Leveraging Generative Models to Recover Variable Names from Stripped Binary

Xiangzhe Xu Purdue University

Shiwei Feng

Purdue University

Zhuo Zhang Purdue University

Yapeng Ye

Purdue University

Zian Su Purdue University

Nan Jiang Purdue University Ziyang Huang Purdue University Danning Xie

Purdue University

Siyuan Cheng Purdue University

Lin Tan Purdue University Xiangyu Zhang *Purdue University*

Abstract

Decompilation aims to recover the source code form of a binary executable. It has many security applications such as malware analysis, vulnerability detection and code hardening. A prominent challenge in decompilation is to recover variable names. We propose a novel technique that leverages the strengths of generative models while suppressing potential hallucinations and overcoming the input token limitation. We build a prototype, GENNM, from a pre-trained generative model Code-Llama. We fine-tune GENNM on decompiled functions, and leverage program analysis to validate the results produced by the generative model. GENNM includes names from callers and callees while querying a function, providing rich contextual information within the model's input token limitation. Our results show that GENNM improves the state-of-the-art from 48.1% to 57.9% in the most challenging setup where a query function is not seen in the training dataset.

1 Introduction

Deployed software often has the form of binary executable. Understanding these prevalent binaries is essential for various security and safety aspects of software, including conducting security assessments on contemporary devices such as home automation systems [4, 21] and autopilot technology [57], maintaining and hardening legacy software [12, 13, 38], detecting vulnerabilities in commercial-off-the-shelf software [34, 60], and analyzing malware that threatens our daily lives [5,53,59]. A significant challenge, however, is presented by the fact that most these binaries are shipped without source code, making them extremely difficult to comprehend. To bridge this gap, reverse engineering techniques have emerged to recover source-code-level details. Over the past decade, techniques like disassembly [2,9,39,46,62], function boundary identification [3], type inference [33, 35, 45, 51, 52, 64], recovery of high-level abstractions [50], code structure [8], and data structures [50] have advanced significantly.

Despite these successes, a crucial step of reverseengineering pipelines, namely recovering symbol names, remains inadequately addressed. For example, the state-of-theart name recovery technique, DIRTY [15], achieves only 31.2% accuracy. Symbol names, e.g., aes_shared_key in an AES encryption function, offer intuitive insights into variables' roles in the software, without requiring complex program reasoning. Recovering these names entails an in-depth understanding of both *machine semantics*, concerning dataflow and control-flow, and *descriptive semantics*, reflecting how the code is understood by human developers. This duality poses a significant challenge for conventional analysis methods [11, 61] that primarily focus on machine semantics, resulting in the failure of recovering meaningful symbol names.

To address this issue, data-driven methods, e.g., language models, have been suggested. They utilize extensive programming corpora to understand descriptive semantics. Previous efforts, including DIRTY [15], SymLM [29], and VarBERT [44], have reduced the name recovery challenge into a more manageable classification task, leveraging language models' proficiency in such tasks. These methods, taking as input decompiled code and a target variable, choose a likely name from a pre-defined vocabulary. While this approach produces encouraging results for common variable names like fd and size, it struggles with complex names or names not in the vocabulary. For example, our evaluation shows that existing techniques often mislabel rare variable names, e.g., aes shared key, as <UNK> (a placeholder for unknown names), key, or ssh key, failing to provide sufficient context or conveying incorrect implications.

Conversely, the recent success of large language models in generative tasks [10, 14, 41, 43] opens new opportunities for name recovery from binaries. Generative models, unlike the classification models, can creatively produce variable names from decompiled code without being confined to a pre-determined vocabulary. This makes them an intuitive choice for name recovery. However, their creative nature also brings the challenge of *model hallucinations*, where models might generate nonsensical or subtly incorrect names. For example, a generative model might suggest ase_private_key for aes_shared_key, a plausible but fundamentally flawed name given that AES encryption does not entail asymmetric encryption or a private key. Suppressing these hallucinations is thereby crucial, especially in sensitive security applications. In addition, existing generative language models have an input token limit (e.g., 4k tokens for Llama [54] while a nontrivial decompiled function easily has over 1,000 tokens). As such, we cannot afford providing comprehensive code contexts for name generation.

In this paper, we propose a novel technique for name recovery that capitalizes on the strengths of generative language models while suppressing potential hallucinations and overcoming the input token limitation. It does not directly generate names from binaries. Instead, given a binary, it first uses IDA [26] to decompile the binary. The decompiled code is in the C language with recovered code structures close to the original source. However, it does not have meaningful variable names in most cases. We aim to recover names that are ideally semantically consistent with those in the original source. The problem definition is the same as existing works [15, 32, 44]. To suppress hallucinations, we draw inspiration from two well-established psychological principles, *self-regulation* [18] and social conformity [17]. Self-regulation involves balancing imaginative and risk-averse thinking to ensure measured decision-making. Conversely, social conformity pertains to individuals aligning their opinions with group norms. We observe that these principles are also effective in reducing hallucinations in the decompilation context. Specifically, we employ a dual-model approach for self-regulation, i.e., a generative model fosters creative ideas about rare variable names, while a classification model offers cautious perspectives on seen names by choosing a likely name from the vocabulary. These models, sharing the same knowledge base and having significant architectural similarities, are employed to predict symbol names for the same decompiled code. A novel name validation algorithm integrates their predictions to generate the final output. To realize social conformity, we treat predictions from separate sources, e.g., functions, as individual opinions, and integrate them systematically. In particular, the language models first predict variable names for individual functions. We then gather predictions from related functions (e.g., those along a call chain) to establish group norms. This collective information is fed back to the models (as inputs), enhancing their ability to refine predictions through collective insights. The process is iterative, allowing improvement of prediction quality over time.

Specifically, our approach leverages a data preprocessing pipeline to acquire a large corpus of programs sourced from GitHub and collect their binary versions and ground-truth variable names accordingly. Initially, we fine-tune Code-Llama, a pre-trained language model, on code decompiled from the binaries. Since decompiled programs are essentially C pro-

grams without meaningful symbols, their distribution is different from that learned by Code-Llama, which was trained on sources written by human developers. We refer to the fine-tuned model as the stem model. Due to the input token limit, fine-tuning can only be performed at the function level. To further improve model performance by considering calling contexts, we augment data samples with calling context information of functions, formatting them into two sets, question-answer pairs for the generative fine-tuning, and input-label pairs for the classification fine-tuning. We perform the dual-format training upon the stem model, referred as model differentiation, leads to the development of two distinct but related models. During inference, these models initially generate variable names for each function considering the function's calling contexts. These initial names are further integrated using the iterative name validation algorithm to suppress hallucinations and select the most consistent names.

Our contributions are as follows:

- We propose a novel technique for name recovery from binaries, leveraging the strengths of both generative language models and program analysis. This technique is grounded in the established psychological principles of self-regulation and social conformity.
- We develop a specialized training pipeline that fosters the development of two distinct yet interconnected language models, a specialized generative model and a classification model.
- To overcome the prominent challenge of hallucination of language models in our context, we devise a unique name validation algorithm to integrate predicted names from various models. We design an iterative inference pipeline that utilizes a program-analysis-based context propagation algorithm to gather predicted names from related variables, thereby significantly improving the precision of subsequent name predictions.
- We develop a prototype GENNM (Unleashing the Power of Generative Model in Recovering Variable Names from Stripped Binary). We train and evaluate GENNM on a dataset collected from popular GitHub repositories with 940k binary functions. We compare GENNM with two state-of-the-art techniques, DIRTY and VAR-BERT. It outperforms DIRTY by 23.8% and VARBERT by 9.8% in the most challenging setup where a test function is not seen in the training dataset. It demonstrates more than 20% improvement over DIRTY and 10% improvement over VARBERT on names that rarely appear in the training dataset. Moreover, GENNM significantly outperforms black box large language models (e.g., Chat-GPT) by over 50%. We also study the effectiveness of GENNM in two real-world security applications, i.e., malware analysis and binary summarization.

2 Motivation and Overview

We use a motivating example to illustrate the limitations of the state-of-the-art technique for renaming decompiled variables. Then we demonstrate our method.

2.1 Motivating Example

Fig. 1a shows our motivating example, which is adapted from the function import_key_from_file() in the project mbedtls. The function loads the master key from a file and conducts some post-processes. It takes as inputs the options for loading the key (usage and alg), the name of the file that stores the key (key_file_name), and the pointer to the master key (master_key). Lines 4–7 declare the local variables, lines 9–17 read in the data from the key file, lines 18–19 call the function import_key to import the key from the raw data to the master_key structure, and line 20 conducts post-processing.

In Fig. 1b, we show the decompiled code of our motivating example. The green in-line comment shown aside a variable is the source code variable name corresponding to the variable. *They are added for readability and not in the decompiled code input to our tool.* For most variables and functions, the corresponding names in the decompiled code are not meaningful (e.g., a1, and v8).

For library functions (e.g., fopen64, fread, and printf), their names are obtained from the dynamic linking table. These names remain available even in a stripped binary program. The decompilation tool (IDA-Pro in our case) synthesizes the names for some variables based on the library functions. For example, the last parameter of library function fread() has a known name *stream*. Therefore, IDA-Pro renames the variable passed as the last argument to fread() as *stream*. Although these names provide useful information for the decompiled code, they typically fail to reflect program context. For example, the developer named the variable key_file (instead of stream) indicating that the file stores the key. The scope of our tool is to recover meaningful names for both variables with placeholder names and variables whose names are synthesized from library functions.

2.2 Limitations of State-of-the-Art

The state-of-the-art techniques [15,44] leverage Transformer models [55] to perform name recovery. A model takes as input the decompiled function, and predicts a name for each variable. The problem is typically formulated as a classification task for the model. A set of variable names is first collected from the training data, noted as the vocabulary. A model is trained to pick a name from the vocabulary for each variable in the decompiled function. Unfortunately, the performance of the classification model may be sub-optimal because the distribution of variable names are imbalanced and has a longtail. For example, Fig. 2 shows the distribution in our dataset constructed from 2,796 GitHub repositories. Observe that the most frequent name appears around 50k times, while 50% of names only occur less than 3 times. It is challenging to train a classification model for training data with a significantly biased distribution [22,24]. In addition, formulating the problem as a classification problem cannot generate names beyond the vocabulary. In our motivating example, the ground truth name for variable stream (at line 38 in Fig. 1b) is key_file, which discloses critical semantic information. The name only occurs 7 times in our training dataset. Thus, state-of-the-art model mistakenly predicts the name of stream as <unk>, which indicates a name that is not seen in the training dataset.

2.3 Our Method

We propose to formulate the variable name recovery problem as a generation task instead of a classification task following SOTA. The vocabulary of a generative model consists of sub-tokens. When predicting the name for a variable, a generative model outputs one or more sub-tokens and concatenates them to construct a variable name. Intuitively, the generation process mimics how a human developer understands variable names. For our example, she would naturally break down the name key_file to two sub-words key and file. Both these two sub-words appear more than 15k times in the training dataset. Thus, our generative model correctly generates the name key file for the variable stream. In addition, we utilize a language model that has been trained on substantial natural language and code information such that the model can potentially "invent" meaningful names unseen in the training or fine-tuned datasets (examples are shown in Section 5.5).

There are three major challenges of using a generative model to rename variables in decompiled code.

Challenge1: Existing generative models are mostly trained with natural language text and source code. They often fail to effectively understand decompiled code.

Large language models (LLMs) (e.g., ChatGPT, and GPT-4 [41,43]) are advanced generative models. They demonstrate strong capabilities in understanding both natural language text and source code. However, the distribution of decompiled code is dissimilar to either. For example, although the decompiled code by IDA has the same syntax as C code, it is like a direct translation of individual low-level instructions instead of their abstraction. In particular, assume a source statement is compiled to ten instructions. The instructions are likely decompiled to many C statements reflecting low-level operations, instead of one natural source code statement. Such low-level C code is hence out of the training distribution of most LLMs. Our evaluation in Section 5.3 shows that ChatGPT and GPT-4 under-performs our model by 50%.

For instance, we describe the task to GPT-4 and query the variables in our motivating example. GPT-4 suggests

```
31 int64 sub_401639(int a1 /* usage */,
1 status_t import_key_from_file(usage_t usage,
    algorithm_t alg, const char *key_file_name,
                                                                         int a2 /* alg */,
 2
                                                          32
                                                          33
                                                                       char *a3 /* key_file_name */,
 3
    kev id t *master kev){
                                                                 const
                                                                        int *a4 /* master_key */) {
4
    attributes_t attributes = /*...*/;
                                                          34
    uint8_t key_data[40];
                                                              char ptr[48]; /* key_data */
                                                          35
 5
                                                              int64 v8[7]; /* attributes */
    size_t key_size;
6
                                                          36
    FILE *key_file = NULL;
 7
                                                          37
                                                               size_t v9; /* key_size */
8
                                                          38
                                                               FILE *stream; /* key_file */
a
    key_file = fopen(key_file_name, "rb");
                                                          39
                                                               v8[0] = 0;
10
    key_size = fread(key_data, 1,
                                                          40
11
                  sizeof(key_data), key_file);
                                                          41
                                                               v8[5] = 0;
12
                                                          42
13
    if (key_size == 0) {
                                                          43
                                                               stream = fopen64(a3, "rb");
14
      printf("Key file is empty.\n");
                                                          44
                                                               v9 = fread(ptr, 1, 40, stream);
15
       11
                                                          45
                                                               if (v9 == 0) {
          . . .
16
    }
                                                          46
                                                                 printf("Key file is empty.\n");
                                                          47
17
    // ...
                                                              sub_414976(v8, ptr, v9, a4);
18
    import_key(&attributes, key_data,
                                                          48
19
                                                          49
                                                               sub_411B94(ptr, 40);
                          key_size, master_key);
20
    post_process_key(key_data, sizeof(key_data));
                                                          50
                                                               // ...
21
                                                          51 }
    //
        . . .
22 }
```

(b) Decompiled code





(a) Source code

Figure 2: Distribution of name frequencies

fileStream for the variable stream. The suggested name is closer to IDA's output, not reflecting that the file stores the 'key'. The root cause is that the decompiled code of the whole function is out of distribution, and GPT could not understand the code and fail to generate a more meaningful name. In contrast, if we simply mask the variable name key_file in the original source and ask GPT-4 to re-generate it, the model can correctly predict the ground truth name, as the context of masked variable is in distribution.

To address the challenge, we fine-tune an open-source large language model Code-Llama-7b [48] with the variable renaming task. Fig. 3a shows an example of the prompt (shown in the blue box) and the expected response (shown in the green box). The prompt describes the task, provides the model with the decompiled code (shown in the grey box), and lists a sequence of variables to rename. The training loss is the loss for Causal Language Modeling [47]. It is worth noting that we calculate loss on both the prompt and the expected response. It guides the model to learn the syntax of the decompiled code. **Challenge2:** Analyzing functions individually cannot leverage information in both the caller and callee functions. We want to provide the model with information in calling contexts.

We show in Fig. 4 a caller function and two callee functions (in grey boxes) of our motivating example function. The variable names generated by GENNM are shown in yellow, green, and blue callout boxes. We can see that the names of

variables in the caller and callee functions provide meaningful contexts for variables in the analyzed function. For example, the variable a2 in the caller function at the top is predicted to have the name key file name. It may help the model realize the analyzed function is processing the file storing a key. Specifically, with only the code of the analyzed function, a generative model predicts file_name (not shown in the figure) for the variable a3 in sub 401639. We enrich the query to the model with the variable names collected from the caller and callee functions. The updated prompt is shown in Fig. 3b with the added names highlighted in the orange box. Provided names from the contexts, the model correctly updates the prediction for a3 to key_file_name. An alternative design is to include caller and callee code bodies into the query. However, we find it introduces substantially higher cost due to the entailed large number of tokens. In addition, it remains a research challenge training a language model to understand extensively long context [30, 36].

Challenge3: A generative model tends to generate diversified variable names and may have hallucinations. We need to validate generated names and select the most informative ones.

Generative models have inherent uncertainty as their outputs are by random sampling following the distributions of their training. To increase the probability of finding the optimal answer, it is a common practice that a user samples the top-N responses from the model [23]. For example, in Fig. 4, suppose that GENNM is predicting the name for the variable ptr in the analyzed function. The top-3 candidate names are shown in the yellow callout box. They are key_bytes, key_data, and pointer. We can see that all the three names have similar meanings, but the model predicts three different names in three generation rounds. In addition, it is well known that language models may have hallucinations [27,63], producing misleading names. Therefore, an approach to vali-

You are a helpful binary analysis expert.
Please help user understand decompiled
code by giving variables meaningful
names.
<pre>int64 sub_401639(int a1, int a2,</pre>
<pre>const char *a3, int *a4) { char ntr[48];</pre>
int64 v8[7];
<pre>FILE *stream;</pre>
Q:[a1, a2,]
Assistant: {a1:usage, a2:alg}

(a) Prompt to query and fine-tune the generative model

You are a helpful meaningful names.
<pre>int64 sub_401639(int a1, int a2,){ char ptr[48]; int64 v8[7]; FILE *stream; </pre>
Names in callers: [status,
key_file_name,]
Names in callees: [attributes,]
Q:[a1, a2,]
Assistant: {a1:usage, a2:alg}

(b) Prompt with names from calling con-

texts (highlighted in the orange box)

Candidate names key data key bytes pointer 0.2 key_buffer 0.6 0.4key buffer 0.6 0.2 0.4 key data 1.0 0.4 0.2 1.0 0.2 key_bytes 0.4 pointer 0.2 0.2 1.0 Relevant Semantics similarity

Semantics similar

(c) Name validation algorithm

names

Figure 3: Key components of GENNM



Figure 4: Calling contexts of the function sub_401639, and the names GENNM leverages to predict the name for ptr.

dating generating names and selecting the most appropriate ones is critical.

We propose a name validation algorithm that selects the best names from all the generated name candidates. Intuitively, the algorithm leverages program analysis to identify variables that are likely to have correlated names (e.g., through their data-flow). The correlated names are further used to detect inconsistencies (similar to type checking) and rank the candidate names. The most consistent name will be selected.

For example, we use the green callout boxes in Fig. 4 to show names that have correlations with the variable ptr. Take the parameter a2 in the callee function sub_414976 as an example. At line 48, the variable ptr is passed as the second argument corresponding to a2. Thus ptr and a2 should have

$\mathcal{B} \in \text{Binary} ::= \{ bid : id, funcs : list \mathcal{F}, cg: set \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} \}$
$\mathcal{F} \in \texttt{Function} \coloneqq \{ \textit{fid} : id, \textit{body} : str, \textit{ids} : set id \}$
$\mathcal{N} \in \texttt{NameMap} ::= id o id o str$
$\mathcal{D} \in \texttt{Dataset}, \mathcal{P} \in \texttt{Predictions} ::= \mathit{list} \left(\; \mathcal{B} imes \mathcal{N} \; ight)$

Figure 5: Definitions

similar meanings, and their names are likely to have correlation. Similarly, ptr and a1 in sub_411B94 are also likely to have correlation.

After collecting all correlated names with program analysis, GENNM leverages majority voting to decide which name candidate is better. The algorithm is illustrated in Fig. 3c. Each column indicates a candidate name, and each row indicates a relevant name. The relevant names include both the correlated names obtained by program analysis (the first two key_buffers) and the candidate names (the other three names). GENNM uses the generative model to obtain the semantics embeddings of all names, and calculate the cosine similarity between each relevant name and each candidate name. In this case, we can see that key_data is most similar to all the relevant names, and thus is selected by GENNM.

3 Problem Definition

To facilitate discussion, we formalize the problem as shown in Fig. 5. We use *id* to refer to the placeholder names synthesized by the decompiler, and use *name* to refer to meaningful names. A binary program consists of an id, a list of binary functions, and a call graph. The call graph is a set of edges from caller functions to callee functions. A decompiled function consists of an function id, the string of decompiled code, and a set of identifiers used in the function. A name map is associated with a binary program. It takes as input the id of a function, the id of a variable in this function, and returns a meaningful name for the variable. The (fine-tuning) dataset \mathcal{D} and the tool output \mathcal{P} have the type of a list of pairs. Each pair consists of a binary program and the corresponding name map. In \mathcal{D} , the

name map contains the groundtruth names, whereas the tool output contains the predicted names.

4 Method

We show the workflow of GENNM in Fig. 6. It consists of three pipelines: the data preprocessing pipeline (Fig. 6a), the training pipeline (Fig. 6b), and the inference pipeline (Fig. 6c). **Data Preprocessing.** The data preprocessing pipeline takes as input binary programs with debug information. It collects groundtruth variable names from the input binary programs, and associate them with data samples constructed by *fully* stripping the binary programs. The resulting data samples are partitioned to the training and test datasets.

Training. We show the training pipeline in Fig. 6b. It takes as input a pre-trained language model Code-Llama, and outputs a classification model and a generative model fine-tuned on the variable renaming task. The training pipeline has three steps. In the fine-tune step (marked as step 2), we use *causal* language modeling (CLM) loss to let the model learn the distribution (e.g., syntax) of decompiled functions, resulting a stem model. At step 3, we augment the training dataset with information from the calling contexts of functions. We let the stem model predict names given individual functions, and propagate the predictions following the call graphs of the binary programs. The model differentiation step (step 4) fine-tunes two models that can understand information from calling contexts. The first model is a generative model trained with the CLM loss. The second model is a classification model trained with both the CLM loss and the classification (CLS) loss.

Inference. The inference pipeline takes as input decompiled functions without debug information. It outputs decompiled code with placeholder names replaced by predicted names. The process is iterative, as depicted in step 5. For each iteration, GENNM uses the two models to make predictions. The models' output names are merged with the names obtained in the previous rounds, resulting a candidate name set for each variable. Then GENNM leverages a program-analysis-based name validation algorithm to remove contradictions and select the best name for each variable from the candidate set. The selected names are propagated by the same context propagation algorithm used at the data augmentation step (step 3). Then the input to the model is updated with context information.

In the following sections, we detail each step in Fig. 6.

4.1 Data Preprocessing

Decompiling and Groundtruth Acquisition. Following existing work [15, 32], the data preprocessing pipeline (Fig. 6a) takes as input binary programs with debug information. We use IDA [26] to decompile them and separate the results to individual decompiled functions with the groundtruth variable names. Then we *fully strip* the input binaries (by removing

both the debug information containing names for local variables, and the symbol tables containing names for functions and global variables). We then run the decompilation script on the fully stripped binary programs again. Although the two decompiled versions may have substantial differences, each variable is associated with its memory location in both versions. We therefore use the location to match variables across the two versions and acquire the groundtruth names for variables in the fully stripped versions. We partially reuse the data preprocessing scripts published by DIRTY's authors [15] and add support to fully-stripped binary programs.

Dataset Construction. Our dataset construction is inspired by DIRTY's method. We use GHCC to compile C/C++ projects on GitHub created in 2012-2022. Different from DIRTY, (1) we additionally filter out projects with less than 20 stars for the quality consideration. (2) We only include executable binary programs in our dataset, precluding intermediate relocatable binary files since the semantics of a relocatable file relies on its symbol table [56], which may be stripped away. The process yields 106k binary programs in total. We follow the string-based deduplication criterion proposed by VARBERT [44] to deduplicate the binary programs. The final dataset includes 11.7k binary binary programs and 940k functions. We split them to the training and the test datasets based on binary programs in 9:1, ensuring that all functions within a binary program are included in either the training set or the test set.

4.2 Finetuning

The finetuning process aims to adapt the pre-trained model to the distribution of decompiled code. Most code models are pretrained on source code, which is written by human developers. However, decompiled code is very low level, and most variables/functions do not have meaningful names, denoting a distribution different from the pre-train dataset. Thus we need to finetune the model to bridge the distribution gap.

We construct the training corpus as follows. For each binary function, the corresponding training sample consists of a query and an expected response. The query has the same format as the inputs to the model at the inference stage. It consists of a prompt briefly describing the task, the body of a decompiled function, and a list of variables to rename. The expected response is a map from variable ids to predicted names. Fig. 3a in the motivating example shows a concrete example.

We formally define the constructed finetune dataset D_{CLM} as follows:

$$D_{CLM} ::= \{ \{ query : (prompt, f.body, f.ids), \\ resp : n[f.fid] \} | (b,n) \in \mathcal{D} \land f \in b \},$$
(1)

where \mathcal{D} denotes the binary training dataset, and b and n a binary and its name map, respectively, as defined in Fig. 5.



Hence n[f.fid] denotes the list of groundtruth variable names for function f.

In the training process, GENNM tokenizes a data sample (noted as d) as follows: U = [tokenize(d.query); tokenize(d.resp)], where $[\cdot; \cdot]$ denotes list concatenation. Then the standard causal language modeling (CLM) loss is leveraged to optimize the weights of the model. Formally, the CLM loss is represented as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CLM}(U) = \sum_{i=1}^{\operatorname{len}(U)} \log P(u_i | u_{t < i}; \Theta),$$
(2)

where $P(u_i|u_{t < i}; \Theta)$ denotes the probability for the groundtruth token u_i output at the *i*-th position by a language model parameterized by Θ , given the previous groundtruth tokens $u_{t < i}$. It is worth noting that our finetuning stage calculates the CLM loss for both the query and the response. That is because a query contains the body of a decompiled function. Training on it can help the model understand the distribution of decompiled code.

4.3 Data Augmentation

The fine-tuned model can be further improved. In particular, the training corpus constructed by Equation 1 only contains a decompiled function in each data sample. However, a single function may not have enough information for the model to predict high-quality names. For example, the model may realize a function is initializing some data structures. But it may hardly deduce whether the function is initializing an image or creating a network package without names from its calling contexts.

To further improve model performance, GENNM thus leverages a context propagation algorithm to gather names following the call graphs of binary programs. Besides propagating context information at the inference stage, the algorithm is also leveraged at the training stage to augment the training data so that the fine-tuned model can be further improved to leverage information from calling contexts. We formally define the calling context propagation rules as follows:

$$CallerCtx(f) ::= \bigcup \left\{ n[clr.fid][vid] | (clr, f) \in b.cg \\ \wedge vid \in n[clr.fid] \right\}$$
(3)

$$CalleeCtx(f) ::= \bigcup \left\{ n[cle.fid][vid] | (f, cle) \in b.cg \\ \land vid \in n[cle.fid] \right\}$$
(4)

$$Ctx(f) ::= CallerCtx(f) \cup CalleeCtx(f)$$
(5)

where b and n are the binary program that the function f belongs to and the corresponding name map predicted by the fine-tuned model (not the ground truth name map).

Given a data sample containing a decompiled function f, Equation 3 depicts the rule to propagate names from its caller. Specifically, $(clr, f) \in b.cg$ describes the constraint that clris a caller of f; vid denotes any identifiers whose names are in clr's predicted name map. Similarly, Equation 4 depicts the rule to propagate names from the callee of f. Note that GENNM uses the names predicted by the model, instead of the groundtruth names, from the callers and callees. The rationale is that names predicted by the fine-tuned model are closer to those used in the inference stage where GENNM first predicts names based on individual functions and then propagates the predicted names to other functions. We show a concrete example on how GENNM augments a training data sample in AppendixA.1.

An alternative design is to include caller and callee code bodies into the query. However, we find this incurs a substantially higher cost due to the much larger number of tokens entailed and is unnecessary because the set of variable names in callers and callees provide sufficient contextual information (see our results in Section 5.2).

4.4 Model Differentiation

During inference, the generative model is able to generate more diversified names compared to a classification approach because it iteratively selects sub-tokens to compose variable names. On the other hand, the classification model makes more stable predictions when a data sample is close to the training distribution. That is because a classification model always selects from a pool of variable names (i.e., the training vocabulary). The model differentiation stage of GENNM aims to further fine-tune from the stem model (using the augmented dataset) for a classification model and a generative model, respectively. Therefore GENNM can benefit from the advantage of both models.

Generative Model. The training for the generative model simply follows the causal language modeling loss specified in Equation 2.

Classification Model. The stem model has the architecture of a Decoder-Only Transformer [10, 54] model. It consists of a sequence of Transformer blocks that generate one *embedding* for each output position. Then the embedding is forwarded

to a language modeling head that outputs the probabilistic distribution in the token space. The embedding is referred to as the *hidden state* of a position. We construct a classification model based on the stem model by appending a classification head to the hidden states. The classification head is essentially a linear layer that takes as input the hidden state of a position, and outputs the probability distribution in the space of class labels (i.e., variable names).

We only calculate the classification loss for positions corresponding to the beginning of variables. Formally, we define our loss as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CLS}(U) = \sum_{i=1}^{\operatorname{len}(U)} is_var(i) \, \log P_C(l_i | u_{t < i}; \Theta_C), \quad (6)$$

where $is_var(i)$ returns *true* if and only if *i* is corresponding to the beginning token of a variable name in the expected response. $P_C(l_i|u_{t < i}; \Theta_C)$ denotes the classification probability for the groundtruth class label l_i output by a classification model parameterized by Θ_C , given the previous groundtruth tokens $u_{t < i}$. Note that the parameters include those of the Transformer blocks and the classification head. We choose not to freeze the Transformer blocks' parameters and allow them to be updated for the classification task.

It is worth noting that the loss shown in Equation 6 only provides guidance to the model at relatively few positions in a training sample because the major part of a training sample is the decompiled code of the query function. The guidance may degrade the model's decoding quality. To prevent such degradation, we additionally leverage the CLM loss shown in Equation 2 to train the classification model. That is, $\mathcal{L}(U) =$ $\mathcal{L}_{CLS}(U) + \mathcal{L}_{CLM}(U)$, where $\mathcal{L}(U)$ denotes the training loss. Our ablation study in Section 5.6 shows that the model trained with both $\mathcal{L}_{CLS}(U)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{CLM}(U)$ achieves better performance than one trained with only $\mathcal{L}_{CLS}(U)$.

In Fig. 7, we show an example about how the training loss for the classification model is calculated. The trainable weights are marked with an icon representing for optimization. At the shown step, the Transformer blocks take as input all the tokens before key. The hidden state for the latest position, noted as h_i , is corresponding to key. It is forwarded to the language modeling head and the classification head, respectively. The language modeling head outputs a probability distribution in the token space while the classification head outputs a distribution in the variable name space. The CLM loss guides the language modeling head to predict the token key with a high probability, whereas the CLS loss guides the classification head to predict the name key_size with a high probability.

4.5 Iterative Inference

At the inference stage, we iteratively run GENNM because the input contexts to the models are updated based on the latest predictions. In each iteration, the newly generated names



Figure 7: Example of how the training loss of the classification model is calculated. It shows the step that the model is generating the hidden state for the output token corresponding to key. Since key is the beginning of the variable key_size, we calculate both the CLM and the CLS loss at this step.

Algorithm 1: Name Validation
Input: <i>B</i> : a binary program
Input: N ₀ : initial name map
Input: \hat{N} : $id \rightarrow id \rightarrow list str$, a map of name candidates
Output: N: name map
1 $update \leftarrow True$
2 $N_{current} \leftarrow N_0$
3 while update do
4 $N_{prev} \leftarrow N_{current}$
5 $\hat{N}' \leftarrow correlated_names(B, N_{current})$
6 $N_{current} \leftarrow semantics_vote(\hat{N}, \hat{N}')$
7 $\lfloor update \leftarrow N_{prev} \neq N_{current}$
8 return N _{current}

along with the names generated in the previous rounds are considered candidate names for the variable. To reduce the hallucination of the models, GENNM leverages a program analysis based method to aggregate the names predicted by different models under individual contexts. The insight is that names correlated through data flow ought to have a certain level of consistency (in terms of their natural language semantics), although they may not be identical. For example, a variable named fout may be passed as an argument to a parameter named stream, but is less likely to be assigned to a variable named size.

The name validation process in GENNM first extracts correlated name candidates for a variable and then selects the candidate with the maximum level of consistency. That is, our goal is to achieve a minimal total semantics distance for all correlated names. We formally define the name validation process in Algorithm 1. The algorithm takes as input a binary program, an initial name map from each variable to its initially selected names, and a map from each variable to a list of its candidate names. It outputs an updated name map from each variable to its (updated) name. At the beginning of the name validation process, the initial name map is constructed as a map from a variable to the top-1 predicted name of the generative model. The name validation algorithm consists of a loop. In each iteration, it collects additional names for each variable by inheriting names from other variables that have direct data flow with the variable (line 5 and details explained later), selects the best name of a variable by *semantics voting* (line 6), which will be explained later in the section, and updates the name map. The algorithm terminates when no variable is updated or until a predefined budget is reached.

Correlated Name Collection by Data-Flow. If a variable is directly copied to another variable, called *a direct use of the variable*, their names should be semantically consistent, analogous to type consistency. In this step, we propagate names across such direct uses to populate the candidate set and enable inconsistency suppression. Note that such propagation is not performed for composite operations. For example, the name of a right-hand-side variable involved in a binary operation may not be semantically consistent with the name of the left-hand-side variable.

To facilitate discussion, we transform the decompiled code of a function to a program in a simple language. The language definition is shown in Fig. 8. While most of the definitions are standard, we fold all expressions except the direct use of an identifier to a place holder *Other*. That is because GENNM only reasons about names between direct uses of identifiers.

We model the correlation extraction process as finding solutions to program constraints. The key constraint rules are shown in Fig. 9. The other rules are in Fig. 14 in the Appendix. The analysis takes as input a binary program and the corresponding name map. Its outputs are a correlated variable map π that maps from a variable (referred by a function id and a variable id) to a list of correlated names. For each variable, the auxiliary data structure σ maintains the origin of each correlated name to prevent duplication. Note that if an origin variable has many data-flow paths to another variable, its name may get propagated multiple times and have an in-appropriate weight in the later voting step. Specifically, an element in σ is a triple, noted as (*fid*, *vid*, *name*), where *fid* and *vid* refers to the origin variable of a correlated name *name*.

A rule $\frac{AB}{C}$ is interpreted as follow: when *A* and *B* are satisfied, *C* is satisfied. The notation $env \vdash Stmt : env'$ is interpreted as given an environment env, the environment env' satisfies the constraints introduced by Stmt. The two special rules **Init** and **Out** are evaluated only once at the beginning and ending of the analysis, respectively. **Init** initializes the correlated name set of a variable to its initially selected name. The rule **Out** converts the correlated name set to the correlated name list for all variables.

The rule **Assign** depicts the constraint introduced by an assignment statement from id_1 to id_0 . The rule requires all

 $\langle Func \rangle \mathcal{F} ::= \mathcal{S} \quad \langle Expr \rangle \mathcal{E} ::= id \mid Other$

 $\begin{array}{l} \langle Stmt \rangle \ \mathcal{S} \ ::= \mathcal{S}_1; \mathcal{S}_2 \ | \ \mathcal{E}_0 := \mathcal{E}_1 \ | \ id_1 := id_0(\mathcal{E}, ...) \\ | \ \mathbf{return} \ \mathcal{E} \ | \ \mathbf{while}(\mathcal{E}) \{ \mathcal{S} \} \ | \ \mathbf{if}(\mathcal{E}) \{ \mathcal{S}_1 \} \mathbf{else} \{ \mathcal{S}_2 \} \end{array}$

Figure 8: Syntax of simplified decompiled code

the correlated names of id_1 to be in the correlated name set of id_0 as well. Here, we assume the name of (the destination variable) id_0 to be more general than the name of (the source variable) id_1 . Therefore, the names correlated to id_1 should also have correlation with the name of id_0 . For example, assume an assignment statement ptr=msg. The name ptr is more general than the name msg. Thus a correlated name of msg (e.g., buffer) is likely to be a correlated name of ptr as well.

Moreover, as depicted by the rule **Assign-R**, we propagate the selected name of id_0 to id_1 because the denotation of id_0 and id_1 may be similar. However, we do not propagate the correlated names of id_0 to id_1 because not all the names correlated to id_0 are necessarily correlated to id_1 , assuming the name of id_0 denotes a broader range of semantics than the name of id_1 .

The intuition of rules **Call** and **Ret** are the same. A function call would have implicit assignments between the arguments and the parameters. And the function return would have an implicit assignment between the return value and the variable storing calling results in the caller function. The dual rules **Call-R** and **Ret-R** are in Fig. 14 in the Appendix for simplicity.

Semantics Voting. Semantics voting takes as input the candidate name map \hat{N} (produced by the model) and the correlated name map \hat{N}' . For each variable, it picks the candidate name that is most similar to all correlated names and other candidate names. It is hard to directly compare the semantics similarity of two strings. Therefore, our algorithm encodes all correlated names and all candidates names to their embeddings, and measures the similarity between two names by calculating the cosine similarity. Formally, the semantics voting process for a given variable is shown as follows:

$$Candi \coloneqq \hat{N}[fid][vid]; \quad Corr \coloneqq \hat{N}'[fid][vid]$$

$$\forall fid \ vid, \underset{n \in Candi}{\operatorname{argmax}} \sum_{\substack{n \in Corr; Candi]}} \langle \mathbf{e}_n, \mathbf{e}_m \rangle \qquad (7)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes cosine similarity between two embeddings and $[\cdot; \cdot]$ denotes list concatenation.

5 Evaluation

5.1 Experimental Setups

In-Train Functions. We discuss how we preprocess binary programs and construct dataset splits in Section 4.1. It is

worth noting that although the training and test datasets do not have overlapping binary programs, they may still have overlapping functions due to the existence of library functions or code clones. We follow the same criteria in existing work [7, 15, 32, 44] to identify the test functions whose function bodies are seen in the training dataset (in-train for short). To evaluate the performance of a model, existing work [15,32]separately reports test performance on functions present in the training dataset (in-train functions for short) and on functions that are not seen in the training dataset (not-in-train functions). The in-train functions are evaluated because they simulate the use scenario that a given binary program may use known libraries, whereas the performance on not-in-train functions measures the generalizability of a model. We follow the same criteria in existing work to identify the test functions whose function bodies are seen in the training dataset. However, because our binary programs are fully stripped, we cannot simply use the strings of function bodies to decide whether two functions are the same. Instead, we first rename all the symbols (including variable names and function names) with their groundtruth names, and then normalize all global variables (e.g., gword XXX and unk YYY) to GLOBAL ADDR. After that, we compare the two transformed strings to decide whether the two functions are the same. It is worth noting that we compare decompiled code instead of source code to align with the setups in existing work. Comparing the corresponding source code strings of two functions will ignore the differences introduced by marcos and conditional compilations that is resolved during the compilation.

Training. In the evaluation section, we train all models with the same data split. The hyper parameters used to train each model are listed in Appendix B.1.

Metrics. We use both exact string match and semantics match to measure the quality of generated variable names.

Exact Match. We use exact string match as a conservative metric, following previous work on variable name recovery [15]. That is, two variable names are considered the same if and only if they are exactly the same string.

Semantics Match. Exact string match may not fully reflect the capacity of a tool. As discussed in SymLM [29], a previous work focusing on recovering function names, even when two variables have the same meaning, the names specified by developers may vary due to many reasons, e.g., the usage of abbreviations and the concatenation of names. We thus adapt the same metrics used in SymLM to measure the quality of generated names. Intuitively, given a groundtruth name n and a predicted name \hat{n} , the metric tokenizes both names into sets of tokens, noted as W and \hat{W} . Then it uses set comparison to calculate precision and recall. Formally,

$$Precision(W, \hat{W}) = \frac{\left\| \{ \hat{w} | \hat{w} \in \hat{W} \land \exists w \in W, \hat{w} \simeq w \} \right\|}{\left\| \hat{W} \right\|}$$
(8)

$$Recall(W, \hat{W}) = \frac{\left\| \{ \hat{w} | \hat{w} \in \hat{W} \land \exists w \in W, \hat{w} \simeq w \} \right\|}{\left\| W \right\|}$$
(9)

 $\begin{array}{c}
 Input: B: \mathcal{B}, N_{in}: \mathcal{N} \quad Output: \pi: id \to id \to list str \\
 Auxiliary Data: \sigma: id \to id \to set (id \times id \times str) \quad State Configuration: \langle \pi, \sigma \rangle \\
 We use f to denote the function that the analyzed statement belongs to.
 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c}
 \underbrace{\sigma_{0}[fid][vid] = n \quad (fid, vid, n) \in N_{in}}_{\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \vdash: \langle \cdot, \sigma_{0} \rangle} \text{Init} \quad & \underbrace{\pi[fid][vid] = [n|(\cdot, \cdot, n) \in \sigma[fid][vid]] \quad (fid, vid) \in \sigma}_{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash Done: \langle \pi, \sigma \rangle} \text{Out} \\
 \underbrace{\sigma' = \sigma[f.fid, id_{0} \rightsquigarrow \sigma[f.fid][id_{0}] \cup \sigma[f.fid][id_{1}]]}_{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash id_{0} := id_{1}: \langle \cdot, \sigma' \rangle} \text{Assign} \quad & \underbrace{\pi[fid][vid] = [n|(\cdot, \cdot, n) \in \sigma[fid][vid]] \quad (f.fid, id_{0}, n_{1}) \in \sigma}_{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash Done: \langle \pi, \sigma \rangle} \text{Out} \\
 \underbrace{\sigma' = \sigma[f.fid, id_{0} \rightsquigarrow \sigma[f.fid][id_{0}] \cup \sigma[f.fid][id_{1}]]}_{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash id_{0} := id_{1}: \langle \cdot, \sigma' \rangle} \text{Assign} \quad & \underbrace{\sigma' = \sigma[f.fid, id_{1} \rightsquigarrow \sigma[f.fid][id_{1}] \cup \{(f.fid, id_{0}, n_{1})\}]}_{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash id_{0} := id_{1}: \langle \cdot, \sigma' \rangle} \text{Assign} \\
 \underbrace{\sigma' = \sigma[f_{1}.fid, p_{0} \rightsquigarrow \sigma[f_{1}.fid][p_{0}] \cup \sigma[f.fid][id_{0}]]}_{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash f_{1}.fid(\dots, id_{0}, \dots): \langle \cdot, \sigma' \rangle} \text{Call} \quad & \underbrace{\sigma' = \sigma[f_{1}.fid, id_{1} \rightsquigarrow \sigma[f_{1}.fid][id_{1}] \cup \sigma[f.fid][id_{0}]]}_{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash return id_{0}: \langle \cdot, \sigma' \rangle} \text{Ret} \\
 \end{array}$

Figure 9: Correlation Extraction Rules

]	Table 1:	Compa	ariso	on	with	base	elines	
					(~)		11/04/	

		Precision(%)	Recall(%)	Exact(%)
In-Train	DIRTY	71.2	71.1	69.8
	VARBERT	83.3	83.2	81.5
	GenNm	83.0	82.7	79.4
Not-In-Train	DIRTY	34.1	33.9	31.2
	VARBERT	48.1	47.5	43.1
	GenNm	57.9	57.2	49.0

In Equations 8 and 9, \simeq denotes whether two tokens have similar semantics. SymLM [29] built a semantics word cluster trained on CodeSearchNet [25] and derived rules to measure the semantics similarity between two tokens. We reuse their word cluster and adapt the rules to the problem of variable renaming. Specifically, a token \hat{w} is considered semantically equivalent to the groundtruth token w if either of the following rules is satisfied: (1) the word cluster indicates w and \hat{w} are synonyms (2) w starts with \hat{w} or \hat{w} starts with w, and both tokens are longer than 2 characters. Note that we additionally require both tokens have at least 2 tokens because developers commonly use one single character to name variables. It introduces undesirable coincidences without constraining name lengths (e.g., s coincides with both string and signal). For similar reasons, we do not include another rule in SymLM that leverages edit distance to measure token similarity. For the integrity of experiments, we also report the results of all tools in Table 3 of the appendix with the original metrics used in SymLM [29].

5.2 Comparison with Baseline

We compare GENNM to two state-of-the-art tools, DIRTY [15] and VARBERT [44]. To make a fair compar-

ison, we train all baseline models on our dataset. Note that VARBERT model requires pre-training on source code. Thus we reuse the pre-trained VARBERT model released by their authors. The results are shown in Table 1.

In-Train Functions. We can see that GENNM outperforms DIRTY on all metrics. On the other hand, GENNM achieves comparable performance with VARBERT in terms of precision and recall. It indicates that for the in-train functions, GENNM has similar capability with VARBERT to predict variable names that are semantically similar to the groundtruth names. However, it slightly under-performs VARBERT by 2.1% in terms of exact match. That is because GENNM may predict synonyms that are not exact matches to the original name, although the meanings of predicted names are close to the groundtruth.

Not-In-Train Functions.We can see that GENNM significantly outperforms DIRTY by 23.8%, 23.3%, and 17.8% in terms of precision, recall, and exact match. It outperforms VARBERT by 9.8%, 9.7%, and 5.9% in the three metrics. That indicates GENNM has better generalizability on functions that are not seen in the training dataset, which is a more challenging setup. In the comparison to both tools, the improvement of GENNM is more significant in terms of precision and recall. That is because GENNM may predict names with similar meanings to the groundtruth but are not exactly the same name. For example, GENNM may predict message_size for a variable with the groundtruth name msg_len.

To demonstrate how GENNM helps on the names that have a low occurrence frequency in the training dataset, we group the performance of all tools by the occurrence frequency of a variable's groundtruth name in the training dataset. We only show statistics for variables from the not-in-train functions since this is a more challenging setup and reflects the generalizability of models. The results are shown in Fig. 10. The x-axis denotes frequency of names, and the y-axis denotes the average precision of variables with at most the corresponding frequency. GENNM consistently outperforms DIRTY and VARBERT on variables with different groundtruth name frequencies. While all models perform better on names with higher frequencies, GENNM is more robust on names with very low frequencies. Especially, for names appears less than 10 times in the training dataset, GENNM achieves an average precision of around 0.4, while DIRTY and VARBERT achieves less than 0.1 and less than 0.3, respectively. It emphasizes the benefit of using a generative model in predicting rare names.

5.3 Comparison with Black Box LLMs

We compare GENNM to two popular black box large language models, ChatGPT-3.5 and ChatGPT-4. GENNM outperforms both LLMs by around 50%. We speculate that is because those LLMs are mostly trained on source code and natural language, and they may not effectively understand decompiled code. Details are in Appendix B.2.

5.4 Time Efficiency

The major time consumption of GENNM is on generating names with the generative and classification models. The median time cost for a function is 2.2 seconds for the generative model (in fp-16 precision) and 0.2 seconds for the classification model (in fp-16 precision). The name validation algorithm takes 9 minutes to process the whole test dataset consisting of 1170 binary programs. Details are in Appendix B.3.

5.5 Case Study

Unseen Names. In this section, we study the names generated by GENNM but are not seen in the training dataset. We show three cases in Fig. 11. In Fig. 11a, GENNM predicts the name fDiv for a variable used in floating point division. We speculate GENNM generates the name based on the mathematical operation in the program. DIRTY predicts unk since the name is not in the training dataset. VARBERT generates scale, which has a different meaning with the groundtruth name. In Fig. 11b, GENNM predicts fpurged for v15. We speculate that is because declaration of v15 at line 11 indicates v15 is a file, and the string at line 13 indicates the file is related to purged data. Both DIRTY and VARBERT predicts unk for this variable. In Fig. 11c, GENNM predicts cmp_key for the variable v42. We speculate that GENNM correlates the string at line 26 with the *if*-condition at line 24, indicating that the condition should be a comparison related to keys. Furthermore, GENNM may also figure out that v42 at line 23 is defined by the same expression as the condition at line 24. Thus it predicts the name cmp_key. Both DIRTY and VAR-BERT predicts unk for this variable. It is worth noting that

predicting names not in the training dataset is a unique benefit of GENNM compared to the baseline classification models. **Low Precision Names.** We also study cases where GENNM predicts names with low precision (in Appendix B.5).

5.6 Ablation study

We conduct comprehensive ablation studies to demonstrate how each component in GENNM contributes to the final results. Details are in Appendix B.4.

6 Security Applications

Malware Reverse Engineering. We use a real-world malware sample [37] to illustrate how GENNM helps a security analyst reverse engineer a malware sample. Fig. 12 shows a code snippets from the studied real-world malware sample. It connects to a command-and-control (C&C) server, parses the command and dispatches the commands from the server. In Fig. 12a we show the decompiled code generated by IDA [26]. In Fig. 12b we show the corresponding code with variables renamed by GENNM. At lines 1–2, the malware receives commands from the server. Lines 3–15 parse the commands, and lines 17–24 dispatch and execute the commands.

We can see that the names predicted by GENNM makes the code snippets easier to understand. For example, i defined at line 3 is renamed to tok. It indicates that the variable stores a *token* of the command. At line 14, the variable v57 is renamed to i_len_1. It indicates that the variable stores the length of a sub-component of the variable i (now renamed to tok). Therefore, it is easier to understand that lines 4–14 split a command to two parts and store them in dest and tok, respectively (line 15).

More importantly, GENNM renames j at line 17 and v73 at line 18 to cmd_ptr and matched_cmd, respectively. It reflects that lines 17–24 are dispatching and executing commands from the server. This would reveal the suspicious intention of this code snippet.

Binary Summarization. We further study how GENNM helps the binary summarization task. We use GENNM to recover names in a decompiled function. Then we feed the function to ChatGPT and ask ChatGPT to summarize the decompiled function. The study shows that with the predicted variable names, ChatGPT captures more accurate information from the decompiled code. Details are in Appendix C.1.

7 Related Work

Recovering Symbol Names in Decompiled Code. There are existing efforts on reconstructing variable names in stripped binary programs [7, 15, 32, 44] leveraging the abstract syntax tree (AST) of programs [32], type information [15] recovered from decompiled code, and pre-training knowledge from



by the frequency of groundtruth names in the training dataset.

Figure 11: Names generated by GENNM but are not seen in the training dataset. Orange boxes denote variables to rename. Green boxes denote variables with their groundtruth names. Names in green boxes are not in the input to GENNM and are added for readability.

```
1
     v48 = recv(fd, v76, 0x1000, 0);
                                                                1
                                                                  nbytes = recv(fd, buf, 0x1000, 0);
     v76[v48] = 0;
                                                                  buf[nbytes] = 0;
2
                                                                2
                                                                  for (tok = strtok(buf, "\n");
     for (i = strtok(v76, "\n");
                                                                3
3
                                                                     tok && *tok; tok = strtok(0, "\n")) {
       i && *i; i = strtok(0, "\n")) {
                                                                    //...`lastidx`:the last non-empty char in `tok`
      //...`v52`:the last non-empty char in `i`
      if (*i == ':') {
                                                                    if (*tok == ':') {
4
                                                                4
5
                                                                5
                                                                    p1 = tok;
      v53 = i:
       // parse the first part of the command
                                                                     // parse the first part of the command
6
       while (1) {
                                                                6
                                                                    while (1) {
        v54 = v53 - i;
                                                                      i len 0 = p1 - tok:
7
                                                                7
                                                                     if (lastidx <= p1 - tok)break;</pre>
8
        if (v52 <= v53 - i) break;
                                                                8
                                                                      c = *p1; lastchar_0 = p1++;
                                                                9
9
        v55 = *v53; v56 = v53++;
        if (v55 == 32) goto LABEL_98;
                                                               10
                                                                      if (c == 32) goto LABEL_98;
10
                                                                   }
11
       }
                                                               11
12
       v56 = v53:
                                                               12
                                                                    lastchar_0 = p1;
13
   LABEL_98:
                                                               13 LABEL_98:
                                                                   *lastchar_0 = 0; i_len_1 = i_len_0;
// stores the first part to `dest`
14
       *v56 = 0; v57 = v54;
                                                               14
       // stores the first part to `dest`
                                                                    strcpy(&dest,tok+1);strcpy(tok,&tok[i_len_1 + 1]);
       strcpy(&dest, i + 1); strcpy(i, &i[v57 + 1]);
15
                                                               15
                                                               16
                                                                  }
16
      }
     // find and execute the related command
                                                                   // find and execute the related command
17
     for (j = (const char **)&unk_60A500;
                                                               17
                                                                   for (cmd_ptr = (const char **)&unk_60A500;
          *j; j = v66 + 2) {
                                                                          *cmd_ptr; cmd_ptr = cmd_tmp + 2) {
18
      v73 = j;
                                                               18
                                                                    matched_cmd = cmd_ptr;
      v65 = strcasecmp(*j, &s2);
                                                               19
                                                                    cmp = strcasecmp(*cmd_ptr, &cmd);
19
20
                                                               20
                                                                    cmd_tmp = matched_cmd;
      v66 = v73:
                                                                    if (!cmp) {
      if (!v65) {
                                                               21
21
                                                                     22
       ((void(*)(int64, char *, char *))v73[1])
                                                               22
23
                                 (fd. &dest. i):
                                                               23
   }}}
                                                               24 }}
24
```

(a) Decompiled code output by IDA

(b) Renamed code (generated names highlighted in orange)

Figure 12: How GENNM helps security analyst understand a malware sample

source code [44]. State-of-the-art techniques [15, 44] formulate the problem as a classification task, whereas GENNM formulates it as a generative task. It can predicts names that rarely appear in the training dataset. There are recent work [58] leveraging ChatGPT [40] in this task. However, ChatGPT is majorly trained on source code and natural language corpus [10, 42, 43], and may not understand decompiled code effectively [28]. Besides recovering variable names, another stream of work focuses on recovering function names in decompiled code [29, 31]. Their efforts are complementary with us.

Reverse Engineering. Existing efforts reverse engineer binary programs to analyze malware [5, 53, 59], harden programs [19] and facilitate fuzzing [16, 20, 49]. Their efforts are complementary with us, and the results of GENNM can benefit the reverse engineering tasks, as shown in Section 6.

Foundational Binary Program Analysis. GENNM leverages existing foundational techniques to analyze binary programs, such as disassembly [2,9,39,46,62], function boundary identification [3], type recovery [33,35,45,51,52,64], and decompilation [8,11,61]. State-of-the-art techniques achieve good performance in most cases [2,8,46].

8 Conclusion

We propose a novel technique that leverages the strengths of generative models to recover meaningful variable names from the decompiled code of fully stripped binary programs. We employ a dual-model approach and use program analysis to suppress hallucinations. Our prototype GENNM demonstrates improvements on SOTA in challenging setups.

References

- Ali Al-Kaswan, Toufique Ahmed, Maliheh Izadi, Anand Ashok Sawant, Premkumar Devanbu, and Arie van Deursen. Extending source code pre-trained language models to summarise decompiled binarie. In 2023 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER), pages 260–271. IEEE, 2023.
- [2] Anil Altinay, Joseph Nash, Taddeus Kroes, Prabhu Rajasekaran, Dixin Zhou, Adrian Dabrowski, David Gens, Yeoul Na, Stijn Volckaert, Cristiano Giuffrida, et al. Binrec: dynamic binary lifting and recompilation. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pages 1–16, 2020.
- [3] Jim Alves-Foss and Jia Song. Function boundary detection in stripped binaries. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, pages 84–96, 2019.
- [4] Ioannis Angelakopoulos, Gianluca Stringhini, and Manuel Egele. FirmSolo: Enabling dynamic analysis of binary linux-based IoT kernel modules. In 32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23), pages 5021–5038, Anaheim, CA, August 2023. USENIX Association.
- [5] Simone Aonzo, Yufei Han, Alessandro Mantovani, and Davide Balzarotti. Humans vs. machines in malware classification. In *Proceedings of the 32nd USENIX Conference on Security Symposium*, SEC '23, USA, 2023. USENIX Association.
- [6] Learn the architecture aarch64 instruction set architecture. https://developer.arm.com/ documentation/102374/latest/, 2022.
- [7] Pratyay Banerjee, Kuntal Kumar Pal, Fish Wang, and Chitta Baral. Variable name recovery in decompiled binary code using constrained masked language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.12801*, 2021.
- [8] Zion Leonahenahe Basque, Ati Priya Bajaj, Wil Gibbs, Jude O'Kain, Derron Miao, Tiffany Bao, Adam Doupé, Yan Shoshitaishvili, and Ruoyu Wang. Ahoy sailr! there is no need to dream of c: A compiler-aware structuring algorithm for binary decompilation.
- [9] Erick Bauman, Zhiqiang Lin, Kevin W Hamlen, et al. Superset disassembly: Statically rewriting x86 binaries without heuristics. In NDSS, 2018.
- [10] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda

Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.

- [11] David Brumley, JongHyup Lee, Edward J Schwartz, and Maverick Woo. Native x86 decompilation using semantics-preserving structural analysis and iterative control-flow structuring. In 22nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 13), pages 353–368, 2013.
- [12] Martim Carbone, Weidong Cui, Long Lu, Wenke Lee, Marcus Peinado, and Xuxian Jiang. Mapping kernel objects to enable systematic integrity checking. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*, pages 555–565, 2009.
- [13] Nicholas Carlini, Antonio Barresi, Mathias Payer, David Wagner, and Thomas R. Gross. Control-Flow bending: On the effectiveness of Control-Flow integrity. In 24th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 15), pages 161–176, Washington, D.C., August 2015. USENIX Association.
- [14] 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. Evaluating large language models trained on code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374, 2021.
- [15] Qibin Chen, Jeremy Lacomis, Edward J Schwartz, Claire Le Goues, Graham Neubig, and Bogdan Vasilescu. Augmenting decompiler output with learned variable names and types. In 31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22), pages 4327–4343, 2022.
- [16] Jaeseung Choi, Kangsu Kim, Daejin Lee, and Sang Kil Cha. Ntfuzz: Enabling type-aware kernel fuzzing on windows with static binary analysis. In 2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), pages 677– 693, 2021.
- [17] Robert B Cialdini and Noah J Goldstein. Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 55:591–621, 2004.
- [18] Pamela M Cole, Margaret K Michel, and Laureen O'Donnell Teti. The development of emotion regulation and dysregulation: A clinical perspective. *Monographs of the society for research in child development*, pages 73–100, 1994.

- [19] Gregory J. Duck, Yuntong Zhang, and Roland H. C. Yap. Hardening binaries against more memory errors. In Proceedings of the Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems, EuroSys '22, page 117–131, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [20] Andrea Fioraldi, Daniele Cono D'Elia, and Emilio Coppa. Weizz: Automatic grey-box fuzzing for structured binary formats. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGSOFT international symposium on software testing and analysis*, pages 1–13, 2020.
- [21] Eric Gustafson, Paul Grosen, Nilo Redini, Saagar Jha, Andrea Continella, Ruoyu Wang, Kevin Fu, Sara Rampazzi, Christopher Kruegel, and Giovanni Vigna. Shimware: Toward practical security retrofitting for monolithic firmware images. In *Proceedings of the* 26th International Symposium on Research in Attacks, Intrusions and Defenses, pages 32–45, 2023.
- [22] Haibo He and Edwardo A Garcia. Learning from imbalanced data. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 21(9):1263–1284, 2009.
- [23] Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. The curious case of neural text degeneration. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [24] Chen Huang, Yining Li, Chen Change Loy, and Xiaoou Tang. Learning deep representation for imbalanced classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference* on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 5375– 5384, 2016.
- [25] Hamel Husain, Ho-Hsiang Wu, Tiferet Gazit, Miltiadis Allamanis, and Marc Brockschmidt. CodeSearchNet challenge: Evaluating the state of semantic code search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09436*, 2019.
- [26] A powerful disassembler and a versatile debugger. https://hex-rays.com/ida-pro/, 2023.
- [27] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. ACM Computing Surveys, 55(12):1– 38, 2023.
- [28] Xin Jin, Jonathan Larson, Weiwei Yang, and Zhiqiang Lin. Binary code summarization: Benchmarking chatgpt/gpt-4 and other large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.09601, 2023.
- [29] Xin Jin, Kexin Pei, Jun Yeon Won, and Zhiqiang Lin. Symlm: Predicting function names in stripped binaries via context-sensitive execution-aware code embeddings.

In Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, pages 1631–1645, 2022.

- [30] Jean Kaddour, Joshua Harris, Maximilian Mozes, Herbie Bradley, Roberta Raileanu, and Robert McHardy. Challenges and applications of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10169*, 2023.
- [31] Hyunjin Kim, Jinyeong Bak, Kyunghyun Cho, and Hyungjoon Koo. A transformer-based function symbol name inference model from an assembly language for binary reversing. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 951–965, 2023.
- [32] Jeremy Lacomis, Pengcheng Yin, Edward Schwartz, Miltiadis Allamanis, Claire Le Goues, Graham Neubig, and Bogdan Vasilescu. Dire: A neural approach to decompiled identifier naming. In 2019 34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE), pages 628–639. IEEE, 2019.
- [33] JongHyup Lee, Thanassis Avgerinos, and David Brumley. Tie: Principled reverse engineering of types in binary programs. 2011.
- [34] Yao Li, Weiyang Xu, Yong Tang, Xianya Mi, and Baosheng Wang. Semhunt: Identifying vulnerability type with double validation in binary code. In SEKE, pages 491–494, 2017.
- [35] Zhiqiang Lin, Xiangyu Zhang, and Dongyan Xu. Automatic reverse engineering of data structures from binary execution. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual Information Security Symposium*, CERIAS '10, West Lafayette, IN, 2010. CERIAS - Purdue University.
- [36] Nelson F Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03172, 2023.
- [37] Virustotal. https://www.virustotal.com/gui/ file/03cfe768a8b4ffbe0bb0fdef986389dc, 2024.
- [38] Jean-Phillipe Martin, Michael Hicks, Manuel Costa, Periklis Akritidis, and Miguel Castro. Dynamically checking ownership policies in concurrent c/c++ programs. ACM Sigplan Notices, 45(1):457–470, 2010.
- [39] Kenneth Miller, Yonghwi Kwon, Yi Sun, Zhuo Zhang, Xiangyu Zhang, and Zhiqiang Lin. Probabilistic disassembly. In 2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE), pages 1187–1198. IEEE, 2019.
- [40] OpenAI. Chatgpt, 2023.

- [41] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- [42] OpenAI. Introducing chatgpt, 2023.
- [43] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 27730–27744. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.
- [44] Kuntal Kumar Pal, Ati Priya Bajaj, Pratyay Banerjee, Audrey Dutcher, Mutsumi Nakamura, Zion Leonahenahe Basque, Himanshu Gupta, Saurabh Arjun Sawant, Ujjwala Anantheswaran, Yan Shoshitaishvili, et al. "len or index or count, anything but v1": Predicting variable names in decompilation output with transfer learning. In 2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), pages 152–152. IEEE Computer Society, 2024.
- [45] Kexin Pei, Jonas Guan, Matthew Broughton, Zhongtian Chen, Songchen Yao, David Williams-King, Vikas Ummadisetty, Junfeng Yang, Baishakhi Ray, and Suman Jana. Stateformer: Fine-grained type recovery from binaries using generative state modeling. In Proceedings of the 29th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, pages 690–702, 2021.
- [46] Kexin Pei, Jonas Guan, David Williams-King, Junfeng Yang, and Suman Jana. Xda: Accurate, robust disassembly with transfer learning.
- [47] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
- [48] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950, 2023.
- [49] Tobias Scharnowski, Nils Bars, Moritz Schloegel, Eric Gustafson, Marius Muench, Giovanni Vigna, Christopher Kruegel, Thorsten Holz, and Ali Abbasi. Fuzzware: Using precise mmio modeling for effective firmware fuzzing. In 31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22), pages 1239–1256, 2022.

- [50] Edward J Schwartz, Cory F Cohen, Michael Duggan, Jeffrey Gennari, Jeffrey S Havrilla, and Charles Hines. Using logic programming to recover c++ classes and methods from compiled executables. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 426–441, 2018.
- [51] Yan Shoshitaishvili, Ruoyu Wang, Christopher Salls, Nick Stephens, Mario Polino, Audrey Dutcher, John Grosen, Siji Feng, Christophe Hauser, Christopher Kruegel, and Giovanni Vigna. SoK: (State of) The Art of War: Offensive Techniques in Binary Analysis. In IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, 2016.
- [52] Asia Slowinska, Traian Stancescu, and Herbert Bos. Howard: A dynamic excavator for reverse engineering data structures. In *NDSS*, 2011.
- [53] Chad Spensky, Hongyi Hu, and Kevin Leach. LO-PHI: Low-Observable Physical Host Instrumentation for Malware Analysis. February 2016.
- [54] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023.
- [55] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. Advances in neural information processing systems, 30, 2017.
- [56] Yuting Wang, Xiangzhe Xu, Pierre Wilke, and Zhong Shao. Compcertelf: verified separate compilation of c programs into elf object files. 4(OOPSLA), nov 2020.
- [57] Haohuang Wen and Zhiqiang Lin. Egg hunt in tesla infotainment: A first look at reverse engineering of qt binaries. In 32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX

Security 23), pages 3997–4014, Anaheim, CA, August 2023. USENIX Association.

- [58] Xiangzhe Xu, Zhuo Zhang, Shiwei Feng, Yapeng Ye, Zian Su, Nan Jiang, Siyuan Cheng, Lin Tan, and Xiangyu Zhang. Lmpa: Improving decompilation by synergy of large language model and program analysis, 2023.
- [59] Zhaoyan Xu, Antonio Nappa, Robert Baykov, Guangliang Yang, Juan Caballero, and Guofei Gu. Autoprobe: Towards automatic active malicious server probing using dynamic binary analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2014* ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, pages 179–190, 2014.
- [60] Zhengzi Xu, Bihuan Chen, Mahinthan Chandramohan, Yang Liu, and Fu Song. Spain: security patch analysis for binaries towards understanding the pain and pills. In 2017 IEEE/ACM 39th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE), pages 462–472. IEEE, 2017.
- [61] Khaled Yakdan, Sebastian Eschweiler, Elmar Gerhards-Padilla, and Matthew Smith. No more gotos: Decompilation using pattern-independent control-flow structuring and semantic-preserving transformations. In NDSS. Citeseer, 2015.
- [62] Yapeng Ye, Zhuo Zhang, Qingkai Shi, Yousra Aafer, and Xiangyu Zhang. D-arm: Disassembling arm binaries by lightweight superset instruction interpretation and graph modeling. In 2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), pages 2391–2408. IEEE, 2023.
- [63] Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, et al. Siren's song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01219, 2023.
- [64] Zhuo Zhang, Yapeng Ye, Wei You, Guanhong Tao, Wenchuan Lee, Yonghwi Kwon, Yousra Aafer, and Xiangyu Zhang. Osprey: Recovery of variable and data structure via probabilistic analysis for stripped binary. In 2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP), pages 813–832, 2021.

Appendix

A Method

A.1 Example of How GENNM Augments a Data Sample

Fig. 13 shows a concrete example on how GENNM augments a training data sample (Fig. 13a) with the information from the calling contexts. Assume the analyzed function is foo. We show two caller functions bar1() and bar2() in Fig. 13c and 13d. We show a callee function gee() in Fig. 13e. Fig. 13b shows the information gathered from the calling contexts. For example, under the context of bar1, the model predicts two names err_msg and err_location. Under the context of bar2, the model predicts another two names fd and buf. GENNM adds all the four names to the *CallerCtx*, as depicted at the first two rows of Fig. 13b. Similarly, GENNM adds the name fp predicted in the callee function gee() to the *CalleeCtx*, as shown at the last row of Fig. 13b.



Figure 13: How GENNM augments a training data sample with names from calling contexts. Orange boxes denote names predicted by the model and the propagated contexts.

B Evaluation

B.1 Hyper-Parameters

We train DIRTY and VARBERT with the hyper parameters specified in their paper and the default values in the code shared by their authors. For our model, the hyper-parameters are listed in Table 2. In the evaluation, we tune both DIRTY and VARBERT for 15 epochs. We tune our stem model for 4 epochs, and tune the classification model and generative model for 3 epochs, respectively. In total, our models are trained for 10 epochs.

Table 2: Hyper-parameters in GENNM

Model	Parameter	Value
	batch size	128
Stam Madal	learning rate scheduler	linear
Stem Wodel	learning rate	5e-5
	warmup steps	2000
CLS Model	batch size	128
	learning rate scheduler	cosine
CLS Model	learning rate	5e-5
CLS WIDdel	learning rate warmup steps	5e-5 1000
	learning rate warmup steps batch size	5e-5 1000 128
CEN Model	learning rate warmup steps batch size learning rate scheduler	5e-5 1000 128 cosine
GEN Model	learning rate warmup steps batch size learning rate scheduler learning rate	5e-5 1000 128 cosine 5e-5
GEN Model	learning rate warmup steps batch size learning rate scheduler learning rate warmup steps	5e-5 1000 128 cosine 5e-5 1000

Table 3: Performance of all techniques in terms of the original metrics used by SymLM. We can see that the statistics for all techniques are slightly higher than the metrics used in Section 5.2, indicating that our metrics are more strict. On the other hand, the relative relation between techniques are preserved.

		Precision-Ori(%)	Recall-Ori(%)
In-Train	DIRTY	72.0	71.8
	VARBERT	84.1	84.0
	GenNm	84.0	83.6
Not-In-Train	DIRTY	36.0	35.4
	VARBERT	51.5	50.7
	GenNm	60.2	59.3

Table 4: Comparison with black box large language models.

	Precision(%)	Recall(%)	Exact(%)
ChatGPT-3.5 (0-shot)	6.0	9.0	0.4
ChatGPT-3.5 (3-shot)	11.8	12.7	4.1
ChatGPT-4 (0-shot)	14.0	21.3	0.7
ChatGPT-4 (3-shot)	20.1	25.4	4.1
GENNM (Overall)	72.9	72.2	62.9
GENNM (In-Train)	75.0	75.2	70.8
GENNM (Not-In-Train)	72.7	71.9	62.0

B.2 Prompt input to ChatGPT

In this section, we compare GENNM to two popular black box large language models, ChatGPT and GPT-4. Due to budget limitation, we randomly sample 1k binary functions (with 6k variable names) from our test dataset. For each model, we start a query with a prompt describing the task and output format, as follows:

$$f_{1} \in B.funcs \quad id_{0} \text{ is the ith arg} \quad p_{0} \text{ is the ith param of } f_{1}$$

$$\underline{n_{1} = N_{in}[f_{1}.fid][p_{0}]} \quad \sigma' = \sigma[f.fid,id_{0} \rightsquigarrow \{(f_{1}.fid,p_{0},n_{1})\} \cup \sigma[f.fid][id_{0}]]}{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash f_{1}.fid(\dots,id_{0},\dots) : \langle \cdot, \sigma' \rangle} \text{Call-R}$$

$$\frac{f_{1} \in B.funcs \quad id_{1} \coloneqq f.fid(\dots) \in f_{1}.body}{f_{1} \in B.funcs \quad id_{1} \coloneqq f.fid(\dots) \in f_{1}.body} \text{A} = N_{in}[f_{1}.fid][id_{1}] \quad \sigma' = \sigma[f.fid,id_{0} \rightsquigarrow \sigma[f.fid][id_{0}] \cup \{(f_{1}.fid,id_{1},n_{1})\}]}{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash return id_{0} : \langle \cdot, \sigma' \rangle} \text{Ret-R}$$

$$\frac{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash S_{1} : \langle \cdot, \sigma_{1} \rangle \quad \langle \cdot, \sigma_{1} \rangle \vdash S_{2} : \langle \cdot, \sigma_{2} \rangle}{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash S_{1}; S_{2} : \langle \cdot, \sigma_{2} \rangle} \text{Step} \quad \frac{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash S : \langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle}{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash while(\mathcal{E})\{S\} : \langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle} \text{While}$$

$$\frac{\cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash S_{1} : \langle \cdot, \sigma_{1} \rangle \quad \langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash (fid, vid) \in \sigma_{1} \lor (fid, vid) \in \sigma_{2})}{\sigma_{3}[fid][vid] = \sigma_{1}[fid][vid] \cup \sigma_{2}[fid][vid]}} \text{If} \quad \frac{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash Other Stmts : \langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle}{\langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle \vdash Other Stmts : \langle \cdot, \sigma \rangle} \text{Default}$$

Figure 14: Other Correlation Extraction Rules

Prompt: You are a helpful binary program expert. You are helping the user to understand the binary program below. You will suggest meaningful names for the variables and functions the user asks about. The asked identifiers are specified in the format of Q:[var1,var2,...] You will suggest one name for each asked identifier. You must output the suggested names in the json format: {"var1": "suggested_name1", "var2": "suggested_name2", ...}

We evaluate each model with both 0-shot and 3-shot settings. In a 0-shot experiment, we simply follow the prompt with a decompiled function to query. In a 3-shot experiment, we gives each model 3 "examples" before each query. In each query, we randomly sample 3 decompiled functions from the training dataset. Then we input both the sampled decompiled functions and the expected output of these functions. After that, we send to the model the query function.

The results are shown in Table 4. We can see that although few-shot learning improves the performance of both black-box models, their performance significantly lower than GENNM. We speculate that is because those models are mostly trained on source code and natural language texts. They rely on symbol information to reason about code snippets. The decompiled functions, on the other hand, has limited symbol information. Thus they have sub-optimal performance.

B.3 Time Efficiency

We run each model in both the *float-32* precision and the *float-16* precision, and record the time cost. The median time consumption for the generative model to process all variables in a function is 3.9 seconds (float-32) and 2.2 seconds



Figure 15: Time efficiency of GENNM. Gen and Cls denotes the generative and classification model, respectively. The number 32 denotes models with the float-32 precision and 16 denotes models with the float-16 precision. Orange lines indicate the median number for each distribution.

(float-16). The median time for the classification model is 1.3 seconds (float-32) and 0.2 seconds (float-16). We show the detailed distribution of time consumption in Fig. 15. The name validation algorithm in GENNM takes 9 minutes to process the whole test dataset consisting of 1170 binary programs.

B.4 Ablation Study

We change individual components in GENNM to see how each component contributes to the final results. In this section, we conduct all experiments with a randomly sampled test subset consisting of 6.4k binary functions and 23k names.

Iterative Process. Fig. 16 shows that the performance of GENNM improves over the iterations at the inference stage. For each iteration, we calculate the performance of GENNM after the name validation process. We can see that the improvement is most significant in the first two iterations. It demonstrates that the iterative process converges quickly. Empirically, we run GENNM for only 1 rounds in the other parts of the evaluation.

Name Validation. Fig. 17 shows that the name validation process is more effective than a naive name combination strategy. We develop a naive name combination strategy that prioritizes the predictions from the classification model, and only takes the prediction of the generative model when the classification model predicts unk for a variable. We show the performance of both algorithms in four iterations. The results demonstrate that the name combination process consistently outperforms a naive combination strategy.

Combining the Generative Model and the Classification Model. Table 5 shows that GENNM achieves better performance than only using the generative model or only using the classification model in it. For both GENNM and the compared models, we report the corresponding results obtained at the fourth iteration. The results demonstrates that GENNM benefits from the advantages of both models.

Data Augmentation. Fig. 18 shows that the data augmentation with model's predictions are more effective than that with the groundtruth names. In this experiment, we train another model with the dataset augmented by the groundtruth names. For both models, we show the statistics of all the variables whose predictions have the *different* precision before and after one round of context propagation. The x-axis denotes the precision difference, and the y-axis denotes the number of variables with the corresponding difference. We can see that the model augmented by model's predictions tends to be more conservative when considering context information. It appears to make fewer modifications to the previous predictions compared to the model augmented with groundtruth names. This suggests that the model might learn to tolerate some noisy information and preserve the previous predictions. Moreover, we can see that it prevents more negative changes to variables without significantly sacrificing positive changes.

CLM Loss on Queries. Fig. 19 shows that training a stem model with CLM loss on both the queries and the expected responses is more effective than only calculating CLM loss on the expected responses. The two models shown in Fig. 19 are both fine-tuned from Code-Llama-7B [48] with the same dataset and to the same steps. We can see that the model trained with CLM loss on both the query and the responses significantly outperforms the other one. That suggests the CLM loss on the queries helps the model better understand the distribution of decompiled code.

CLM Loss for the Classification Model. Fig. 20 shows that calculating both the CLM loss and the classification loss (CLS loss) is more effective when training the classification model. The two models shown in Fig. 20 are trained with the same dataset and to the same steps. We can see that the model trained with both the CLM loss and the CLS loss has better performance, illustrating that the additional CLM loss renders the training of the classification model more effective.



Figure 16: How performance improves over iterations.



Figure 17: How name validation is better than a naive combination algorithm.

Table 5: How GENNM is better than using only a generative model (GEN) or a classification model (CLS).

		Precision	Recall	Exact
	GEN	82.2	82.1	78.2
In-Train	CLS	78.1	77.8	75.3
	GenNm	83.9	83.6	80.0
Not In Train	GEN	59.8	59.3	50.3
not-m-main	CLS	49.5	48.4	44.4
	GenNm	62.0	61.3	52.5

B.5 Case Study: Names with Low Precision

We study two cases that GENNM achieves a precision of 0. They are presented in Fig. 21. The code snippet in Fig. 21a randomly initializes an array (lines 1–2) and iteratively writes the array to a file fd (lines 3–6) with a chunk size of 1 Megabyte (i.e., 0x1000000 bytes indicated at lines 4 and 5). GENNM predicts total_mib for the variable a2 at line 3, while the groundtruth name is megabytes. Although the metric indicates a precision of 0 for the predicted name, we can see that the predicted name has the same semantics with the groundtruth name. We leave as future work to develop a metric that can capture semantics similarity more accurately.

The code snippet in Fig. 21b decodes an ARM instruction [6] stored at address. An ARM instruction can have a length of either 16 bits or 32 bits. At line 21, the code reads the first 16 bits (in variable v13) from the address of this instruction. It determines the length of the instruction at lines 22–23.



Figure 18: Data augmentation with model's predictions is more effective



Figure 19: Calculating CLM loss on query renders the training more effective.



Figure 20: CLM loss helps training the classification model.

```
1 for (i = 0; i <= (int)0xFFFFFF; ++i)
   dword_4111A0[i] = random();
 3
   for (i = 0; i < a1; i += 16)</pre>
    11
       . . .
 4
   bytes = write(fd, dword_4111A0,
               (size_t)0x1000000);
 5
   base
            0×1000000;
         +=
 6
  }
Groundtruth: megabytes, GenNm: total_mib
                       (a) Case 1
21 v13 = target_read_u16(address & 0xFFFFFFE);
  v3 = v13 & 0×F800;
22
  if (v3 != 0xF800 &&
23
                        ...){
    // ... decode 16-bit insturctions
24
  }else{
    // read the next 2 bytes
25
    opcode = target_read_u16(address+2) | (v13 << 16);</pre>
           decode 32-bit instructions
26
   }
Groundtruth: op, GenNm: word
```

(b) Case 2

Figure 21: Two cases GENNM achieves a precision of 0. Orange boxes denote variables to rename. Green boxes denote variables with their groundtruth names. Names in green boxes are not in the input to GENNM, and are added for readability.

If the instruction is 32-bit long, the code further reads the next two bytes and combine them with the first 16 bits at line 25. For the variable v13, GENNM predicts its name as word, indicating a 16-bit long variable, whereas the groundtruth name is op. We speculate that is because the model does not understand the decoding details of an ARM instruction, and thus does not realize v13 can be interpreted as an opcode as well.

C Application

C.1 Binary Summarization

Binary summarization helps a reverse engineer understand a binary function by generating natural language summary for the function. [1,28]. Existing work show that the state-ofthe-art code models still have gaps understanding decompiled code due to the lack of symbols [28]. We show an example in Fig. 22 to illustrate how names generated by GENNM benefit the binary summarization downstream task. We show the source code, the decompiled code, and the renamed code in Fig. 22a, 22b, and 22c, respectively. The code snippet initializes a BMP image structure. It calculates the absolute values of the width and height (lines 2–3 in Fig. 22a), calculates the row size of the image (line 4), allocates a chunk of memory for the image (line 5), and returns a value indicating whether the initialization succeeds (line 6).

We input the three versions to ChatGPT and show part of its response below. We use numbers to label the sentences and use red texts to emphasize extra information obtained from the renamed code (compared to the decompiled code). The full response from ChatGPT are shown as follows: lint bmp_create(BMP *pb,int w,int h){
2 pb->width = abs(w);
3 pb->height = abs(h);
4 pb->stride = ALIGN(pb->width*3,4);
5 pb->pdata = malloc((size_t)pb->stride * h);
6 return pb->pdata ? 0 : -1;
7}

(a) Source code

(b) Decompiled code

(c) Renamed code (generated names highlighted in orange)

Figure 22: Binary summarization

Source code: This function, bmp_create, **①***initializes a* BMP structure with specified width w and height h. **2**It sets the width and height of the BMP structure to the absolute values of w and h, **3** calculates the stride (which is the aligned width considering a 4-byte boundary), and **4** allocates memory for the pixel data (pdata). The function **5** returns 0 if memory allocation is successful, and -1 otherwise.

Decompiled code: This function, sub_401580, takes three arguments and performs a series of operations on them. 2 It calculates the absolute values of a2 and a3 and stores them at specific memory locations relative to a1. 3 It then calculates a value based on these absolute values and stores it at another location. Finally, the function attempts to allocate memory proportional to the calculated value and a3. If the memory allocation is successful, the function returns 0; otherwise, it returns -1. This suggests the function is used for setting up a data structure with dynamically allocated memory.

Renamed code: This function, sub_401580, **1** initializes an image structure. It takes three parameters: a pointer to the image structure img, and two integers w and h for width and height. **2** The width and height are stored as absolute values in the image structure. **3** It then calculates and stores the row size, aligning it to a 4-byte boundary. **4** Memory is allocated for the image data, the size of which is based on the calculated row size and height. **5** The function returns 0 if the memory allocation is successful, or -1 (indicating an error) if the allocation fails.

We can see that the description for the renamed code is closer to that of the source code. It is more relevant to the context (e.g., in **1** "initializes an image structure" vs "setting up a data structure") and is more accurate at the details (e.g., in **3**, the description for the decompiled version misses the "4-byte boundary alignment").