-running the process.

Type-Directed Synthesis is a category of synthesis algorithms that perform syntax-based synthesis mainly driven by the types of variables and methods, and the construction of the program is performed through type-derivation rules. While type-directed methods tend to

be user-driven, many of them [12, 15, 27] require only initial specifications and the user manually chooses from multiple candidate programs that match the specification. The philosophy behind GIM is that a user shouldn't consider many programs (could be dozens or more) at a time with no additional data. Rather, programs should be considered one at a time, with additional information that can help the user consider the program in depth and direct the search.

Adding examples to Type-directed synthesis Recent work connects PBE with type-driven synthesis [11, 25]. These tools accept their initial specifications as examples (and their inherent type information), use type derivations to produce candidate programs, and verify them with the examples. BIG λ [31] synthesizes MapReduce processes via sketching and type derivations over lambda calculus and a vocabulary. Examples are also used to verify determinism. SYPET [10] is a type-directed, component-based synthesis algorithm that uses Petri-nets to represent type relationships, and finds possible programs by reachability. Candidates are tested using tests provided by the user. SYPET requires full test cases rather than examples, which, while more descriptive, still require the user to learn a lot about the library in order to program the test case, effort that may be equal to learning about the methods required to solve the programming task at hand.

Sketching The user can restrict the search space via sketches [32–34], structural elements (e.g. conditions or loops) which includes holes to be synthesized. Sketching is a way to leverage a programmer's knowledge of expected syntactic elements, and when used in conjunction with restrictions on the syntax [2] can allow very intricate synthesis. However, since the most general sketch, a program with only a single hole, is usually too unconstrained for the synthesizer, the user must come armed with at least some knowledge of the expected structure rather than iteratively build it as in GIM.

Enriching user input Several existing works have enriched the specification language, or the interface for specifying program behavior. Adding examples to type-directed synthesis is an example of such enrichment. Another approach by Polikarpova et al. [28] with SYNQUID is to use refinement types instead of types, which encode constraints on the solution program, which can be imposed on the candidate space. While these constraints are mainly semantic, unlike GIM's syntactic predicates, this embodies the same ideal of passing off some responsibility to a user that can understand code, or in this case, write code. Likewise, Barman et al. [6] suggest an interactive, user-dependent extension of sketching intended to synthesize *the sketch* itself by leveraging the user to decompose the specifications

and examine the results. Angelic programming [8] leverages programmer knowledge by an expanded interface from synthesizer to user: the user is shown a synthesized program with a nondeterministic “angelic operation” and execution traces for that operation to make the program correct, and it is their responsibility to identify the needed operation to replace the angelic operator.

9 Conclusion

We presented a novel granular interaction model (GIM) for interacting with a synthesizer. This interaction model extends common PBE approaches and enables a programmer to communicate more effectively with the synthesizer.

First, we prove that using only examples is insufficient for eliminating certain undesired operations in a program, where these undesired operations are easy to eliminate when using syntactic operations made available by GIM.

Second, we show the effectiveness of GIM by a controlled user study that compares GIM to standard PBE. Our study shows that participants have *strong preference* (66% of the time) to using granular feedback instead of examples, and are able to provide granular feedback up to 3 times faster (and 2.14 times faster on average).

10 Acknowledgements

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union’s - Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) under grant agreement no. 615688 - ERC- COG-PRIME.

The authors thank Yifat Chen Solomon for her indispensable assistance in getting the user study off the ground, and Hadas E. Sloin and Yoav Goldberg for their help in analyzing the data.

References

- [1] Aws Albarghouthi, Sumit Gulwani, and Zachary Kincaid. 2013. Recursive program synthesis. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*. Springer, 934–950.
- [2] Rajeev Alur, Rastislav Bodik, Garvit Juniwal, Milo MK Martin, Mukund Raghothaman, Sanjit A Seshia, Rishabh Singh, Armando Solar-Lezama, Emina Torlak, and Abhishek Udupa. 2015. Syntax-guided synthesis. *Dependable Software Systems Engineering* 40 (2015), 1–25.
- [3] Rajeev Alur, Dana Fisman, Rishabh Singh, and Armando Solar-Lezama. 2016. SyGuS-Comp 2016: Results and Analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.07627* (2016).
- [4] Rajeev Alur, Arjun Radhakrishna, and Abhishek Udupa. 2017. Scaling Enumerative Program Synthesis via Divide and Conquer. In *International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*. Springer, 319–336.
- [5] Tobias Anton. 2005. XPath-Wrapper Induction by generalizing tree traversal patterns. In *Lernen, Wissensentdeckung und Adaptivität (LWA) 2005, GI Workshops, Saarbrücken*. 126–133.
- [6] Shaon Barman, Rastislav Bodik, Satish Chandra, Emina Torlak, Arka Bhat-tacharya, and David Culler. 2015. Toward tool support for interactive synthesis. In *2015 ACM International Symposium on New Ideas, New Paradigms, and Reflections on Programming and Software (Onward!)*. ACM, 121–136.
- [7] L. Blaine, L. Gilham, J. Liu, D. Smith, and S. Westfold. 1998. Planware - Domain-Specific Synthesis of High-Performance Schedulers. In *Proceedings of the 13th IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE '98)*. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 270–. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=521138.786844>
- [8] Rastislav Bodik, Satish Chandra, Joel Galenson, Doug Kimelman, Nicholas Tung, Shaon Barman, and Casey Rodarmor. 2010. Programming with angelic nondeterminism. In *ACM Sigplan Notices*, Vol. 45. ACM, 339–352.
- [9] Rezaul Chowdhury, Pramod Ganapathi, Jesmin Jahan Tithi, Charles Bachmeier, Bradley C. Kuszmaul, Charles E. Leiserson, Armando Solar-Lezama, and Yuan Tang. 2016. AUTOGEN: Automatic Discovery of Cache-oblivious Parallel Recursive Algorithms for Solving Dynamic Programs. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, Article 10, 12 pages. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2851141.2851167>
- [10] Yu Feng, Ruben Martins, Yuepeng Wang, Isil Dillig, and Thomas Reps. 2017. Component-Based Synthesis for Complex APIs. In *Proceedings of the 44th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2017*.
- [11] 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.
- [12] 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*. ACM, 653–663.
- [13] Sumit Gulwani. 2011. Automating String Processing in Spreadsheets Using Input-output Examples. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL '11)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 317–330. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1926385.1926423>
- [14] Sumit Gulwani. 2012. Synthesis from examples: Interaction models and algorithms. In *Symbolic and Numeric Algorithms for Scientific Computing (SYNASOC), 2012 14th International Symposium on*. IEEE, 8–14.
- [15] Tihomir Gvero, Viktor Kunčak, Ivan Kuraj, and Ruzica Piskac. 2013. Complete completion using types and weights. In *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, Vol. 48. ACM, 27–38.
- [16] Daqing Hou and David M Pletcher. 2011. An evaluation of the strategies of sorting, filtering, and grouping api methods for code completion. In *Software Maintenance (ICSM), 2011 27th IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 233–242.
- [17] Shachar Itzhaki, Rohit Singh, Armando Solar-Lezama, Kuo Yessenov, Yongquan Lu, Charles Leiserson, and Rezaul Chowdhury. 2016. Deriving Divide-and-Conquer Dynamic Programming Algorithms using Solver-Aided Transformations. In *international conference companion on Object oriented programming systems languages and applications*. To appear.
- [18] Shachar Itzhaky, Sumit Gulwani, Neil Immerman, and Mooly Sagiv. 2010. A Simple Inductive Synthesis Methodology and Its Applications. *SIGPLAN Not.* 45, 10 (Oct. 2010), 36–46. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1932682.1869463>
- [19] Shachar Itzhaky, Rohit Singh, Armando Solar-Lezama, Kuo Yessenov, Yongquan Lu, Charles Leiserson, and Rezaul Chowdhury. 2016. Deriving divide-and-conquer dynamic programming algorithms using solver-aided transformations. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, Systems, Languages, and Applications*. ACM, 145–164.
- [20] Jürgen Landauer and Masahito Hirakawa. 1995. Visual AWK: A Model for Text Processing by Demonstration.. In *vl*. 267–274.
- [21] Tessa Lau, Steven A Wolfman, Pedro Domingos, and Daniel S Weld. 2001. Learning repetitive text-editing procedures with SMARTedit. *Your Wish Is My Command: Giving Users the Power to Instruct Their Software* (2001), 209–226.
- [22] Vu Le and Sumit Gulwani. 2014. FlashExtract: a framework for data extraction by examples. In *Proceedings of the 35th Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, Michael F. P. O’Boyle and Keshav Pingali (Eds.). ACM, 55. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2594291.2594333>
- [23] Feng Liu, Nayden Nedev, Nedyalko Prasadnikov, Martin Vechev, and Eran Yahav. 2012. Dynamic synthesis for relaxed memory models. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 47, 6 (2012), 429–440.
- [24] Adi Omari, Sharon Shoham, and Eran Yahav. 2016. Cross-supervised synthesis of web-crawlers. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2016, Austin, TX, USA, May 14-22, 2016*. 368–379. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2884781.2884842>
- [25] Peter-Michael Osera and Steve Zdancewicz. 2015. Type-and-example-directed program synthesis. In *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, Vol. 50. ACM, 619–630.
- [26] Robert Paige. 1990. Symbolic finite differencing-part I. In *European Symposium on Programming*. Springer, 36–56.
- [27] Daniel Perelman, Sumit Gulwani, Thomas Ball, and Dan Grossman. 2012. Type-directed completion of partial expressions. In *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, Vol. 47. ACM, 275–286.
- [28] Nadia Polikarpova, Ivan Kuraj, and Armando Solar-Lezama. 2016. Program synthesis from polymorphic refinement types. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. ACM, 522–538.
- [29] Olegsandr Polozov and Sumit Gulwani. 2015. Flashmeta: A framework for inductive program synthesis. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 50, 10 (2015), 107–126.
- [30] Veselin Raychev, Martin Vechev, and Eran Yahav. 2014. Code completion with statistical language models. In *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, Vol. 49. ACM, 419–428.
- [31] Calvin Smith and Aws Albarghouthi. 2016. MapReduce program synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. ACM, 326–340.
- [32] Armando Solar-Lezama. 2008. *Program synthesis by sketching*. ProQuest.
- [33] Armando Solar-Lezama, Christopher Grant Jones, and Rastislav Bodik. 2008. Sketching concurrent data structures. In *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, Vol. 43. ACM, 136–148.
- [34] Armando Solar-Lezama, Liviu Tancau, Rastislav Bodik, Sanjit Seshia, and Vijay Saraswat. 2006. Combinatorial sketching for finite programs. *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review* 40, 5 (2006), 404–415.

- [35] Abhishek Udupa, Arun Raghavan, Jyotirmoy V Deshmukh, Sela Mador-Haim, Milo MK Martin, and Rajeev Alur. 2013. TRANSIT: specifying protocols with concolic snippets. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 48, 6 (2013), 287–296.
- [36] Martin Vechev, Eran Yahav, and Greta Yorsh. 2010. Abstraction-Guided Synthesis of Synchronization. In *POPL'10: 37th ACM SIGACT-SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*. 327–338.
- [37] Martin T Vechev, Eran Yahav, and David F Bacon. 2006. Correctness-preserving derivation of concurrent garbage collection algorithms. In *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, Vol. 41. ACM, 341–353.
- [38] Martin T Vechev, Eran Yahav, David F Bacon, and Noam Rinetzkly. 2007. CGC-Explorer: a semi-automated search procedure for provably correct concurrent collectors. In *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, Vol. 42. ACM, 456–467.
- [39] Chenglong Wang, Alvin Cheung, and Rastislav Bodik. 2017. Synthesizing highly expressive SQL queries from input-output examples. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. ACM, 452–466.
- [40] Ian H Witten and Dan Mo. 1993. TELS: Learning text editing tasks from examples. In *Watch what I do*. MIT Press, 183–203.
- [41] Shanchan Wu, Jerry Liu, and Jian Fan. 2015. Automatic Web Content Extraction by Combination of Learning and Grouping. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web*. ACM, 1264–1274.