

THE CREAM RISES TO THE TOP: EFFICIENT RERANKING METHOD FOR VERILOG CODE GENERATION

Guang Yang[♣] Wei Zheng[♣] Xiang Chen[◇] Yifan Sun[†] Fengji Zhang[♡] Terry Yue Zhuo[♠]

[♣] Northwest Polytechnical University, Shaanxi, China

[◇] Nantong University, Jiangsu, China

[†] Minzu University of China, Beijing, China

[♡] City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

[♠] Monash University, Victoria, Australia

ABSTRACT

LLMs face significant challenges in Verilog generation due to limited domain-specific knowledge. While sampling techniques improve $\text{pass}@k$ metrics, hardware engineers need one trustworthy solution rather than uncertain candidates. To bridge this gap, we formulate it as a semantic alignment problem between requirements and Verilog implementations, and propose VCD-RNK, a discriminator model tailored for efficient Verilog code reranking. Specifically, VCD-RNK incorporates Verilog-specific reasoning by distilling expert knowledge across three dimensions: code semantic analysis, test case generation, and functional correctness assessment. By explicitly simulating the above reasoning processes during inference, VCD-RNK effectively avoids computationally intensive test execution in existing methods.

Index Terms— Verilog Generation, Code Rerank, Knowledge Distillation

1. INTRODUCTION

Modern integrated circuit design complexity necessitates automated Hardware Description Language (HDL) generation (e.g., Verilog, VHDL, and SystemVerilog) to reduce costs and engineering workload [1, 2]. While LLMs have shown promising capabilities in software code generation [3], they exhibit limited performance in Verilog generation due to insufficient domain knowledge [4, 5], and retraining multiple models remains prohibitively resource-intensive [6, 7].

Current methods [8, 9] improve Verilog code quality through sampling techniques, generating multiple candidates and calculating $\text{pass}@k$ metrics. This strategy leverages the observation that correct implementations often exist within a larger candidate pool, as evidenced by significantly higher $\text{pass}@k$ compared to $\text{pass}@1$ performance across diverse LLMs (as shown in Figure 1).




Fig. 1: Performance on ResBench benchmark.

However, $\text{pass}@k$ quantifies model potential but lacks a mechanism to identify optimal implementations. In practical scenarios, engineers require a single reliable solution rather than multiple uncertain candidates [10], making it challenging to select the best implementation from top- k candidates.

To address these limitations, we introduce VCD-RNK, a lightweight discriminator model for efficient Verilog code reranking that incorporates Verilog-specific reasoning through knowledge distillation. VCD-RNK emulates human engineers' evaluation across three dimensions (code semantic analysis, test case generation, and functional correctness assessment) while eliminating test execution overhead. Our method constructs a discrimination dataset $\langle \text{nl}, \text{verilog}, \text{label} \rangle$, employs collaborative distillation with dual teacher models to create **VerilogJudge-47K**, and fine-tunes Qwen3-4B with majority voting for candidate selection, achieving 10.4-25.8% improvement in $\text{pass}@1$ performance across multiple LLMs.

Our contributions are: (1) We formulate Verilog code reranking as a functional consistency evaluation between natural language and code. (2) We construct a reasoning dataset and a customized discriminator model VCD-RNK tailored for efficient Verilog code reranking. (3) We achieve 10.4-25.8% improvement in $\text{pass}@1$ performance across multiple LLMs while maintaining lower computational overhead.

Wei Zheng is corresponding author.




Fig. 2: Comparison of existing methods and VCD-RNK.

2. BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

2.1. Code Generation for Verilog

Verilog features concurrency, timing-dependent behavior, and hardware-specific syntax that create unique challenges for code generation systems. Given dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|}$ where x_i is natural language specification and y_i is Verilog implementation, a code generation model computes $p_\theta(y|x) = \prod_{t=1}^{|y|} p_\theta(y_t|x, y_{<t})$.

2.2. Pass@k Metric

The pass@k metric assesses whether at least one correct implementation exists among k candidates:

$$\text{pass}@k := \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[1 - \frac{\binom{n-c(x)}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \right] \quad (1)$$

where n is total candidates, $c(x)$ is correct implementations for problem x .

2.3. Reranking Method for Code Generation

The pass@k metric quantifies model performance but lacks a mechanism to select optimal implementations from multiple candidates.

Given k candidates $\mathcal{Y}_k = \{\hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_k\}$ for input x , a reranking function $R: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ selects:

$$\hat{y}^* = \arg \max_{\hat{y}_i \in \mathcal{Y}_k} R(x, \hat{y}_i) \quad (2)$$

Existing methods include manual selection [11], mutual information-based CodeReviewer [12], and test-based CodeT [10]. However, they perform poorly in Verilog domain and introduce significant computational overhead.

3. METHOD

As shown in Figure 2, VCD-RNK directly learns the semantic mapping between specifications and implementations without test case execution and complex consensus calculations.

Algorithm 1 Collaborative Knowledge Distillation

Require: Seed dataset \mathcal{D} ; Teacher models T_1, T_2 ; Code Generator G

Ensure: Distilled dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{distill}}$

- 1: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{candi}} \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2: **for each** $(x, y, t) \in \mathcal{D}$ **do**
- 3: $\{y^1, \dots, y^k\} \leftarrow G(x)$
- 4: **for each** y^j in $\{y^1, \dots, y^k\}$ **do**
- 5: $\text{label}_j \leftarrow \text{EXECUTE}(y^j, t)$
- 6: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{candi}}.\text{append}\{(x, y^j, \text{label}_j)\}$
- 7: **end for**
- 8: **end for**
- 9: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{distill}} \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 10: **for each** $(x, y, \text{label}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{candi}}$ **do**
- 11: **if** $T_1(x, y).\text{pred} = \text{label}$ **then**
- 12: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{distill}}.\text{append}\{(x, y, \text{label}, T_1(x, y).\text{reason})\}$
- 13: **else if** $T_2(x, y).\text{pred} = \text{label}$ **then**
- 14: $\mathcal{D}_{\text{distill}}.\text{append}\{(x, y, \text{label}, T_2(x, y).\text{reason})\}$
- 15: **end if**
- 16: **end for**

3.1. Problem Formulation

Formally, given a natural language specification $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and k candidate implementations $\mathcal{Y}_k = \{\hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2, \dots, \hat{y}_k\} \subset \mathcal{Y}$ generated by a model $p_\theta(\cdot|x)$, we define a discriminator $F_\phi: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ parameterized by ϕ that computes the probability of functional correctness:

$$F_\phi(x, \hat{y}_i) = p(\text{correct}|x, \hat{y}_i; \phi) \quad (3)$$

The discriminator is trained to maximize the likelihood of correct classification:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{disc}}(\phi) = -\mathbb{E}(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D} [c(y) \log F_\phi(x, y) + (1 - c(y)) \log(1 - F_\phi(x, y))] \quad (4)$$

During inference, the optimal implementation is selected by:

$$\hat{y}^* = \arg \max_{\hat{y}_i \in \mathcal{Y}_k} F_\phi(x, \hat{y}_i) \quad (5)$$

3.2. VCD-RNK Design

Figure 3 shows VCD-RNK design. VCD-RNK extracts Verilog-specific knowledge through collaborative dual-teacher distillation using VeriCoder’s dataset [13], trains a discriminator to learn semantic mapping between specifications and implementations, then reranks candidates based on discriminator decisions.

(1) Collaborative Knowledge Distillation Algorithm 1 outlines our dual-teacher distillation approach. We use SeedCoder [14] to sample 10 implementations per specification. For knowledge distillation, we employ doubao-seed-1.6 as primary teacher (T_1) and DeepSeek-R1-671B as sec-




Fig. 3: Overview of our method.




Fig. 4: Ablation results on ResBench.

ondary teacher (T_2) to handle cases where T_1 fails, creating **VerilogJudge-47K** dataset.

(2) **Model Training** We fine-tune Qwen3 on **VerilogJudge-47K** using LoRA [15], which freezes pre-trained weights $W_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ while introducing trainable matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times k}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ ($r \ll \min(d, k)$). Weight updates follow $W = W_0 + BA$, reducing parameters from dk to $r(d + k)$.

(3) **Reranking Workflow** Our workflow uses syntax checker for filtering, then majority voting for final selection. We perform multiple inference passes and calculate:

$$F_\phi(x, \hat{y}_i) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{I}[F_\phi^{(j)}(x, \hat{y}_i) = 1]}{m} \quad (6)$$

where $F_\phi^{(j)}(x, \hat{y}_i)$ represents the prediction from the j -th inference pass.

4. EXPERIMENTS

4.1. Setup

Datasets We evaluate on two diverse real-world Verilog benchmarks: **RTLMLM-v1.1** [16] and **ResBench** [17].

Evaluation Metrics We follow standard practice in code generation literature by using $\text{pass}@k$, and $\text{pass}@1$ after applying different reranking strategies to the top- k candidates.

Studied Models We evaluate across general-purpose (GPT-3.5-Turbo, GPT-4o, DeepSeek-V3), code-specialized (DeepSeek-Coder, Qwen2.5-Coder, Seed-Coder), and Verilog-specialized (CodeV-QC [18], RTLCode [9], Origen [8]) LLMs.

Baselines We compare against Probability, CodeReviewer, CodeRank, and CodeT methods. We use CodeRankEmbed¹ for CodeRank and generate five test cases per implementation for CodeT.

4.2. Main Results

The main results are presented in Table 1. For closed-source models, probability information is unavailable, resulting in “-” for Probability and CodeReviewer methods.

(1) **Comparison with Baselines** VCD-RNK achieves superior performance on RTLMLM-v1.1 (50.40%) and ResBench (62.90%), with improvements of +5.8-16.2% over CodeT and

¹<https://github.com/cornstack/CodeRankEmbed>

Model	Pass@1	Pass@1 (Reranking k=5)						Pass@5	
		Prob.	CodeReviewer	CodeRank	CodeT	Ours	T_1	T_2	
Evaluation on RTLLM-v1.1									
GPT-3.5-Turbo	32.14	-	-	32.14	35.71	35.71	39.29	35.71	39.29
DeepSeek-V3	57.14	-	-	57.14	64.29	67.86	57.14	57.14	67.86
GPT-4o	60.71	-	-	57.14	64.29	67.86	64.29	67.86	75.00
DeepSeek-Coder	32.14	28.57	21.43	28.57	28.57	32.14	39.29	28.57	42.86
Qwen2.5-Coder	42.86	39.29	35.71	39.29	46.43	50.00	42.86	46.43	53.57
Seed-Coder	42.86	39.29	50.00	46.43	42.86	53.57	53.57	39.29	64.29
CodeV-QC	46.43	46.43	42.86	42.86	46.43	53.57	53.57	53.57	60.71
RTLCoder	42.86	28.57	32.14	28.57	42.86	39.29	35.71	39.29	50.00
Origen	53.57	53.57	57.14	46.43	57.14	53.57	57.14	50.00	71.43
Avg.	45.64	39.29	39.88	42.06	47.62	50.40	49.21	46.43	58.33
Evaluation on ResBench									
GPT-3.5-Turbo	42.86	-	-	42.86	46.43	53.57	51.79	48.21	57.14
DeepSeek-V3	64.29	-	-	64.29	71.43	73.21	69.64	64.29	76.79
GPT-4o	71.43	-	-	66.07	71.43	80.36	76.79	75.00	82.14
DeepSeek-Coder	33.93	42.86	25.00	26.79	46.43	50.00	50.00	39.29	51.79
Qwen2.5-Coder	46.43	39.29	53.57	39.29	46.43	60.71	60.71	60.71	66.07
Seed-Coder	46.43	44.64	41.07	46.43	53.57	64.29	60.71	55.36	71.43
CodeV-QC	48.21	50.00	46.43	48.21	50.00	57.14	55.36	57.14	62.50
RTLCoder	48.21	46.43	35.71	37.50	51.79	64.29	58.93	53.57	67.86
Origen	48.21	41.07	44.64	48.21	50.00	62.50	57.14	48.21	69.64
Avg.	50.00	44.05	41.07	46.63	54.12	62.90	60.12	55.75	67.26

Table 1: Performance comparison (%) of various model categories across two Verilog benchmarks.

+10.4-25.8% over original Pass@1, demonstrating better semantic alignment capture than existing methods.

(2) **Comparison with Teacher Models** VCD-RNK successfully distills complementary reasoning from both teachers, outperforming individual models, showing effective dual-teacher distillation.

(3) **Comparison with Theoretical Upper Bound** VCD-RNK achieves 86.4% (50.40/58.33) and 93.5% (62.90/67.26) of theoretical upper bounds on RTLLM-v1.1 and ResBench respectively, substantially narrowing the performance gap.

(4) **Statistical Significance** To rigorously validate the improvements observed in pass@1 metrics, we conducted Wilcoxon signed-rank tests comparing VCD-RNK against baselines, showing VCD-RNK’s improvements are statistically significant ($p < 0.01$) in 14/18 model configurations.

4.3. Ablation Results

To evaluate individual component contributions, we conducted ablation studies on VCD-RNK’s three main components in Figure 4. **Knowledge Distillation** provides substantial improvement (+9.52% on average), confirming Verilog-specific knowledge enhances specification-implementation

consistency evaluation. **Syntax Checker** and **Majority Voting** both offer consistent improvement, demonstrating the importance of filtering syntactically incorrect candidates.

4.4. Efficiency Comparison

We compare computational efficiency between VCD-RNK and CodeT across different scenarios. CodeT requires three sequential stages: code generation (1-5s), test generation (1.5-5s), and test execution (1s per iteration). In contrast, VCD-RNK achieves 1.5s inference latency per instance, remaining substantially lower even with voting iterations. Importantly, VCD-RNK eliminates the test execution phase, providing significant deployment advantages.

5. CONCLUSION

We introduced VCD-RNK, a discriminative reranking method for Verilog code generation that addresses the gap between model capability and practical hardware design requirements. Future directions include extending our framework to other hardware description languages to enable more complex hardware design tasks.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Peter Flake, Phil Moorby, Steve Golson, Arturo Salz, and Simon Davidmann, “Verilog hdl and its ancestors and descendants,” *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, vol. 4, no. HOPL, pp. 1–90, 2020.
- [2] Shadan Alsaqer, Sarah Alajmi, Imtiaz Ahmad, and Mohammad Alfaiakawi, “The potential of llms in hardware design,” *Journal of Engineering Research*, 2024.
- [3] Guang Yang, Yu Zhou, Xiang Chen, Xiangyu Zhang, Terry Yue Zhuo, and Taolue Chen, “Chain-of-thought in neural code generation: From and for lightweight language models,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2024.
- [4] Chia-Tung Ho, Haoxing Ren, and Brucek Khailany, “Verilogcoder: Autonomous verilog coding agents with graph-based planning and abstract syntax tree (ast)-based waveform tracing tool,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2025, vol. 39, pp. 300–307.
- [5] Yi Liu, XU Changran, Yunhao Zhou, Zeju Li, and Qiang Xu, “Deeprtl: Bridging verilog understanding and generation with a unified representation model,” in *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [6] Haizhou Shi, Zihao Xu, Hengyi Wang, Weiyi Qin, Wenyuan Wang, Yibin Wang, Zifeng Wang, Sayna Ebrahimi, and Hao Wang, “Continual learning of large language models: A comprehensive survey,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, 2024.
- [7] Marcus De Carvalho, Mahardhika Pratama, Jie Zhang, Chua Haoyan, and Edward Yapp, “Towards cross-domain continual learning,” in *2024 IEEE 40th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 1131–1142.
- [8] Fan Cui, Chenyang Yin, Kexing Zhou, Youwei Xiao, Guangyu Sun, Qiang Xu, Qipeng Guo, Yun Liang, Xingcheng Zhang, Demin Song, et al., “Origen: Enhancing rtl code generation with code-to-code augmentation and self-reflection,” in *Proceedings of the 43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design*, 2024, pp. 1–9.
- [9] Shang Liu, Wenji Fang, Yao Lu, Jing Wang, Qijun Zhang, Hongce Zhang, and Zhiyao Xie, “Rtl-coder: Fully open-source and efficient llm-assisted rtl code generation technique,” *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 2024.
- [10] Bei Chen, Fengji Zhang, Anh Nguyen, Daoguang Zan, Zeqi Lin, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen, “Codet: Code generation with generated tests,” in *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [11] Jason Blocklove, Siddharth Garg, Ramesh Karri, and Hammond Pearce, “Chip-chat: Challenges and opportunities in conversational hardware design,” in *2023 ACM/IEEE 5th Workshop on Machine Learning for CAD (MLCAD)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [12] Mingjie Liu, Nathaniel Pinckney, Brucek Khailany, and Haoxing Ren, “Verilogeval: Evaluating large language models for verilog code generation,” in *2023 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer Aided Design (ICCAD)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [13] Anjiang Wei, Huanmi Tan, Tarun Suresh, Daniel Mendoza, Thiago SFX Teixeira, Ke Wang, Caroline Trippel, and Alex Aiken, “Vericoder: Enhancing llm-based rtl code generation through functional correctness validation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.15659*, 2025.
- [14] Yuyu Zhang, Jing Su, Yifan Sun, Chenguang Xi, Xia Xiao, Shen Zheng, Anxiang Zhang, Kaibo Liu, Daoguang Zan, Tao Sun, et al., “Seed-coder: Let the code model curate data for itself,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03524*, 2025.
- [15] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al., “Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models,” *ICLR*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 3, 2022.
- [16] Yao Lu, Shang Liu, Qijun Zhang, and Zhiyao Xie, “Rtllm: An open-source benchmark for design rtl generation with large language model,” in *2024 29th Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 722–727.
- [17] Ce Guo and Tong Zhao, “Resbench: A resource-aware benchmark for llm-generated fpga designs,” in *Proceedings of the 15th International Symposium on Highly Efficient Accelerators and Reconfigurable Technologies*, 2025, pp. 25–34.
- [18] Yang Zhao, Di Huang, Chongxiao Li, Pengwei Jin, Ziyuan Nan, Tianyun Ma, Lei Qi, Yansong Pan, Zhenxing Zhang, Rui Zhang, et al., “Codev: Empowering llms for verilog generation through multi-level summarization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10424*, 2024.