

Beyond Classification: Evaluating LLMs for Fine-Grained Automatic Malware Behavior Auditing

Xinran Zheng
University College London
London, UK

Xingzhi Qian
University College London
London, UK

Yiling He*
University College London
London, UK

Shuo Yang
The University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong SAR, China

Lorenzo Cavallaro
University College London
London, UK

Abstract

Automated malware classification approaches have achieved tantalizing detection performance. Yet, malware behavior auditing, which focuses on providing causal and verifiable explanations of malicious behavior—fundamental to trust results and translate into actionable insights—remains a critical challenge. Once automated systems flag a sample as malware, analysts must determine not only what the malware does, but also how to substantiate such claims with evidence. This task is particularly difficult in practice, as adversarial intent is often concealed within complex, framework-heavy applications, making manual auditing a slow and costly bottleneck. Large Language Models (LLMs) may play a pivotal role in addressing this gap, but their usefulness in auditing tasks has largely remained unexplored, due to three main limitations: (1) the scarcity of fine-grained behavioral and evidence annotations for fair assessment; (2) the abundant of benign code that interferes with malicious signals; and (3) untraceable and unverifiable outputs with hallucinations that undermine the credibility of behavioral attribution.

To close this gap, we introduce MalEval, a comprehensive evaluation framework for fine-grained Android malware auditing, designed to assess how effectively LLMs can support behavior auditing under real-world constraints. It provides expert-verified reports and an updated sensitive API list to mitigate ground truth scarcity and reduce noise via static reachability analysis. Function-level context-driven structural representations are designed as intermediate attribution units for verifiable and consistent evaluation. On this basis, we define four analyst-aligned evaluation tasks: function prioritization, evidence attribution, behavior synthesis, and sample discrimination, together with domain-specific metrics and a unified workload-oriented score to assess strengths and limitations on each step. We evaluate seven widely used LLMs on a curated dataset comprising the latest malware samples and potential misclassified

benign apps, providing the first systematic assessment of their auditing capabilities. MalEval reveals both promising capabilities and critical limitations across the audit stages, offering a reproducible framework and establishing a foundation for future research on LLM-enhanced malware behavior auditing. MalEval is publicly available at <https://github.com/ZhengXR930/MalEval.git>

CCS Concepts

• Security and privacy → Software security engineering; Malware and its mitigation.

Keywords

Malware Analysis, Evaluation, Large Language Model

ACM Reference Format:

Xinran Zheng, Xingzhi Qian, Yiling He, Shuo Yang, and Lorenzo Cavallaro. 2018. Beyond Classification: Evaluating LLMs for Fine-Grained Automatic Malware Behavior Auditing. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Malware poses serious threats to user privacy, financial security, and sensitive data, with the rapid expansion of Android ecosystem further increasing the attack surface. Although large-scale automated analysis systems form the first line of defense against the increase in Android malware [3, 10, 15, 32, 38, 60], their output is typically only the start of the operational workflow. Once a sample is flagged as suspicious, it enters the stage of security auditing, where analysts must determine not only what the malware does but also how to substantiate such claims. Auditing thus goes beyond behavior summarization: it requires systematic malicious behavior reports and, critically, provides supporting analyses and causal evidence to justify such findings [9]. In addition, auditing entails filtering misclassified samples and refuting prior detections when evidence does not support them, thereby serving as a corrective safeguard in the Security Operations Center (SOC) scale workflow.

The emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) introduces a new paradigm for scalable malware behavior auditing, as they can synthesize natural-language summaries resembling analyst reports [38, 42, 45]. This capability stands in stark contrast to traditional methods. For instance, precise dynamic analysis techniques, such as system-level instrumentation [14, 43, 53], are often costly and susceptible to evasion [25]. Meanwhile, model interpretation

*Corresponding author: heyilinge0@gmail.com

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference acronym 'XX, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/2018/06

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

methods [12, 17, 21], though scalable, are often limited to coarse-grained feature or snippet-level analysis, lack provenance-attached reasoning, and are sensitive to spurious features and obfuscation, thus exhibit limited reliability for auditing purposes. Despite their promise, the reliability of LLMs for malware behavior auditing remains an open and systematically unevaluated question. It is unclear whether current LLMs can generate reproducible, evidence-backed analysis connecting malicious behaviors to function-level evidence, or robustly handle upstream misclassifications by refuting erroneous detections. Directly applying LLMs to auditing reveals three primary limitations: 1) **Ground Truth Scarcity**: Fine-grained ground truth for malware behavior auditing is scarce [52]. The lack of function-level labels necessitates reliance on indirect indicators to validate behavior attributions [22], while high-quality behavior reports themselves are rare, leaving few samples for verifiable evaluation [47]; 2) **Noise Interference**: Malicious logic is typically buried within a massive benign codebase. Feeding raw decompiled codebase directly to an LLM can overwhelm it with irrelevant content [40]. Although summarization-based preprocessing has been proposed [22], aggregating numerous unrelated function summaries can still mislead the model's attention [27], increasing the risk of missing critical artifacts. 3) **Fragile Traceability and Consistency**: In malware auditing, the critical requirement is to provide accurate, verifiable attributions of behavior to concrete evidence. However, when tasked with analyzing large codebases, LLMs frequently hallucinate [40] or lose invocation relationships [18]. This generates claims that are untraceable to the evidence and inconsistent across repeated analyses. This failure to ensure both traceability and reproducibility severely undermines their trustworthiness in security-critical contexts.

These limitations highlight that an end-to-end, black-box evaluation of LLMs for malware auditing is insufficient. To facilitate systematic evaluation, we decompose the complex auditing process into a sequential workflow following the existing analysis [57], allowing for a granular assessment of LLM performance at each distinct stage: **Stage S1: Prioritize Function at Scale**: Identify the small set of malicious functions hidden among thousands of benign ones by leveraging semantic understanding of functions and their context [20, 38]; **Stage S2: Causal Evidence Grounding**: Establish causal relationships that connect low-level indicators (e.g., API calls, permissions) to intermediate attack capabilities, thereby contextualizing how individual elements cooperate to shape the application's malicious intent [44, 59]; **Stage S3: Behavior report synthesis**: Integrate dispersed technical evidence into a coherent, human-readable narrative that abstracts low-level artifacts into higher-level semantics and aligns with established threat taxonomies [13, 41, 58]; **Stage S4: False Alarm Filtering**: Perform holistic reasoning over the entire codebase to distinguish genuine threats from false positives produced by upstream detection systems, thereby reducing wasted analyst effort [56].

Building on this understanding of the workflow and limitations of LLMs, we introduce MalEval, a comprehensive evaluation framework designed to examine how LLMs can support malware behavior auditing under real-world conditions. To comprehensively evaluate, we curated a dataset containing the latest malware and potential misclassified benign applications, complete with manually verified low-level indicators and high-level narrative reports as ground truth.

MalEval further performs static reachability analysis to reduce the code space and builds context-driven intermediate structural representations as traceable, verifiable units for behavior reports, aligning with recent work showing that focused signals (e.g., code slices) provide LLMs the right context for reliable explanations [22, 38], grounding models more in semantics than in syntactic recalls capabilities [40]. On top of these, MalEval defines four analyst-aligned evaluation tasks, **Task 1 -> S1: Function Prioritization**: evaluates LLMs' ability on highlight high-risk functions; **Task 2 -> S2: Evidence Attribution**: measures whether an LLM can correctly identify functions that embody low-level evidence, aligning them with causal chains that substantiate malicious intent; **Task 3 -> S3: Behavioral Synthesis**: tests the ability of LLMs on transforming dispersed technical evidence into a concise, logically consistent narrative; **Task 4 -> S4: Sample Discrimination**: examines whether LLMs can distinguish misclassified benign samples while preserving judgments that are already correct. To unify the evaluation, we also propose the Workload Reduction Score (WRS), a composite metric that quantifies the reduction in professional effort achieved by using LLMs in security operations center (SOC) workflows.

We summarize the contribution of this paper as follows:

- We propose MalEval, the first comprehensive framework for systematically evaluating LLMs in fine-grained Android malware auditing, addressing key limitations that hinder trustworthy assessment: ground truth scarcity, noise interference, and fragile traceability (Section 3).
- We design four analyst-aligned evaluation tasks, Function Prioritization, Evidence Attribution, Behavioral Synthesis, and Sample Discrimination, together with task-specific metrics and the unified Workload Reduction Score (WRS) to quantify analyst workload reduction (Section 3.5).
- We construct a diverse, manually verified dataset covering archived malware, latest malware, and misclassified benign apps, ensuring reliable evaluation. All ground truth indicators and behavior reports are manually verified, ensuring the credibility of the evaluation (Section 3.2).
- We conduct extensive experiments on seven widely used LLMs, showing that while high-performance LLMs can partially assist in reducing analyst workload, their reliability in evidence attribution and behavior reasoning is far from sufficient, underscoring the long road toward trustworthy fine-grained malware behavior auditing (Section 4).

2 Background

2.1 Malware Behavior Analysis to Auditing

Early approaches to Android malware behavior analysis rely heavily on *specialized tools* for static or dynamic inspection. Static frameworks, such as FlowDroid [4], model application lifecycles to detect data leaks, while dynamic systems, like TaintDroid [14], DroidScope [53], and CopperDroid [43], enable runtime behaviour tracing. These methods provide valuable foundations but often produce low-level, voluminous outputs and remain vulnerable to obfuscation or conditional triggers. To improve scalability, *learning-based* methods extend detection models toward fine-grained analysis, leveraging explainable AI and post-hoc attribution to identify malicious snippets [20], sensitive functions [21], critical traces [61],

and behavioral concepts [19]. Some works also generate rule-based natural language explanations [50], mapping features with high attention scores to semantics provided by official documents.

More recently, *LLM-powered* behavior analysis offers a new paradigm by directly interpreting code and generating narrative reports, potentially reducing analysts' workload beyond traditional tools. Early efforts use decision-centric prompts with pre-extracted features [28], while later work explored summarization, slicing, and multi-tier reasoning for behavioral attribution [38, 45]. Studies also showed LLMs can attribute malicious behaviors to small methods with careful prompting [42], though evaluation remains small-scale due to annotation cost. Despite these advances, current LLM-based analysis still struggles with noisy codebases, obfuscation, scalability, and scarce ground truth, limiting its reliability for real-world malware behavior analysis.

From Analysis to Auditing. Prior research emphasizes *analysis*, deriving insights about potential malicious behaviors from code or features, but stops short of full *auditing*. We distinguish the two: analysis focuses on identifying behaviors or generating explanations, whereas auditing demands a more rigorous process that (i) grounds behaviors in concrete, verifiable evidence and (ii) filters upstream false positives to avoid overwhelming analysts. In practice, auditing subsumes analysis, requiring both accurate behavioral synthesis and trustworthy evidence attribution. Yet, to our knowledge, no prior work has systematically explored malware *auditing* with LLMs, leaving open whether current models can truly reduce analyst workload beyond behavior analysis.

2.2 Assessing LLMs for Security-centric Code Understanding

LLMs have advanced rapidly in code intelligence, powering tasks from completion and summarization to semantic reasoning [7, 23, 39, 51]. Correspondingly, frameworks such as HumanEval and CodeXGLUE [8, 31] measure basic correctness on isolated snippets, while newer software-engineering-related work, including CoRe [51], REval [7], CodeSense [39], and A.S.E. [29], push toward richer semantics, multi-file reasoning, and repository-level evaluation, sometimes with a focus on the security of generated code. However, security-centric code understanding requires capabilities that go beyond software-engineering evaluations. Specifically, it demands: (i) **Trustworthy attribution**: model claims must be linked to concrete, verifiable evidence to ensure reproducibility and analyst trust [21]; (ii) **Scalable context management**: mechanisms to manage large, noisy codebases while mitigating hallucinations and maintaining robustness [34, 46]. Existing benchmarks only partially satisfy these principles, leaving a gap for security-critical reasoning. (iii) **Compositional reasoning**: the ability to reason across interdependent functions and APIs, uncovering how multiple snippets jointly enable malicious behaviors [47];

Malware analysis exemplifies this challenge, where analysts must attribute high-level malicious intent to specific correlated implementations. Preliminary efforts such as CAMA [22] represent an initial step, evaluating LLMs on Android malware summarization and function maliciousness estimation. While inspiring, it remains insufficient for auditing, where understanding correlations across

functions and how to link them to final behaviors is essential. Moreover, CAMA faces several limitations: it relies on unverifiable model-generated ground truth [38], struggles to scale as inference on large malware corpora with advanced LLMs becomes costly or infeasible, and reports only limited observations on small open-source LLMs [1, 49], restricting its generality. Consequently, constructing a comprehensive evaluation of LLMs for malware behavior auditing remains an open problem. To fill this gap, we propose MalEval, the first traceable and credible framework for malware behavior auditing. It introduces human-labeled ground truth, static-analysis-based context reduction, and analyst-aligned tasks, directly addressing the needs for verifiable attribution, scalable context management, and compositional reasoning.

3 MalEval

3.1 Overview

MalEval is a comprehensive evaluation framework designed to evaluate Large Language Models (LLMs) potential in malware behavior auditing. By focusing on three core limitations, we provide a traceable and realistic evaluation framework that mirrors the workflow of security experts, which is structured as follows:

Verifiable Ground Truth Generation. To address the lack of reliable ground truth, MalEval curates a dataset of diverse Android applications with a two-tier design. At the low level, each sample is paired with a sensitive API list derived from official platforms. At the high level, expert-written reports are parsed and aligned with predefined behavior categories and summary narratives. This ensures both fine-grained evidence and holistic malicious behaviors are covered, forming a trustworthy evaluation foundation.

Code Context Reduction. To combat noise inference from vast codebases, MalEval performs static reachability analysis starting from manifest-declared and framework-overridden entrypoints. This process extracts all potentially executable functions as the source, narrowing analysis to semantically relevant code and preventing benign fragments from interfering with malicious signals.

Fine-grained Traceable and Verifiable Evaluation. At the core of MalEval are two components that enable systematic and trustworthy assessment. First, we introduce a context-driven intermediate structural representation, where each function is represented as $\langle \text{function signature, summary, sensitivity score} \rangle$. This design distills complex decompiled code into concise, context-aware units, while assigning a quantifiable score that reflects potential maliciousness. Such representations create consistent and traceable anchors, allowing performance to be evaluated at a fine-grained level rather than only through final reports; 2) **Expert-guided Tasks**: To evaluate how LLMs reduce the manual workload on malware analysis, we design a suite of expert-guided tasks that mirror the workflow of human analysts: **Task 1: Function Prioritization** examines whether an LLM can highlight the most sensitive functions tied to malicious intent; **Task 2: Evidence Attribution** evaluates its ability to link low-level indicators to functions that substantiate malicious capabilities; **Task 3: Behavioral Synthesis** tests whether dispersed evidence can be integrated into a coherent, high-level report; and **Task 4: Sample Discrimination** assesses whether misclassified




Figure 1: Evaluation pipeline of MalEval.

benign samples can be correctly refuted without undermining valid judgments. Together with task-specific and global metrics, these components yield a reproducible and fine-grained evaluation process that closely reflects real-world malware auditing.

3.2 Verifiable Ground Truth Generation

3.2.1 Dataset Curation. To construct a benchmark that reflects realistic auditing conditions, we curated a dataset combining archived and the latest malware with simulated false positive benign samples. The design aims to ensure diversity, temporal coverage, and realistic operational scenarios. All samples are paired with manually verified behavior reports and API-level indicators, providing reliable ground truth for evaluation.

Malware Set. The construction of our malware dataset adheres to three guiding principles: 1) **Diversity:** We include a broad spectrum of malware families and behavioral patterns to mitigate the risk of a model overfitting to a narrow set of threat classes; 2) **Representativeness:** We prioritize malware families with uniform and consistent behaviors, avoiding idiosyncratic cases to ensure the reliability and consistency of our evaluation metrics; 3) **Reliability:** We select samples with rigorously verified behavioral annotations and accessible analysis reports, providing a robust knowledge base for assessment. To reduce redundancy, we perform de-duplication by filtering out APKs with identical .dex files within each malware category. To reflect both historical and emerging threats, the dataset is divided into two subsets:

Archive Malware : We select well-documented public samples from trusted sources, Malradar [47], ensuring access to reliable analysis reports and behavior category labels that serve as ground truth. All samples are from families without known variants. This

subset contains a total of 222 samples, spanning 51 families across 6 distinct categories.

Latest Malware : We collect the latest malware reports after July 2024 from Malpedia ¹, and all malware whose hash values are mentioned in reports is downloaded from Koodous ². This set represents more recent threats that extend beyond the training horizon of most LLMs. Unlike the archive set, these samples are inherently scarce due to the high cost of producing reliable reports. To maintain reliability, we restrict selection to families with unique, well-documented behavior reports, and ensure their categories are consistent with archived set. After deduplication of APKs with identical .dex files, we obtain 33 samples, spanning 10 families across 3 categories.

The combined statistics of both subsets are reported in Table 1, including family counts, prevalence of obfuscation and packing, and average sample size. These figures highlight the diversity of threats and the practical challenges posed by both archived and recent malware.

Simulated False Positive Benign Set. To emulate persistent false positives in real-world detectors, we use recent benign apps. Owing to concept drift [6], detectors trained on past data often misclassify new samples. We thus select 25 post-July 2024 benign apps from Androzoo ³, yielding a simulated false positive rate of about 10%. This setup evaluates auditing models not only on malware detection but also on handling mislabeled benign cases without inflating analyst workload.

3.2.2 Ground Truth Generation.

¹<https://malpedia.caad.fkie.fraunhofer.de>

²<https://koodous.com>

³<https://androzoo.uni.lu>

Table 1: Information on archived (AM) and latest (LM) malware sets, including categories, family counts, obfuscated/packed samples, and average sample size per category.

Category			Number of Family		Obfuscated		Packed		Avg. Size/MB	
Name	AM.	LM.	AM.	LM.	AM.	LM.	AM.	LM.	AM.	LM.
Trojan	28	/	9	/	9	/	22	/	4.26	/
Banker	63	15	15	5	26	9	28	4	2.78	4.58
Rootkits	21	4	3	1	4	0	12	0	2.54	0.25
Spyware	56	14	12	4	27	6	32	12	1.62	4.86
Adware	25	/	6	/	5	/	20	/	5.55	/
Ransomware	29	/	6	/	2	/	9	/	2.15	/
Total	222	33	51	10	73	15	123	16	2.70	3.23

Behavior Report Parsing. To generate structured behavior ground truth, we built an automated pipeline that crawls behavior reports from major security vendors and normalizes them into a standardized format. The pipeline standardizes reports into Markdown, filters irrelevant boilerplate (e.g., ads), and then uses a large language model to parse the text. The model maps behaviors into 12 categories defined by Malradar [47] and extracts corresponding textual evidence, which is preserved as verifiable traces. In total, 57 reports corresponding to our malware samples were processed, producing structured JSON files that contain behavior categories, extracted evidence, confidence scores, and concise summaries.

Sensitive API Retrieve. To construct low-level evidence, we developed an API retrieval module that maintains an up-to-date list of sensitive Android APIs. Starting from the PScout list [5], we crawled metadata from the official Android developer site, parsing package/class documentation to extract API descriptions. We then identify and filter out deprecated APIs, leveraging the same powerful LLM as report parsing to identify their replacements from documentation. If a deprecated API appeared in the original list, its successor was added. We further expanded the list with all APIs requiring explicit permissions. This process resulted in a curated set of 20,337 sensitive APIs, ensuring timeliness and reliability as the basis for API-level evidence evaluation.

3.3 Code Context Reduction

To focus analysis on relevant code and improve efficiency, we reduced each application’s code context through entrypoint identification and reachable code extraction. This yielded 733 entrypoints per APK on average and 689,232 reachable functions total, cutting the analysis scope by 66.02% compared to the original 3,187,032 functions, thus making evaluation more practical and aligned with real-world auditing.

3.3.1 Entrypoint Identification. We define an entrypoint as a method invocable without a prior call to another user-defined method. Following this, we combined two approaches: (1) extracting lifecycle methods (e.g., onCreate) specified in the Android Manifest, which are guaranteed to be invoked by the framework; and (2) detecting user-defined functions that override or implement Android Framework methods, inspired by DroidsIFT [59], by traversing class hierarchies to match system-level signatures. This ensures comprehensive entrypoint coverage for subsequent analysis.

3.3.2 Reachable Code Extraction. To exclude dead or irrelevant code, we perform static reachability analysis from each entrypoint. Using a Breadth-First Search (BFS) traversal on the call graph, we collect all transitively reachable functions, producing a focused and executable code analysis base more consistent with real-world auditing practices.

3.4 Context-driven Intermediate Structural Representation

Instead of analyzing raw source code directly, auditors often rely on high-level function summaries to assess potential risks. Following this principle, we represent each reachable function $f \in \mathcal{F}_r$ with an intermediate structural unit $IR(f)$, which serves as a traceable anchor for evaluation, ensuring consistency across models and decoupling assessment from the quality of final reports.

To construct $IR(f)$, we generate a context-driven description $\mathcal{D}_c(f)$ by analyzing the one-hop caller–callee neighborhood $\mathcal{C}(f)$ of f in the call graph. An evaluated language model first summarizes the functionalities of these neighbors. Then, combining them with the function’s source code and signature $\mathcal{N}(f)$, yields $\mathcal{D}_c(f)$, a concise summary of the function’s role within the application. Paired with a sensitivity score $\mathcal{S}(f)$, this produces the final representation: $IR(f) = \langle \mathcal{N}(f), \mathcal{D}_c(f), \mathcal{S}(f) \rangle$. This process yields a context-aware summary that captures the function’s role within the application, providing focused and meaningful input for reliable evaluation.

LLM Operation I: Context-driven Intermediate Structural Representation

Task: Generate a context-aware structural representation $IR(f)$ for each reachable function f , serving as a traceable evaluation unit of behavior.
Input: (1) The source code and function name $\mathcal{N}(f)$ of function f ; (2) its one-hop caller–callee neighborhood $\mathcal{C}(f)$ extracted from the call graph. Each element of $\mathcal{C}(f)$ is represented as a tuple $\langle \mathcal{N}(f_{\text{call}}), \mathcal{D}(f_{\text{call}}) \rangle$, where $\mathcal{N}(f_{\text{call}})$ denotes the signature of the caller or callee function, and $\mathcal{D}(f_{\text{call}})$ provides a functionality description derived solely from its source code (without contextual information).
Output: (1) A context-driven description $\mathcal{D}_c(f)$ that summarizes the function’s behavior within its invocation context; (2) a sensitivity score $\mathcal{S}(f)$ reflecting the potential security risk of f . Together with the function signature $\mathcal{N}(f)$, these elements form the complete representation $IR(f) = \langle \mathcal{N}(f), \mathcal{D}_c(f), \mathcal{S}(f) \rangle$.

3.5 Expert-guided Evaluation Takes

To align our evaluation with real-world auditing practices, we design four expert-guided tasks and a series of corresponding metrics. Each task reflects a concrete need faced by human analysts, while the associated metrics provide measurable criteria for model performance.

3.5.1 Task 1: Function Prioritization. Auditors must quickly isolate suspicious functions from a vast codebase to narrow the scope of manual inspection. Formally, given a set of reachable functions \mathcal{F}_r , the model assigns sensitivity scores $\mathcal{S}(f)$, with higher scores indicating stronger suspicion. Since function-level labels are unavailable, we adopt a fidelity score, inspired by explainable AI (XAI) evaluation [55], to measure whether the highlighted functions truly drive malicious classification. Specifically, a well-trained malware classifier predicts category \hat{y} based on function descriptions. Fidelity Score (FS) quantifies the confidence drop when the top- $k\%$ sensitive functions \mathcal{F}_k are removed. The Fidelity Score is formalized as shown in Eq. 1,

$$FS(k) = 1 - \frac{P(\hat{y} | \mathcal{F}_r \setminus \mathcal{F}_k)}{P(\hat{y} | \mathcal{F}_r)}, \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{F}_k is the subset of removed high-sensitivity functions, and $P(\hat{y}, |, \cdot)$ is the classifier's confidence in predicting \hat{y} given the input function set. A higher FS indicates that excluding the top- $k\%$ functions substantially reduces classification confidence, showing the model successfully identified functions crucial to malicious attribution.

3.5.2 Task 2: Evidence Attribution. While Stage S2 ultimately aims to connect low-level indicators into coherent attack capabilities, the absence of ground truth for the complete evidence chain, from APIs to functions to behaviors, prevents a direct evaluation of causal attribution. We therefore scope this task to API-level attribution: each application is associated with a ground-truth set $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of sensitive APIs (Section 3.2.2), and the model must identify functions whose invocations cover these APIs. This setup treats sensitive APIs in their function context as atomic evidence units of malicious capabilities, providing the necessary building blocks for subsequent behavior synthesis. Effective attribution requires balancing two goals: covering as many ground-truth sensitive APIs as possible, while avoiding excessive function selection that inflates analysis cost. We capture this trade-off using the Coverage-of-Selected Rate (CSR). Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_r = \{f \in \mathcal{F}_r \mid \mathcal{S}(f) \geq \tau\}$ be the set of high-sensitivity functions selected under threshold τ , and let $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{A}}$ denote the sensitive APIs they invoke. CSR is defined as:

$$CSR = \frac{|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{A}} \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}| / |\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}|}{|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_r| / |\mathcal{F}_r|}, \quad (2)$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes set cardinality function. A higher CSR thus reflects not only accurate API-level attribution but also efficient narrowing of evidence, directly supporting auditors by reducing noise while preserving the core signals needed for reliable behavior synthesis.

3.5.3 Task 3: Behavioral Synthesis. The ultimate goal of malware auditing is to answer: "What did this malware do?" This requires reasoning from low-level evidence to high-level semantics while

reassessing whether the sample is truly malicious. We therefore task models with generating structured JSON reports that include a binary maliciousness flag, identified behaviors (12 types from Malradar [47]), supporting evidence with related functions, and a high-level summary. Input is provided as a ranked list of structural representations for sensitive functions, ordered from high to low sensitivity. We do not impose any manual threshold; instead, the effective truncation is naturally determined by the model's context window.

We design three complementary metrics to evaluate behavioral synthesis, capturing both report quality and potential hallucinations. Since benign samples lack behavior reports, all metrics in this task are evaluated only on malware. Conventional similarity-based metrics (e.g., BLEU [37], BERTScore [48]) are inadequate here, as they only measure surface overlap and cannot assess whether a report correctly identifies malicious intent or grounds its claims in valid evidence. To overcome this, we adopt an LLM-as-a-judge [16] paradigm, where the judge acts as a cybersecurity analyst. **1) Report Quality (RQ):** Assesses the analytic value of the report across three dimensions: (i) Insight: whether the core malicious objective is correctly identified; (ii) Comprehensiveness: whether all relevant behaviors are covered; and (iii) Quality of Evidence: whether the supporting evidence logically substantiates the behaviors, with preference for coherent attack chains. The final RQ score is the weighted average of these three criteria; **2) Evidence Authenticity Score (EAS):** Measures whether the cited functions genuinely support the claimed behaviors, addressing the risk of hallucinations where plausible descriptions are linked to irrelevant evidence. Higher scores indicate stronger alignment between evidence and behavior; **3) Syntax Authenticity Score (SAS):** Evaluates whether all referenced functions exist in the input set of structural representations. Formally, $SAS = |\mathcal{F}_s| / |\mathcal{F}_{in}|$, where \mathcal{F}_s is the set of cited functions and \mathcal{F}_{in} is the input. A higher SAS reflects stronger compliance with grounding constraints, ensuring reports remain verifiable. Together, these metrics test whether LLMs can not only produce fluent summaries but also pinpoint core behaviors, maintain coverage, and ground claims in authentic, valid evidence.

LLM Operation II: Behavior Report Generation

Task: 1. *Analyze Intent:* Given a suspicious application's sensitive function summaries, assess the intent. If the evidence confirms malicious intent, proceed. Otherwise, refute the suspicion. 2. *Generate a JSON Report:* Generate a JSON object strictly following the specified format.

Input: A set of intermediate structural representations $\{IR(f_1), IR(f_2), \dots, IR(f_n)\}$ for ranked sensitive functions, with higher sensitive functions ranked top.

Output:

```
- For Benign Apps: {"is_malicious": false,
"present_behaviors": [], "summary": "Explanation of
legitimate purpose."}
- For Malicious Apps: {"is_malicious": true,
"present_behaviors": [{"behavior": "...", "confidence":
"...", "evidence": "...", "related_functions": [...]}],
"summary": "High-level explanation of malicious
operation.", "category": "..."}

```




Figure 2: Metrics for Each Evaluation Task.

LLM Operation III: Report Quality (RQ) Judgement

Task: Evaluate the quality of a generated report by comparing it against a ground-truth report.

Input: A report generated by a specific LLM and its corresponding parsed ground-truth report.

Output: A set of scores, Insight (s_i), Comprehensiveness (s_c), and Evidence Quality (s_e), with supporting justifications. Report Quality is the weighted average of above scores: $RQ = w_i s_i + w_c s_c + w_e s_e$.

LLM Operation IV: Evidence Authenticity Score (EAS) Calculation

Task: Assess whether the cited related functions genuinely support the behaviors to which they are linked.

Input: (1) The list of behaviors in the generated report; (2) the structural representations $IR(f)$ of functions, where $f \in \mathcal{F}_s$ and \mathcal{F}_s is the set of support functions identified for the application.

Output: A support score for each behavior and an overall average score reflecting authenticity.

3.5.4 Task 4: Sample Discrimination. This task evaluates whether LLMs can distinguish benign from malicious applications after initial detection, serving as a corrective safeguard. It involves two aspects: 1) *False Positive Correction*: recognizing benign applications mistakenly flagged as malware, thereby reducing analyst workload; 2) *True Positive Maintenance*: ensuring true malware remains identified as malicious, avoiding dangerous false negatives.

To evaluate this setting, benign and malware sets are treated as false positives and true positives from the first-line detector, with binary decisions and categories derived from Task 3 reports. We design two metrics: **False Positive Correction Rate (FPCR)** measures how effectively LLMs recover benign samples misclassified as malware; **True Positive Maintenance Rate (TPMR)** measures whether malware samples remain correctly judged as malicious. Together, these two metrics quantify the LLM’s ability to separate

true threats from false alarms. In addition, understanding the category of malware helps auditors correctly refer to related behavior patterns. Here, we also evaluate $F1_c$ to represent the macro F1-score on malware category classification.

3.5.5 Overall Evaluation. To provide a holistic comparison of LLMs in malware auditing, we define the Workload Reduction Score (WRS), which quantifies how much manual effort an LLM can save. Since Tasks 1 and 2 mainly contribute to evidence attribution, their effects are reflected in Tasks 3 and 4. Thus, WRS integrates two complementary dimensions: **1) Analytical Accuracy (AA)**: Measures the quality and trustworthiness of generated reports. For each malware i , accuracy is defined as the product of report quality and authenticity scores, but multiplied by an indicator I_i that equals 1 only if it is correctly classified as malicious, and 0 otherwise. This enforces correctness of the maliciousness judgment as a hard constraint. The Analytical Accuracy is formalized as:

$$AA = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N I_i \cdot (RQ_i \times EAS_i \times SAS_i), \quad (3)$$

where N is the number of malware samples we analyze. **2) Decision Support (DS)**: Captures whether the model aids security decisions at the application level, defined as the average of FPCR, TPMR, and $F1_c$:

$$DS = \{FPCR + TPMR + F1_c\} / 3 \quad (4)$$

Finally, we integrate these two dimensions into a unified workload-oriented metric:

$$WRS = w_{aa} \cdot AA + w_{ds} \cdot DS. \quad (5)$$

Here, w_{aa} and w_{ds} control the relative emphasis of the two dimensions. A high WRS requires both accurate classification and high-quality analysis, indicating the model’s practical potential to reduce analyst workload.

4 Experiment

This section presents a systematic evaluation of various LLMs on Android malware behavior auditing, guided by the MalEval framework. Our experiments are designed to answer the following key research questions:

- **RQ1 (Section 4.2):** How effectively do prominent LLMs perform across the four core auditing tasks, and what is their potential to reduce manual workload for security analysts?
- **RQ2 (Section 4.3):** How does incorporating inter-procedural context into function summaries impact the LLM’s performance on auditing tasks?
- **RQ3 (Section 4.4):** To what extent does providing LLMs with application-level metadata (e.g., components, signing certificates) as additional evidence improve their performance?

Beyond this, we conduct an in-depth assessment of LLM capabilities in identifying different behaviors, understanding latest malware, and common failure cases (Section 4.5). This aims to better understand the current limitations of LLMs in this domain and explore the potential for extending the model to other types of malware.

4.1 Experiment Setting

4.1.1 Model Selection. We evaluate a diverse set of state-of-the-art LLMs, covering both open-source and commercial offerings, as well as general-purpose and code-specialized variants:

Open-source models. : Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct [33], Qwen2.5-Coder-14B-Instruct [24], Qwen3-32B [54], and DeepSeek-V3-0324 [30]. These represent recent advancements in open LLMs, with Qwen2.5-Coder and DeepSeek specifically optimized for reasoning and code understanding, allowing us to benchmark the progress of open models against commercial APIs.

Commercial models. : GPT-4o-mini [35], Gemini-2.5-Flash [11], and Claude-3.7-Sonnet [2]. These are leading proprietary LLMs known for their strong general-purpose reasoning, robustness, and efficiency. Evaluating them provides a reference point for the upper bound of practical deployment.

This selection ensures a comparison between code-focused and general-purpose LLMs, as well as between open-source and closed-source ecosystems with different model sizes. It reflects the real-world decision analysts face when choosing LLMs for deployment in security pipelines.

4.1.2 Implementation Details. For open-source models without API support (Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, Qwen2.5-Coder-14B-Instruct, and Qwen3-32B), we use the latest HuggingFace snapshots and deploy them locally with vLLM [26] for efficient batched decoding. Llama-3.1-8B and Qwen2.5-14B are hosted on a single NVIDIA H100 NVL GPU, while Qwen3-32B requires four NVIDIA A100-SXM4-40GB GPUs. Models with official APIs (Deepseek-v3, GPT-4o-mini, Gemini-2.5-Flash, and Claude-3.7-sonnet) are accessed through their respective endpoints, ensuring consistency with production settings. All models are run with a temperature of 0 for deterministic outputs. In Task 1 (Section 3.5.1), the Fidelity Score (FS) is computed using an XGBoost classifier trained on TF-IDF features of function summaries for malware category prediction. We split

malware samples into 80% training and 20% testing sets, and fidelity is measured as the probability drop after removing the top 10% most sensitive functions. In Task 3 (Section 3.5.3), the Report Quality (RQ) and Evidence Authenticity Score (EAS) are assessed with an LLM-as-a-judge strategy. To avoid bias, we use a held-out third-party model (GPT-5-mini [36]), excluded from the evaluation pool, as the judge. For RQ and the Workload Reduction Score (WRS), all weights (e.g., w_{aa} and w_{ds}) are set equally.

4.2 Effectiveness of LLMs on Malware Behavior Auditing

This section answers RQ1 by reporting the performance of seven representative LLMs across the four auditing tasks and their overall Workload Reduction Score (WRS), as summarized in Table 2. Results show that current LLMs remain far from reliable in malware auditing; even the strongest model, Claude-3.7-sonnet, achieves only 50.67% WRS, underscoring the intrinsic difficulty of synthesizing accurate and verifiable behavioral insights from source code.

For low-level attribution (Task 1 & Task 2), a clear distinction emerges between precise identification of decisive risk functions (Fidelity Score, FS) and broad evidence coverage (Coverage-of-Selected Rate, CSR). All models obtain relatively low FS, indicating difficulty in consistently identifying the few functions most critical to malicious classification. The Qwen family stands out in CSR: Qwen-2.5-Coder-14B benefits from code-oriented pretraining, achieving broad coverage even at a moderate scale, while the larger Qwen-3-32B attains similar coverage through sheer model capacity despite lacking explicit code specialization. Claude-3.7-Sonnet, in contrast, adopts a precision-focused style: it achieves the highest FS by pinpointing some decisive functions, but misses broader coverage, underscoring that scale alone does not guarantee comprehensive attribution.

At higher-level understanding (Task 3 & 4), Gemini-2.5-Flash leads in report quality (RQ), producing the most comprehensive and coherent reports while maintaining competitive evidence authenticity (EAS) and syntax authenticity (SAS). Its outputs are not only fluent but relatively well grounded in cited functions, enabling it to link sensitive functions into a coherent attack chain. This deeper reasoning also improves its ability to filter misclassified benign samples while preserving true positives. Claude-3.7-sonnet, while slightly weaker in report fluency, performs best in sample discrimination: it effectively corrects false positives and shows strong malware categorization accuracy, indicating better integration of behaviors into family-level semantics. Deepseek-V3 strikes a middle ground. Its reports are detailed and coherent, but it consistently fails to reject benign misclassifications, limiting practical reliability. By contrast, GPT-4o-mini shows relative failure modes. Optimized for speed and efficiency, it exhibits shallow reasoning, is easily misled by prior detections, and performs poorly on false positive correction. Finally, the smallest model, Llama-3.1-8B, lacks the capacity to handle this task: its report quality drops steeply, and it fails across nearly all metrics, confirming that complex malware auditing requires models with larger reasoning capacity and stronger grounding ability.

Table 2: Each task and overall performance of LLMs on MalEval. The input is context-driven intermediate structural representations. All results are presented as percentages.

Models	Task 1	Task 2	Task3			Task4			Overall
	FS	CSR	RQ	EAS	SAS	FPCR	TPMR	$F1_c$	WRS
Llama 3.1-8B-I	9.36	37.17	16.63	61.00	69.12	44.00	85.09	12.21	27.06
Qwen 2.5-coder-14B-I	12.25	54.83	30.12	81.89	92.55	16.00	99.61	17.86	33.66
Qwen 3-32B	12.97	69.20	37.12	78.09	86.63	4.00	98.04	26.68	34.25
Deepseek v3	11.44	42.15	41.25	84.55	90.48	56.00	96.47	28.14	45.88
GPT-4o-mini	14.32	51.91	27.06	74.93	77.73	0.00	100.00	17.72	27.50
Gemini-2.5-flash	14.84	41.72	49.61	87.75	90.85	60.00	97.26	27.55	50.58
Claude-3.7-sonnet	16.88	55.19	40.69	82.24	89.28	92.00	90.59	31.82	50.67

4.3 Result w/o Inter-procedural Context Augmentation

Functions within Android applications are not isolated entities. Real-world audits require reasoning across inter-procedural links to understand how functions propagate information and contribute to malicious behaviors. To assess the role of such context, we removed inter-procedural information from MalEval’s structural representations. Results are shown in Table 3.

Fidelity Scores (FS) drop sharply without context, confirming that models rely on inter-procedural cues to identify the few functions truly decisive for malicious classification. By contrast, Coverage-of-Selected Rate (CSR) remains largely unchanged. This stability, however, is not a sign of robustness but rather a symptom of a critical weakness. It reveals that models can identify functions containing sensitive APIs based on simple, context-free signature matching. The divergence between FS and CSR highlights two attribution modes: models can still recognize sensitive APIs as evidence (stable CSR), but without context they fail to pinpoint the few decisive functions that drive malicious behavior (drop in FS). At the behavioral level, removing context reduces models’ ability to integrate evidence into coherent malicious behaviors, causing average declines of 5.70% in RQ and 3.83% in EAS. The effect is especially pronounced for Llama-3.1-8B and Qwen-3-32B, showing their dependence on superficial contextual cues. At the sample discrimination level, context shows mixed effects. For Qwen-2.5-coder-14B, FPCR drops sharply without context, suggesting its importance for validating benign samples. In contrast, Qwen-3-32B achieves higher FPCR when context is removed, implying that excessive inter-procedural links act as confirmatory noise—reinforcing false suspicions rather than enabling deeper inspections. Overall, the consistent and significant degradation of Behavioral Synthesis (Task 3) outweighs these model-dependent variations in discrimination (Task 4). The corresponding decline in WRS demonstrates that, despite occasionally introducing noise, inter-procedural context is indispensable for achieving holistic and reliable malware auditing.

4.4 Result w/ Additional Application Evidence

Beyond code semantics, practical malware auditing often relies on non-code contextual evidence. Analysts routinely incorporate metadata such as application components, signing certificates, or

package structures to disambiguate cases where code alone is insufficient. To examine this dimension, we augment function-level summaries with application-level metadata and assess its effect on high-level auditing tasks: Behavior Synthesis (Task 3) and Sample Discrimination (Task 4). Specifically, we leverage the *AndroidManifest.xml* file to extract three categories of evidence: 1) Package Information: the package name and version details; 2) Application Components: the app’s core entry points (Activities, Services, and Broadcast Receivers); 3) Certificate Information: details about the app’s digital signature to verify its authenticity. Metadata is then organized into a structural dictionary for model input. Table 4 reports the corresponding results.

The effect on behavior synthesis (Task 3) highlights a fundamental divergence in reasoning strategies. Gemini-2.5-flash, the top-performing model in Section 4.2, suffers a 21.35% drop in Report Quality (RQ), showing that its strength lies in code-centric analysis and that metadata acts as distracting noise. In contrast, Deepseek-v3 (+8.50% RQ) and Claude-3.7-sonnet (+3.47% RQ) improve with metadata, suggesting a more integrative reasoning style that treats it as corroborating evidence. Smaller models, such as Llama-3.1-8B, collapse under information overload. A broader side effect is the degradation of Syntax Authenticity (SAS), as non-function identifiers like component names interfere with correct function referencing.

In sample discrimination (Task 4), metadata introduces a clear trade-off. It consistently improves False Positive Correction Rate (FPCR), but often at the cost of reduced True Positive Maintenance Rate (TPMR), which is a dangerous outcome, since even a single missed malware can be catastrophic. Only Gemini-2.5-flash and Deepseek-V3 manage to balance this dilemma, maintaining near-perfect TPMR while still benefiting from metadata. As a result, metadata lifts Deepseek-V3 above Gemini-2.5-flash on WRS, though Claude-3.7-sonnet remains the strongest overall. These results show that metadata is not universally beneficial; its value depends on model type, and careful structuring or filtering is needed to make it useful in practice.

4.5 Further Discussion and Failure Cases

4.5.1 Performance on Identify Each Behavior. We further examine model performance across behavior categories. Fig. 3 shows deviations from ground truth: blue denotes under-observation, red denotes over-observation, and white indicates ideal alignment. The

Table 3: Each task and overall performance of LLMs on MalEVal after removing function-level context from intermediate structural representation generation. Blue and red indicators highlight differences compared to results derived from the intermediate structural representation. All results are presented as percentages.

Models	Task 1	Task 2	Task3			Task4			Overall
	FS	CSR	RQ	EAS	SAS	FPCR	TPMR	F1 _c	WRS
Llama 3.1-8B-I	6.05	37.08	13.71	59.21	52.95	40.00	68.63	10.36	21.98
	↓ 35.36%	↓ 0.24%	↓ 17.56%	↓ 2.93%	↓ 23.39%	↓ 9.09%	↓ 19.34%	↓ 15.15%	↓ 18.77%
Qwen 2.5-coder-14B-I	<u>9.83</u>	53.40	29.92	78.10	<u>90.92</u>	4.00	<u>100.00</u>	14.88	30.44
	↓ 19.76%	↓ 2.61%	↓ 0.66%	↓ 4.63%	↓ 1.76%	↓ 75.00%	↑ 0.39%	↓ 16.69%	↓ 9.57%
Qwen 3-32B	7.13	<u>69.20</u>	31.58	66.81	88.34	28.00	97.65	23.72	34.21
	↓ 45.03%	- 0.00%	↓ 14.92%	↓ 14.44%	↑ 1.97%	↑ 600.00%	↓ 0.40%	↓ 11.09%	↓ 0.12%
Deepseek v3	8.24	42.15	<u>40.43</u>	<u>84.13</u>	75.39	56.00	95.69	<u>31.28</u>	43.32
	↓ 27.97%	- 0.00%	↓ 1.99%	↓ 0.50%	↓ 16.68%	- 0.00%	↓ 0.81%	↑ 11.16%	↓ 5.58%
GPT-4o-mini	8.91	51.91	26.79	74.64	76.47	4.00	<u>100.00</u>	15.50	27.56
	↓ 37.78%	- 0.00%	↓ 1.37%	↓ 0.39%	↓ 1.62%	+ 4.00%	- 0.00%	↓ 12.53%	↑ 0.02%
Gemini-2.5-flash	9.12	41.72	<u>49.48</u>	<u>86.40</u>	<u>90.32</u>	<u>60.00</u>	<u>98.04</u>	26.21	<u>49.09</u>
	↓ 38.54%	- 0.00%	↓ 0.26%	↓ 1.54%	↓ 0.58%	- 0.00%	↑ 0.90%	↓ 4.86%	↓ 2.95%
Claude-3.7-sonnet	<u>10.20</u>	<u>55.19</u>	39.40	80.29	86.26	<u>96.00</u>	89.10	<u>33.12</u>	<u>50.03</u>
	↓ 39.57%	- 0.00%	↓ 3.17%	↓ 2.37%	↓ 3.38%	↑ 4.35%	↓ 1.64%	↑ 4.09%	↓ 1.26%

Table 4: Performance on related tasks after adding meta information as one of the evidence to generate behavior reports. Blue and red indicators highlight differences compared to results derived from the intermediate structural representation. All results are presented as percentages.

Models	Task3			Task4			Overall
	RQ	EAS	SAS	FPCR	TPMR	F1 _c	WRS
Llama 3.1-8B-I	11.94	57.36	44.63	76.00	58.82	11.32	25.88
	↓ 28.20%	↓ 5.97%	↓ 35.43%	↑ 72.73%	↓ 30.87%	↓ 7.29%	↓ 4.36%
Qwen 2.5-coder-14B-I	29.35	<u>83.12</u>	79.42	60.00	93.33	18.45	38.31
	↓ 2.56%	↑ 1.50%	↓ 14.19%	↑ 275.00%	↓ 6.30%	↑ 3.30%	↑ 13.81%
Qwen 3-32B	37.80	81.70	83.51	4.00	96.87	<u>31.35</u>	34.93
	↑ 1.83%	↑ 4.62%	↓ 3.60%	- 0.00%	↓ 1.19%	↑ 17.50%	↑ 1.99%
Deepseek v3	<u>44.76</u>	<u>85.35</u>	<u>84.32</u>	<u>92.00</u>	97.65	25.71	<u>52.00</u>
	↑ 8.50%	↑ 0.95%	↓ 6.81%	↑ 64.29%	↑ 1.22%	↓ 8.64%	↑ 13.34%
GPT-4o-mini	26.16	77.37	73.82	32.00	<u>99.89</u>	15.48	32.03
	↓ 3.33%	↑ 3.26%	↓ 5.03%	+ 32.00%	↓ 0.11%	↓ 12.64%	↑ 16.47%
Gemini-2.5-flash	39.02	82.32	76.88	<u>92.00</u>	<u>99.22</u>	16.70	47.00
	↓ 21.35%	↓ 6.19%	↓ 15.38%	↑ 53.33%	↑ 2.02%	↓ 39.38%	↓ 7.08%
Claude-3.7-sonnet	<u>42.10</u>	82.73	<u>86.00</u>	<u>96.00</u>	89.02	<u>32.51</u>	<u>51.23</u>
	↑ 3.47%	↑ 0.60%	↓ 3.67%	↑ 4.35%	↓ 1.73%	↑ 2.17%	↑ 1.11%

“Other” column denotes behaviors newly created by models, representing deviation in conceptual understanding. The “Miner” category, while listed in MalRadar[47], due to the small number of samples, we intentionally exclude from our dataset and is retained here as a hallucination probe.

The results reveal systematic, non-random biases. First, complex behaviors such as *privilege escalation*, *trick behavior*, and *stealthy escalation* are consistently under-observed by all models. Even Claude-3.7-Sonnet, the strongest model, shows extreme negative deviations (-82, -91), underscoring a fundamental weakness in reasoning over comprehend code logic and multi-step attack chains. Second, model

reliability forms a clear hierarchy. Llama-3.1-8B exemplifies a pattern of pervasive under-observation, with large negative deviations across most categories, rendering it unsuitable for reliable auditing, while Claude-3.7-Sonnet demonstrates the most well-calibrated profile, with its deviations remaining closest to zero across the board. Models like Qwen and GPT-4o-mini occupy the middle ground: they tend to over-observe explicit API-driven behaviors (e.g., *SMS abuse*, *bank stealing*) but fail on reasoning-intensive ones, reflecting over-reliance on surface cues. Finally, the hallucination columns offer insights into conceptual fidelity. The near-zero deviations for *miner* indicate that models correctly avoid inventing absent behaviors. In contrast, deviations in the “Other” column highlight a tendency

to generate novel or misaligned behaviors. Llama-3.1-8B (+81) and Coder (+58) exhibit strong hallucination tendencies, while Claude, Qwen, and DeepSeek remain near zero, showing better adherence to the analytical schema.

Overall, LLMs reliably capture API-driven behaviors but systematically miss complex ones, indicating dependence on surface signals rather than deep inter-procedural reasoning. Improving malware auditing with LLMs thus requires better cross-function reasoning, calibration across behavior types, and stricter hallucination control.

4.5.2 Results on the Latest Malware Set. This section analyzes model performance on the Latest Malware Set (LM). Because manually verified reports are costly to obtain, LM is substantially smaller than the Archived Malware Set (AM). To ensure comparability, we restrict evaluation to categories shared by both datasets and focus on high-level metrics: Report Quality (RQ) and Evidence Authenticity Score (EAS). Since the two sets differ in size but both metrics are computed as averages, we apply Welch’s t-test to test statistical significance. Table 5 reports the results, with gray-shaded cells denoting p -values > 0.05 (no significant difference).

Overall, most models show no significant differences between AM and LM. This reflects a core trait of Android malware: families often reuse templates or frameworks with minor variations. Our summary-based evaluation, which relies on function summaries rather than raw code, further mitigates the effect of superficial implementation changes. Variations are shown in Rootkits and Spyware, as modern rootkits increasingly hide behind loaders or obfuscation layers, while newer spyware adopts stealthy exfiltration techniques that do not map cleanly to API patterns, making attribution less stable. Results on Banker increase. By comparing ground truth reports from AM. and LM., we observe that LM bankers (e.g., ERMAC, Coper) tend to follow a standardized chain: Accessibility abuse \rightarrow Overlay phishing \rightarrow Remote control, closely matching canonical banker definitions, whereas AM bankers (e.g., Anubis, Faketoken) mix cross-platform features, phishing, ransomware, and stealthy C2 hiding. Thus, performance differences across timeframes often reflect differences in behavioral complexity rather than true generalization. Even though we intentionally constructed LM with more recent samples, the intrinsic difficulty of malware analysis remains hard to quantify, as it typically requires reverse engineering and dynamic analysis beyond what function summaries capture. Therefore, similar performance across AM and LM should not be interpreted as evidence that LLMs can readily handle entirely novel attack strategies.

4.5.3 Failure Case Study. We identify four distinct failure modes when applying LLMs to malware behavior auditing, exposing the gap between statistical pattern recognition and the adversarial reasoning required for security. All failure cases are *excerpts* from portions of reports generated by a specific LLM, corresponding to the ground truth report.

Failure Case I: Inability to Synthesize Global Threat Objectives: The model fails to combine low-level actions into a coherent objective. For instance, it detects Privacy Stealing and Ads but mislabels a financial fraud campaign as simple Adware. The root cause of this issue is the model’s limited contextual scope. While our structural representations provide local context but lack the global

perspectives required to infer strategy intent. Consequently, the model can determine that an action occurs but not why it occurs within the broader attack chain. Providing such global context is non-trivial for large-scale Android applications, highlighting the need for designs that enrich strategic understanding without overwhelming models with excessive information.

Failure Case I: Inability to Synthesize Global Threat Objectives

Generated Report by Claude-3.7-sonnet: ...**behavior**: Privilege Escalation...; Abusing Accessibility...; Privacy Stealing...; Ads...; Remote Control...; **application summary**: This malicious app is a hybrid adware-spyware that aggressively collects sensitive user data, serves intrusive ads, and abuses Accessibility Services to achieve deep device monitoring; **category**: Adware.

Ground truth: ...**behavior**: Privacy Stealing...; SMS/CALL...; Remote Control...; Abusing Accessibility...; Ads...; Premium Service...; **application summary**: This Ztorg family Trojan performs remote-controlled financial fraud through premium SMS and silent subscription attacks, using stealth techniques to hide its activity and abusing Accessibility Services to install additional payloads; **category**: rootkits.

Failure Case II: Superficial Technical Interpretation: The model interprets malicious actions only at a surface level. It correctly classifies the malware and identifies the behavior but grounds its rationale in artifacts rather than true exploit reasoning. The ground truth is privilege escalation via downloading and executing root exploit code, yet the model attributes it solely to the common permission “chmod 777”. In fact, this command is merely preparatory, not the cause of escalation. This exposes the model’s reliance on high-probability associations over causal inference, failing to reason through action sequences. Addressing this requires stronger reasoning to explore context thoroughly and avoid superficial pattern matching.

Failure Case II: Superficial Technical Interpretation

Generated Report by Deepseek-V3: ...**behavior**: Privilege Escalation, **behavior evidence**: The app creates and executes shell scripts (boy, post.sh) in system directories, modifies file permissions to 777, and checks for root access, indicating attempts to escalate privileges., **category**: rootkits.

Ground truth: ...**behavior**: Privilege Escalation; **behavior evidence**: The malware downloads and runs root exploit code to gain root privileges on the device.; **category**: rootkits.

Failure Case III: Judgmental Error from Benign by Association Bias: This error occurs when malicious intent is obscured by a trusted entity. The ground truth shows that the popular “Cam-Scanner” app is compromised to drop malware enabling remote control and aggressive ads. The model, however, rationalizes the suspicious behaviors as benign, citing commercial protection services like “Qihoo 360’s Jiagu”. In effect, LLMs grant the well-known app undue credibility, misattributing malicious actions to plausible, benign causes rather than recognizing the trusted app itself as the attack vector.

Failure Case IV: Logical Blindness due to the Legal API Abusing: The model observes a sequence of actions but misclassifies the overall behavior as benign. The root issue is its atomic evaluation: since each step uses legitimate APIs, it deems them harmless in isolation, missing the malicious intent that arises from their combination. This exposes the model’s significant vulnerability to modern evasion techniques where malware abuses legitimate APIs to blend in, resulting in a definitive false negative.




Figure 3: Behavior deviation heatmaps for each LLM trained on malware datasets. Here, shades closer to blue indicate the model under-observes that behavior, while red indicates the model over-observes it. A well-performing model should be closer to white (zero deviation) across all behaviors.

Table 5: Report Quality (RQ) and Evidence Authenticity Score (EAS) on shared categories of Archived (AM) and Latest Malware (LM) sets. Welch’s t-test p-values (p) compare metrics across sets; $p > 0.05$ denotes no significant difference. Model names are abbreviated due to space constraints.

Models	Banker						Rootkits						Spyware					
	RQ			EAS			RQ			EAS			RQ			EAS		
	AM.	LM.	P-	AM.	LM.	P-	AM.	LM.	P-	AM.	LM.	P-	AM.	LM.	P-	AM.	LM.	P-
Llama	16.49	21.30	0.09	55.22	63.37	0.12	16.89	23.88	0.01	59.38	71.08	0.25	24.20	25.75	0.68	61.97	54.32	0.17
Coder	25.32	29.75	0.12	82.74	85.41	0.35	23.19	31.20	0.16	81.93	75.00	0.39	41.99	44.98	0.48	85.43	79.64	0.03
Qwen	32.67	38.77	0.10	78.01	81.17	0.30	26.82	41.05	0.07	75.27	80.21	0.31	50.53	48.80	0.69	82.33	77.74	0.03
Deepseek	36.89	50.89	0.02	83.05	89.11	0.00	32.00	24.75	0.01	82.09	80.63	0.79	52.40	54.81	0.59	85.01	86.43	0.41
GPT	20.57	27.50	0.00	74.09	73.81	0.94	22.07	36.43	0.05	78.42	70.00	0.07	39.81	27.37	0.00	77.30	67.20	0.01
Gemini	44.26	58.30	0.06	86.60	84.39	0.67	35.71	44.00	0.22	86.11	76.25	0.06	65.06	62.96	0.65	90.44	88.80	0.27
Claude	38.15	48.43	0.06	82.87	85.48	0.16	34.91	49.80	0.02	81.93	77.08	0.44	57.67	50.46	0.17	84.74	85.27	0.78

Failure Case III: Judgmental Error from Benign-by-Association Bias

Generated Report by Gemini: `'is_malicious'`: False; `'application summary'`: The analysis indicates the application’s suspicious behaviors stem from a legitimate commercial hardening service used for anti-tampering and intellectual property protection, rather than from any confirmed malicious intent.

Ground truth: `'is_malicious'`: True; `'behavior'`: Ads...; Remote Control...; Premium Service...; `'application summary'`: This sample is the Trojan-Dropper.AndroidOS.Necro.n trojan, embedded within the CamScanner app, which downloads and executes remote payloads from a C2 server to enable aggressive advertising, fraudulent subscriptions, and silent device control; `'category'`: trojan.

Failure Case IV: Logical Blindness due to Legal API Abusing

Generated Report by Claude-3.7-sonnet: `'is_malicious'`: False; `'application summary'`: The analysis indicates the application’s suspicious behaviors stem from a legitimate commercial hardening service used for anti-tampering and intellectual property protection, rather than from any confirmed malicious intent.

Ground truth: `'is_malicious'`: True; `'behavior'`: Privacy Stealing...; SMS/CALL...; Bank Stealing...; Tricky Behavior...; `'application summary'`: This credential-stealing malware, Android/FakeApp.KP, impersonates a cryptocurrency exchange to phish for login details and circumvents 2FA by intercepting one-time passwords directly from the user’s notifications; `'category'`: trojan.

4.5.4 Extensibility for Other Ecosystem. Beyond Android ecosystem, MalEval can naturally extend to Windows, Linux, and IoT malware. Its core principles, verifiable ground truth, code context

reduction, and intermediate structural representations, are platform-agnostic and only require ecosystem-specific adaptation, such as preparing relevant ground truth and function-level abstractions. Thus, MalEval serves as a versatile foundation for fine-grained, evidence-driven malware auditing across diverse software environments.

5 Conclusion

This work introduced MalEval, a comprehensive evaluation framework for fine-grained malware behavior auditing with large language models (LLMs). MalEval constructs reliable ground truth from manually verified reports and sensitive APIs, reduces code noise via static reachability analysis, and builds function-level structural representations to enable consistent, traceable evaluation. We further design four expert-guided tasks: Function Prioritization, Evidence Attribution, Behavioral Synthesis, and Sample Discrimination, that mirror real-world workflows and allow reproducible assessments. Our evaluation of seven widely used models shows that LLMs hold promise for malware auditing: they capture typical malicious patterns and partially reduce analyst workload. Yet their capabilities remain inadequate, struggling to reconstruct coherent attack chains, reasoning only at surface level, and showing weak reliability in evidence attribution and behavioral synthesis. These limitations underscore that advancing toward trustworthy

and fine-grained malware auditing with LLMs remains a long and challenging journey.

References

- [1] Wasi Ahmad, Saikat Chakraborty, Baishakhi Ray, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2021. Unified Pre-training for Program Understanding and Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 2655–2668.
- [2] Anthropic. 2025. Claude 3.7 Sonnet and Claude Code. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-7-sonnet/>. Accessed: 2025-05-10.
- [3] Daniel Arp, Michael Spreitzenbarth, Malte Hubner, Hugo Gascon, Konrad Rieck, and CERT Siemens. 2014. Drebin: Effective and explainable detection of android malware in your pocket.. In *Ndss*, Vol. 14. 23–26.
- [4] Steven Arzt, Siegfried Rasthofer, Christian Fritz, Eric Bodden, Alexandre Bartel, Jacques Klein, Yves Le Traou, Damien Octeau, and Patrick McDaniel. 2014. Flowdroid: Precise context, flow, field, object-sensitive and lifecycle-aware taint analysis for android apps. *ACM sigplan notices* 49, 6 (2014), 259–269.
- [5] Kathy Wain Yee Au, Yi Fan Zhou, Zhen Huang, and David Lie. 2012. Pscout: analyzing the android permission specification. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security*. 217–228.
- [6] Federico Barbero, Feargus Pendlebury, Fabio Pierazzi, and Lorenzo Cavallaro. 2022. Transcending transcend: Revisiting malware classification in the presence of concept drift. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 805–823.
- [7] Junkai Chen, Zhiyuan Pan, Xing Hu, Zhenhao Li, Ge Li, and Xin Xia. 2024. Reasoning runtime behavior of a program with llm: How far are we? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16437* (2024).
- [8] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374* (2021).
- [9] Qian Chen and Robert A Bridges. 2017. Automated behavioral analysis of malware: A case study of wannacry ransomware. In *2017 16th IEEE International Conference on machine learning and applications (ICMLA)*. IEEE, 454–460.
- [10] Yizheng Chen, Zhoujie Ding, and David Wagner. 2023. Continuous Learning for Android Malware Detection. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. USENIX Association, Anaheim, CA, 1127–1144. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity23/presentation/chen-yizheng>
- [11] Google DeepMind. 2025. *Gemini 2.5 Flash Preview: Model Card*. Technical Report. Google. Accessed: 2025-05-10.
- [12] Evan Downing, Yisroel Mirsky, Kyuhong Park, and Wenke Lee. 2021. {DeepReflect}: Discovering malicious functionality through binary reconstruction. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 3469–3486.
- [13] Manuel Egele, Theodor Scholte, Engin Kirda, and Christopher Kruegel. 2008. A survey on automated dynamic malware-analysis techniques and tools. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* 44, 2 (2008), 1–42.
- [14] William Enck, Peter Gilbert, Seungyeop Han, Vasant Tendulkar, Byung-Gon Chun, Landon P Cox, Jaeyeon Jung, Patrick McDaniel, and Anmol N Sheth. 2014. Taintdroid: an information-flow tracking system for realtime privacy monitoring on smartphones. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems (TOCS)* 32, 2 (2014), 1–29.
- [15] Kathrin Grosse, Nicolas Papernot, Praveen Manoharan, Michael Backes, and Patrick McDaniel. 2017. Adversarial examples for malware detection. In *Computer Security—ESORICS 2017: 22nd European Symposium on Research in Computer Security, Oslo, Norway, September 11–15, 2017, Proceedings, Part II 22*. Springer, 62–79.
- [16] Jiawei Gu, Xuhui Jiang, Zhichao Shi, Hexiang Tan, Xuehao Zhai, Chengjin Xu, Wei Li, Yinghan Shen, Shengjie Ma, Honghao Liu, et al. 2024. A survey on llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15594* (2024).
- [17] Wenbo Guo, Dongliang Mu, Jun Xu, Purui Su, Gang Wang, and Xinyu Xing. 2018. Lemma: Explaining deep learning based security applications. In *proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 364–379.
- [18] Ariful Haque, Sunzida Siddique, Md Mahfuzur Rahman, Ahmed Rafi Hasan, Laxmi Rani Das, Marufa Kamal, Tasnim Masura, and Kishor Datta Gupta. 2025. SOK: Exploring Hallucinations and Security Risks in AI-Assisted Software Development with Insights for LLM Deployment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18468* (2025).
- [19] Yiling He, Junchi Lei, Zhan Qin, Kui Ren, and Chun Chen. 2025. Combating Concept Drift with Explanatory Detection and Adaptation for Android Malware Classification. In *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 1.
- [20] Yiling He, Yiping Liu, Lei Wu, Ziqi Yang, Kui Ren, and Zhan Qin. 2023. MsDroid: Identifying Malicious Snippets for Android Malware Detection. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing* 20, 3 (2023), 2025–2039.
- [21] Yiling He, Jian Lou, Zhan Qin, and Kui Ren. 2023. Finer: Enhancing state-of-the-art classifiers with feature attribution to facilitate security analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 416–430.
- [22] Yiling He, Hongyu She, Xingzhi Qian, Xinran Zheng, Zhuo Chen, Zhan Qin, and Lorenzo Cavallaro. 2025. On benchmarking code llms for android malware analysis. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 153–160.
- [23] 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 Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* 33, 8 (2024), 1–79.
- [24] Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Keming Lu, et al. 2024. Qwen2. 5-coder technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12186* (2024).
- [25] Yigitcan Kaya, Yizheng Chen, Marcus Botacin, Shoumik Saha, Fabio Pierazzi, Lorenzo Cavallaro, David Wagner, and Tudor Dumitraş. 2025. ML-Based Behavioral Malware Detection Is Far From a Solved Problem. In *2025 IEEE Conference on Secure and Trustworthy Machine Learning (SaTML)*. IEEE, 921–940.
- [26] Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the 29th symposium on operating systems principles*. 611–626.
- [27] Jiaqi Li, Mengmeng Wang, Zilong Zheng, and Muhan Zhang. 2023. Loogle: Can long-context language models understand long contexts? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04939* (2023).
- [28] Yao Li, Sen Fang, Tao Zhang, and Haipeng Cai. 2024. Enhancing Android Malware Detection: The Influence of ChatGPT on Decision-centric Task. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04352* (2024).
- [29] Keke Lian, Bin Wang, Lei Zhang, Libo Chen, Junjie Wang, Ziming Zhao, Yujie Yang, Haotong Duan, Haoran Zhao, Shuang Liao, et al. 2025. ASE: A Repository-Level Benchmark for Evaluating Security in AI-Generated Code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.18106* (2025).
- [30] Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Cheng-gang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. 2024. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437* (2024).
- [31] Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Junjie Huang, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Ambrosio Blanco, Colin Clement, Dawn Drain, Daxin Jiang, Duyu Tang, et al. 2021. Codexglue: A machine learning benchmark dataset for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04664* (2021).
- [32] Niall McLaughlin, Jesus Martinez del Rincon, BooJoong Kang, Suleiman Yerima, Paul Miller, Sakir Sezer, Yeganeh Safaei, Erik Trickle, Ziming Zhao, Adam Doupé, et al. 2017. Deep android malware detection. In *Proceedings of the seventh ACM conference on data and application security and privacy*. 301–308.
- [33] Meta AI. 2024. Introducing Llama 3.1: Our most capable models to date. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3-1/>. Accessed: 2025-09-08.
- [34] Serge Lionel Nikiema, Jordan Samhi, Abdoul Kader Kaboré, Jacques Klein, and Tegawendé F Bissyandé. 2025. The Code Barrier: What LLMs Actually Understand? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.10557* (2025).
- [35] OpenAI. 2024. GPT-4o mini: advancing cost-efficient intelligence. <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4o-mini-advancing-cost-efficient-intelligence/>. Accessed: 2025-09-08.
- [36] OpenAI. 2025. Introducing GPT-5. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-gpt-5/>. Accessed: 2025-09-09.
- [37] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 311–318.
- [38] Xingzhi Qian, Xinran Zheng, Yiling He, Shuo Yang, and Lorenzo Cavallaro. 2025. LAMD: Context-Driven Android Malware Detection and Classification with LLMs. In *2025 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*. IEEE, 126–136.
- [39] Monoshi Kumar Roy, Simin Chen, Benjamin Steenhoeck, Jinjun Peng, Gail Kaiser, Baishakhi Ray, and Wei Le. 2025. CodeSense: a Real-World Benchmark and Dataset for Code Semantic Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.00750* (2025).
- [40] Adam Storek, Mukur Gupta, Samira Hajizadeh, Prashast Srivastava, and Suman Jana. 2025. Sense and Sensitivity: Examining the Influence of Semantic Recall on Long Context Code Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13353* (2025).
- [41] Bo Sun, Akinori Fujino, and Tatsuya Mori. 2016. Poster: Toward automating the generation of malware analysis reports using the sandbox logs. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 1814–1816.
- [42] Tiezhu Sun, Marco Alecci, Aleksandr Pilgun, Yewei Song, Xunzhu Tang, Jordan Samhi, Tegawendé F Bissyandé, and Jacques Klein. 2025. MalLoc: Toward Fine-grained Android Malicious Payload Localization via LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.17856* (2025).
- [43] Kimberly Tam, Aristide Fattori, Salahuddin Khan, and Lorenzo Cavallaro. 2015. Copperdroid: Automatic reconstruction of android malware behaviors. In *NDSS Symposium 2015*. 1–15.
- [44] Brandon J Walton, Mst Eshita Khatun, James M Ghawaly, and Aisha Ali-Gombe. 2024. Exploring large language models for semantic analysis and categorization

- of android malware. In *2024 Annual Computer Security Applications Conference Workshops (ACSAC Workshops)*. IEEE, 248–254.
- [45] Brandon J Walton, Mst Eshita Khatun, James M Ghawaly, and Aisha Ali-Gombe. 2025. Exploring Large Language Models for Semantic Analysis and Categorization of Android Malware. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.04848* (2025).
- [46] Chengpeng Wang, Wuqi Zhang, Zian Su, Xiangzhe Xu, Xiaoheng Xie, and Xiangyu Zhang. 2024. LLMDFa: analyzing dataflow in code with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), 131545–131574.
- [47] Liu Wang, Haoyu Wang, Ren He, Ran Tao, Guozhu Meng, Xiapu Luo, and Xuanzhe Liu. 2022. MalRadar: Demystifying android malware in the new era. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems* 6, 2 (2022), 1–27.
- [48] Ruiqi Wang, Jiyu Guo, Cuiyun Gao, Guodong Fan, Chun Yong Chong, and Xin Xia. 2025. Can llms replace human evaluators? an empirical study of llm-as-a-judge in software engineering. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* 2, ISSTA (2025), 1955–1977.
- [49] Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven CH Hoi. 2021. CodeT5: Identifier-aware Unified Pre-trained Encoder-Decoder Models for Code Understanding and Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 8696–8708.
- [50] Bozhi Wu, Sen Chen, Cuiyun Gao, Lingling Fan, Yang Liu, Weiping Wen, and Michael R Lyu. 2021. Why an android app is classified as malware: Toward malware classification interpretation. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 30, 2 (2021), 1–29.
- [51] Danning Xie, Mingwei Zheng, Xuwei Liu, Jiannan Wang, Chengpeng Wang, Lin Tan, and Xiangyu Zhang. 2025. CORE: Benchmarking LLMs Code Reasoning Capabilities through Static Analysis Tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.05269* (2025).
- [52] Haichuan Xu, Mingxuan Yao, Runze Zhang, Mohamed Moustafa Dawoud, Jeman Park, and Brendan Saltaformaggio. 2024. {DVa}: Extracting Victims and Abuse Vectors from Android Accessibility Malware. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*. 701–718.
- [53] Lok Kwong Yan and Heng Yin. 2012. {DroidScope}: Seamlessly reconstructing the {OS} and dalvik semantic views for dynamic android malware analysis. In *21st USENIX security symposium (USENIX security 12)*. 569–584.
- [54] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, et al. 2025. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388* (2025).
- [55] Fan Yang, Mengnan Du, and Xia Hu. 2019. Evaluating explanation without ground truth in interpretable machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.06831* (2019).
- [56] Limin Yang, Zhi Chen, Chenkai Wang, Zhenning Zhang, Sushruth Booma, Phuong Cao, Constantin Adam, Alexander Withers, Zbigniew Kalbarczyk, Ravishankar K Iyer, et al. 2024. True attacks, attack attempts, or benign triggers? an empirical measurement of network alerts in a security operations center. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*. 1525–1542.
- [57] Miuyin Yong Wong, Matthew Landen, Manos Antonakakis, Douglas M Blough, Elissa M Redmiles, and Mustaque Ahamad. 2021. An inside look into the practice of malware analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 3053–3069.
- [58] Mu Zhang, Yue Duan, Qian Feng, and Heng Yin. 2015. Towards automatic generation of security-centric descriptions for android apps. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 518–529.
- [59] Mu Zhang, Yue Duan, Heng Yin, and Zhiruo Zhao. 2014. Semantics-aware android malware classification using weighted contextual api dependency graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 1105–1116.
- [60] Xinran Zheng, Shuo Yang, Edith CH Ngai, Suman Jana, and Lorenzo Cavallaro. 2025. Learning temporal invariance in android malware detectors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.05098* (2025).
- [61] Huijuan Zhu, Xilong Chen, Liangmin Wang, Zhicheng Xu, and Victor S Sheng. 2024. A dynamic analysis-powered explanation framework for malware detection. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2024).