

Generating Energy-Efficient Code via Large-Language Models – Where are we now?

Radu Apsan[†], Vincenzo Stoico[†], Michel Albonico^{*}, Rudra Dhar[‡],
Karthik Vaidhyanathan[‡], Ivano Malavolta[†]

[†] Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, ^{*} Federal University of Technology of Paraná (UTFPR), [‡] IIIT Hyderabad
r.apsan@vu.nl, v.stoico@vu.nl, michelalbonico@utfpr.edu.br, rudra.dhar@research.iiit.ac.in
karthik.vaidhyanathan@iiit.ac.in, i.malavolta@vu.nl

Abstract

Context. The rise of Large Language Models (LLMs) has led to their widespread adoption in development pipelines.

Goal. We empirically assess the energy efficiency of Python code generated by LLMs against human-written code and code developed by a Green software expert.

Method. We test 363 solutions to 9 coding problems from the EvoEval benchmark using 6 widespread LLMs with 4 prompting techniques, and comparing them to human-developed solutions. Energy consumption is measured on three different hardware platforms: a server, a PC, and a Raspberry Pi for a total of ≈ 881 h (36.7 days).

Results. Human solutions are 16% more energy-efficient on the server and 3% on the Raspberry Pi, while LLMs outperform human developers by 25% on the PC. Prompting does not consistently lead to energy savings, where the most energy-efficient prompts vary by hardware platform. The code developed by a Green software expert is consistently more energy-efficient by at least 17% to 30% against all LLMs on all hardware platforms.

Conclusions. Even though LLMs exhibit relatively good code generation capabilities, no LLM-generated code was more energy-efficient than that of an experienced Green software developer, suggesting that as of today there is still a great need of human expertise for developing energy-efficient Python code.

ACM Reference Format:

Radu Apsan[†], Vincenzo Stoico[†], Michel Albonico^{*}, Rudra Dhar[‡], Karthik Vaidhyanathan[‡], Ivano Malavolta[†]. 2026. Generating Energy-Efficient Code via Large-Language Models – Where are we now? . In *2026 IEEE/ACM 48th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '26)*, April 12–18, 2026, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3744916.3764522>

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in understanding natural language and generating human-like text. LLMs are supporting a wide variety of Software Engineering tasks [59], ranging from requirements [81] to design, code generation, and maintenance [82]. Most of LLMs-related research

in Software Engineering regarded code generation, with the emergence of models such as CodeBERT, codeLLama, and Deepseek-Coder [31]. This has also resulted in the development and adoption of different AI code assistants like Github Co-Pilot and Cursor. Their ability to streamline development workflows has positioned them as indispensable aids for both novice and expert developers [3, 59, 68].

The rapid integration of LLMs into Software Engineering processes and practices raises critical questions about their long-term implications, particularly on sustainability. While much focus has been given to the performance [18, 40], readability [61, 67], and maintainability of LLM-generated code [11, 21, 75], its energy efficiency is being studied only recently [15, 20, 69]. This oversight is surprising, given the growing importance and relevance of Green AI [73] and software sustainability in general [14, 38]. As LLMs automate more aspects of code generation, their role in propagating or mitigating such inefficiencies becomes a urgent concern.

This work is an empirical study comparing the energy efficiency of code generated by state-of-the-art LLMs against human-written code. Specifically, we systematically select six of the top Large Language Models (LLMs) in one of the most recent coding benchmarks for LLMs (EvoEval [80]): GPT4 [48], ChatGPT [1], DeepSeek Coder 33B [83], Speechless Codellama 34B [2], Code Millenials 34B [4], and WizardCoder 33B [41]. Further, we generate Python solutions for nine *difficult* coding problems in EvoEval from two different types of developers (average and Green software expert) and the 6 considered LLMs through 4 different prompting techniques. A systematic approach is followed to curate guidelines from existing research literature to develop prompts for improving the energy efficiency of the generated code. We then systematically measure the energy consumption of the generated Python code by executing it on three types of hardware devices: Server, Personal Computer (PC), and Raspberry Pi (RPi). In total, we collect ≈ 4.6 billion energy measures for ≈ 881 h (36.7 days) of sheer execution time.

Our **results** indicate that while code generated via a base prompt outperforms developer-implemented code on the PC by 25%, the average developer outperforms LLMs on the server and RPi by 16% and 3%, respectively. There is no ‘most energy-efficient’ prompt, but having prompts tailored around energy efficiency did demonstrate an impact on improving energy efficiency. Further, code developed by a Green software expert consistently outperforms all other implementations across devices by at least 17%. This result is particularly interesting since it provides evidence about the need for carrying out more research on improving the reasoning capabilities of LLMs in terms of generating energy efficient (Python) code.

The **main contributions** of this study are: (i) an extensive empirical study on the energy efficiency of Python source code generated

This paper is published under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0) license. Authors reserve their rights to disseminate the work on their personal and corporate Web sites with the appropriate attribution.

ICSE '26, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

© 2026 IW3C2 (International World Wide Web Conference Committee), published under Creative Commons CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 License.

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-2025-3/26/04

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3744916.3764522>

by six different LLMs, under several energy-aware prompting techniques, and one non-energy-aware prompt, (ii) a set of 28 guidelines for developing energy-efficient Python code derived by conducting a quasi-systematic literature review, (iii) energy-efficient implementations for four selected coding problems developed by a Green software expert, (iv) an in-depth discussion on the implications of our results and recommendations for researchers and practitioners, (v) a complete replication package [9] containing all supporting artifacts and raw data for independent verification of the obtained results. This study is the first empirical investigation on the energy-efficiency of LLM-generated Python code with this size and with an explicit assessment against code that has been *intentionally* developed to be energy-efficient by an expert in the field.

The **target audience** of this study includes: (i) *developers* willing to use LLMs for generating (energy-efficient) Python code, (ii) *LLMs vendors* willing to improve the capabilities of their LLMs in terms of generating energy-efficient code, and (iii) *software engineering researchers* who can use the results of this study and our suggested research directions as inspiration for their future research.

2 Background

LLMs for code generation. The field of AI has witnessed a revolution with the advent of transformer-based LLMs [72]. These advanced neural network architectures have dramatically reshaped numerous domains. One such domain is code generation, where LLMs are also called “coding assistants” [54]. The ability of LLMs to understand and generate code has sparked significant interest among researchers and practitioners alike, with many tech players heavily investing on LLM-based coding assistants – e.g., Copilot by GitHub. Owing to the reasonably accurate code generation capabilities of LLMs, coding assistants are increasingly becoming a vital component of the software development pipeline [12, 39, 59].

A critical aspect for the quality of LLM-generated code is **prompting**. A prompt is the input provided to the LLM to get a response and it is typically used to enforce rules and ensure specific characteristics of the output [76]. Prompt engineering is the process of creating prompts to get the most accurate, relevant, and useful outputs. Since LLMs are highly sensitive to the phrasing and structure of their inputs, creating effective prompts is *essential* to achieve the desired results. Two widely-used prompting techniques are (i) *zero-shot prompting*, where the model is expected to generate a response based solely on its pre-existing knowledge [37] and (ii) *few-shot prompting*, which provides the model with a few examples to help the model understand the pattern or context of the request [62].

Green IT. The increasing reliance on IT technologies in our society has led to a sharp increase in energy consumption attributed to digital infrastructure [45].

Energy consumption in IT systems is influenced by many factors, e.g., hardware utilization, software design, and deployment strategies [26]. Energy consumption (E , in Joules) is a function of power (P , in Watts) over a given time period (t , in seconds): $E = \int_{t_0}^{t_n} P(t)dt$, where t_0 and t_n are the start and end of measurement, respectively, and $P(t)$ is the instant power drawn by the system. Factors such as CPU utilization [56], memory access patterns [50], and software dependencies [7, 46, 51] can increase power usage, and thus impact the overall energy usage [16]. Research has shown that even programming choices like selecting certain Java collections [47] or

Python libraries [46], can significantly affect energy use. **Green coding** focuses on minimizing energy consumption through efficient coding practices [34]. Green coding strategies include optimized algorithms, energy-efficient software design, energy-aware programming, etc. [34]. As energy consumption in IT continues to rise, integrating these principles into Software Engineering – including AI-driven code generation – becomes critical.

3 Study Design

We designed and conducted this study according to established guidelines for empirical software engineering [60, 78] and energy efficiency assessment [26, 43]. According to the template by Basili *et al.* [13], the **goal** of this study is to analyse *LLM-generated code* for the purpose of *evaluating its energy efficiency* from the point of view of *software developers, LLM vendors, and Software Engineering researchers* in the context of *Python software development*. This goal is achieved by answering the following research questions.

RQ₀ – How does the energy efficiency of LLM-generated code vary when using different LLMs? This RQ serves for setting the context of the experiment and check if different LLMs generate code with significant differences in terms of energy efficiency.

RQ₁ – What is the difference between human code and LLM-generated code in terms of energy efficiency? This RQ compares the energy efficiency of human-developed Python code and code generated using a generic prompt. It helps determine how well LLMs generate efficient code without specific prompt interventions.

RQ₂ – What is the impact of prompt engineering techniques on the energy efficiency of LLM-generated code? This RQ provides evidence about whether prompt engineering affects the energy efficiency of LLM-generated Python code. We expect to discover the characteristics of the prompts or the prompting strategies leading to more energy-efficient Python code, thus providing actionable insights for developers willing to generate greener Python code without retraining or fine tuning the used LLMs.

RQ₃ – What is the difference between code developed by a Green software expert and LLM-generated code in terms of energy efficiency? This RQ assesses how code developed by a Green software expert compares to LLM-generated code. Previous research (see Section 6) shows inconsistent results when about whether human-developed code is more efficient than LLM-generated one. However, no study compared how much it is different from code that has been *intentionally* developed to be energy-efficient by an expert in the field; this code can be seen as an empirically-defined lower bound for the energy usage of Python code.

Figure 1 shows the main phases of this study; each phase is described in the remainder of this section. To ensure independent verification, we provide a complete **replication package** [9] containing the source code, intermediate artifacts, raw and aggregated measures, and documentation related to each phase of the study.

3.1 LLMs and coding problems selection

3.1.1 LLMs selection. For this study, we select the top 6 accessible, unique LLMs in the difficult category of the EvoEval leaderboard [79], as of July 2024 (see Table 1). EvoEval builds on the well-known HumanEval benchmark by OpenAI and includes 828 coding problems across different domains [80]. We choose EvoEval

since it (i) is one of the most recent benchmarks for evaluating LLMs trained for code generation, (ii) contains human-curated ground truth solutions, (iii) includes multiple test cases for each coding problem, and (iv) includes evaluation scripts already usable in our pipeline [9]. In the context of this study, an LLM is (i) *accessible* if it is either open-source or available through APIs and (ii) *unique* if it uses a different base model compared to other already-chosen LLMs. Accessibility and uniqueness of the selected LLMs facilitate the replicability and external validity of the study.

Table 1: LLMs used in this study (* = unofficial information).

LLM	Parameters	Open	EvoEval rank
ChatGPT	175B*	No	6
GPT4	1.76T*	No	2
DeepSeek Coder Instruct	33B	✓	4
Speechless Codellama v2.0	34B	✓	10
CodeMillenials	34B	✓	9
WizardCoder v1.1	33B	✓	5

3.1.2 Coding problems selection. We start from the 100 problems in the Difficult category in EvoEval since we aim to generate Python code with higher computational complexity and additional requirements compared to the other categories in EvoEval [80]. Since our goal was to evaluate the energy efficiency of the generated code given that effectiveness (correctness) was already established, we selected those problems that are correctly solved by all six selected LLMs (*i.e.*, the solutions generated by all LLMs pass all tests). This selection step leads to the following 9 coding problems: (1) `weighted_mean_absolute_deviation` (EvoEval ID: 4), (2) `count_distinct_characters_substrings` (EvoEval ID: 16), (3) `below_above_threshold` (EvoEval ID: 52), (4) `add_elements` (EvoEval ID: 53), (5) `correct_bracketing_advanced` (EvoEval ID: 61), (6) `customFibFib` (EvoEval ID: 63), (7) `advancedDigitSum` (EvoEval ID: 66), (8) `decimal_to_binary` (EvoEval ID: 79), (9) `next_smallest_and_largest` (EvoEval ID: 90).

The selected coding problems are about tasks involving string manipulation, recursion, numerical calculations, etc. In this step we also collect the 9 *canonical solutions* provided in the EvoEval dataset; those solutions have 3 to 22 lines of code and contain different programming constructs, such as (nested) loops, recursion, variable assignments, conditionals, regular expressions. From the EvoEval dataset we also collect (i) the 54 *functional solutions* generated for each coding problem by the 6 LLMs selected in the previous step – these solutions are particularly useful for answering RQ_1 since they have been curated by third parties (thus, no internal threat to validity for our study) and are curated by humans – and (ii) 539 test cases (min: 20, max: 86, median: 62), which we use for assessing the correctness of the coding solutions generated in Phase 3.

3.2 Green guidelines elicitation

In this phase we systematically elicit guidelines for energy-efficient Python code. The guidelines elicitation process is intentionally designed to produce guidelines that are *broadly applicable to any Python project*, regardless of the specific coding problems considered in this study. In this study, the guidelines are used in Phase 3 for (i) crafting prompts and (ii) manually developing Green solutions. Inspired by systematic literature reviews [36], we apply the following six steps.

3.2.1 Initial search. We collect the first 100 results from a query on Google Scholar, which is currently considered one of the most comprehensive academic search engines publicly available [27].

3.2.2 Systematic selection. We manually analyse each of the 100 potentially-relevant studies and rigorously assess whether it is about energy efficiency of software, peer-reviewed, and in English. Following the guidelines for systematic literature review for software engineering [35], we define a priori a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria (see replication package). To avoid bias, this analysis is carried out in parallel by two independent researchers, which achieved a 94% level of agreement, with Cohen Kappa = 0.67 (*substantial*) [44]. After discussing the 6 studies with conflicts, we obtain a final set of 10 relevant studies.

3.2.3 Fragments extraction. Three researchers independently extract from the 10 studies verbatim text fragments containing indications about how to implement energy-efficient Python code.

3.2.4 Coding. Three researchers independently apply a process inspired by the (open) card sorting technique [64] in two phases: (i) we code each fragment with its representative information (*e.g.*, use compiled languages for critical code sections) and (ii) we group the extracted codes into meaningful families with a descriptive title (*e.g.*, threading, parallel computation).

3.2.5 Guidelines definition. Similar codes are consolidated into broader themes, which are then summarized into 28 guidelines (see Table 2). Each guideline is defined as a one-sentence recommendation that is widely applicable across different software projects/organizations. Each guideline is also categorized according to 7 families, namely: Code optimization, Multithreading, Native code, Function calls, Object-orientation, Network, and Other.

3.2.6 Applicability assessment. Two researchers assess whether each guideline is directly applicable to at least one of the 9 coding problems selected in Phase 1, leading to the final set of 10 Green guidelines we will use in Phase 3.




Figure 1: Overview of study.

Table 2: Guidelines for energy-efficient Python code. The asterisk (*) marks the guidelines that were selected for this study.

ID	Guideline	Family	Provenance
G1*	When there are multiple occurrences of the same expression, assign it to a variable and use the variable.	Code optimization	[25]
G2*	Avoid redundant operations in sorting already sorted or semi-sorted collections	Code optimization	[66]
G3*	Use loop optimization techniques (e.g., loop unrolling, loop unswitching, early termination) to improve performance, such as storing loop end condition in a variable	Code optimization	[28] [25] [66]
G4*	Use short-circuit versions of logical operators where the second argument of a logical expression is evaluated only if the first argument is insufficient to determine the value of the expression.	Code optimization	[25]
G5	When high-precision computation is not needed, approximate computations	Code optimization	[25]
G6	Avoid storing or saving data that has already been computed, saved, or is unnecessary. For example, don't recompute data that is available in a local variable, or avoid having variables only for debugging purposes.	Code optimization	[28] [25]
G7	Use bulk operations to reduce overhead from handling individual tasks, e.g., generating a batch of integers at once rather than one by one.	Code optimization	[25] [8]
G8	Delegate parallelizable computations to external modules such as <code>ctypes</code> to avoid bottlenecks caused by Python's Global Interpreter Lock.	Multithreading	[49] [19] [25]
G9	When possible, reduce data dependencies between iterations of the same code section to make the code parallelizable.	Multithreading	[74] [28] [58]
G10	For parallelized code, use multithreading frameworks, such as <code>PyOpenGL</code> and <code>mpi4py</code> .	Multithreading	[28] [58] [66]
G11	For multithreading, use thread shuffling to group slow threads on the same core through migration, improving execution efficiency.	Multithreading	[25]
G12	For multithreading, enable work-stealing dynamic scheduling to utilize idle processor queues and accelerate execution.	Multithreading	[25]
G13	Put processes or threads on sleep state if they are waiting for I/O operations or they are no longer active.	Multithreading	[25]
G14	Cache frequently used data shared by processes or nodes.	Multithreading	[58]
G15*	Write the energy- and performance-critical code sections of a Python program using a compiled language (e.g., C, C++, Rust) using SWIG wrappers, Numba, or Cython.	Native code	[74] [49] [28] [8] [46] [66]
G16	Use compiler optimization flags to enhance the performance of compiled language code in Python.	Native code	[28]
G17	Avoid repeatedly calling heavy functions (e.g., calls to the NumPy library) within loops.	Native code	[66]
G18	Use memoization to avoid repeated execution of expensive pure functions.	Function calls	[25] [66]
G19	Reduce function calls to minimize overhead; use static methods and inline code to avoid lookup delays.	Function calls	[25]
G20*	Reduce the number of created objects to minimize the memory used for creating them.	Object-orientation	[25]
G21*	Use energy-efficient design patterns like Flyweight, Mediator, and Proxy, and avoid energy-intensive patterns like Decorator and Abstract Factory.	Object-orientation	[25]
G22	Reduce network utilization by compressing data before transmitting it.	Network	[25]
G23	Perform complex operations using more powerful hardware, such as cloud-based resources, to achieve better performance.	Network	[25]
G24*	For computationally intensive tasks, such as, matrix-matrix multiplications, eigenvalue computation and fast fourier transform, use High-Performance Computing libraries like NumPy and SciPy.	Other	[74] [28] [52] [58] [66]
G25	For parallelizable complex workload, such as, matrix multiplication and pointwise evaluation, offload the workload to accelerators like GPUs.	Other	[74] [19] [25]
G26	Allocate all available computational resources (e.g., CPU cores) to a process to improve execution time and energy efficiency.	Other	[58] [46]
G27*	Replace native Python data structures (e.g., <code>List</code>) with high-performance alternatives like HDF5 for better parallelization and efficiency.	Other	[58] [25]
G28*	Minimize memory accesses to improve performance and energy efficiency, e.g., by aggregating operations to reduce I/O calls.	Other	[25]

3.3 Code generation and implementation

In this phase we obtain the Python source code of all solutions; we will run and measure it in Phase 4 (see Figure 1).

3.3.1 Prompts definition. We consider the original prompt in EvoEval as our *prompt template*, such prompt is used for generating the 54 functional solutions described in Section 3.1. Then, we consider four different variations of the prompt template: keyword, hardware platform, guideline, and few-shot. In the *keyword* prompt we append the following sentence at the end of the prompt template: "Generate the following code for me such that this is 'energy efficient'". With this prompt we assess whether LLMs have intrinsic knowledge about energy efficiency and are able to generate energy efficient software without any additional information from the developer. In the *hardware platform* prompts we include the technical specification of the hardware where the generated Python code will run on. With this prompt we investigate on whether LLMs are able to generate Python code that can take advantage of hardware characteristics (e.g., presence of a GPU, limited memory, etc.). Since the experiment will be executed on three different machines, i.e., a server, a personal computer, and a Raspberry Pi (see Section 3.4), we generate one prompt for each of them. The *guidelines* prompts include the 10 guidelines elicited in Phase 2. To keep the context provided to the LLM as focused as possible, we create a prompt specific to each of the 9 coding problems where we include only the subset

of guidelines that can be directly applicable to the coding problem. In *few-shot* prompts we include examples of code optimization for energy efficiency. Each example is composed of a pair of Python snippets, where the first one is a textbook implementation of the `bubble sort` algorithm and the second one is an energy-efficient version of the same algorithm obtained by applying a Green guideline for each family elicited in Phase 2. Both implementations are validated by running an ad-hoc experiment to ensure that (i) both implementations are correct and (ii) the energy-efficient version consumes less energy than the base one.

3.3.2 LLMs execution. In this step the 6 LLMs are prompted to generate solutions for each of the 9 coding problems. The prompting is done automatically for each of the LLMs. ChatGPT, GPT4, and DeepSeek Coder are prompted via their proprietary APIs, whereas Speechless Codellama, Code Millenials, and WizardCoder are deployed using HuggingFace inference endpoints on the AWS. Once the LLM generates the response, it is saved separately in its raw format, then filtered for any additional text tags, and other irrelevant lines of code (i.e., example use cases, or `main()` functions), and saved to a separate file from the raw response. A visual inspection is carried out by one researcher for identifying issues regarding typos, duplicate lines of code, or wrong function names. This checking step does not change the semantics of the generated program, but tackles generic syntax mistakes.

3.3.3 Solutions testing. In this step we test the correctness of each generated solution using the 539 test cases collected in Phase 1. If a solution is deemed incorrect (*i.e.*, any of the test cases fail), then we reprompt the LLM for the current coding problem. If a solution for a given LLM and a given prompt is not correct after 6 reprompts, the solution is excluded from the study. Refer to Figure 1 for the number of correct solutions for each type of prompt.

3.3.4 Scaffolding preparation. In this phase we prepare the so-called *blank solution* for each coding problem, *i.e.*, the Python code containing (i) `sol`, a function that currently contains a pass instruction, but later will contain the source code of the generated solution, (ii) `tc`, the set of test cases for `sol`, (iii) `n`, the number of iterations in which `sol` must be executed on all entries in `tc`, (iv) a main function sequentially calling `sol` on all entries in `tc`, `n` times.

Blank solutions act as a baseline since they isolate the overhead of the Python interpreter, operating system, and scaffolding Python code from the energy consumption of the LLM-generated solutions. These values are used as reference points, and are not subtracted from any of the energy readings throughout this study to preserve the original datapoints.

3.3.5 Green solutions development. In this step we produce `Green solutions`, the best possible implementations of the coding problems from an energy efficiency point of view. The Green solutions are manually developed by a senior developer with over 7 years of experience in Green software development. For each coding problem, the expert is given as input (i) the description of the coding problem to solve, (ii) its canonical solution (see Section 3.1), (iii) its test cases, and (iv) the set of guidelines for energy-efficient Python code (see Section 3.2), and they are tasked to make the given canonical solution as energy-efficient as possible, while passing all given test cases. The expert is tasked to develop the Green solutions by applying as much as possible their own technical expertise and by using all the inputs listed above. The expert produced `Green solutions` for 4 of the 9 coding problems since problems 16, 52, 53, 66, and 79 have low cyclomatic complexity with little for improving their source code.

At the end of Phase 3 we have a total of 363 solutions, which will be executed and measured in Phase 4.

3.4 Experiment execution

The goal of this phase is to execute the 363 solutions on three different hardware platforms: a server, a personal computer (PC), and a Raspberry Pi (RPi). The reason for using three different platforms is to cover a wide spectrum of hardware specifications, so to be able to generalize the obtained results across different hardware specifications, thus strengthening the external validity of the experiment. The hardware platform is a blocking factor in our experiment.

3.4.1 Platforms configuration. The technical specifications of the chosen platforms are summarized in Table 3. For all machines we ensure that all non-critical processes are stopped to reduce overhead, and we set the power governor (*i.e.*, `CPUFreq`) to performance. We install energy tracking tools on the machines: `EnergiBridge` on the server and PC and `Monsoon Power Meter` on the RPi, along with the necessary prerequisites for running the generated code on the test devices, including any Python packages that the code imports. As the `Monsoon Power Meter` requires a companion machine to track energy usage on the RPi, the `Monsoon Python` package is

installed on companion machines along with an HTTP server that allows the measurement to be remotely controlled. We use the `SAR` tool on the RPi to profile code performance.

Table 3: Technical specifications of the hardware platforms.

Platform	CPU	GPU	RAM	OS	Python
Server	Intel Xeon Silver 4208 @2.10GHz	-	384Gb	Ubuntu 20.04	3.8
PC	Intel Core i9 @3.50 GHz	Nvidia RTX 4070	64Gb	Ubuntu 24.04	3.12
RPi	Cortex-A72 (ARM v8) @1.8GHz	-	8Gb	Raspberry Pi OS	3.11

The experiment is orchestrated via `Experiment Runner` [42], an open-source tool for orchestrating measurement-based experiments used in several studies in the literature [42]. To avoid influencing the energy readings on the hardware platforms, `Experiment Runner` is executed on a dedicated machine, the experiment manager, which communicates with the server, PC, and RPi via SSH. We measure the energy efficiency of the test platforms using `EnergiBridge` [22, 53, 55] for PC and server, and the `Monsoon Power Monitor` [5] for RPi [30, 33, 57]. The data generated by the energy measurement tools is converted to Parquet files to optimize storage use.

3.4.2 Run solutions. In this phase we execute the 363 solutions on the server, PC, and Raspberry Pi. The input for each solution is the same as the 539 test cases. The execution follows two main phases: **Phase 1:** Determining the number of iterations. In this phase, we aimed to determine X_p^m , *i.e.*, the number of iterations for all test cases of problem `p` on machine `m`, to achieve an approximate running time of 3 minutes in the second phase (to ensure sufficient energy samples). Specifically, for each problem `p`, we ran its 9 functional solutions, iterating 10,000 times over all its test cases, and repeated this process 30 times to capture variability. X_p^m was then calculated as: $(3 \text{ minutes} \times 10000) / (\text{mean execution time of the solution of } p \text{ on } m \text{ over } 30 \text{ repetitions})$. This process ensures that the execution time for each solution variant in the main experiment would be approximately three minutes.

Phase 2: Measuring energy consumption. We then measured the energy consumption for all 363 solution variants across the 3 machines. On each machine `m`, we executed all test cases for each variant of a solution to problem `p` for X_p^m iterations. Each of these runs was repeated 21 times on each hardware platform to (i) take into account the intrinsic fluctuations of energy measures and (ii) strengthen statistical power [26]. The experiment execution took ≈ 881 hours across all machines and generated a total of ≈ 4.6 B data points. We do not subtract the energy consumption of a machine’s idle state, as this avoids introducing errors and better reflects real-world costs. Instead, we use *blank solutions* (see Section 3.3.4), which isolate the overhead of scaffolding code and reveal the additional energy used for computation.

3.5 Data analysis and synthesis

3.5.1 Data exploration. We compute summary statistics and apply data summarization and visualization techniques based on tables, histograms, boxplots, and violin plots. For example, Table 4 presents descriptive statistics for energy consumption, grouped by LLM and prompt type to directly address our RQs. The table is structured in two parts: the top panel aggregates metrics by LLM (averaged over all prompt types), and the bottom panel aggregates by prompt

type (averaged over all LLMs). Data is aggregated in this manner because our RQs focus on the LLMs and prompts, rather than the characteristics of individual solutions. Descriptive statistics are discussed using the median, as the distribution of all our samples was found to be non-normal. A qualitative analysis of the generated source code is provided in the Discussion section. For the sake of brevity, in this paper we report only a part of the exploration artifacts, leaving the others in the replication package [9]. To further ensure the accuracy of our analysis, we employ the Interquartile Range (IQR) method to remove outliers in the energy metric.

3.5.2 Statistical analysis. We firstly assess the distribution of the data via Q-Q plots and the Shapiro-Wilk test (for checking normality, $\alpha = 0.05$). We anticipate that the collected measures do not follow a normal distribution, thus, after checking other assumptions, we statistically analyse the collected energy measure using the Aligned Rank Transformation (ART) ANOVA test. ART ANOVA is a non-parametric method that allows for multiple independent variables, interactions, and repeated measures [77]. When applying the ART ANOVA test, we (i) have two main factors, namely the used LLMs (with 6 treatments, one for each LLM) and the type of solution (with 7 levels, e.g., canonical, functional, “energy efficiency” keyword, platform, guidelines, etc.), (ii) consider the energy efficiency of each experiment run as response variable. Post hoc analysis is conducted via the Aligned Ranked Transform Contrasts [23] and the obtained p-values are corrected via the Holm-Bonferroni procedure [29]. We use Cliff’s Delta [17] for *effect size estimation* and interpret its results as proposed by Vargha and Delaney [70]. For RQ₃, we statistically analyze only the subset of data about the 4 coding problems for which we have solutions developed by the Green expert.

3.5.3 Data synthesis. We (i) explicitly answer the RQs of this study based on the results of the previous analysis steps and (ii) contextualize the answers to the RQs by elaborating on relevant findings and implications for developers, researchers, and LLM maintainers.

4 Results

4.1 Efficiency of LLM-generated code (RQ₀)

Data Exploration. We observe different results in all three hardware platforms (see Table 4), which confirms that segmenting our experiment by hardware platform was a good choice. On the server, the most energy efficient solutions were those generated by Speechless Codellama (5.115 kJ), followed by those produced by ChatGPT (5.582 kJ). In contrast, the solutions generated by Speechless Codellama exhibit the highest median energy consumption (6.341 kJ). On the PC, Code Millenials solutions are the most energy-efficient (8.480 kJ), followed by those generated by WizardCoder (8.470 kJ), and GPT4 generated the less energy-efficient solutions (9.545 kJ). On the RPi, WizardCoder solutions are the most energy-efficient (0.399 kJ), while GPT4 solutions are the less energy-efficient (0.480 kJ). It is worth noting the high dispersion ($CV > 1.4$) of the GPT4 solutions on the server, which led us to a deeper investigation of the impact of the other factors of this study, namely the prompts.

Statistical Analysis. The Shapiro-Wilk test and the Q-Q plots suggest non-normal data on each hardware platform. Thus, we use the ART ANOVA and the Cliff’s Delta test to quantify the differences between the groups. Table 5 reports the results of both tests. The ART ANOVA gives a *significant difference* between the




Figure 2: Energy of canonical and functional solutions.

energy efficiency of the solutions generated by different LLMs *on all hardware platforms* ($p\text{-value} < 2.22e - 16$). The post-hoc analysis, consisting of a pairwise comparison among the LLMs, confirms the observations of our data exploration. The energy usage of generated code is significantly different across all LLMs ($p\text{-value} < 1e - 4$), except for a few cases; specifically, the energy efficiency of generated solutions are not significantly different for (i) ChatGPT and GPT4 on PC (0.16) and RPi (0.88), (ii) Code Millenials and DeepSeek Coder on both server and RPi (0.088), and (iii) Code Millenials and WizardCoder on PC (0.107).

The Cliff’s delta test confirms that the solutions generated by Speechless Codellama are more energy-efficient on the server. We find a *large* effect size when comparing to Speechless Codellama solutions those generated with Code Millenials (0.637), DeepSeek Coder (0.548), and WizardCoder (0.529), while the effect size is medium compared to ChatGPT (0.36) and GPT4 (0.362). Additionally, we notice *medium* effect size contrasting ChatGPT to Code Millenials (0.409) solutions. The rest of the comparisons result in either *small* or *negligible* effect size. The effect size results *medium* on the PC confronting ChatGPT to Code Millenials (−0.457) and WizardCoder (−0.39), as well as GPT4 with Code Millenials (−0.398) and WizardCoder (−0.335). We notice a *large* effect size on RPi comparing ChatGPT with Code Millenials (−0.577) and WizardCoder (−0.68), as well as Code Millenials and GPT4 (0.527) and the latter against WizardCoder (−0.634). This result confirms the lower energy consumption of WizardCoder solutions observed in Table 4.

Answer to RQ₀ – Generated code exhibits significantly different levels of energy efficiency, both across LLMs and hardware platforms. The magnitude of these differences varies across hardware platforms. Speechless Codellama solutions are most efficient on the server rather than on PC and RPi, where Code Millenials and WizardCoder achieved the best results, respectively. Solutions generated by GPT4 are the least energy-efficient across all hardware platforms.

Table 4: Energy Consumption (kJ) Statistics for LLMs and prompt type. Legend - SRV : Server, Std: Standard Deviation

	ChatGPT			Code Millenials			DeepSeek Coder			GPT4			Speechless Codellama			WizardCoder		
	SRV	PC	RPi	SRV	PC	RPi	SRV	PC	RPi	SRV	PC	RPi	SRV	PC	RPi	SRV	PC	RPi
Mean	5.640	9.100	0.475	6.408	8.001	0.418	6.585	8.441	0.430	8.862	9.075	0.477	4.953	8.383	0.426	6.764	8.735	0.396
Min	3.640	5.640	0.350	0.644	0.881	0.060	2.602	3.820	0.234	3.527	5.073	0.324	2.472	4.055	0.222	3.570	4.143	0.250
50%	5.582	9.468	0.473	6.341	8.480	0.411	6.233	8.576	0.407	5.598	9.545	0.480	5.115	9.393	0.454	6.026	8.570	0.399
Max	8.861	12.591	0.744	11.404	10.875	0.771	13.004	12.546	0.678	75.168	18.304	0.828	7.562	10.628	0.533	24.436	27.672	0.671
Std	0.878	1.526	0.064	1.530	1.628	0.089	1.950	2.170	0.100	12.863	2.172	0.082	1.033	1.993	0.076	3.328	3.838	0.071
CV	0.156	0.168	0.135	0.239	0.204	0.213	0.296	0.257	0.232	1.452	0.239	0.173	0.209	0.238	0.179	0.492	0.439	0.179

	Canonical			Functional			Keyword			Platform			Guideline			Few-shot		
	SRV	PC	RPi	SRV	PC	RPi	SRV	PC	RPi	SRV	PC	RPi	SRV	PC	RPi	SRV	PC	RPi
Mean	5.131	11.345	0.442	6.082	8.588	0.452	6.293	8.728	0.441	6.111	8.492	0.442	7.525	8.663	0.412	6.880	8.670	0.450
Min	3.355	6.523	0.326	2.596	4.093	0.267	2.587	3.855	0.242	2.485	3.850	0.245	0.644	0.881	0.060	2.472	3.820	0.234
50%	5.105	12.396	0.434	5.785	8.681	0.460	5.829	8.579	0.445	5.872	8.838	0.443	5.833	9.010	0.407	5.416	8.699	0.441
Max	7.294	14.161	0.559	11.301	12.007	0.671	24.436	27.672	0.744	12.059	12.591	0.723	75.168	13.540	0.771	53.096	18.304	0.828
Std	0.688	2.216	0.062	1.384	1.597	0.063	2.828	3.229	0.078	1.504	1.732	0.084	10.543	2.206	0.105	7.431	2.309	0.095
CV	0.134	0.195	0.140	0.228	0.186	0.140	0.449	0.370	0.178	0.246	0.204	0.191	1.401	0.255	0.255	1.080	0.266	0.211

Table 5: P-values of pairwise comparison and effect sizes.

Contrast		P-value (effect size)		
		Server	PC	RPi
chatgpt	code-millenials	< 1e-4(0.409)	< 1e-4(-0.457)	< 1e-4(-0.577)
chatgpt	deepseek-coder	< 1e-4(0.329)	< 1e-4(-0.256)	< 1e-4(-0.398)
chatgpt	gpt-4	0.014(0.052)	0.165(0.026)	0.880(0.038)
chatgpt	speechless-codellama	< 1e-4(-0.36)	< 1e-4(-0.137)	< 1e-4(-0.296)
chatgpt	wizardcoder	< 1e-4(0.262)	< 1e-4(-0.39)	< 1e-4(-0.68)
code-millenials	deepseek-coder	0.086(0.004)	< 1e-4(0.119)	0.088(-0.057)
code-millenials	gpt-4	< 1e-4(-0.288)	< 1e-4(0.398)	< 1e-4(0.527)
code-millenials	speechless-codellama	< 1e-4(-0.637)	< 1e-4(0.287)	< 1e-4(0.247)
code-millenials	wizardcoder	2e-4(-0.117)	0.107(-0.032)	< 1e-4(-0.257)
deepseek-coder	gpt-4	< 1e-4(-0.218)	< 1e-4(0.198)	< 1e-4(0.356)
deepseek-coder	speechless-codellama	< 1e-4(-0.548)	0.002(0.099)	< 1e-4(0.125)
deepseek-coder	wizardcoder	0.024(-0.086)	0.005(-0.041)	< 1e-4(-0.162)
gpt-4	speechless-codellama	< 1e-4(-0.362)	2e-4(-0.129)	< 1e-4(-0.333)
gpt-4	wizardcoder	< 1e-4(0.168)	< 1e-4(-0.335)	< 1e-4(-0.634)
speechless-codellama	wizardcoder	< 1e-4(0.529)	< 1e-4(-0.214)	< 1e-4(-0.364)
functional	chatgpt	< 1e-4(-0.462)	< 1e-4(0.639)	0.140(-0.068)
functional	code-millenials	< 1e-4(-0.056)	< 1e-4(0.550)	< 1e-4(0.027)
functional	deepseek-coder	< 1e-4(-0.640)	< 1e-4(0.764)	< 1e-4(0.204)
functional	gpt-4	< 1e-4(-0.529)	< 1e-4(0.693)	0.164(0.111)
functional	speechless-codellama	0.019(-0.323)	< 1e-4(0.482)	< 1e-4(-0.219)
functional	wizardcoder	1.0(0.068)	< 1e-4(0.587)	0.677(0.086)
functional	gpt-4	< 1e-4(-0.516)	< 1e-4(0.705)	0.677(0.385)
expert	functional	< 1e-4(-0.763)	< 1e-4(-0.541)	< 1e-4(-0.699)
expert	chatgpt	< 1e-4(-0.454)	< 1e-4(-0.368)	< 1e-4(-0.436)
expert	code-millenials	< 1e-4(-0.839)	< 1e-4(-0.417)	< 1e-4(-0.538)
expert	deepseek-coder	< 1e-4(-0.646)	< 1e-4(-0.336)	< 1e-4(-0.363)
expert	gpt-4	< 1e-4(-0.806)	< 1e-4(-0.607)	< 1e-4(-0.815)
expert	speechless-codellama	1.0(-0.071)	0.119(-0.149)	0.150(-0.076)
expert	wizardcoder	< 1e-4(-0.801)	< 1e-4(-0.385)	0.003(-0.281)
functional	few-shot	< 1e-4(-0.224)	< 1e-4(-0.012)	2e-4(-0.075)
functional	guideline	< 1e-4(-0.027)	0.03(0.06)	< 1e-4(-0.379)
functional	keyword	1.0(-0.025)	1.0(-0.069)	1.0(-0.06)
functional	platform	1.0(0.014)	1.0(0.009)	1.0(-0.011)
functional	guideline	1.0(0.038)	1.0(0.05)	0.09(-0.034)
functional	keyword	< 1e-4(0.002)	0.004(-0.123)	< 1e-4(0.294)
functional	platform	< 1e-4(0.037)	0.006(-0.07)	< 1e-4(0.272)
few-shot	guideline	< 1e-4(0.172)	0.01(0.07)	< 1e-4(-0.247)
few-shot	keyword	< 1e-4(0.187)	1.0(-0.049)	0.49(-0.007)
few-shot	platform	< 1e-4(0.224)	1.0(0.006)	0.308(-0.033)

P-values lower than $\alpha = 0.05$ are shown in bold. Effect sizes: **Large** - **Medium** - **Small** - **Negligible** - **Negligible**

4.2 Human VS LLM-generated code (RQ₁)

Data Exploration. As shown in Figure 2 and Table 4, canonical solutions provided in the EvoEval benchmark suite tend to use less energy than the functional ones generated by the LLMs on both server (5.105 vs 5.785 kJ) and RPi (0.434 vs 0.460 kJ). In contrast, on the PC, the energy consumption of canonical solutions tends to be higher than that of functional solutions (12.396 vs 8.681 kJ). Additionally, canonical solutions on the server tend to be the most efficient ones, even when compared to all LLM-generated functional solutions, except for Speechless Codellama (in which the generated solution is slightly more efficient). This result is reversed on PC, where canonical solutions are the most inefficient ones. On the RPi, instead, functional solutions generated by Code Millenials and DeepSeek Coder are the most efficient ones.

Statistical Analysis. The Shapiro-Wilk and the Q-Q plots show a normal distribution of the energy data of canonical solutions. The energy data of the functional solutions is not normally distributed. The ART ANOVA test suggests a significant difference between the groups on the server and the PC ($< 2.22e - 16$), while a non-statistical significant difference on the RPi (0.140). Table 5 presents the p-values and effect sizes of the post-hoc analysis, which compares the energy consumption of the canonical and functional solutions produced by each LLM. On the server, the analysis reveals a statistically significant difference between the canonical and functional solutions generated by each LLM, with the exception of Speechless Codellama (1.0). On the PC, the test comparing the canonical and functional solutions groups for each LLM consistently shows statistical significance. We notice no significant difference on the RPi between canonical and functional solutions generated by DeepSeek Coder (0.164), Speechless Codellama (0.677), and WizardCoder (0.677). The difference is statistically significant in comparison with Code Millenials and ChatGPT.

The effect size is *medium* on the server comparing canonical to functional solutions (-0.462). We have *large* effect sizes when comparing canonical solutions to Code Millenials (-0.640), DeepSeek Coder (-0.529), and WizardCoder (-0.516). This result confirms the higher energy efficiency of canonical solutions on the server. The effect sizes are *medium* or *negligible* for the other LLMs. On the PC, canonical solutions are less efficient than the functional ones. Indeed, the effect sizes are *large* in both canonical vs functional (0.639) and LLM-specific comparisons. For GPT4, the effect size is *medium* (0.382). The effect sizes on the RPi are all either *negligible* or *small*, except for WizardCoder, where it is *medium* (0.385).

Answer to RQ₁ – Human-developed solutions (canonical) tend to be more efficient than LLM-generated ones (functional) on the server, but they are less efficient on the PC. On the RPi, this difference is less (statistically) prominent. The type of LLM does not heavily influence the results of this comparison.

4.3 Impact of prompt engineering (RQ₂)

Data Exploration. On the server, functional solutions exhibit lower energy usage (5.785 kJ) than those generated with other prompts, except for the few-shot ones (5.416 kJ), as indicated in Table 4. We also observe that code generated using the guideline (5.833 kJ)

prompts consume more energy. Note that the standard deviation of the collected energy measures is significantly high for the guideline and few-shot prompts, suggesting that the hints we provided in the prompts for helping the LLMs generate greener software led to higher variation in characteristics of the generated source code.




Figure 3: Energy consumption on the server of solutions generated via different prompting techniques.

This variation can be noticed in Figure 3, which shows how the energy usage varies across prompts for each LLM on the server. We see an unremarkable difference, except for GPT4, where a few data points influence the dispersion. We obtain similar violin plots on PC and RPi. On the PC, the energy consumption for the code generated with the functional (8.681 kJ), keyword (8.579 kJ), and platform (8.838 kJ) prompts, and few-shot (8.699 kJ) is comparable, while the energy usage of guideline solutions is higher (9.010 kJ). On the RPi, the solutions generated with the guideline prompt are the most energy-efficient (0.407 kJ), while the ones consuming the most are the functional solutions (0.460 kJ). The high dispersion observed in the server and PC is not present on the RPi.

Statistical Analysis. The Shapiro-Wilk test ($p\text{-value} < 1e - 4$) and the analysis of the Q-Q plots confirm that the data for RQ_2 does not follow a normal distribution. The ART ANOVA test evidences a statistically significant impact of the prompting strategies on the energy efficiency of generated code. We also observe a significant interaction effect between the prompt type and the LLM used to generate the code. This result is consistent across hardware platforms.

In the post-hoc analysis, we compare the combination of each prompting strategy. Table 5 include the p-values of the post-hoc analysis and the effect sizes of the Cliff’s Delta test. The post-hoc analysis on the server shows a statistically significant difference between most of prompting strategies, except when comparing functional against keyword and platform (1.0) data, as well as keyword and platform (1.0). The same result is seen on the PC, where, additionally, the comparison becomes also not statistically significant when contrasting few-shot and guideline solutions (1.0). On the RPi, the test yields a statistically significant difference between solutions generated via the functional prompt and all other prompts, confirming the observations done on the PC and server. The test results indicate no significant difference comparing the few-shot with keyword (0.490) and platform (0.308) solutions, as well as between keyword and platform solutions (0.09).

Despite the statistically significant differences observed, the effect size is small or negligible across all combinations of prompt engineering techniques across all hardware platforms (see Table 5).

Answer to RQ₂ – Prompt engineering techniques tend to have limited impact on the energy consumption of LLM-generated Python code. We notice particularly higher variability in the energy usage of the solutions generated via the guideline and few-shot prompts on the server.

4.4 Green vs. LLM-generated code (RQ₃)

Data Exploration. As shown in Figure 4, expert-developed solutions tend to be consistently more efficient than LLM-generated ones across all hardware platforms. On the server the expert solutions are the most energy-efficient solutions (3.962 kJ), followed by Speechless Codellama solutions (4.504 kJ). The highest energy is used by Code Millenials solutions. On the PC, expert solution confirm to be the most energy efficient (5.898 kJ), followed by WizardCoder solutions (6.986). The most inefficient are the solutions generated with DeepSeek Coder (8.482 kJ). Expert and Speechless Codellama solutions are the most energy efficient on the RPi, where their energy usage is 0.299 kJ and 0.374 kJ, respectively. We found some cases in which Speechless Codellama and DeepSeek Coder generate solutions that are more energy-efficient than expert code.




Figure 4: Energy of Green expert and LLM solutions.

Analyzing each prompt-LLM pair on the server, we find that Speechless Codellama yields more energy-efficient solutions than the expert (3.962 kJ) under the few-shot (3.926 kJ) and guideline (3.539 kJ) prompts, where the latter solutions consume the lowest median energy usage on the server. The solutions generated from all other prompt-LLM pairs consume more energy than the solutions developed by the expert. The highest median energy is consumed by Code Millenials solutions generated with the keyword prompt (6.811 kJ). The PC also showcases prompt-LLM combinations that yield more energy-efficient solutions than the ones developed by the expert (5.898), namely WizardCoder via guideline (5.713 kJ) and few-shot (5.870 kJ) prompts, Speechless Codellama via the few-shot prompt (5.441 kJ). Overall, the most energy efficient solutions are those generated by Speechless Codellama with the guideline prompt (5.441 kJ), while the highest median energy is consumed by Code Millenials solutions generated using the few-shot prompt

(9.831 kJ). On the RPi, solutions generated by WizardCoder (0.297 kJ) and Speechless Codellama (0.283 kJ) via the guideline prompts are more efficient than the solutions developed by the expert (0.299 kJ). Overall, Speechless Codellama with the guideline prompt generates the most energy-efficient solutions (0.283 kJ), with the worst solutions generated by GPT4 using the few-shot prompt (0.518 kJ). **Statistical Analysis.** The Shapiro-Wilk test yields values lower ($p\text{-value} < 1e-4$) than our significance level. The Q-Q plots confirm the results of the Shapiro-Wilk test. We use the ART ANOVA test to compare the groups. Table 5 includes the p-values of the ART ANOVA test and the effect sizes produced by the Cliff’s Delta test to quantify the differences between the groups. ART ANOVA presents a *significant difference* between expert code and all generated solutions on the server, PC, and RPi, except for Speechless Codellama, confirming the observations deriving from descriptive statistics. In Table 5, the effect sizes are *large* or *medium* when comparing the expert code to the solutions generated by each LLM. This suggests that, in general, the expert code is more efficient. However, there are exceptions. The comparison between expert and Speechless Codellama solutions results in a *negligible* effect on the server (-0.071) and RPi (-0.076), while it is *small* (-0.149) on the PC. For WizardCoder, the difference is *small* on the RPi (-0.281).

Answer to RQ₃ – The solutions developed by the Green software expert are more energy-efficient than almost all LLM-generated solutions across all hardware platforms, with large effect size. Some solutions generated by Speechless Codellama and WizardCoder outperform those by the Green software expert. However, there is no consistent LLM-prompt pairing that consistently outperforms the solutions by the Green software expert across all hardware platforms.

5 Discussion

5.1 Implications for developers

Keep a critical attitude towards LLM-generated code. The results of our experiment provide evidence that the energy efficiency of LLM-generated code is *highly context-dependent*, varying considerably when targeting different hardware platforms (see Section 4.1) and the used LLMs (see Section 4.2). Our findings demonstrate that there is no single best LLM for generating energy-efficient code. Across all contexts, the execution environment plays a crucial role in determining actual performance. This insight is particularly important for practitioners, as LLM-generated code that appears efficient on one hardware platform might behave completely differently on another. We encourage developers to consider at least the hardware platform where the generated code will be executed. As a further step, we analyzed how each LLM performs with respect to individual coding problems and manually inspected the source code of solutions exhibiting low, medium, and high energy consumption (plots and raw data in the replication package [9]). There, we observe the following: (i) GPT4 is the only LLM able to generate code that uses external Python modules (*i.e.*, NumPy via the guideline and few-shot prompts), and in those cases, the solutions exhibited considerably higher energy consumption than the others probably because of the overhead from importing and initializing the NumPy library that is not amortized over the small computational workload

as in this case; (ii) those solutions consuming higher amounts of energy primarily do so due to algorithmic inefficiencies (*e.g.*, nested for loops), rather than the usage of specific Python constructs like string concatenation, sorting, or slicing, which are known to have a higher theoretical complexity [6]; (iii) we observed the vast majority of outliers in the RPi and much fewer in the server and PC, confirming that the hardware platform strongly interacts with the energy efficiency of the analyzed solutions.

Consider how LLM-generated code fits with the targeted Python environment and refine it accordingly. We know from the literature that a prominent role in energy efficiency is played by code-level characteristics, *e.g.*, in terms of used libraries [46], the presence of (anti) patterns [65], and its interaction with the lower layers of the Python execution stack (*e.g.*, multithreading, compilation) [24]. As such, we invite developers to review the LLM-generated code and manually refine it to enhance its efficiency, when needed. The guidelines we established in phase 2 of this study can serve as an initial checklist for identifying areas of improvement. A ready-to-use checklist for Green Python code based on our guidelines is available in the replication package [9].

Prompt engineering seems to do not pay off. According to our results for RQ₂, prompt engineering techniques tend to have an inconsistent and limited impact on the energy efficiency of the generated Python code on all hardware platforms. This phenomenon is also generally confirmed in other recent independent studies, despite those studies were considering different coding solutions, prompts, hardware platforms, and statistical analyses [15, 20, 68]. So, overall, we have convergent evidence that giving more freedom to the LLM via the prompt does not strongly contribute to the energy efficiency of LLM-generated code. Also, in our manual analysis of individual solutions, we also noticed that prompting might even lead to solutions that are *less* energy efficient. In addition, our findings also point towards future possibilities where LLMs could be fine-tuned with hardware or energy awareness built in, leading to more context sensitive and energy efficient code generation.

5.2 Implications for LLM vendors

LLMs should consider (energy) efficiency as a first-class metric. Currently, LLMs perform relatively well in benchmarks targeting the functional correctness [59]. However, the situation is different when considering *non-functional aspects* like energy efficiency. Our results show that LLMs perform similarly to human-developed code (RQ₁ and RQ₂), but they are worse compared to code developed by a Green software expert (RQ₃). This result aligns with another recent study targeting performance [32], where GPT4-generated solutions are on average 3.12x slower than human-developed solutions. This gap represents both an environmental challenge and an economic opportunity, as energy-efficient code can directly lead to reduced operational costs for large-scale LLM deployments. This is a problem for LLM vendors, as confirmed in a recent large survey with 547 participants from both academia and industry, where the most negative opinions about the code provided by AI assistants concern the alignment with non-functional requirements and security aspects [59]. While LLMs continue to evolve rapidly, our analysis across six diverse models with different architectures, sizes, and training approaches provides a robust foundation for understanding this persistent challenge.

Greener code is a responsibility for everyone involved in LLMs development. The fact that LLM-generated code is not consistently and significantly energy-efficient is not merely a technical issue; more importantly, it is a *responsibility* for both LLM vendors and us, researchers. It is well-known that developers today extensively use LLMs for their coding tasks [3, 59]. If the generated code is inefficient, we risk having *thousands or even millions of inefficient lines of code going into production every day*, thereby missing a significant opportunity to reduce the CO₂ emissions of our software systems. We urge LLM vendors such as OpenAI, Google, Anthropic, and DeepSeek to invest in better techniques for generating energy-efficient code. Promising techniques include fine-tuning, Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG), or even smaller domain-specific models dedicated to green code generation. As organizations increasingly prioritize both cost optimization and energy metrics, LLMs that can generate more efficient code may find competitive advantages in enterprise markets. The Software Engineering research community is already active in this direction (see Section 6) and is more than willing to contribute in various ways (read below).

5.3 Implications for researchers

The hardware platform has a significant impact on code energy efficiency, yet it is often overlooked. Our study does not show consistent trends across hardware platforms. As demonstrated by Table 4, we are not able to indicate a specific LLM to obtain code with higher energy efficiency. We also notice this discrepancy when comparing the energy of the solutions generated across prompts. Functional solutions are the most efficient on the server, while those generated using the platform and guideline solutions present higher energy efficiency on PC and RPi. Looking at Figure 2 and Figure 4, we can observe the difference in terms of energy usage of the canonical and expert solutions across hardware platforms. In particular, in both cases, the execution on the PC introduces higher energy consumption. We recommend researchers to *consider the hardware platform as a factor* when testing the energy efficiency of generated code, as results may considerably vary across different platforms. This aspect is frequently overlooked in existing experiments on the energy consumption of LLM-generated code [15, 20, 32]. Lower levels of the Python execution stack can affect energy efficiency. However, other factors also play a role, including the OS, the availability of computing resources, and the temperature of the testing environment [10]. These factors can confound experiments on software energy efficiency, specially when targeting resource-constrained devices.

Learning about Green software is still a valuable skill. The results of RQ₃ demonstrate the higher energy efficiency of expert-developed code compared to generated one. The observation holds on all hardware platforms with some exceptions, such as the solutions generated with Speechless Codellama using the few-shot and guideline prompts. Therefore, in most cases *having expertise in Green software remains the most effective approach for implementing energy-efficient code*. We highlight the need for further research on combining LLMs and prompting strategies to generate more energy-efficient code, as some generated solutions did outperform expert-developed code. We advise *caution* when integrating generated code into larger software systems, as it may negatively impact non-functional requirements [39], such as energy efficiency. This

point is significantly important, considering growing evidence that shows generated code is blindly integrated by software developers, especially when the output meets their expectations [12].

Practitioners need a Green code base for benchmarking. Well-known benchmarks for measuring the accuracy of LLMs have generic problems that are not tailored to specific code quality attributes. We highlight the need for a code base of examples of Green software to effectively benchmark the capabilities of LLMs in generating scientific software. For instance, EvoEval [80] contain problems such as string matching and sorting, which are generic and do not consider energy efficiency as a criterion. We advise researchers in AI for Software Engineering to develop a benchmark for investigating the capabilities of LLMs in generating energy-efficient code. Addressing this gap requires concerted efforts to develop and maintain representative Green code examples for different programming languages, along with prompting strategies proven to be designed for energy-efficient code generation. Additionally, Green code bases can further help advance research in Green Software, in particular Green AI, by i) providing a reference dataset for performing more empirical studies, ii) allowing the development of models that can generate energy-efficient code, and iii) providing a platform for researchers and developers to promote best practices in Green software development. This can further lead to the development of leaderboards that allow researchers/developers to select LLMs by comparing the accuracy of the generated code and the energy efficiency of the generated code.

6 Related Work

The energy-efficiency of LLM-generated code has been studied only recently. Cursaru *et al.* [20] conducted an experiment on a Raspberry Pi, generating code for three programming problems in C++, JavaScript, and Python using Code Llama. The study revealed that while human-written code was generally more energy efficient, generated JavaScript outperformed human code. Moreover, prompting Code Llama for energy efficiency did not yield improvements, and varying temperature settings had no significant effect. Cappendijk *et al.* [15] compared the energy efficiency of Python code generated by Code Llama and DeepSeek Coder for three coding problems on a laptop. Notably, switching from `while` loops to `for` loops can reduce energy consumption by up to 60%, although the code using `for` loops was not always correct. Tuttle *et al.* [69] examined the energy consumption and execution time of eight LeetCode problems solved by eight LLMs on a single server. Two are the main differences with respect to our study: (i) they share two solution types with us (*i.e.*, *functional* and *keyword* prompts), but do not include solutions related to hardware platform, guidelines, and few-shot learning, and (ii) they also introduce an additional prompt for the chain of thoughts strategy. Tuttle *et al.* found that only 5.7% of LLM-generated solutions are more efficient than human code, and LLMs are inconsistent at generating energy-efficient Python code. Vartziotis *et al.* [71] evaluated the energy consumption (and other performance-related metrics) of the Python code solving 6 coding problems from LeetCode, as generated by GitHub Copilot, OpenAI ChatGPT-3, and Amazon CodeWhisperer. Their study confirms that (i) LLM-generated code tends to be less sustainable than code developed by humans and (ii) applying prompt engineering techniques leads to slightly more efficient code. Solovyeva *et al.* [63] evaluated

the correctness and energy efficiency of 53 solutions of LeetCode problems in 3 programming languages (Python, Java, and C++), as generated by GitHub Copilot, OpenAI ChatGPT 4o, and OpenAI o1-mini. The solutions were executed on two laptops with different hardware configurations. Their results show that (i) Python solutions have the highest pass@1 accuracy, but it is still very low, (ii) the energy efficiency of human- and LLM-generated solutions tends to be similar for Python and Java, but not for C++, and (iii) LLM-generated solutions tend to be machine-agnostic, showing strong energy correlation across the two laptops. Overall, for all studies mentioned above, the main differences and complementarities with our study are the following: (i) in our study we cover three *complementary* hardware platforms (*i.e.*, server, laptop, and RPi), whereas all other studies focus on a single type of hardware platform (we recall that hardware aspects are a key factor of the energy efficiency of software [26]), (ii) in our study we consider solutions that are developed by a Green software expert, whereas all human-developed solutions in the other studies are only the canonical ones, and (iii) in our study we also propose a systematically-elicited set of guidelines for developing energy-efficient Python code.

7 Threats to Validity

External Validity. This study focuses exclusively on Python code, so its results may not generalize to other programming languages. Nevertheless, our experiment covers a heterogeneous set of coding problems, demonstrating that even Python code can be optimized for energy efficiency. Future work should extend the evaluation of LLM-generated code to multiple programming languages. The selected problems include recursion, string manipulation, numerical calculations, and other common coding patterns that ensure a broad coverage of real-world scenarios. Although our hardware platforms do not cover the entire range of possible architectures, we analyze three distinct platforms to provide insights into how energy efficiency varies between different hardware architectures. For solutions developed by the Green software expert, we do not claim that they are fully representative of all sustainable coding practices among professionals; however, they serve as a practical upper bound with respect to what can be practically achieved when aiming to develop energy-efficient Python code. Further, the rapid evolution of LLMs presents a potential threat to the long-term generalizability of our findings, as newer models may exhibit different energy efficiency characteristics. However, we mitigate this threat through several design choices such as selection of six diverse LLMs spanning different architectures, sizes, and training approaches, providing a broad foundation for generalization as well as using systematically derived energy-efficiency guidelines that are problem-agnostic regardless of the specific LLM used.

Internal Validity. LLMs inherently introduce variability due to their probabilistic nature of generating. For the reliability of our findings, we evaluate multiple coding problems (each with multiple test cases) and multiple LLMs. To control external influences such as concurrent processes, all experiments are conducted in a controlled environment where only the test workloads run, ensuring minimal influence/overhead due to system processes. Potential inaccuracies in energy measurement tools are mitigated by executing (and repeating) multiple experimental runs, improving the reliability of the obtained measures. To address the significant fluctuations in

energy readings at runtime, we (i) repeat each individual trial of the experiment 21 times and (ii) utilize the highest available sampling frequency for each measuring tool, *i.e.*, 5Hz for the server and PC, and 5000Hz for the Raspberry Pi, ensuring consistency in within-device comparisons. To mitigate the effects of CPU temperature variations due to continuous code execution, we set a cooldown period of 60 seconds after each run, which also reduces the risk of the Monsoon Power Monitor tool overheating and dropping data.

Construct Validity. In our study we use one measurement tool for each hardware platform, *i.e.*, a software tool for the server and PC, and a hardware power meter for the RPi. To mitigate this potential threat, the tools used in this study are all peer-reviewed (EnergiB-ridge [22, 53, 55]), and industry-standard (Monsoon Power Monitor [20, 30, 33, 57]) tools that have been tried and tested throughout their lifespans in multiple peer-reviewed studies. In our experiments, we employed few-shot prompting with generic examples rather than designing them to specific algorithmic or data structure problems. This choice may limit the representativeness of the evaluation, as more contextually relevant examples could lead to different outcomes. While this aspect can be further investigated, the use of generic examples reflects the perspective of non-experts in energy efficiency interacting with the LLM.

Conclusion Validity. The results described in Section 4 are supported by a coherent statistical analysis, which mitigates potential measurement interferences and identifies outliers (which have been removed by using a standard procedure – see Section 3.5 for further details). The Q-Q plots and the Shapiro-Wilk normality test indicate that our data does not follow a normal distribution, necessitating the use of a non-parametric test (ART ANOVA in our analysis). Each trial, defined by a unique combination of LLM, coding problem, prompt technique, and hardware platform has been repeated 21 times to increase the number of data points and statistical power, a number deemed sufficient for reliability in existing literature in the area of Green Software Engineering [26].

8 Conclusion and future work

In this study we determine whether LLMs can generate energy-efficient code. Specifically, we investigate the energy efficiency of code generated by six state-of-the-art LLMs by prompting them to generate solutions for nine Python problems using five prompt styles. We compared the energy efficiency of the generated Python solutions against each other and against two levels of human-implemented solutions. We conducted the measurements on three different hardware platforms to increase the robustness of our conclusions. Overall, we executed 363 solutions on each hardware platform for a total of ≈ 881 h of sheer execution time and collected ≈ 4.6 B data points, which are then statistically analyzed. Based on our results, we offer recommendations for LLM vendors and future research. We advise developers to consult Green software experts or follow the Green Python guidelines from this study, rather than relying solely on LLMs for energy-efficient code.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the Network Institute (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) for providing the Nebula platform for prompting the LLMs used in this study.

References

- [1] 2022. Introducing ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/index/chatgpt> [Online; accessed 14. Mar. 2025].
- [2] 2024. `uukuguy/speechless-codellama-34b-v2.0` · Hugging Face. <https://huggingface.co/uukuguy/speechless-codellama-34b-v2.0> [Online; accessed 14. Mar. 2025].
- [3] 2024. AI | 2024 Stack Overflow Developer Survey. <https://survey.stackoverflow.co/2024/ai> [Online; accessed 14. Mar. 2025].
- [4] 2025. `budecosystem/code-millennials-34b` · Hugging Face. <https://huggingface.co/budecosystem/code-millennials-34b> [Online; accessed 14. Mar. 2025].
- [5] 2025. High Voltage Power Monitor. <https://www.msoon.com/online-store/High-Voltage-Power-Monitor-p90002590> [Online; accessed 10. Mar. 2025].
- [6] 2025. Time Complexity - Python Wiki. <https://wiki.python.org/moin/TimeComplexity> [Online; accessed 14. Mar. 2025].
- [7] Benjamin Antunes and David R. C. Hill. 2024. Reproducibility, energy efficiency and performance of pseudorandom number generators in machine learning: a comparative study of python, numpy, tensorflow, and pytorch implementations. *arXiv:2401.17345* [cs.MS] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.17345>
- [8] Benjamin Antunes and David R. C. Hill. 2024. Reproducibility, energy efficiency and performance of pseudorandom number generators in machine learning: a comparative study of python, numpy, tensorflow, and pytorch implementations. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2401.17345 arXiv:2401.17345 [cs].
- [9] Radu Apsan, Vincenzo Stoico, Michel Albonico, Rudra Dhar, Karthik Vaidhyanathan, and Ivano Malavolta. 2025. Replication package of this study. doi:10.5281/zenodo.16762090
- [10] Luca Ardito, Riccardo Coppola, Maurizio Morisio, and Marco Torchiano. 2019. Methodological guidelines for measuring energy consumption of software applications. *Scientific Programming* 2019, 1 (2019), 5284645.
- [11] Shrikara Arun, Meghana Tedla, and Karthik Vaidhyanathan. 2025. LLMs for Generation of Architectural Components: An Exploratory Empirical Study in the Serverless World. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02539* (2025).
- [12] Shraddha Barke, Michael B. James, and Nadia Polikarpova. 2023. Grounded Copilot: How Programmers Interact with Code-Generating Models. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 7, OOPSLA1, Article 78 (April 2023), 27 pages. doi:10.1145/3586030
- [13] Victor R Basili and H Dieter Rombach. 1988. The TAME project: Towards improvement-oriented software environments. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering* 14, 6 (1988), 758–773.
- [14] Coral Calero, M^a Ángeles Moraga, and Mario Piattini. 2021. Introduction to software sustainability. In *Software Sustainability*. Springer, 1–15.
- [15] Cappendijk, Tom and de Reus, Pepijn and Opreescu, Ana. 2024. Generating Energy-efficient code with LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.10599* (2024).
- [16] Fernando Castor. 2024. Estimating the Energy Footprint of Software Systems: a Primer. *arXiv:2407.11611* [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.11611>
- [17] Norman Cliff. 1993. Dominance statistics: Ordinal analyses to answer ordinal questions. *Psychological bulletin* 114, 3 (1993), 494.
- [18] Tristan Coignion, Clément Quinton, and Romain Rouvoy. 2024. A Performance Study of LLM-Generated Code on Leetcode. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering, EASE 2024, Salerno, Italy, June 18–21, 2024*. ACM, 79–89. doi:10.1145/3661167.3661221
- [19] Miles D. Cranmer, Benjamin R. Barsdell, Danny C. Price, Jayce Dowell, Hugh Garsden, Veronica Dike, Tarraneh Eftekhari, Alexander M. Hegedus, Joseph Malins, Kenneth S. Obenberger, Frank Schinzel, Kevin Stovall, Gregory B. Taylor, and Lincoln J. Greenhill. 2017. Bifrost: A Python/C++ Framework for High-Throughput Stream Processing in Astronomy. *Journal of Astronomical Instrumentation* 06, 04 (2017), 1750007. doi:10.1142/S2251171717500076
- [20] Vlad-Andrei Cursaru, Laura Duits, Joel Milligan, Damla Ural, Berta Rodriguez Sanchez, Vincenzo Stoico, and Ivano Malavolta. 2024. A Controlled Experiment on the Energy Efficiency of the Source Code Generated by Code Llama. In *International Conference on the Quality of Information and Communications Technology*. Springer, 161–176.
- [21] Marc Dillmann, Julien Siebert, and Adam Trendowicz. 2024. Evaluation of large language models for assessing code maintainability. *CoRR* (2024).
- [22] Francisco Durán, Matias Martínez, Patricia Lago, and Silverio Martínez-Fernández. 2024. Energy consumption of code small language models serving with runtime engines and execution providers. *arXiv:2412.15441* [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.15441>
- [23] Lisa A Elkin, Matthew Kay, James J Higgins, and Jacob O Wobbrock. 2021. An aligned rank transform procedure for multifactor contrast tests. In *The 34th annual ACM symposium on user interface software and technology*. 754–768.
- [24] Stefanos Georgiou, Stamatia Rizou, and Diomidis Spinellis. 2019. Software Development Lifecycle for Energy Efficiency: Techniques and Tools. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 52, 4, Article 81 (Aug. 2019), 33 pages. doi:10.1145/3337773
- [25] Stefanos Georgiou, Stamatia Rizou, and Diomidis Spinellis. 2020. Software Development Lifecycle for Energy Efficiency: Techniques and Tools. *Comput. Surveys* 52, 4 (July 2020), 1–33. doi:10.1145/3337773 Publisher: Association for Computing Machinery (ACM).
- [26] Achim Guldner, Rabea Bender, Coral Calero, Giovanni S Fernando, Markus Funke, Jens Gröger, Lorenz M Hilty, Julian Hörschemeyer, Geerd-Dietger Hoffmann, Dennis Junger, et al. 2024. Development and evaluation of a reference measurement model for assessing the resource and energy efficiency of software products and components—Green Software Measurement Model (GSMM). *Future Generation Computer Systems* 155 (2024), 402–418.
- [27] Michael Gusenbauer. 2019. Google Scholar to overshadow them all? Comparing the sizes of 12 academic search engines and bibliographic databases. *Scientometrics* 118, 1 (2019), 177–214.
- [28] Håvard H. Holm, André R. Brodtkorb, and Martin L. Sætra. 2020. GPU Computing with Python: Performance, Energy Efficiency and Usability. *Computation* 8, 1 (2020). doi:10.3390/computation8010004
- [29] Sture Holm. 1979. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian journal of statistics* (1979), 65–70.
- [30] Linfei Hou, Liang Zhang, and Jongwon Kim. 2019. Energy Modeling and Power Measurement for Mobile Robots. *Energies* 12, 1 (2019). doi:10.3390/en12010027
- [31] Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Yue Liu, Zhou Yang, Kailong Wang, Li Li, Xiapu Luo, David Lo, John Grundy, and Haoyu Wang. 2024. Large Language Models for Software Engineering: A Systematic Literature Review. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* 33, 8, Article 220 (Dec. 2024), 79 pages. doi:10.1145/3695988
- [32] Dong Huang, Yuhao Qing, Weiji Shang, Heming Cui, and Jie M Zhang. 2024. Effibench: Benchmarking the efficiency of automatically generated code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02037* (2024).
- [33] Wonwoo Jung, Chulko Kang, Chanmin Yoon, Donwon Kim, and Hojung Cha. 2012. DevScope: a nonintrusive and online power analysis tool for smartphone hardware components. In *Proceedings of the Eighth IEEE/ACM/IFIP International Conference on Hardware/Software Codesign and System Synthesis (Tampere, Finland) (CODES+ISSS '12)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 353–362. doi:10.1145/2380445.2380502
- [34] Dennis Junger, Max Westing, Christopher P. Freitag, Achim Guldner, Konstantin Mittelbach, Kira Obergöker, Sebastian Weber, Stefan Naumann, and Volker Wohlgemuth. 2024. Potentials of Green Coding – Findings and Recommendations for Industry, Education and Science – Extended Paper. *arXiv:2402.18227* [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.18227>
- [35] Barbara Kitchenham, Stuart Charters, et al. 2007. Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering.
- [36] Barbara Kitchenham, Rialette Pretorius, David Budgen, O Pearl Brereton, Mark Turner, Mahmood Niazi, and Stephen Linkman. 2010. Systematic literature reviews in software engineering—a tertiary study. *Information and software technology* 52, 8 (2010), 792–805.
- [37] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang (Shane) Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Reasoners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (Eds.), Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 22199–22213. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/8bb0d291acd4ac606ef112099c16f326-Paper-Conference.pdf
- [38] Patricia Lago, Sedef Akinli Koçak, Ivica Crnkovic, and Birgit Penzenstadler. 2015. Framing sustainability as a property of software quality. *Commun. ACM* 58, 10 (2015), 70–78.
- [39] Jenny T. Liang, Chenyang Yang, and Brad A. Myers. 2024. A Large-Scale Survey on the Usability of AI Programming Assistants: Successes and Challenges. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering (Lisbon, Portugal) (ICSE '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 52, 13 pages. doi:10.1145/3597503.3608128
- [40] Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and LINGMING ZHANG. 2023. Is Your Code Generated by ChatGPT Really Correct? Rigorous Evaluation of Large Language Models for Code Generation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine (Eds.), Vol. 36. Curran Associates, Inc., 21558–21572. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/43e9d647ccd3e4b7b5baab53f0368686-Paper-Conference.pdf
- [41] Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xiubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. WizardCoder: Empowering Code Large Language Models with Evol-Instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08568* (2023).
- [42] Ivano Malavolta, Vincenzo Stoico, and Patricia Lago. 2024. *Ten Years of Teaching Empirical Software Engineering in the Context of Energy-Efficient Software*. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 209–253. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-71769-7_8
- [43] Javier Mancebo, Felix Garcia, and Coral Calero. 2021. A process for analysing the energy efficiency of software. *Information and Software Technology* 134 (2021), 106560.
- [44] Mary L McHugh. 2012. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochemia medica* 22, 3 (2012), 276–282.
- [45] David Mytton and Masaó Ashtine. 2022. Sources of data center energy estimates: A comprehensive review. *Joule* 6, 9 (2022), 2032–2056.
- [46] Felix Nahrstedt, Mehdi Karmouche, Karolina Bargiel, Pouyeh Banijamali, Apoorva Nalini Pradeep Kumar, and Ivano Malavolta. 2024. An Empirical

- Study on the Energy Usage and Performance of Pandas and Polars Data Analysis Python Libraries. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment on Software Engineering (EASE)*. IEEE, 58–68. http://www.ivanomalavolta.com/files/papers/EASE_2024.pdf
- [47] Wellington Oliveira, Renato Oliveira, Fernando Castor, Gustavo Pinto, and João Paulo Fernandes. 2021. Improving energy-efficiency by recommending Java collections. *Empirical Software Engineering* 26, 3 (2021), 55.
- [48] OpenAI et al. 2024. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv:2303.08774 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>
- [49] Radoglou Grammatikis Panagiotis, Manganopoulou Evdoxia, and Dasygenis Minas. 2016. Parallelization of the hierarchical search in Python for high performance embedded systems. In *2016 5th International Conference on Modern Circuits and Systems Technologies (MOCAST)*. IEEE, Thessaloniki, Greece, 1–4. doi:10.1109/mocast.2016.7495138
- [50] Rui Pereira, Marco Couto, Francisco Ribeiro, Rui Rua, Jácome Cunha, João Paulo Fernandes, and João Saraiva. 2017. Energy efficiency across programming languages: how do energy, time, and memory relate?. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Software Language Engineering (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (SLE 2017)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 256–267. doi:10.1145/3136014.3136031
- [51] Nurzihan Fatema Reya, Abtahi Ahmed, Tashfia Zaman, and Md Motaharul Islam. 2023. GreenPy: evaluating application-level energy efficiency in Python for green computing. *Annals of Emerging Technologies in Computing (AETiC)* 7, 3 (2023), 92–110.
- [52] Nurzihan Fatema Reya, Abtahi Ahmed, Tashfia Zaman, and Md Motaharul Islam. 2023. GreenPy: Evaluating Application-Level Energy Efficiency in Python for Green Computing. *Annals of Emerging Technologies in Computing (AETiC)* 7, 3 (July 2023), 92–110. doi:10.33166/AETiC.2023.03.005 Number: 3 Publisher: International Association for Educators and Researchers (IAER).
- [53] Enrique Barba Roque, Luis Cruz, and Thomas Durieux. 2024. Unveiling the Energy Vampires: A Methodology for Debugging Software Energy Consumption. arXiv:2412.10063 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.10063>
- [54] Steven I. Ross, Fernando Martinez, Stephanie Houde, Michael Muller, and Justin D. Weisz. 2023. The Programmer’s Assistant: Conversational Interaction with a Large Language Model for Software Development. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces (Sydney, NSW, Australia) (IUI '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 491–514. doi:10.1145/3581641.3584037
- [55] June Sallou, Luis Cruz, and Thomas Durieux. 2023. *EnergiBridge: Empowering Software Sustainability through Cross-Platform Energy Measurement*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2312.13897
- [56] Vijayalakshmi Saravanan, Senthil Kumar Chandran, Sasikumar Punnekkat, and D. P. Kothari. 2011. A study on factors influencing power consumption in multithreaded and multicore CPUs. *W. Trans. on Comp.* 10, 3 (March 2011), 93–103.
- [57] Aaron Schulman, Thomas Schmid, Prabal Dutta, and Neil Spring. 2011. Phone power monitoring with batter. In *Proc. ACM MobiCom*.
- [58] S. Sehrish, J. Kowalkowski, M. Paterno, and C. Green. 2017. Python and HPC for High Energy Physics Data Analyses. In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Python for High-Performance and Scientific Computing*. ACM, Denver CO USA, 1–8. doi:10.1145/3149869.3149877
- [59] Agnia Sergeev, Yaroslav Golubev, Timofey Bryksin, and Iftekhar Ahmed. 2025. Using AI-based coding assistants in practice: State of affairs, perceptions, and ways forward. *Information and Software Technology* 178 (2025), 107610.
- [60] Forrest Shull, Janice Singer, and Dag IK Sjøberg. 2007. *Guide to advanced empirical software engineering*. Springer.
- [61] Mohammed Latif Siddiq, Lindsay Roney, Jiahao Zhang, and Joanna C. S. Santos. 2024. Quality Assessment of ChatGPT Generated Code and their Use by Developers. In *21st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Mining Software Repositories, MSR 2024, Lisbon, Portugal, April 15-16, 2024*, Diomidis Spinellis, Alberto Bacchelli, and Eleni Constantinou (Eds.). ACM, 152–156. doi:10.1145/3643991.3645071
- [62] Jake Snell, Kevin Swersky, and Richard Zemel. 2017. Prototypical Networks for Few-shot Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/cb8da6767461f2812ae4290eac7cbc42-Paper.pdf
- [63] Lola Solovyeva, Sophie Weidmann, and Fernando Castor. 2025. AI-powered, but power-hungry? energy efficiency of llm-generated code. In *2025 IEEE/ACM Second International Conference on AI Foundation Models and Software Engineering (Forge)*. IEEE, 49–60.
- [64] Donna Spencer. 2009. *Card sorting: Designing usable categories*. Rosenfeld Media.
- [65] Mark Summerfield. 2013. *Python in practice: create better programs using concurrency, libraries, and patterns*. Addison-Wesley.
- [66] Jialiang Tan, Yu Chen, Zhenming Liu, Bin Ren, Shuaiwen Leon Song, Xipeng Shen, and Xu Liu. 2021. Toward efficient interactions between Python and native libraries. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. ACM, Athens Greece, 1117–1128. doi:10.1145/3468264.3468541
- [67] Davide Tosi. 2024. Studying the Quality of Source Code Generated by Different AI Generative Engines: An Empirical Evaluation. *Future Internet* 16, 6 (2024), 188. doi:10.3390/FI16060188
- [68] Christoph Treude and Margaret-Anne Storey. 2025. Generative AI and Empirical Software Engineering: A Paradigm Shift. arXiv:2502.08108 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.08108>
- [69] Jonas F. Tuttle, Dayuan Chen, Amina Nasrin, Noe Soto, and Ziliang Zong. 2024. Can LLMs Generate Green Code - A Comprehensive Study Through LeetCode. In *2024 IEEE 15th International Green and Sustainable Computing Conference (IGSC)*. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 39–44. doi:10.1109/IGSC64514.2024.00017
- [70] András Vargha and Harold D Delaney. 2000. A critique and improvement of the CL common language effect size statistics of McGraw and Wong. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics* 25, 2 (2000), 101–132.
- [71] Tina Vartziotis, Ippolyti Dellatolas, George Dasoulas, Maximilian Schmidt, Florian Schneider, Tim Hoffmann, Sotirios Kotsopoulos, and Michael Keckeisen. 2024. Learn to Code Sustainably: An Empirical Study on Green Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Large Language Models for Code (Lisbon, Portugal) (LLM4Code '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 30–37. doi:10.1145/3643795.3648394
- [72] A Vaswani. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2017).
- [73] Roberto Verdecchia, June Sallou, and Luis Cruz. 2023. A systematic review of Green AI. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 13, 4 (2023), e1507.
- [74] Peter Vincent, Freddie Witherden, Brian Vermeire, Jin Seok Park, and Arvind Iyer. 2016. Towards Green Aviation with Python at Petascale. In *SC16: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. IEEE, Salt Lake City, UT, 1–11. doi:10.1109/sc.2016.1
- [75] Nalin Wadhwa, Jui Pradhan, Atharv Sonwane, Surya Prakash Sahu, Nagarajan Natarajan, Aditya Kanade, Suresh Parthasarathy, and Sriram Rajamani. 2024. Core: Resolving code quality issues using llms. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* 1, FSE (2024), 789–811.
- [76] Jules White, Quchen Fu, Sam Hays, Michael Sandborn, Carlos Olea, Henry Gilbert, Ashraf Elnashar, Jesse Spencer-Smith, and Douglas C. Schmidt. 2023. A Prompt Pattern Catalog to Enhance Prompt Engineering with ChatGPT. arXiv:2302.11382 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.11382>
- [77] Jacob O. Wobbrock, Leah Findlater, Darren Gergle, and James J. Higgins. 2011. The aligned rank transform for nonparametric factorial analyses using only anova procedures. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (CHI '11)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 143–146. doi:10.1145/1978942.1978963
- [78] C. Wohlin, P. Runeson, M. Höst, M.C. Ohlsson, B. Regnell, and A. Wesslén. 2012. *Experimentation in Software Engineering*. Springer.
- [79] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, and Lingming Zhang. 2024. EvoEval leaderboard. <https://evo-eval.github.io/leaderboard.html> [Online; accessed 10. July. 2024].
- [80] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, and Lingming Zhang. 2024. Top Leaderboard Ranking = Top Coding Proficiency, Always? EvoEval: Evolving Coding Benchmarks via LLM. *arXiv preprint* (2024).
- [81] Danning Xie, Byungwoo Yoo, Nan Jiang, Mijung Kim, Lin Tan, Xiangyu Zhang, and Judy S Lee. 2023. Impact of large language models on generating software specifications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03324* (2023).
- [82] Zibin Zheng, Kaiwen Ning, Qingyuan Zhong, Jiachi Chen, Wenqing Chen, Lianghong Guo, Weicheng Wang, and Yanlin Wang. 2025. Towards an understanding of large language models in software engineering tasks. *Empirical Software Engineering* 30, 2 (2025), 50.
- [83] Qihao Zhu, Daya Guo, Zhihong Shao, Dejian Yang, Peiyi Wang, Runxin Xu, Y Wu, Yukun Li, Huazuo Gao, Shirong Ma, et al. 2024. DeepSeek-Coder-V2: Breaking the Barrier of Closed-Source Models in Code Intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11931* (2024).