

Reverse Engineering User Stories from Code using Large Language Models

Mohamed Ouf
Queen's University
Kingston, Canada
24blr2@queensu.ca

Haoyu Li
Queen's University
Kingston, Canada
17hl66@queensu.ca

Michael Zhang
Queen's University
Kingston, Canada
18jz111@queensu.ca

Mariam Guizani
Queen's University
Kingston, Canada
mariam.guizani@queensu.ca

Abstract—User stories are essential in agile development, yet often missing or outdated in legacy and poorly documented systems. We investigate whether large language models (LLMs) can automatically recover user stories directly from source code and how prompt design impacts output quality. Using 1,750 annotated C++ snippets of varying complexity, we evaluate five state-of-the-art LLMs across six prompting strategies. Results show that all models achieve, on average, an F1 score of 0.8 for code up to 200 NLOC. Our findings show that a single illustrative example enables the smallest model (8B) to match the performance of a much larger 70B model. In contrast, structured reasoning via Chain-of-Thought offers only marginal gains, primarily for larger models.

Index Terms—User story automation; Agile development; Large language models; LLM;

I. INTRODUCTION

User stories are a cornerstone of agile development, capturing stakeholder needs and guiding feature delivery with a focus on user value. Typically structured as “As a [user role], I want [goal] so that [benefit]”, these concise narratives align development activities with business goals and user expectations [1], [2]. Recent research has explored automating user story generation from textual artifacts during requirements elicitation. For instance, Rahman and Zhu used GPT-4 to distill requirement documents into user stories [3], while Veitia et al. applied NLP techniques to extract stories from software issue records [4]. These methods reduce reliance on manual effort but require existing textual specifications.

In contrast, source code remains the most persistent and widely available artifact, often outliving design notes, meeting records, and other documentation especially in legacy systems or after team turnover. This makes code a promising source for automated recovery of user stories, particularly in contexts where traditional documentation is sparse or outdated. Automatically generating user stories from code has both technical and managerial value. For example, agile teams can use code-derived stories during retrospectives to compare intended and implemented functionality. New team members can use them to understand the goals behind features, improving onboarding.

Unlike code summaries, which describe how a system functions (e.g., “This module implements Dijkstra’s algorithm to compute shortest paths in a graph”), user stories emphasize the underlying user need and value (e.g., “As a logistics manager, I want to find the most efficient delivery routes so that I can

reduce transportation costs and meet delivery deadlines”). This shift from implementation to intent makes user stories more accessible to non-technical stakeholders—product managers, clients, and end-users alike—and enables more intuitive progress tracking. Open-source software (OSS) communities stand to benefit significantly from this approach due to issues such as fragmented documentation, high contributor turnover, and barriers to entry [5]–[7]. For newcomers, clearly articulated user stories can foster understanding and inclusion, potentially improving retention and engagement. In both OSS and industry settings, reverse engineering user stories can help navigate undocumented legacy systems.

Despite its broad potential, the automatic recovery of user stories directly from source code remains largely unexplored. To our knowledge, this is the first work to investigate this problem. We explore its feasibility and provide the first empirical foundation for reverse engineering user stories across varying levels of code complexity.

This paper makes the following contributions:

- We present the first study to evaluate the automatic generation of user stories from code.
- We release a dataset of 1,750 C++ code–story pairs.
- We empirically analyze how model size and prompt design, including structured reasoning (SCoT) and few-shot techniques, impact generation quality.

We address two research questions:

- **RQ1:** *Can large language models generate user stories from code? How do code complexity and model architecture affect story quality?*
- **RQ2:** *To what extent do prompting techniques (e.g., SCoT, k-shot) improve user story generation?*

II. RELATED WORK

Existing research on user stories has primarily focused on extracting them from textual artifacts, such as test cases [8], [9], diagrams [10], [11], and use case scenarios [12]. Raharjana et al. [13] highlight two major limitations in this space: limited coverage of diverse software artifacts and a lack of benchmark datasets tailored to user-story–related tasks. Significant efforts have explored generating user stories from textual sources. Techniques have been applied to requirements documents [3], [14], issue records [4], [15], stakeholder interviews [16], [17],




Fig. 1. Overview of our Approach.

and design specifications [12]. For instance, Rahman and Zhu [3] introduced “GeneUS”, a GPT-4-powered tool that transforms requirement documents into structured user stories, while Abed et al. [16] investigated the use of AI for generating user stories from stakeholder interviews and evaluated the results using the Quality User Stories (QUS) framework. However, these approaches all rely on the presence of existing textual specifications and do not extend to generating user stories directly from code. Large Language Models (LLMs) have increasingly been adopted for various software engineering tasks, including code refactoring [18], [19], commit message generation [20], debugging [21], and requirements elicitation [18]. As demonstrated by Wong et al. [22], transformer-based LLMs trained on large code corpora can capture both syntactic and semantic program structures—enabling new capabilities in downstream tasks such as automated code summarization.

The closest body of work to ours is code summarization. This field has evolved from rule-based approaches [23], [24], to neural models [25], [26], and more recently, to LLM-based techniques [27], [28]. Zhu et al. [29] show that fine-tuning LLM parameters improves summarization performance. However, while code summarization aims to describe what the code does, primarily for technical audiences, our goal is to surface why the code exists, capturing user-facing intent and benefits. This distinction makes user stories more suitable for diverse stakeholders, including non-developers and newcomers in open-source or distributed development settings. Despite the growth in both user story generation from text and LLM-based code summarization, no prior work has explored generating user stories directly from source code. This paper addresses this gap.

III. METHODOLOGY

Figure 1 illustrates our approach for reverse engineering user stories from source code using LLMs.

A. Dataset Selection and Ground-Truth Development

C++ ranks 6th on GitHub with 10% of public contributions [30] and remains in the TIOBE top 3 throughout 2024 [31]. Its prevalence makes it well-suited for studying reverse-engineered user stories.

We use the `Project_CodeNet_C++1400` subset of IBM CodeNet, which contains approximately 420,000 accepted C++ solutions to 1400 competitive-programming tasks [32], [33].

To define realistic size bands, we cloned the top 200 C++ GitHub repositories by stars (as of March 2025) and measured

non-commenting lines of code (NLOC) across 950 classes and 15400 functions. Functions averaged 55 NLOC, while classes ranged from 100 to 200. Based on this, we created 35 equal-length strata (1–10, 11–20, . . . , 341–350 NLOC) and randomly sampled 50 CodeNet files per stratum, yielding 1,750 snippets. We highlight the 100 to 200 NLOC as our range of interest, the grayed range in our figures in the findings section. Prompt lengths ranged from 350 input tokens (zero-shot, 1–10 NLOC) to 3500 tokens (few-shot + SCoT, 341–350 NLOC). This range tests both logical complexity and LLM robustness to the “lost in the middle” effect [34].

Three C++ proficient researchers independently authored user stories for each code snippet, then reconciled differences; inter-rater reliability measured via Cohen’s κ was 0.86, indicating almost perfect agreement [35]. Our dataset mapping 1,750 C++ code snippets of varying complexity to user stories is available in the supplemental material [36].

B. Model Selection, Characteristics & Configuration

Our study evaluates five large language models chosen to capture the effect of *parameter count*, *architecture*, and *economic cost* shown in Table I on the automatic generation of user stories from code.

We use three instruction-tuned variants of LLAMA 3.1—8B, 70B, and 405B parameters. These models share the same transformer architecture and training data, but differ by two orders of magnitude in scale. Because the 8B model can run locally on a single GPU, the 70 B requires a modest cloud instance, and the 405 B needs multi-GPU servers, these three models isolate the “more parameters \Rightarrow better quality” hypothesis without confounding architectural changes.

We include DeepSeek-R1 to investigate whether architectural optimizations for step-by-step reasoning translate into higher-quality user stories. DeepSeek-R1 augments the vanilla transformer with explicit reasoning controllers and built-in structured chain-of-thought (SCoT).

OpenAI’s GPT-4o-MINI represents a widely-used commercial LLM. We test it “as-is” and with lightweight fine-tuning (70 in-context examples) to gauge the marginal benefits of task-specific adaptation.

Table I lists the pay-as-you-go prices (USD per 10^6 tokens) advertised at the time of writing. While input tokens, costs rise steeply with scale and proprietary licensing. The new GPT-4o reasoning model is $\sim 200\times$ more expensive for inputs and $\sim 160\times$ for outputs, and even standard GPT-4o is three to five

TABLE I
MODEL COST PER-1M-TOKEN (USD).

Model	Input	Output	Model	Input	Output
LLAMA 3.1-8B	0.05\$	0.25\$ [37]	LLAMA 3.1-70B	0.65\$	2.75\$ [37]
LLAMA 3.1-405B	9.50\$	9.50\$ [37]	DeepSeek-R1	0.55\$	2.19\$ [38]
GPT-4o-MINI	0.80\$	3.20\$ [39]	O1	10.00\$	40.00\$ [39]

TABLE II
AVERAGE SIMILARITY SCORES.

Metric	Model	Twin-Minimal	Paraphrase-50	Different-Meaning
BERTScore-P (F1)	bert-base-uncased	97	85	60
	roberta-large	99	96	81
	microsoft/deberta-large	97	90	84
BLEU-P (F1)	default	90	65	56
	smoothing	90	65	56
ROUGE-L (F1)	default	89	55	50
	no-stem	89	55	50

times costlier than DeepSeek-R1. Reasoning-centric models are more verbose. In our experimentation, DeepSeek-R1 averaged 620 output tokens (occasionally exceeding 2500), roughly a $5 \times$ increase over the 100 to 130 token range observed for LLAMA-70B, and GPT-4o MINI.

C. Prompt Design

We designed prompts through iterative refinement by two researchers who met on a weekly basis to discuss and refine the prompts. This process resulted in six templates combining three techniques zero-shot, one-shot, few-shot, with and without Structured Chain of Thought (SCoT) reasoning. All prompt variants are available in Supplemental Material [36]. Unlike standard Chain-of-Thought (CoT), which produces free-form reasoning in natural language [40], Structured Chain-of-Thought (SCoT) imposes programmatic structure by decomposing reasoning into sequence, branch, and loop primitives [41]. This alignment with code structure (e.g., control flow) makes SCoT suitable for reverse engineering user stories.

We added directives (e.g., “*Output user stories in 'As a...' format*”) at the beginning of the prompt to combat the “lost in the middle” effect [34], where LLMs might forget central content in long contexts. This optimization improved instruction adherence by 22% in pilot tests.

D. Evaluation of Semantic Similarity Metrics

To identify the most suitable metric for comparing LLM-generated user stories against ground-truth references, we conducted an experiment using 60 curated user-story pairs divided into three categories. The Twin-Minimal category included 20 pairs with only minor lexical changes that preserved identical meaning (e.g., “sum two large numbers” \rightarrow “add two significant numbers”). The Paraphrase-50 category consisted of 20 pairs with approximately 50% lexical variation while maintaining semantic equivalence (e.g., “merge tasks into streamlined schedule” \rightarrow “organize tasks into clear schedule”). The Different-Meaning category featured 20 pairs exhibiting fundamental semantic divergence (e.g., “encrypted storage for document security” \rightarrow “compression for storage reduction”). Each pair was evaluated using multiple metrics: three BERTScore variants (bert-base-uncased, roberta-large, and microsoft/deberta-large),

ROUGE (both default and no_stem), and BLEU (with and without smoothing). Table II summarizes the average precision scores in these categories.

The result showed that BLEU and ROUGE have marginal differentiation between Paraphrase-50 (65 and 55 respectively) and Different-Meaning pairs (56 and 50). Both BLEU and ROUGE fail to distinguish between outputs that preserve the intended meaning (semantic equivalence) and those that do not. Among BERTScore variants, roberta-large and microsoft/deberta-large has limited discrimination for meaning-altered pairs (Different-Meaning scores: 81 and 84). Only bert-base-uncased demonstrated a good scoring gradient: near-perfect for Twin-Minimal (97), lower for Paraphrase-50 (85), and distinct for Different-Meaning (60).

Therefore, we adopt bert-base-uncased and interpret its F1 scores as follows:

- Faithful generation (≥ 0.9)
- Adequate paraphrases (0.66 – 0.9)
- Meaning-divergent generation (≤ 0.65)

E. Experimental Setup

We investigate three core dimensions influencing user story generation from source code. First, we evaluate model architecture effects by comparing five large language models representing distinct design paradigms: parameter-scaled variants of the LLAMA 3.1 family (8B, 70B, and 405B parameters) to isolate scale-dependent capabilities; the reasoning-optimized DeepSeek-R1 architecture; and OpenAI’s production-grade GPT-4o-mini both in its base configuration and a fine-tuned alternative. All models were deployed through the Replicate platform [42] to ensure consistent execution environments.

Second, we measure the impact of Structured Chain-of-Thought (SCoT) reasoning augmentation across all models. Each model was evaluated in paired configurations: with standard prompting and with SCoT-enhanced prompting. Third, we conduct focused prompt engineering on the smallest model (LLaMA-8B) to determine if exemplar-based techniques can compensate for parameter limitations. This investigation employs six prompt variants: three strategies (zero-shot, one-shot, few-shot) each tested with and without SCoT augmentation to isolate improvement potential from both knowledge injection (via examples) and structured reasoning.


All experiments share consistent decoding parameters: temperature=0, minimum output length=50 tokens, and repetition penalty=0.2. Evaluations are stratified across 35 code complexity bands (1-10 to 341-350 non-comment lines of code).

IV. FINDINGS

A. *RQ1: Can LLMs generate user stories from code? And how do different code complexity levels and LLMs architectures factor in the generated user stories?*

1) *Overall performance:* Our findings show that overall, LLMs can generate user stories from code. However, across all six models, the F1 score decreases as NLOC increases (See Fig. 2 and Table III). This highlights that despite overall adequate performance scaling the generation of user stories

Fig. 2. BERTScore F1 across all NLOC range across all different models using zero-shot prompting without SCOT.



from code, our future research focus, can be challenging. For code with less than 100 NLOC, every model achieves an F1 score of 0.78 or above. None of the models’ average F1 scores were below 0.83 as shown in Table III, which is within the high end of the *Adequate-Paraphrasing* threshold (0.66 - 0.9), where the generated user story exhibits different lexical variations while maintaining its overall meaning. For code within the 100 to 200 NLOC range, which represents functionality complexity in practice, F1 scores range from 0.77 to 0.84, maintaining *Adequate Paraphrasing* quality.

Even when exceeding 200 NLOC, none of the models falls below the 0.74 F1 score. This highlights that no model crosses the *Meaning-divergent* boundary (≤ 0.65), where the semantic meaning of the user story is compromised. The decreasing F1 in the 200+ NLOC range could be attributed to the “lost-in-the-middle” effect, where tokens in the middle of long prompts have less attention [34].

2) *Model-specific trends*: As illustrated in Figure 2, the LLAMA-8B model consistently underperforms relative to its larger counterparts, the LLAMA-70B and LLAMA-405B models. Notably, the LLAMA-8B model shows a marked decline in performance, particularly at lower levels of code complexity, where it consistently achieves the lowest F1 scores up to 255 NLOC. Beyond this threshold, the performance of the LLAMA-405B model falls below that of the LLAMA-8B, underscoring the challenges smaller models face in generating user stories, even for relatively simple code samples.

In contrast, the performance trajectories of the LLAMA-70B and LLAMA-405B are similar up to 100 NLOC, at which point the difference in performance increases. LLAMA-70B model consistently outperforms the LLAMA-405B across increasingly complex code samples (> 55 NLOC), and this performance gap continues to expand as complexity increases. This highlights that up to a certain number of parameters, higher parameter count does not necessarily result in a performance increase.

Given that the 70B model costs significantly less than the 405B variant (Table I), it represents the most cost-effective open-source option.

Despite its larger parameter count, DeepSeek-R1 performs

similarly to LLAMA-8B across all code complexity levels as shown in Table III. This suggests that parameter count is not always equated with better performance.

This might be due to the fact that the reasoning architecture of DeepSeek-R1 was trained mainly on code and mathematics tasks [43], whereas user-story generation requires capturing both code functionality and the human goals and intentions behind it.


Our findings show that light fine-tuning of GPT-4o-mini produces performance improvement for small to medium NLOC ranges (see Figure 2). It is worth noting that fine-tuning does have the added benefit of reducing output token usage by 80% which can be particularly useful when inference is run at scale

RQ1 Answer. Overall, LLMs can adequately generate user stories from source code, averaging F1 scores of 0.8 for code up to 200 NLOC. Up to a certain model size, increasing the number of parameters has diminishing returns. Reasoning models do not outperform standard models, while light fine-tuning a smaller model improves performance for small to medium NLOC ranges and reduces output size by 80%.

B. *RQ2: To what extent do prompting techniques (SCoT, k-shot) optimize user story generation?*

The impact of SCoT reasoning on model performance is contingent upon model size, as illustrated in Table III. Larger models, such as LLAMA-70B and LLAMA-405B, show improvements in F1 scores, up to 4% in the 101-200 and 201-350 NLOC ranges when SCoT reasoning is employed. In contrast, smaller models, including LLAMA-8B, GPT-4o-mini, and fine-tuned GPT-4o-mini, exhibit either no significant performance change or a reduction in F1 scores across all NLOC ranges. This suggests that smaller models may lack the representational capacity to effectively integrate the additional reasoning instructions provided by SCoT.

Fig. 3. Comparing all prompting techniques using LLAMA-8B model to base LLAMA-70B model.



As for the example-based prompting, our findings show that having one example (one-shot) is beneficial, while additional examples (few-shot) offer diminishing returns.

Table IV shows that moving from zero-shot to one-shot prompt increases LLAMA-8B’s F1 scores by 4% in the 101-200

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF GROUND TRUTH VS. GENERATED USER STORIES WITH AVERAGE PRECISION, RECALL AND F1 SCORES, BOLD RESULTS = INCREASING FROM NO SCOT TO WITH SCOT.

NLOC		LLAMA 8B		LLAMA 70B		LLAMA 405B		GPT 4o-mini		GPT 4o-mini Fine-tuned	
		No SCOT	With SCOT	No SCOT	With SCOT	No SCOT	With SCOT	No SCOT	With SCOT	No SCOT	With SCOT
1-100	P	0.82	0.81	0.87	0.85	0.86	0.84	0.87	0.84	0.88	0.86
	R	0.84	0.82	0.85	0.83	0.85	0.84	0.85	0.83	0.89	0.87
	F1	0.83	0.81	0.86	0.84	0.86	0.84	0.86	0.84	0.88	0.87
101-200	P	0.75	0.75	0.79	0.83	0.75	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.74	0.73
	R	0.79	0.77	0.82	0.84	0.81	0.83	0.80	0.81	0.79	0.78
	F1	0.77	0.77	0.80	0.83	0.78	0.80	0.79	0.79	0.76	0.75
201-350	P	0.72	0.72	0.76	0.78	0.72	0.73	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.75
	R	0.79	0.79	0.80	0.83	0.78	0.81	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80
	F1	0.75	0.75	0.78	0.80	0.75	0.77	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.77

and 201-350 NLOC ranges. However, few-shot prompting adds only 1% improvements over one-shot approaches. This pattern suggests that LLAMA-8B can effectively extract implicit rules from a single worked example. SCoT shows minimal impact when combined with example-based prompting. Table IV shows that adding SCoT to one-shot and few-shot configurations produces negligible F1 changes or sometimes reduces it.

TABLE IV

AVERAGED PRECISION, RECALL, AND F1 FOR LLAMA 8B ACROSS NLOC BANDS, SCoT USAGE, AND PROMPT TYPES. BOLD = SCoT IMPROVEMENT; \uparrow = ONE/FEW-SHOT NO-SCoT GAIN OVER ZERO-SHOT NO-SCoT.

NLOC		Zero-Shot		One-Shot		Few-Shot	
		No SCoT	With SCoT	No SCoT	With SCoT	No SCoT	With SCoT
1-100	P	0.82	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.82	0.81
	R	0.84	0.82	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.80
	F1	0.83	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.80
101-200	P	0.75	0.75	0.80 \uparrow	0.78	0.81 \uparrow	0.78
	R	0.79	0.77	0.82 \uparrow	0.82	0.82 \uparrow	0.81
	F1	0.77	0.77	0.81 \uparrow	0.80	0.81 \uparrow	0.79
201-350	P	0.72	0.72	0.79 \uparrow	0.76	0.79 \uparrow	0.77
	R	0.79	0.79	0.80 \uparrow	0.81	0.81 \uparrow	0.80
	F1	0.75	0.75	0.79 \uparrow	0.78	0.80 \uparrow	0.78

Prompt engineering improves LLAMA-8B performance, enabling it to match larger models despite parameter limitations.

As shown in Figure 3, the basic LLAMA-8B configuration achieves a maximum F1 score of 0.73 across all complexity levels when using minimal prompting instructions. One-shot and few-shot prompting deliver performance improvements for LLAMA-8B, allowing it to consistently outperform LLAMA-70B after the 120 NLOC mark. SCoT showed mixed results, when combined with example-based prompting, it produces $\pm 1\%$ F1 change, and when used without exemplar prompting, it improved LLAMA-8B performance beyond the 150 NLOC mark. These findings highlight that strategic prompting can improve the performance of smaller models, especially for medium-complexity code generation tasks. Such tasks, which reflect typical functionality complexity in practice, provide a foundation for scaling this approach to larger codebases.

RQ2 Answer. One-shot prompts yield the most substantial gains for LLAMA-8B, whereas few-shot and SCoT provide minimal additional benefit. Exemplar prompting alone allows the smaller 8B model to match or even exceed the performance of a 70B model for medium-sized code.

V. THREATS TO VALIDITY

Our study relies on CodeNet’s competitive programming solutions, which may not reflect the complexity of large-scale production systems. We mitigate this by noting that these tasks provide self-contained functional units suitable for proof-of-concept validation. The focus on snippets up to 350 NLOC also simplifies the problem space, though this range aligns with typical class and function sizes observed in popular GitHub repositories and we hierarchical extraction and chunking can be used as strategies for larger systems in future work. Our restriction to C++ limits generalizability, yet its popularity and prevalence in codebases justifies the choice, and the approach is transferable to other languages. Finally, while ground-truth user stories involve subjective interpretation, they were authored by three C++ proficient annotators with reconciled differences and achieved strong agreement (Cohen’s $\kappa = 0.86$), supporting the reliability of our dataset.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We analyzed 1,750 C++ snippets and demonstrated that large language models can successfully reverse-engineer user stories from source code with at least Adequate-paraphrase fidelity. A key finding is that a lightweight 8B model can match the performance of a much larger 70B model, enabling cost-effective and locally deployable solutions. Looking forward, we plan to extend our approach to larger codebases through hierarchical extraction, where function-level stories aggregate into class- and module-level narratives using chunking strategies for code exceeding 200 NLOC. Beyond scalability, we envision user story recovery as a validation mechanism for AI coding assistants. This verification can detect divergences from user intent, enabling automatic hallucination detection and self-correction. Such validation directly addresses a pressing need as AI tools become increasingly integrated into software development workflows.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by NSERC Discovery Grant RGPIN-2024-06511.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Lucassen, F. Dalpiaz, J. M. E. Van Der Werf, and S. Brinkkemper, "Forging high-quality user stories: towards a discipline for agile requirements," in *2015 IEEE 23rd international requirements engineering conference (RE)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 126–135.
- [2] B. Ramesh, L. Cao, and R. Baskerville, "Agile requirements engineering practices and challenges: an empirical study," *Information Systems Journal*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 449–480, 2010.
- [3] T. Rahman and Y. Zhu, "Automated user story generation with test case specification using large language model," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01558*, 2024.
- [4] A. Chinnaswamy, B. Sabarish, and R. Deepak Menan, "User story based automated test case generation using nlp," in *International Conference on Computational Intelligence in Data Science*. Springer, 2024, pp. 156–166.
- [5] M. Guizani, A. Chatterjee, B. Trinkenreich, M. E. May, G. J. Noa-Guevara, L. J. Russell, G. G. Cuevas Zambrano, D. Izquierdo-Cortazar, I. Steinmacher, M. A. Gerosa *et al.*, "The long road ahead: Ongoing challenges in contributing to large oss organizations and what to do," *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 5, no. CSCW2, pp. 1–30, 2021.
- [6] M. Guizani, B. Trinkenreich, A. A. Castro-Guzman, I. Steinmacher, M. Gerosa, and A. Sarma, "Perceptions of the state of d&i and d&i initiative in the asf," in *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM/IEEE 44th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Society*, 2022, pp. 130–142.
- [7] I. Steinmacher, M. A. G. Silva, M. A. Gerosa, and D. F. Redmiles, "A systematic literature review on the barriers faced by newcomers to open source software projects," *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 59, pp. 67–85, 2015.
- [8] A. Genaid *et al.*, "Connecting user stories and code for test development," in *2012 third international workshop on recommendation systems for software engineering (rsse)*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 33–37.
- [9] J. Fischbach, A. Vogelsang, D. Spies, A. Wehrle, M. Junker, and D. Freudenstein, "Specmate: Automated creation of test cases from acceptance criteria," in *2020 IEEE 13th international conference on software testing, validation and verification (ICST)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 321–331.
- [10] M. Elallaoui, K. Nafil, and R. Touahni, "Automatic generation of uml sequence diagrams from user stories in scrum process," in *2015 10th international conference on intelligent systems: theories and applications (SITA)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [11] —, "Automatic transformation of user stories into uml use case diagrams using nlp techniques," *Procedia computer science*, vol. 130, pp. 42–49, 2018.
- [12] F. Gilson, M. Galster, and F. Georis, "Generating use case scenarios from user stories," in *Proceedings of the international conference on software and system processes*, 2020, pp. 31–40.
- [13] I. K. Raharjana, D. Siahaan, and C. Fatichah, "User stories and natural language processing: A systematic literature review," *IEEE access*, vol. 9, pp. 53 811–53 826, 2021.
- [14] P. V. Nistala, A. Rajbhoj, V. Kulkarni, S. Soni, K. V. Nori, and R. Reddy, "Towards digitalization of requirements: generating context-sensitive user stories from diverse specifications," *Automated Software Engineering*, vol. 29, no. 1, p. 26, 2022.
- [15] G. Colavito, F. Lanubile, N. Novielli, and L. Quaranta, "Leveraging gpt-like llms to automate issue labeling," in *2024 IEEE/ACM 21st International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 469–480.
- [16] O. Abed, K. Nebe, and A. B. Abdellatif, "Ai-generated user stories supporting human-centred development: An investigation on quality," in *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*. Springer, 2024, pp. 3–13.
- [17] A. B. Marques, A. F. Costa, I. Santos, and R. Andrade, "Enriching user stories with usability features in a remote agile project: a case study," in *Proceedings of the XXI Brazilian Symposium on Software Quality*, 2022, pp. 1–10.
- [18] N. Marques, R. R. Silva, and J. Bernardino, "Using chatgpt in software requirements engineering: A comprehensive review," *Future Internet*, vol. 16, no. 6, p. 180, 2024.
- [19] A. Tikayat Ray, B. F. Cole, O. J. Pinon Fischer, A. P. Bhat, R. T. White, and D. N. Mavris, "Agile methodology for the standardization of engineering requirements using large language models," *Systems*, vol. 11, no. 7, p. 352, 2023.
- [20] J. Y. Lee, S. Kang, J. Yoon, and S. Yoo, "The github recent bugs dataset for evaluating llm-based debugging applications," in *2024 IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 442–444.
- [21] S. MacNeil, P. Denny, A. Tran, J. Leinonen, S. Bernstein, A. Hellas, S. Sarsa, and J. Kim, "Decoding logic errors: a comparative study on bug detection by students and large language models," in *Proceedings of the 26th Australasian Computing Education Conference*, 2024, pp. 11–18.
- [22] M.-F. Wong, S. Guo, C.-N. Hang, S.-W. Ho, and C.-W. Tan, "Natural language generation and understanding of big code for ai-assisted programming: A review," *Entropy*, vol. 25, no. 6, p. 888, 2023.
- [23] M. Kim, D. Notkin, D. Grossman, and G. Wilson, "Identifying and summarizing systematic code changes via rule inference," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 45–62, 2012.
- [24] C. Zhang, J. Wang, Q. Zhou, T. Xu, K. Tang, H. Gui, and F. Liu, "A survey of automatic source code summarization," *Symmetry*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 471, 2022.
- [25] A. Bansal, S. Haque, and C. McMillan, "Project-level encoding for neural source code summarization of subroutines," in *2021 IEEE/ACM 29th International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 253–264.
- [26] A. LeClair, A. Bansal, and C. McMillan, "Ensemble models for neural source code summarization of subroutines," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 286–297.
- [27] W. Sun, Y. Miao, Y. Li, H. Zhang, C. Fang, Y. Liu, G. Deng, Y. Liu, and Z. Chen, "Source code summarization in the era of large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07959*, 2024.
- [28] S. Yun, S. Lin, X. Gu, and B. Shen, "Project-specific code summarization with in-context learning," *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 216, p. 112149, 2024.
- [29] J. Zhu, Y. Miao, T. Xu, J. Zhu, and X. Sun, "On the effectiveness of large language models in statement-level code summarization," in *2024 IEEE 24th International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security (QRS)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 216–227.
- [30] GitHub, "The top programming languages on github — octoverse 2022," <https://octoverse.github.com/2022/top-programming-languages>, 2022, c++ ranked 6th with 8% of contributions; accessed 30 May 2025.
- [31] TIOBE Software, "Tiobe index for 2024," <https://www.tiobe.com/tiobe-index/>, 2024, c++ ranked in top 3 throughout 2024; accessed 31 May 2025.
- [32] R. Puri, D. S. Kung, G. Domeniconi, and *et al.*, "Project codenet: A large-scale ai for code dataset for learning a diversity of coding tasks," in *NeurIPS Datasets & Benchmarks*, 2021, dataset overview and benchmark definitions.
- [33] IBM Research, "Project codenet – ibm developer exchange," <https://developer.ibm.com/exchanges/data/all/project-codenet/>, 2021.
- [34] N. F. Liu, N. Scharli, A. Lewkowycz, J. P. Lee, K. Guu, I. Schlag, A. M. Dai, A. W. Yu, M. van Zuylen, and D. Zhou, "Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03172*, 2023.
- [35] J. Cohen, "A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales," *Educational and psychological measurement*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 37–46, 1960.
- [36] Anonymized, "Supplemental material for reverse engineering user stories from code using large language models," 2025, supplemental Material. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15849709>
- [37] Meta AI, "meta-llama-3-8b – run with an api on replicate," 2024.
- [38] DeepSeek, "Models & pricing – deepseek api docs," 2024.
- [39] OpenAI, "Api pricing," <https://openai.com/api/pricing/>, 2025, gPT-4o-mini price card, accessed 30 May 2025.
- [40] M. Fujita, T. Onaga, and Y. Kano, "Llm tuning and interpretable cot: Kis team in coliee 2024," in *JSAI International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 2024, pp. 140–155.
- [41] J. Li, G. Li, Y. Li, and Z. Jin, "Structured chain-of-thought prompting for code generation," *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 2023.
- [42] Replicate - run machine learning models in the cloud. Accessed: 2024-12-05. [Online]. Available: <https://replicate.com/>
- [43] DeepSeek-AI, "Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning," 2024.