

NaturalEdit: Code Modification through Direct Interaction with Adaptive Natural Language Representation

Ningzhi Tang

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN, USA
ntang@nd.edu

Yiyu Shi

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN, USA
yshi4@nd.edu

David Meiningen

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN, USA
dmeining@nd.edu

Yu Huang

Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN, USA
yu.huang@vanderbilt.edu

Gelei Xu

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN, USA
gxu4@nd.edu

Collin McMillan

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN, USA
cmc@nd.edu

Toby Jia-Jun Li

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN, USA
toby.j.li@nd.edu

Abstract

Code modification requires developers to comprehend code, plan changes, articulate intentions, and validate outcomes, making it a cognitively demanding process. Generated natural language code summaries aid comprehension but remain static and limited in supporting the full workflow. We present NATURALEDIT, a system that makes code summaries interactive and adaptive representations directly linked to source code. Grounded in the *Cognitive Dimensions of Notations*, NATURALEDIT implements a paradigm of code modification through interaction with natural language representations through three key features: (1) adaptive multi-faceted representation of code summaries with flexible *Abstraction Gradient*; (2) interactive mapping mechanisms between summaries and codes, ensuring a tight *Closeness of Mapping*; and (3) intent-driven, bidirectional synchronization that reduces *Viscosity* in editing and validation. A technical evaluation confirms the performance of NATURALEDIT, and a user study with 12 developers shows that it enhances comprehension, intent articulation, and validation, giving developers greater confidence and control.

Keywords

Natural Language Programming, Code Modification, Code Summarization

1 Introduction

Developers devote a substantial portion of their effort to code modification—altering an existing program to fit a new task [69]. Code modification is central to software maintenance, and its cognitive and technical complexity makes it a major contributor to industrial cost [53, 58]. Shneiderman and Mayers’ model [69] characterizes this process as a cycle: developers first construct an “internal semantics,” or a mental model of the program’s logic [41]. Then, based on this understanding, they mentally update the “internal semantics” to form a modification plan, and then map the intended change back to the program’s formal syntax, either manually or with tool support [66]. Finally, they validate that the modified code

reflects their plan and identify unintended side effects [3, 52]. Each stage increases complexity and cognitive load, creating persistent bottlenecks in software development [15, 18].

A longstanding strategy for mitigating this complexity is to improve program representations [4, 24]. Effective representations act as externalizations of program logic, bridging the formal code with the developer’s “internal semantics.” They enable developers to comprehend logic, reason about behavior, and express modifications [1, 27]. Natural Language (NL) is an especially promising medium for this purpose, as it provides a representation that aligns with the developer’s native mode of thought, allowing them to interact with programs “*in the same way they think about them*” [51]. In practice, *code summaries* provide such representations by describing program functionality in NL form—even a short summary such as “*adds transparency to the currently selected polygon*” can give a programmer insights about what code does. However, although a substantial body of research has explored their generation and use for comprehension [40, 71, 78], these summaries have traditionally been treated as static documentation. This limits their utility to the early phase of the modification, leaving significant gaps between understanding and the later stages of planning and expressing changes.

We propose bridging this gap by transforming NL summaries into a primary, interactive surface for modification. This paradigm, modifying code through interaction with its NL representation, externalizes the developer’s “internal semantics” from an implicit mental model into a tangible, manipulable artifact. Recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs) make this vision feasible by enabling high-fidelity translation between NL and code [9, 12]. Our approach builds upon, yet distinguishes itself from, recent work that leverages NL summaries to connect developer intent and code in various contexts. Prior work has demonstrated the paradigm’s feasibility and potential benefits, including improved prompt authoring and increased developer control over AI behavior [16, 46, 68, 75]. However, they have largely treated the NL summary as an intermediate medium for instructing the model. Consequently, key HCI questions about the representations themselves and the mechanisms for

interacting with them remain underexplored. Specifically, what constitutes an effective NL representation? How should their mapping to code be established and visualized? And how can these components be integrated into a coherent code modification workflow?

Recent empirical findings by Tang *et al.* [73] underscore the importance of these questions. The study showed that editing NL summaries can help developers comprehend system edits and construct more comprehensive prompts, but also highlighted major usability issues: overly rigid detail, implicit and effortful links to code, and disproportionate editing effort for simple changes. These issues point to the need for a systematic analysis of NL as a first-class interaction artifact. To structure this, we draw on the *Cognitive Dimensions of Notations* framework [27], which provides precise terms for evaluating how an information artifact supports users' cognitive tasks. Our analysis is in four dimensions:

- (1) Presenting NL summaries at a single, fixed level of detail creates a poor *abstraction gradient*, preventing developers from adjusting structure and granularity to suit different cognitive needs.
- (2) The connection between NL and code is implicit, leading to poor *closeness of mapping* and forcing developers to mentally trace their correspondences, increasing cognitive load on working memory.
- (3) Interaction on NL is also often rigid, exhibiting high *viscosity*, where conceptually simple changes require many tedious edits to the NL summary, discouraging iterative refinement.
- (4) Updates between code and NL are unclear, undermining *visibility* and *consistency*, forcing developers to manually verify changes and disrupting workflow.

To address these challenges, we present NATURALEdit, a practical interactive system, in the form of a VS Code extension, that treats a program's NL description as a first-class interactive representation. NATURALEdit introduces three core features, each targeting the cognitive dimensions outlined above:

- (1) **Adaptive Multi-Faceted Representation:** enables developers to dynamically adjust the NL summary across two orthogonal dimensions: structure (e.g., paragraph vs. bulleted) and granularity (from high-level overviews to line-by-line details). This creates an adaptive *abstraction gradient*, allowing users to tailor the representation to the task at hand.
- (2) **Interactive Cross-Representation Mapping:** establishes a tangible, visual connection between NL sub-segments and their corresponding code blocks. Selecting an element in the NL view highlights its counterpart in the code editor, making the relationship explicit and ensuring *closeness of mapping*.
- (3) **Intent-Driven Bidirectional Synchronization:** maintains synchronization between NL and code, ensuring *visibility* and *consistency*. Updates appear as clear, incremental visual diffs, enabling developers to validate changes. To also reduce *viscosity*, the workflow is intent-driven: developers can express high-level modification goals, and the system executes corresponding low-level edits on the NL representation.

We evaluated NATURALEdit through a two-part study. First, a technical evaluation established the approach's soundness: a benchmark confirmed that our NL-mediated workflow is technically viable, achieving performance comparable to direct-instruction baselines, while an expert-driven assessment further demonstrated that NATURALEdit's generated artifacts are of consistently high quality. Second, a controlled lab study with 12 experienced developers provides strong evidence of NATURALEdit's usability and cognitive benefits. This study shows that by systematically addressing key cognitive bottlenecks, NATURALEdit significantly enhances developers' comprehension, intent specification, and sense of control, resulting in a more effective NL-centric modification workflow.

In summary, our contribution is threefold:

- A new paradigm for code modification transforms NL summaries from static documents into interactive representations within workflows. It is supported by a set of actionable design principles, derived from the *Cognitive Dimensions* framework, that address key usability challenges.
- The instantiation of these principles in NATURALEdit, a practical interactive system in the form of a VS Code extension that demonstrates the viability of this paradigm through a set of novel interactive mechanisms.
- Empirical evidence from a mixed-methods evaluation shows that our approach is both technically effective and reduces cognitive effort, while also enhancing developers' control and confidence.

2 Background and Related Work

2.1 Cognitive Demands of Code Modification

Modifying existing code for tasks (e.g., debugging, refactoring, or feature enhancement) is central to software engineering but remains costly [6, 38, 58]. Its difficulty arises not only from technical complexity but also from the limits of human cognition [15, 31]. At the core of this activity lies code comprehension, a cognitively demanding process in which developers construct an "internal semantics" of a program's logic [7, 26, 41, 69]. The process requires developers to move across multiple levels of abstraction, from individual statements to overall program logic [67]. This cognitive activity places a heavy load on working memory, which must simultaneously store and process information about the program's state and behavior [19]. The scale of this bottleneck is significant: a field study by Xia *et al.* [82] estimated that comprehension alone can consume up to 58% of a developer's working time.

Building on comprehension, the subsequent stages of implementing and validating a change can be understood through Norman's theory of action, particularly the iterative cycle of the *Gulf of Execution and Evaluation* [32, 55]. The *Gulf of Execution* represents the challenge of this second stage: translating the developer's intended change into the precise syntax of the programming language. This translation involves a two-stage cognitive process [69]: first, developers devise a plan by decomposing the problem and formulating a general solution strategy [28, 80, 81]; second, they implement that plan by mapping the strategic steps to concrete actions, which requires substantial effort in recalling and correctly applying APIs and formal syntax [27, 57, 61]. While modern LLMs can support this

implementation process by translating a natural language requirement into a complete program, they also introduce new cognitive challenges. For example, Sarkar *et al.* [66] observed that developers often iteratively refine prompts to instruct the LLM toward the desired behavior, a difficulty they termed the “fuzzy abstraction matching” problem.

Following this, developers face the *Gulf of Evaluation*, the challenge of verifying that the modified source code accurately reflects their intent. This diagnostic task requires verifying that a change fixes a bug or implements a feature, without introducing unintended side effects [8, 83] or breaking existing correctness (i.e., regressions) [62]. The cognitive difficulty of this process motivates structured quality practices such as code review [3, 21] and software testing [14, 52]. The emergence of LLM-generated code further complicates evaluation. Prior studies showed that developers must devote substantial effort to validating and repairing LLM-generated code [45, 49, 72]. Such validation often relies on surface-level inspection (e.g., executing the program and checking logs) rather than a deep understanding of code semantics [73], increasing the risk of subtle but critical bugs being overlooked and thereby threatening software security and reliability [33, 48]. Taken together, these persistent cognitive bottlenecks across the modification cycle indicate the need for an interaction paradigm that moves beyond task automation to support developers’ cognitive processes.

2.2 Natural Language Programming

The ambition to program computers using NL is almost as old as programming itself. It originated from a vision to democratize computation. Early proponents, such as Sammet, argued that allowing people to communicate with computers in their native tongue would reduce the cognitive overhead of formal languages and let users focus on their problem domain [64]. However, this vision faced strong criticism. Dijkstra argued that the imprecision of NL was a fundamental flaw, calling the pursuit of NL programming “foolishness” [17]. He contended that the power of computation derives from the very formality and symbolism that NL lacks, and that these qualities are essential for precise reasoning. This tension gave rise to early systems (e.g., AppleScript [13]) that employed naturalistic keywords and grammars but preserved the rigidity of formal languages, creating a “passive English” that was readable but not truly writable for non-programmers [29].

Today, the advent of LLMs has revived this ambition. With a strong ability to interpret context and parse NL [12, 34], LLMs now power a new generation of AI coding agents that execute high-level prompts from developers (e.g., GitHub Copilot¹, Cursor²). This shift has given rise to “vibe coding” [65], where programming is conducted through conversation with an AI. Tools such as Bolt³ exemplify this trend, aiming to support low- or no-code development through only conversational prompts and live previews with minimal manual edits. However, while fluid on the surface, this paradigm fragments the cognitive workflow discussed in Section 2.1 and transforms rather than eliminates classic cognitive bottlenecks.

First, in the *Gulf of Execution*, developers often bypass code comprehension, compressing intent directly into a prompt, leading to the “fuzzy abstraction matching” challenge [46, 66, 73]. Second, in the *Gulf of Evaluation*, the AI’s output forces them to validate and debug large-scale code edits, overwhelming their cognitive load [33, 45, 49, 72]. As a result, the continuity across comprehension, planning, and validation is disrupted.

Our work addresses these challenges by reframing NL not as a *delegational* command language but as an interactive representation of code itself. Grounded in the previously discussed cognitive model of code modification [69], we propose to externalize the developer’s implicit “internal semantics” into a tangible NL layer. This approach addresses the long-standing tension in NL programming: it enables developers to work closer to their mental model [51] while maintaining the formal precision emphasized by Dijkstra [17]. Developers operate across both NL and source code, a practice of semi-formal programming [84] that positions the NL layer as an equal medium for reasoning and modification.

2.3 Interactive Code Summaries

The automated generation of NL code summaries and the study of their role in program comprehension are well-established research areas in software engineering [40, 71, 78, 85]. Recent work has explored elevating these summaries from static text to interactive surfaces for modification. This interactive approach has been shown to be feasible and useful in exploratory data analysis, where programming tasks are often localized (typically a single query or data transformation) and constrained by simpler, well-defined contexts such as a database schema. For instance, systems like Grounded Abstraction Matching (GAM) [46], STEPS [75], and SQLCID [74] allow users to interact with data through structured NL, but their translations rely on semantically constrained, pre-defined rules that are less generalizable.

In general programming, Shi *et al.* [68] introduced “NL outlines” that synchronize bidirectionally with code to support understanding and navigation. Di and Zhang [16] proposed PI_{NG}, showing that iteratively modifying comments can improve code generation performance on benchmarks. While these systems demonstrate technical feasibility, they underscore the importance of interaction design that effectively integrates these features into developer workflows. A recent empirical study by Tang *et al.* [73] provided a deeper exploration of the cognitive advantages and interaction challenges. Through a study with 15 developers, the authors found that modifying NL summaries for prompting can bridge the gap between code comprehension and modification. At the same time, the study surfaced usability issues and suggested design insights such as flexible granularity and a consistent workflow.

Building on insights from the prior work, we apply the *Cognitive Dimensions of Notations* to analyze the revealed interaction challenges in practical general programming tasks. As summarized in Table 1, prior work made important strides but also highlighted opportunities for improvement across several dimensions. For instance, while systems such as NL outlines introduced hierarchical structures, they also exposed the difficulty of relying on a single, fixed representation to support all tasks (an issue of *abstraction gradient*). Likewise, early linking approaches demonstrated the value

¹<https://github.com/features/copilot>

²<https://cursor.com/>

³<https://bolt.new/>

Table 1: Comparison of NATURALEDIT with prior work along key *Cognitive Dimensions*. Symbols denote the level of support: ● Fully Supported, ○ Partially Supported, and ○ Not Supported. Generally, partial support refers to mechanisms that are fixed, coarse-grained, or domain-specific, while full support implies dynamic, fine-grained, and generalizable solutions. Rationales for specific ratings (○) are detailed in the table notes.

	Abstraction Gradient <i>Rigid, single-level NL representation</i>	Closeness of Mapping <i>Implicit, non-interactive NL-code mapping</i>	Viscosity <i>High cost for simple semantic changes</i>	Visibility & Consistency <i>Opaque, disruptive NL updates from code</i>
GAM [46]	○	○	○	○
STEPS [75]	○	○	●	○
SQLUCID [74]	○	●	●	○
NL outlines [68]	●	●	○	●
PING [16]	○	●	○	○
PASTA [73]	○	○	○	○
NATURALEDIT	●	●	●	●

¹ *Abstraction Gradient*: NL outlines took a step towards managing abstraction by introducing a hierarchical structure (while fixed).

² *Closeness of Mapping*: Pioneering forms of mapping were explored, including coarse-grained navigation (NL outlines), comment anchoring (PING), and direct data mapping (SQLUCID).

³ *Viscosity*: STEPS and SQLUCID provided valuable insights into reducing viscosity in domain-specific contexts by exploring rule-based entity transformations (e.g., variables).

of traceability but underscored the cognitive burden when *close-ness of mapping* was not sufficiently explicit. These systems also surfaced challenges of high *viscosity* in editing and the need for greater *visibility* and *consistency* in updates. Our work is motivated by these findings and aims to build on prior efforts while directly addressing the empirically observed challenges.

3 NATURALEDIT

To address the gaps in existing interactive code summaries (Section 2.3) for supporting code modification tasks, we designed and implemented NATURALEDIT. NATURALEDIT instantiates the paradigm of modifying code through its NL representation by introducing three key interactive features: *Adaptive Multi-Faceted Representation*, *Interactive Cross-Representation Mapping*, and *Intent-Driven Bidirectional Synchronization*. Each feature is grounded in the *Cognitive Dimensions* framework and targets the gaps identified in Table 1.

3.1 Design Goals

The design of NATURALEDIT is guided by four core design goals (DGs), each directly targeting a cognitive dimension identified as a gap in our related work analysis:

DG1: Enable an Adaptive Abstraction Gradient. A fixed representation cannot address all cognitive needs. Developers must be able to move fluidly between levels of abstraction [77], including structural presentation and level of detail, to match the demands of different cognitive tasks.

DG2: Ensure Tight and Interactive Mapping. NL segments should be explicitly linked to corresponding code, reducing the cognitive cost of mentally tracing connections and offloading working memory [35].

DG3: Promote Low-Viscosity, Intent-Driven Editing. Editing summaries manually is effortful, requiring tedious adjustments across text segments [73]. Developers should instead

express high-level intent that the system translates into consistent modifications with minimal effort.

DG4: Maintain High Visibility and Consistency. NL and code should be perceived as a unified representation. Edits must be communicated clearly, via explicit, incremental diffs, so developers can validate alignment with their intent.

3.2 Key Features

To achieve these goals, NATURALEDIT introduces three key features. Our discussion is organized by their roles: we first describe the design of the NL representation itself (Section 3.2.1), then the interactive mapping between NL and code representations (Section 3.2.2), and finally the end-to-end workflow that supports code modification through this interactive layer (Section 3.2.3).

3.2.1 Adaptive Multi-Faceted Representation. To meet **DG1** and enable an adaptive abstraction gradient, NATURALEDIT introduces an NL representation that is not static, but dynamically adjustable along two orthogonal dimensions: **Structure** and **Granularity** (Figure 1). This design goes beyond the one-size-fits-all summaries of prior systems by allowing developers to tailor the representation to their immediate cognitive needs. The choice of these two dimensions is informed by both empirical findings and established design principles.

- **Structure:** This dimension lets developers toggle between prose paragraphs and a bulleted list. Prior study showed that developers often prefer structured formats for readability and alignment with code organization [73]. Conceptually, it presents a representational trade-off: the paragraph format supports a holistic, narrative view, while the bulleted format mirrors the procedural logic of the source code. Providing both enables developers to choose the format that best aligns their mental model with the program for the task at hand.
- **Granularity:** This dimension controls the level of detail, ranging from a high-level overview (what the function does),




Figure 1: The adaptive, multi-faceted NL representation in NATURALEDIT features a concise **Title that summarizes the function’s purpose. It is adjustable along two orthogonal dimensions: (1) **Structure**, toggling between a paragraph and bulleted format ; and (2) **Granularity**, scaling from a high-level overview to a procedural summary to a line-by-line explanation .**

a procedural summary (how it works), to a line-by-line explanation (specific implementation details). Prior study suggested that developers desire to have access to adjustable levels of detail to balance efficiency and thoroughness [73]. This control is analogous to semantic zooming [5, 56], an interaction technique that was proven useful for users to navigate information at different levels of abstraction in other contexts.

Developers can interact with these dimensions through simple UI controls: a toggle switch for Structure and a three-stop slider for Granularity. Internally, NATURALEDIT generates a concise **Title** along with all six representations (2 structures \times 3 granularities) on demand using a single structured prompt to an LLM. This design ensures that toggling between views is instantaneous and consistent for the user, while the title is consistently available in the interface as a compact summary of the function. Together, these features provide an adaptive abstraction gradient, allowing developers to customize the NL representation to match their current cognitive focus (e.g., rapid orientation, procedural reasoning, or detailed inspection).

3.2.2 Interactive Cross-Representation Mapping. To address **DG2** and ensure closeness of mapping, NATURALEDIT replaces the implicit, static relationship between summary and code with explicit, dynamic links. Inspired by expressiveness benchmarks⁴ that match NL specifications to code for usability analysis across programming language designs, we repurpose the idea from a static human annotation into an interactive bridge for comprehension. Rather than requiring developers to mentally trace connections between text

and code, a process that burdens working memory, NATURALEDIT externalizes the link as a tangible mapping.

As shown in Figure 2, the mapping is fine-grained and responsive. NATURALEDIT segments each NL representation into several semantic units. When a user hovers the cursor over a segment, the system instantaneously highlights the corresponding block of code. To enable this interactivity, we instruct the LLM to generate a structured JSON object containing an array of (text segment, code segment) pairs. This structured data serves as the backbone of the interactive mapping. The schema of this JSON object, along with the matching and rendering engine used for visualization, is detailed in Section 3.4. This interactive mapping transforms the cognitively demanding task of tracing logic into a lower-effort perceptual operation.

3.2.3 Intent-Driven Bidirectional Synchronization. The final key feature of NATURALEDIT integrates adaptive representation and interactive mapping into a cohesive end-to-end process for code modification. As illustrated in Figure 3, this workflow guides developers from articulating their initial intent to validating the final result.

Intent Articulation and NL Refinement. The workflow begins with ① the developer authorizing a high-level instruction based on their modification goal. ② The system acts on this intent by generating a proposed modification to the summary, presented as an editable diff with **insertions** highlighted in green and **deletions** in red. This NL diff is a critical intermediate artifact. ③ The developer can validate, accept, or iteratively refine it to ensure it precisely captures their intent before the code is modified. This intent-driven approach directly addresses **DG3** by lowering the viscosity of the modification process, allowing conceptually simple changes to be performed with a single high-level command.

⁴<https://willcrichton.net/expressiveness-benchmark/>

```

1 def process_user_data(users):
2     active_users = [u for u in users if u['status'] == 'active']
3
4     from datetime import datetime, timedelta
5     one_year_ago = datetime.now() - timedelta(days=365)
6     long_term_users = [
7         u for u in active_users if u['join_date'] < one_year_ago
8     ]
9
10    results = []
11    for u in long_term_users:
12        results.append(f"{u['name']} <{u['email']}>")
13
14    return results

```

Figure 2: Interactive cross-representation mapping in NATURALEdit. As the user’s cursor moves from one semantic segment (e.g., **have been members...** in the left panel) to another (e.g., **formats each...** in the right panel), the system dynamically updates the corresponding code highlight.




Figure 3: Intent-driven bi-directional synchronization in NATURALEdit, where developer actions are shown as solid arrows → and system actions as dashed arrows ⇢. The workflow connects intent articulation, NL refinement, code modification, and global/local validation into a cohesive loop.

Code Modification and Bidirectional Synchronization. ④ Once the developer approves the NL representation, the system generates the corresponding code modification. To do this, it provides the LLM with the original code along with the original and edited summary, instructing it to focus on the developer-approved NL diff. ⑤ After the code is modified, NATURALEdit automatically updates the persistent NL representation to keep it synchronized. To make these updates transparent rather than disruptive, they are presented as **Incremental Diffs**. This is achieved by supplying the original summary as context to the LLM and prompting it to make minimal changes that highlight the semantic impact of the code modification.

Multi-Level Validation. This synchronized, dual-diff view supports validation at two levels. ⑥ Developers can first perform a *global validation* by inspecting the summary and code diffs side by side to understand the overall change. ⑦ They can then perform a *local validation* by leveraging the interactive mapping feature directly on the highlighted diffs (e.g., **purple highlights** in Figure 3).

This enables fine-grained inspection of the correspondence between specific NL and code changes, ensuring that the details are correct. This validation loop directly addresses **DG4** by giving each edit high visibility and ensuring consistency between the two representations, giving developers improved confidence that the final program state aligns with their intent.

3.3 Example Workflow

To illustrate how NATURALEdit’s features integrate, we follow a developer, Grace, as she performs a refactoring task shown in Figure 4. Her goal is to modify the existing function `process_user_data`, which *filters active users who joined over a year ago and returns their names and emails*. She wants to change it to group the resulting users by email domain.

① Grace begins by selecting the `process_user_data` function in her editor and clicking **Summarize Selected Code**. This opens a new interactive session in the NATURALEdit panel, titled **Filter and**




Figure 4: The user interface and key steps of the example workflow. The developer begins by summarizing the code (A), interacts with the NL representation (B), provides an instruction (C), validates the proposed NL change (D), reviews the updated summary and code in a visual diff (E), and reverts unintended code changes (F).

Format Long-Term Active Users, which is linked to its source code location main.py (1-13).

Next, **B** Grace interacts with the generated multi-faceted summary to understand the existing logic. She adjusts the summary's Structure and Granularity to suit her needs, choosing a structured, low-granularity view that presents the function's logic as three clear bullet points. To map these points to the implementation, she uses interactive mapping, hovering over each bullet to highlight the corresponding code in the editor. With a clear mental model established, she determines that this view provides the right level of abstraction for her change and clicks the edit button to load the summary into the **Modifiable Code Summary** area.

Rather than directly editing the text manually, **C** Grace types a high-level instruction, **Group the results by the users' email domain**, into the **Edit Instruction** text box. To validate the system's understanding of her intent, she clicks **↓ Apply to Summary**. The system generates a proposed change, inserting the phrase **grouped by email domain** into the summary. **D** Grace reviews this NL diff. Although it is correct according to her originally expressed intent, she decides to more specifically define the type of the function's return value. She edits the text to state that the function should return **the a dictionary of formatted lists**.

Once satisfied with the refined NL representation, Grace then proceeds to modify the code by clicking the send button . **E** NATURALEDIT applies the change to the source code and presents a synchronized code diff, while also generating a new section for the updated NL representations with **Incremental Diffs** (Section 3.2.3). Grace inspects the result and sees that the system has correctly imported `collections.defaultdict` and rewritten the logic to group users by domain. **F** During this validation phase, she retains fine-grained control: if the system introduces incorrect logic, she can click the revert button to roll back specific lines directly from the diff view, or choose to iterate on the task in either the current or a new working session. This example illustrates how NATURALEDIT enables a collaborative workflow that supports the full code modification process.

3.4 Implementation

NATURALEDIT is implemented as an extension for Visual Studio (VS) Code⁵, with its main user interface rendered in a side panel. This architecture ensures compatibility with all forks of VS Code, e.g., Cursor, ensuring the practicality and wide applicability of NATURALEDIT. The front end is a web application built with React and Vite, embedded within a VS Code Webview, styled with

⁵<https://code.visualstudio.com/api>

the `@vscode/webview-ui-toolkit` for seamless integration into different themes. All natural language processing and generation are powered by OpenAI’s GPT-4.1 model⁶. For transparency and reproducibility, all prompts used in NATURALEDIT are provided in Appendix A. The source code for NATURALEDIT is available at <https://github.com/TTangNingzhi/NaturalEdit>, and the extension is available in the VS Code Marketplace at <https://marketplace.visualstudio.com/items?itemName=sandwich-lab.naturaledit>.

3.4.1 Generating Adaptive Representations and Mappings. To enable instantaneous adjustments of the summary’s structure and granularity, as described in Section 3.2.1, NATURALEDIT uses a single comprehensive prompt that instructs the LLM to generate all 2×3 summary variants at once and return them in a single JSON object. This ensures that UI interactions remain fluid and responsive.

The interactive mapping feature relies on prompting the LLM for structured data. To establish this mapping for all six summary variants with low latency, the process runs in parallel for each summary. In each run, the model is given a detailed prompt (see Appendix A) and the source code, which is pre-annotated with line numbers. The prompt instructs the model to return a JSON array where each object contains a `summaryComponent` key, representing an exact substring from the summary, and a `codeSegments` key. The latter holds an array of objects, each specifying a code fragment and its 1-based line number from the annotated source file. Including line numbers is crucial for precise alignment and robustly handling cases where identical code fragments appear multiple times in a function [68]. The front-end then consumes this structured JSON to render the summary as interactive HTML and to apply highlights in the code editor using the `TextEditor.setDecorations` API.

3.4.2 Ensuring Workflow Robustness and Synchronization. To ensure robust operation on live, mutable code, NATURALEDIT employs a resilient location and patching strategy for its two most critical operations: activating a working session and applying an LLM-generated code change. For both tasks, the system first attempts a fast, exact match using the stored filename, start line, and text content. If this fails due to concurrent edits, it falls back to a fuzzy-matching algorithm based on the `diff-match-patch` library⁷. Specifically, it calls the `match_main` API with a high confidence threshold of 0.9 to locate the most likely code position or apply the patch intelligently. This two-step approach ensures that sessions remain valid and modifications apply correctly, even as the source code changes.

Incremental NL diffs are generated by prompting the LLM with the original summary and instructing it to produce minimal edits. The visual diff for the NL summary is computed and rendered on the client side using `diff-match-patch`. We use `diff_main` to compute the differences and `diff_cleanupSemantic` to simplify the output into more human-readable edits. For code changes, we leverage the native VS Code diffing engine by invoking the `vscode.diff` command, providing developers with a familiar and powerful interface for inspecting changes.

⁶<https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-1/>

⁷<https://github.com/google/diff-match-patch>

4 Technical Evaluation

Before evaluating the usability of NATURALEDIT in a user study (Section 5), we conducted a two-phase technical evaluation to establish the technical soundness of our NL-mediated interaction paradigm.

In the first phase, we ran a benchmark evaluation on standard code modification datasets to verify that our approach maintained accuracy comparable to state-of-the-art standard direct-instruction methods. In the second phase, we assessed the quality of the intermediate artifacts (summaries and mappings) through expert review, as these representations are central to user experience.

4.1 Benchmark Performance of NL-Mediated Modification

The primary objective of this benchmark is to assess the technical viability of our NL-mediated modification approach. Notably, our goal is not to surpass state-of-the-art automated methods, but to establish that our interactive paradigm is built upon a technically reliable foundation that does not compromise the modified code quality.

4.1.1 Experimental Setup.

Datasets. For our evaluation, we used two standard code modification benchmarks. Both datasets provide natural language instructions for a desired code change and a set of unit tests to verify the correctness of the modified code.

- **CanItEdit** [11]: A benchmark comprising 105 hand-crafted Python code editing challenges, constructed by a team of experienced programmers. It features two distinct instruction styles: (1) *Lazy*, which are concise and potentially ambiguous, and (2) *Descriptive*, which are highly detailed.
- **EditEval** [44]: A benchmark containing 194 Python code editing tasks derived from GitHub commits, MBPP [2], and HumanEval [12]. Each task includes a human-written canonical solution as the ground truth.

Comparison Conditions. We compared two conditions:

- **Direct Instruction (Baseline):** The model directly generates the modified code from the original code and instruction in a single step. This represents the standard automated code editing workflow.
- **NL Mediation (NATURALEDIT):** This condition follows our proposed two-step workflow (i.e., first incorporating the modification instruction into an NL summary, then generating code from the updated summary) as implemented in NATURALEDIT (Section 3.2.3). For this condition, we evaluated six representation variants crossing two Structures and three Granularity levels, as detailed in Section 3.2.1.

Implementation Details. The experimental setup mirrors the implementation of the NATURALEDIT prototype (Section 3.4). Both conditions were powered by GPT-4.1 via the OpenAI API. The prompts used were identical to those in NATURALEDIT, with minor adjustments to fit the benchmark format (e.g., removing file context unavailable in the datasets). The *Direct Instruction* baseline corresponds to the system’s existing fallback mechanism.

Evaluation Metric. We report **Pass@1** accuracy, defined as the proportion of tasks where the *first* generated code passes all ground-truth unit tests.

4.1.2 Results. Our primary finding is that the NL-mediated workflow is technically viable, achieving performance comparable to the direct instruction baseline and surpassing it in 6/18 tested configurations. Figure 5 shows the Pass@1 accuracy of our NL-mediated conditions relative to the baseline.⁸ Across all datasets, none of the NL representation variants caused substantial performance degradation (average -1.92%, maximum -8.98%). This result demonstrates that the intermediate NL representation provides a solid technical foundation for our approach without compromising final code quality.

Furthermore, there is no single, universally optimal NL representation; the ideal format is task-dependent. For example, the Structured, Medium-granular representation achieved the best performance, outperforming the baseline on both Can-ItEdit instruction types (Figure 5, left and center). However, this pattern did not hold for the Unstructured representation, where performance peaked at different granularity levels depending on the dataset. This task-dependent variability motivates our Adaptive Multi-Faceted Representation. By enabling developers to dynamically adjust the NL representation, NATURALEDIT gives users the flexibility to configure it for optimal task performance.

Finally, our approach outperformed the baseline more consistently on Lazy instructions than on Descriptive instructions. With Lazy instructions, which are concise and potentially ambiguous (similar to human-written ones), our workflow was shown to be robust, exceeding the baseline on average (+0.48%). In contrast, performance with Descriptive instructions was more volatile, averaging below the baseline (-4.45%). This suggests that when user workflows contain vague or underspecified intentions, our NL-mediated workflow can be more resilient.

4.2 Expert Evaluation of Intermediate Representations

To complement the benchmark analysis, we conducted an expert evaluation to assess the quality of the intermediate NL representations, which are central to the user experience in NATURALEDIT.

4.2.1 Evaluation Protocol.

Corpus. We used the six code modification tasks from our user study (Section 5.1.3) as the corpus. These tasks were chosen over smaller benchmark snippets for their ecological validity, as they involve multi-file edits and represent the realistic scenarios that NATURALEDIT is designed to support. For each task, we generated the six representation variants (Section 3.2.1) for both the initial code and our ground-truth final solution. The summaries for the final solution were generated with semantic diffs against the original summary (Section 3.2.3), and all code-to-summary mappings were built using the process in Section 3.2.2. This yielded a corpus of 72 summaries (36 with diffs) and 487 summary-code mappings.

⁸To enhance transparency, we provide an interactive browser with all individual data points and model outputs on our supplementary website: <https://www.nztang.com/naturaledit-evaluation-showcase/#/benchmark>

To facilitate the rating process, we developed a web-based interface that presented these artifacts to raters.⁹

Procedure. Drawing on prior work in code summarization [76, 78], the first two authors collaboratively defined the evaluation criteria for each generated artifact, as summarized in Table 2. The complete rating guide is in Appendix B.1.

Two experts rated the quality of the generated NL representations. They were computer science researchers experienced in software development; one specialized in evaluating AI models, and the other in designing developer tools.

The rating procedure is as follows: two raters independently scored all items on a 5-point scale (1=Very Poor, 5=Excellent). They then assessed inter-rater reliability using percent agreement. We chose this metric because our data was highly skewed, with the majority of ratings being 5. In such cases, coefficients like Cohen's Kappa are known to produce paradoxically low reliability scores despite high actual agreement [22]. We calculated both strict agreement (exact match) and relaxed agreement (ratings within ± 1 point). This yielded a strict agreement of 70.4% (96.3% relaxed) for Summary Quality, 74.1% (99.1% relaxed) for Diff Quality, and 94.3% (98.0% relaxed) for Mapping Quality, indicating a high level of consistency. To create the final consensus scores, items with a one-point difference were averaged, while disagreements greater than one point were resolved through consensus meetings. During the discussions, the raters also qualitatively analyzed instances of low-quality artifacts to identify recurring error patterns.

4.2.2 Results. The generated NL artifacts were consistently rated as high quality across most dimensions. The majority (42/48) of mean scores fell between 4.5 and 5.0 on a 5-point scale, confirming the viability of our pipeline for producing accurate and clear NL representations of realistic code.

However, the perceived utility of code segmentation decreased at high granularity in unstructured summaries. Although most mapping metrics were rated as high-quality, raters rated *Segmentation Granularity* significantly lower for the high-granularity unstructured variant ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.74$; Wilcoxon signed-rank test: $W = 2.5$, $p = .038 < .05$). Raters noted that at this level of detail, consecutive highlighted blocks often mapped to nearly identical code regions, indicating that a coarser semantic segmentation would be more effective.

A critical trade-off was observed between a diff's level of detail and its salience. While ratings for *Faithfulness* and *Completeness* remained high, *Salience*, defined as the ability of a diff to highlight important changes, showed a strong negative correlation with granularity, reaching its lowest in the high-granular unstructured variant ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 1.08$). Raters attributed this to two factors. First, the large volume of insertions and deletions in long texts made it difficult to distinguish critical changes from trivial ones. Second, the use of action-oriented language (e.g., “*Current price... added to the response*”) occasionally broke the “objective description” metaphor of the summary, reducing clarity.

⁹Deployed at: <https://www.nztang.com/naturaledit-evaluation-showcase/#/ratings>




Figure 5: Pass@1 accuracy of our NL-mediated workflows (blue and red lines) against the Direct Instruction baseline (dashed gray line), evaluated on CanItEdit (using both *Lazy* and *Descriptive* instructions) and EditEval benchmarks.

Table 2: Expert rating dimensions for the quality of intermediate NL representations.

Artifact	Quality Dimension	Guiding Question
Summary Quality	Accuracy	Does the summary accurately and correctly describe the functionality and logic of the corresponding code?
	Clarity	Is the summary written in clear, unambiguous, and easy-to-understand language for a developer?
Mapping Quality	Segmentation Granularity	Is the code broken down into segments of an appropriate and useful size?
	Accuracy	Does this specific link correctly connect the summary segment to this code segment?
	Coverage	Does this summary segment successfully link to all the relevant parts of the code that implement the concept it describes?
Diff Quality	Faithfulness	Does the change in the summary accurately represent the change that occurred in the code?
	Completeness	Does the summary diff capture all of the important semantic changes from the code diff?
	Salience	Does the summary diff make the most important aspects of the change stand out clearly and effectively?

5 User Study

Besides confirming that NATURALEDIT’s workflow is computationally sound, we conducted a controlled lab user study to examine the usability and usefulness of NATURALEDIT.¹⁰ The study also examines the cognitive and practical impact of NATURALEDIT: How does the paradigm of modifying code through its NL representation affect the developer experience, and in what ways do our design features informed by the *Cognitive Dimensions of Notations* contribute to this effect?

We framed our inquiry around four research questions (RQs):

- **RQ1:** How does transforming static NL summaries as primary interactive artifacts influence developers’ modification strategies and perceived usability?
- **RQ2:** How does the adaptive, multi-faceted representation affect developers’ management of the *abstraction gradient* during code comprehension and modification?

- **RQ3:** How does interactive mapping influence the developer experience of *closeness of mapping* across NL and code representations?
- **RQ4:** How does the intent-driven and bidirectional synchronization mechanism shape the *viscosity*, *visibility*, and *consistency* of the modification workflow?

5.1 Study Design

5.1.1 Participants. We recruited 12 participants (seven male, five female; ages 21–52, $M = 26.0$, $SD = 8.05$) through purposive sampling [20]. All had significant experience with Python and JavaScript. The group consisted of two undergraduates, six graduate students, and four industry professionals, with an average of 8.17 years of programming experience ($SD = 6.91$). All eight students majored in Computer Science or Engineering, and six reported professional internship experience. Each participant received a \$66 Amazon gift card as compensation.

Participants reported “frequently” (5) or “almost always” (7) usage of LLM-powered tools for programming, including ChatGPT

¹⁰The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at our institution.




Figure 6: Expert ratings of the quality of NATURALEDIT artifacts (summaries, mappings, and diffs). Points indicate mean ratings, and shaded regions represent standard deviations.

(11), GitHub Copilot (9), Cursor (6), and Claude Code (3). 10 participants were familiar with the VS Code IDE, while two had used it before but reported low familiarity. Most participants also reported relevant domain experience with the task scenarios: web development (12/12) and machine learning (11/12). A detailed summary of participant demographics is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of Participant Demographics.

ID	Gender	Age	Occupation	Experience
P1	Male	23	PhD Student	5 years
P2	Male	25	Software Engineer	8 years
P3	Male	24	Graduate Student	6 years
P4	Male	25	PhD Student	6 years
P5	Female	27	PhD Student	11 years
P6	Female	52	IT Professional	30 years
P7	Female	22	PhD Student	5 years
P8	Female	22	Software Engineer	6 years
P9	Male	21	Undergraduate Student	3 years
P10	Female	21	Undergraduate Student	3 years
P11	Male	26	R&D Engineer	7 years
P12	Male	24	PhD Student	8 years

5.1.2 Baseline. To isolate the effects of NATURALEDIT’s key features, we built a controlled baseline version of it. In this baseline, the three core interactive mechanisms were disabled: the *Adaptive Multi-Faceted Representation* was replaced with a static, paragraph-style summary at a fixed medium level of granularity; the *Interactive Cross-Representation Mapping* was removed, leaving no explicit visual link between NL and code; and the *Intent-Driven Synchronization* was simplified to require manual text edits to the summary.

This ablated design intends to represent the current state-of-the-art interaction paradigm. Its workflow consists of editing a static NL summary to modify code, supplemented by a direct instruction mechanism for fallback, making it functionally equivalent to prior systems such as PASTA [73] and GAM [46]. By comparing NATURALEDIT with this baseline, we can measure the cognitive and usability impact of our specific design contributions. To ensure a fair comparison, the baseline was implemented using the same VS Code extension framework and UI style as NATURALEDIT (Figure 7).

5.1.3 Programming Tasks. We designed two programming tasks that represent practical tasks in two distinct domains: full-stack web development and machine learning pipelines, implemented in JavaScript and Python. Each task was developed through a structured, iterative design process. One author selected the task background, implemented a baseline version, and proposed plausible enhancement subtasks. The research team then refined these subtasks to balance realism with the feasibility of completing the task under study time limits. The tasks are summarized here and described in full detail in Appendix C.1:

- **Task 1. Finance Dashboard (full-stack web development):** A web application that visualizes stock prices using a Node.js backend to retrieve data and a React front-end to display it. Participants were asked to (a) implement a helper function to format the x-axis tick marks of the chart, (b) modify the back-end API to include the current stock price in its response, and (c) display this new price data as a reference line on the front-end chart.
- **Task 2. MVP Predictor (machine learning pipeline):** A Python-based data science workflow that scrapes NBA player data, processes it, and trains a model to predict MVP rankings.




Figure 7: A screenshot of the baseline system, implemented as an ablation of NATURALEDIT.

Participants were asked to (a) enhance the web scraper to collect advanced player statistics, (b) tune the `n_estimators` hyperparameter of the XGBRanker model to find the best value, and (c) improve the final visualization by changing its chart type and color scheme.

To validate realism, participants rated their agreement on a 7-point Likert scale (1=Strongly disagree, 7=Strongly agree) as part of the study procedure. The results confirmed a strong perception of realism: all 12 participants gave ratings of 5 or higher, with 58.3% selecting 5, 25.0% selecting 6, and 16.7% selecting 7.

To minimize biasing participant instructions to the system, we designed the task descriptions following the Natural Programming Elicitation method [50]. Tasks were presented through a combination of visual targets (annotated visuals of the desired outcome) and concise textual descriptions, so the task descriptions could *not* be directly reused as instructions when performing the task (see Figure 8 for an example).

A. + Advanced Metrics

```
scraper.py -> scrape_season_stats Scrap (existing) basic stats + advanced stats & Merge them!
```

- Basic (2025): https://www.basketball-reference.com/leagues/NBA_2025_per_game.html
- Advanced (2025): https://www.basketball-reference.com/leagues/NBA_2025_advanced.html

Merge Keys	Basic Stats	Advanced Stats
1	Year, Name, MP, Points, PTS, AST, TRB, FG%, BPM, MS, TS%, WS, PER, Rank	
2	2018, James Harden, 965, 30.4, 8.0, 5.4, 0, 449, 9.9, 8.289, 6.19, 7.7, 15.4, 29.8, 1, 0	
3	2018, LeBron James, 738, 27.5, 9.1, 8.6, 0, 542, 9.7, 8.2, 221, 6, 621, 8.2, 14.0, 28.6, 2, 0	
4	2018, Anthony Davis, 445, 28.1, 2.3, 11.1, 0, 534, 6.7, 0, 241, 0, 612, 5.9, 13.7, 28.9, 3, 0	
5	2018, Damian Lillard, 297, 26.9, 6.6, 6.4, 5, 0, 439, 7.2, 0, 227, 0, 594, 6.3, 12.6, 25.2, 4, 0	
6	2018, Russell Westbrook, 76, 25.4, 10.3, 10.1, 0, 449, 6.3, 0, 166, 0, 524, 6.1, 10.1, 24.7, 5, 0	
7	2018, Giannis Antetokounmpo, 75, 26.9, 4.8, 10.0, 0, 516, 7.3, 0, 215, 0, 64, 5.5, 10.4, 26.0, 7.0, 0	
8	2018, Kevin Durant, 6, 26.4, 5.4, 6.8, 0, 516, 7.3, 0, 215, 0, 64, 5.5, 10.4, 26.0, 7.0, 0	
9	2018, DeMar DeRozan, 32, 23.0, 5.2, 3.9, 0, 456, 2.8, 0, 17, 0, 555, 3.2, 9.6, 21.0, 8.0, 0	
10	2018, LaMarcus Aldridge, 6, 23.1, 2.0, 8.5, 0, 51, 3.9, 0, 209, 0, 57, 3.7, 10.9, 25.0, 9.0, 0	

Figure 2. Example of scraped and pre-processed data data/merged_data.csv

Figure 8: Example task description for Task 2.A. Participants are required to extend existing basic NBA player statistics by scraping advanced statistics from another website and merging them into the dataset.

For some subtasks, where specific details were required for clarity and timely completion, the descriptions included direct pointers to relevant APIs (e.g., “Create a ReferenceLine”). This hybrid approach elicited natural problem-solving language while providing sufficient scaffolding to ensure task feasibility.

To focus the study on code modification, each subtask description included a pointer to the relevant starting point in the codebase (e.g., `scraper.py` → `scrape_season_stats`). This ensured that participants spent most of their limited time interacting with the system features being evaluated, rather than on the variable task of file navigation [37]. Standardizing the starting point aimed to increase the internal validity of our comparison between the two systems.

5.1.4 Study Protocol. We conducted a within-subjects user study to compare NATURALEDIT against *Baseline*.

Environment. To ensure a consistent setup, we deployed both NATURALEDIT and *Baseline* in a web-based environment using CodeSandbox¹¹, a fork of VS Code. This approach provided pre-configured Node.js and Python environments for the tasks, avoiding issues such as local environment configuration and the latency of remote control screen sharing. Participants accessed the study environment through the provided web links.¹² For visual consistency with a standard local setup, the IDE theme was set to Default Light+. We instructed participants to view the task instructions, provided as a Notion link, on a separate device (e.g., an iPad or a second monitor) to minimize context switching.

Procedure. Each study session lasted about 90 minutes. At the beginning of the session, participants were asked to sign a consent form and complete a pre-study questionnaire on demographic information and programming experience. Next, we provided a brief introduction to the study’s objectives. To reduce performance anxiety and encourage authentic user behavior [63], participants were explicitly told that the goal was not to evaluate their task

¹¹<https://codesandbox.io/>

¹²Links are provided in the replication package.

performance but to gather feedback on the systems, and they were encouraged to try out available features. To mitigate learning and ordering effects [54], the sequence of tasks and conditions was counterbalanced across participants.

Before starting to use a system condition, participants were guided through an onboarding example to familiarize themselves with the system's features. We allocate 25 minutes for each task.

Data Collection. We collected data through a mixed-methods approach. The study environment automatically logged all user interactions with the systems to a Firebase database, including timestamps, feature usage events, and the context of LLM responses. The entire session, including the participant's screen and audio, was also recorded for post-hoc analysis. After each task/condition, participants completed the NASA-Task Load Index (NASA-TLX) questionnaire [30] to measure their perceived cognitive workload across its six dimensions (Mental Demand, Physical Demand, Temporal Demand, Performance, Effort, and Frustration). Additionally, we asked participants to self-report their level of understanding of both the original code and the system-generated modifications.

Upon completing both tasks, participants filled out a final questionnaire to evaluate both the *Baseline* and NATURALEDIT systems. The questionnaire contained parallel sections for each condition. The items for each system included the standardized UMUX-Lite usability scale [42], supplemented with custom questions evaluating support for key modification stages (e.g., comprehension, validation) and NATURALEDIT's specific interactive features.

The session concluded with a 20-minute semi-structured interview to gather in-depth qualitative feedback. The interview protocol guided discussion on participants' overall experiences with code modification, a comparative analysis of NATURALEDIT against existing workflows, exploration of system features, and contextual factors (e.g., task type) influencing interactions. The full list of questionnaire items and the protocol are in Appendices C.2 and C.3.

5.1.5 Data Analysis. We transcribed the audio recordings from the semi-structured interviews. Our qualitative coding followed an iterative, discussion-based thematic analysis procedure [39, 79]. To develop the codebook, one author coded 50% of the data to generate a preliminary set of codes. Another author then coded the same data, refining the codebook by adjusting existing codes and adding new ones as needed. The discrepancies were resolved through discussion to produce a unified codebook. Using this version, the two authors collaboratively coded the remaining data, continuously discussing their interpretations to ensure agreement. Because our process was collaborative and discussion-based, a formal inter-coder reliability metric was not calculated [47]. The complete codebook is provided in Appendix C.4, and anonymized coded interview segments are included in the replication package.

We analyzed the quantitative data from our user study using non-parametric statistical tests, as they are robust for small sample sizes and do not assume the data is normally distributed. For all within-subjects comparisons between NATURALEDIT and *Baseline*, we applied the Wilcoxon signed-rank test. We report the median for each condition (Mdn_N for NATURALEDIT and Mdn_B for *Baseline*), the test statistic W , and the corresponding p -value, adopting a significance threshold of $\alpha = .05$.

To understand the behavioral patterns of participants during the study, we constructed transition graphs from user interaction logs. Raw event logs were preprocessed to aggregate low-level UI interactions into higher-level actions. We applied two filters to clean the data. First, only mapping hover events with dwell times over 500 ms were treated as *Inspect Mapping* actions, with consecutive hovers combined, since users often examined multiple mappings on a summary in sequence. Second, because UI constraints could require multiple steps to adjust structure and granularity, consecutive *Adapt Summary Level1* events were collapsed into a single action representing the user's final chosen state. The resulting event counts and transition frequencies are shown in Figure 13.

5.2 Study Results




Figure 9: Distribution of time spent on tasks for each participant in both conditions.

We begin by reporting task performance and completion time. Task correctness per subtask was high and comparable across two conditions (*Baseline*: 88.9%; NATURALEDIT: 86.1%). The average completion times were similar (*Baseline*: 19.92 min, $SD = 5.98$; NATURALEDIT: 20.67 min, $SD = 4.03$) with no significant differences ($W = 22.5$, $p = .641$), as shown in Figure 9. In general, both systems performed well in helping developers complete the modification tasks.

The participants self-reported higher satisfaction with the code modifications produced by NATURALEDIT (Figure 10 Q11: $Mdn_N = 7.0$, $Mdn_B = 5.0$; $W = 0.0$, $p = .002 < .05$). Our subsequent analysis focuses on significant differences in developers' subjective experiences and behavioral strategies.

5.2.1 Overall Usability & Experience (RQ1). NATURALEDIT demonstrated significantly higher usability and was strongly preferred by developers for real-world use. The overall System Usability Scale (SUS) result for NATURALEDIT ($Mdn_N = 74.36$) was significantly higher than for the *Baseline* ($Mdn_B = 66.23$, $W = 22.5$, $p = .0293 < .05$), based on the UMUX-Lite responses [42]. For individual items, participants rated NATURALEDIT's capabilities as better meeting their requirements ($Mdn_N = 6.0$, $Mdn_B = 4.5$, $W = 3.5$, $p = .0273 < .05$). By contrast, there was no significant difference in perceived ease of use (Q2: $Mdn_N = 6.0$, $Mdn_B = 6.0$; $W = 10.5$, $p = .281$) or learnability (Q3: $Mdn_N = 6.5$, $Mdn_B = 7.0$; $W = 4.0$, $p = 1.0$). This suggests that, despite its additional features, NATURALEDIT preserved the simplicity and ease of learning of the more bare-bone *Baseline*. Finally, participants expressed significantly higher perceived usefulness of NATURALEDIT in real development work (Q4: $Mdn_N = 6.5$, $Mdn_B = 3.5$; $W = 0.0$, $p = .001 < .05$).

No significant difference in self-reported workload was found between the two systems. We assessed cognitive workload




Figure 10: Comparison of usability (Q1–Q2, UMUX-LITE) and utility (Q3–Q11) between *Baseline* and *NATURALEDIT*. Questions with statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) are marked with an asterisk (*), based on Wilcoxon signed-rank tests.

using NASA-TLX and found no statistically significant differences across any of the six dimensions: Mental Demand ($Mdn_N = 3.0$, $Mdn_B = 2.0$; $W = 17.5$, $p = .598$), Physical Demand ($Mdn_N = 2.0$, $Mdn_B = 2.0$; $W = 4.0$, $p = .500$), Temporal Demand ($Mdn_N = 2.0$, $Mdn_B = 2.0$; $W = 9.0$, $p = .516$), Performance ($Mdn_N = 2.0$, $Mdn_B = 1.5$; $W = 17.0$, $p = .867$), Effort ($Mdn_N = 2.5$, $Mdn_B = 2.5$; $W = 13.5$, $p = 1.0$), and Frustration ($Mdn_N = 2.0$, $Mdn_B = 2.0$; $W = 12.0$, $p = 1.0$).

NATURALEDIT shifted modification strategies toward an NL-centric workflow by reducing the viscosity of summary editing. As shown in Figure 13, participants using NATURALEDIT frequently worked through the NL summary, iteratively adapting its representation and refining its content. Overall, 52/60 modifications were completed via the modified summary, with only 8/60 using the edit-instruction fallback mechanism. In contrast, participants in the *Baseline* condition avoided manual edits of the generated code summary, relying on direct instructions instead (55/63).

This avoidance was driven by the high effort of manual summary editing. Participants described editing the static, paragraph-style summary as “cumbersome and requiring significant effort” (P1). For non-trivial changes, they often had to modify multiple locations iteratively, which was error-prone (P5, P10). As P5 explained, the *Baseline* forced “*a trade-off between the effort of phrasing a precise summary edit and the uncertainty of a high-level instruction.*” These observations motivated our later design of intent-driven NL updating (Section 3.2.3).

By enforcing code comprehension and providing a shared ground for intent validation, NATURALEDIT enhanced developers’ sense of control. Participants reported a significantly higher sense of control with NATURALEDIT (Q10: $Mdn_N = 6.0$, $Mdn_B = 5.0$, $W = 1.50$, $p = .023 < .05$). This control was linked to developers’ comprehension of the code, which NATURALEDIT’s workflow actively promoted. Participants reported a deeper understanding of the code before making modifications ($Mdn_N = 5.5$,

$Mdn_B = 3.0$, $W = 11.5$, $p = .211$) and significantly greater understanding of the system’s code edits ($Mdn_N = 5.5$, $Mdn_B = 4.5$, $W = 7.0$, $p = .043 < .05$).

By centering modification on the NL summary, NATURALEDIT encouraged a “comprehend-then-act” strategy, consistent with established best practices for code modification [26, 69]. This is in contrast with common practices in vibe coding, where programmers rely on rapid iterations of feature-level testing to modify the code without having sufficient comprehension of the code [25]. Participants saw this not as a burden but as a scaffold for responsible engineering (P1, P2, P9). As P9 argued, “*modifying code without understanding it is completely unreasonable*” in professional contexts, and NATURALEDIT “*forces the user to understand what the machine has done, yet this process was not difficult.*” This comprehension-driven control was particularly critical when working with unfamiliar code, where developers relied on the summary to build a mental model before making changes (P9, P12).

Furthermore, this control was supported by the NL summary serving as a “shared ground” where the developer’s intent and the system’s interpretation could meet and be validated (P2, P5, P7, P9, P11, P12). Participants described this shared ground as something that “*structured the way the system understood intent*” (P9), “*made the black box more transparent*” (P11), and “*gave [them] greater confidence it would work*” (P12), echoing prior findings that summaries provide a grounded way for “abstraction matching” [46].

Developers’ preference for NL interaction diverged between declarative and imperative tasks. Overall, participants rated the NL representation in NATURALEDIT as significantly more useful for achieving task goals ($Mdn_N = 7.0$, $Mdn_B = 5.0$, $W = 0.0$, $p = 0.002 < .05$). The feature was heavily used, with core NL-centric actions such as *Inspect Mapping*, *Adapt Summary Level*, and *Commit Modified Summary* occurring over 500 times (Figure 13).

However, developers’ preferences varied across tasks types. For declarative tasks, where the goal was to specify a final state (e.g., UI or visual changes), participants showed a relative preference for

direct instructions. This aligned with a declarative mental model focused on *what* the outcome should be, and the availability of immediate visual feedback reduced the need for deep code comprehension. As P2 noted, this distinction resembled “*declarative versus imperative programming*,” adding that for front-end tasks, “*I care more about the final effect*.”

In contrast, for procedural tasks involving complex logic or data transformations (e.g., back-end algorithms), participants preferred the summary-centric workflow. This aligned with a procedural mental model focused on *how* a result is achieved, and the lack of direct feedback made code semantics harder to validate, increasing reliance on comprehension. As P12 explained, for back-end work, they “*strongly need additional representation to help understand changes*” because correctness could not be easily verified by simply running the code. Ultimately, NATURALEDIT’s strength lay not in enforcing a single workflow but in supporting both task-dependent mental models and strategies.

5.2.2 Abstraction Gradient (RQ2). Adaptive representation enabled a top-down comprehension workflow by allowing developers to adjust the granularity on demand. NATURALEDIT significantly improved self-reported code comprehension compared to the baseline (Figure 10 Q5: $Mdn_N = 6.5$, $Mdn_B = 3.5$, $W = 0.0$, $p = .001 < .05$). This can be partly attributed to the adaptive code representation supported by NATURALEDIT. All 12 participants rated 6 or 7 for the feature’s usefulness in understanding code at different levels (Figure 11). Qualitative feedback indicated that this benefit came from its support for a top-down “overview-to-detail” workflow (P1, P2, P3, P8). Participants valued having “*on-demand different versions of the explanations*” (P5), which enabled them to begin with a “*coarser view for initial understanding*” (P3) and then drill down into details as needed. This practice allowed them to move “up and down the ladder of abstraction” [77] effectively. Interestingly, although participants conceptually favored beginning with a coarse overview, interaction logs show they rarely switched to the lowest granularity (Figure 12 left). This suggests that the default medium-level summary provided a sufficient and seamless entry point into their top-down workflow, making further descent unnecessary in most cases.

After building an initial understanding, developers often adjusted granularity to locate and validate modification points. During the study sessions, many participants first explored the surrounding context to build confidence (P2, P6, P9, P10). As P8 noted, “*the best workflow starts with a summary of the entire script, then narrows down to target individual functions*.” In one instance, P3 switched to a finer-grained view, discovered a more relevant function that did not appear in the low-granularity view, and selected it as the modification target instead. This active use of summaries for localization reinforces prior findings on their value in code modification workflows [73].

Developers preferred high-granularity summaries when modifying code, valuing their completeness and support for incremental changes (P3, P7, P8, P9, P10, P12). As shown in Figure 12, participants frequently switched to a high-granularity view (left) and applied edit instructions from it (middle). Two main reasons explain this preference. First, detailed summaries were more “*comprehensive*” (P9, P10), providing the information needed

as a solid foundation for edits. As P7 noted, they “*provide the system with more context*,” which increased confidence in the resulting code. Second, editing a portion of a fine-grained summary made changes feel more “*incremental*” and less likely to “*affect other parts*” (P8, P10), which fostered a sense of control.

This preference, however, was not absolute; developers valued the ability to choose the appropriate level of detail on demand. The optimal representation depended on the usage context, especially the scope of the intended edit. As P5 stated, “*If I’m looking to change or add an entire function, I don’t want too many details*.” In such cases, a higher-level summary provided sufficient scaffolding without the cognitive overhead of unnecessary detail. Thus, while high granularity was generally preferred for editing, the adaptability provided in NATURALEDIT allowed developers to align the representation with their intended scope of changes.

Most participants preferred bulleted summaries for their direct alignment with the code’s procedural logic (P1, P3, P6, P8, P10, P11). This is also reflected in Figure 12 (left), where across all granularity levels, participants more often adapted to structured NL. Developers found that the bulleted-list format more clearly represented a program’s step-by-step execution and matched their mental models of problem decomposition. As P1 explained, a key benefit was that “*it corresponds to the code structure, the hierarchy is clearer, and each line represents one thing*.” This alignment was especially valued for targeted modifications, where the structured summary provided “*a closer to a line-by-line comparison with the code*” (P8). In contrast, participants noted that paragraph summaries could obscure this direct mapping by reordering components within sentences, making tracing more difficult (P10, P11).

Bulleted summaries were also valued for their superior scannability, which lowered the cognitive cost of information foraging (P1, P3, P5, P6, P11, P12). Many described paragraph summaries as visually “*overwhelming*” (P6) or a block of text they were reluctant to read (P1, P11). The structured format, with its clear hierarchy and discrete bullet points, was consistently perceived as easier to process. P5 noted it was “*much more useful for searching, because each bullet point represented a single idea and was easier to skim through*.” This advantage was particularly important for non-native English speakers, who found the concise, bulleted format more accessible (P3, P11).

Still, some developers favored paragraph summaries for their narrative coherence (P2, P4, P7, P8). While structured lists presented individual steps clearly, they could feel “*disjointed*” (P2) or “*fragmented in overall logic*” (P7), obscuring causal relationships between operations. In contrast, paragraph summaries offered a more “*coherent*” and logically continuous narrative.

5.2.3 Closeness of Mapping (RQ3). Interactive mapping was the central action in the workflow, serving as the primary bridge between NL summary and code. The interaction logs show that it was the most frequent action in the NATURALEDIT workflow during the study sessions, with 307 total occurrences (Figure 13). It was supported by subjective ratings, with 8/12 participants strongly agreeing that the feature made the code-summary relationship explicit and easy to follow. The mapping also played a pivotal *transitioning* role in the workflow: it was the most common first action after generating a new summary (49/75) or switching to a new section (14/16).




Figure 11: User ratings of NATURALEdit features across four cognitive dimensions.




Figure 12: Usage counts of the adaptive multi-faceted representation across NL granularity and structure. Medium-Paragraph (lighter color, marked with *) introduces a distributional bias since it's the default view: fewer than expected when switching representations and more than expected when editing summaries.

Developers commonly used the mapping as a constant “anchor” to ground their understanding when navigating different NL representations, making it the most common action both immediately before (129/152) and after (146/152) adapting to a new summary level.

Interactive mapping guided developers through the code sequentially, adding a finer layer of comprehension granularity that was instrumental in planning modifications. Participants described inspecting the mappings segment by segment as a natural way to build an understanding of the code’s logic (P3, P5, P7, P9). This interaction created what P7 called “*another layer of granularity*”, allowing them to grasp the purpose of a summary chunk and then immediately see its implementation details. As P9 explained, this enabled a systematic process where “*once you understand one line of code, you can connect it to the whole*”, progressively building a detailed mental model. This guided comprehension was not just a passive activity but also the direct preparation for modification. As P5 noted, the combination of summary and mapping “*helped me not only understand the code but also plan how to change it*”. Figure 13 confirmed this role: inspecting the mapping was the most common action taken immediately before initiating a modification, both for summary editing (43/50) and for direct instructions (6/8).

By making code-summary connections explicit, the mapping provided on-demand localization and externalized the cognitive load of mentally tracing relationships (P1, P2, P5, P6, P11, P12). At a practical level, developers used the feature for

faster localization. P12 noted that “*helped me locate specific code much faster*,” and P5 explained that being able to “*just hover on it, and it would take me to the correct chunk of code*” was a significant improvement over relying only on the summary text. More fundamentally, this externalization reduced the cognitive effort. P2 articulated this benefit, stating that with typical AI tools, “*the human brain needs to do the mapping*,” whereas NATURALEdit “*automatically did the mapping for me, which reduced the burden*.”

Beyond initial comprehension, interactive mapping was also useful for validating code modifications. The value of the interactive mapping extended across the entire modification lifecycle. After NATURALEdit generated a code change and updated the summary, the most common first action developers took was to inspect the mapping on the new summary (36/48). This suggests they relied on it to understand and validate the automated changes. P12 explained that mapping could “*guide me to quickly verify if the summary is correct*,” which accelerated verification and deepened trust. Similarly, P8 noted that if the AI-generated code was incorrect, “*being able to trace each line and where it came from could help you fix it*.”

5.2.4 Viscosity, Visibility & Consistency (RQ4). The intent-driven workflow of NATURALEdit lowered modification viscosity by resolving the tension between the naturalness of issuing instructions and the high effort of manually editing NL summaries (P2, P5, P6, P7, P9, P12). 10/12 participants strongly agreed that expressing intent through high-level instructions to modify summaries was natural and efficient (Figure 11), consistent with their habits from using conversational AI tools (P2, P9). This was further supported by significantly higher ratings of NATURALEdit on intent specification (Figure 10 Q6: $Mdn_N = 6.0$, $Mdn_B = 4.5$, $W = 1.00$, $p = .016 < .05$). As P5 noted, this approach “*did a lot of the heavy lifting for me*.” In contrast, manually editing the summary text was perceived as a high-viscosity activity (Section 5.2.1). P6 felt the effort of doing so was “*comparable to modifying the code directly*,” which undermined the purpose of the NL representation. NATURALEdit’s intent-driven mechanism directly addressed this tension by allowing developers to issue instruction-based input while applying the result to a transparent, verifiable summary.

The intermediate summary diff went beyond simple verification, often disambiguating and elaborating on a developer’s concise initial instruction. This validation step was more than a passive check; it was an active dialogue where the system helped refine the developer’s intent. This is quantitatively reflected in the editing distance: developers’ initial instructions were often concise ($Mdn = 14$ words), which the system expanded into significantly more detailed summary edits ($Mdn = 23$ words, $W = 233.5$,




Figure 13: Transition graphs of user workflows in the *Baseline* (left) and **NATURALEdit (right) conditions. Nodes represent user actions, with occurrence counts shown in parentheses. Gray nodes indicate context-switching actions that shift the section focus, while white nodes indicate in-context actions within the same section. Edges represent transitions between actions, with opacity log-scaled by transition frequency (darker represents more common pathways). For clarity, self-loops and single-occurrence transitions are omitted.**




Figure 14: The editing distance of the instruction and the corresponding summary edits generated by **NATURALEdit, measured as word-level differences using the Gestalt pattern matching [59]. Median values are shown inside each box.**

$p = .0001 < .05$) (Figure 12). As P3 noted, this process could turn a “vague, conversational request” into a “more specific summary.” In several instances, this elaboration clarified ambiguity in the original intent. For example, when P1 vaguely instructed the system to find the *best* NDCG score, the summary specified this as the *highest*, clarifying the metric’s directionality.

While the workflow enabled developers to discover and correct system errors, some remained concerned about the LLM’s ability to interpret subtle instructions. The system’s interpretation was not always perfect. For instance, it sometimes

misreads a vague request by hard-coding specific inputs instead of capturing the underlying intent (P3, P12). For example, when asked to format an x-axis label with abbreviated months (e.g., Jan., Feb.), the system’s proposed summary included literal string examples rather than a general rule about date formatting. Still, the intermediate layer made such failures visible and easier to correct before code generation. Participants suggested enhancing the interface with more explicit warnings or error highlighting in the NL layer (P5).

Finally, the automatic, bidirectional synchronization of the summary provided consistency and visibility, serving as a validation that developers found indispensable. **NATURALEdit** was significantly rated higher to help developers understand and validate the modified code (Figure 10 Q8: $Mdn_N = 6.0$, $Mdn_B = 4.0$, $M = 0.0$, $p = .002 < .05$). After a modification, **NATURALEdit** automatically updated the NL summary and presented the changes as a minimal diff. Participants drew analogies of this step to reviewing a commit on GitHub for “*accidental changes*” before merging (P6). This validation step kept the NL representation and code synchronized, making the modification workflow feel more “*consistent*” (P7) and more supportive of iterative refinement (Figure 10 Q9: $Mdn_N = 6.0$, $Mdn_B = 4.0$, $M = 0.0$, $p = .002 < .05$). It also reduced cognitive load, as developers no longer had to “*re-read everything to find what changed*” (P5) but could instead rely on the concise diff to “*see at a glance where the modification was*” (P8).

6 Discussion and Design Implications for Future Systems

Our findings show that **NATURALEdit** succeeded in externalizing developers’ “internal semantics,” into a shared representation that grounds interaction for code modification. In this section, we reflect

on these findings to outline implications for the future of NL-based programming and representations.

6.1 Representing Code's Non-Linear Structure in NL

Our study showed that developers identified many strengths of bulleted summaries over paragraphs in programming tasks (Section 5.2.2), indicating that adding structure to NL representations is helpful. However, our effort in NATURALEDIT represents only a first step. A developer's mental model of a codebase is fundamentally non-linear, and future representations should reflect this reality. As P2 noted, a bulleted list effectively conveys "*parallel and hierarchical relationships*" but is not well suited for representing logical causality.

Furthermore, a codebase is a complex combination of tree structures (files, classes, methods) and graph structures (call dependencies, data flow, control flow). While developers may read localized text sequentially for detailed comprehension, in larger codebases, they navigate along these structural edges to comprehend the system and locate relevant modification points [23, 37]. This suggests that structured NL representations should evolve beyond simple lists and incorporate richer tree- and graph-based forms. This raises several research questions: What should such representations look like, and how should their mappings to code be visualized across different granularities? How can developer intent be applied to produce clear and comprehensible diffs? And how might NL representations support navigation analogous to moving through code?

6.2 Malleable and Personalized NL Representations

An ideal representation should also be malleable and personalized to the unique needs of the developer and the task at hand [10, 60]. In NATURALEDIT, the malleability of the NL representation is represented in its support for switching and sliding across six predefined combinations, which was appreciated by developers. However, they also express the need for more fine-grained customization. For example, P2 suggested that "*it might be better to have some customization options or alternative templates [for the NL representations]*," noting that at a low granularity they wanted to see the function signatures within a file rather than a descriptive summary of its overall functionality. This indicates that a one-size-fits-all approach to granularity is insufficient.

Looking ahead, two directions merit exploration. First, the system should implicitly learn developer preferences across contexts, as information needs vary with expertise, code complexity, task context, and individual programming habits. NL representations should adapt accordingly. Second, the system should also allow developers to explicitly initiate and control the style of NL representation, turning it into a malleable interface that empowers users to flexibly and efficiently express how the representation should appear.

6.3 Fluid Navigation Across Code Abstraction Layers

Our results suggest that the adaptivity in code abstraction layers needs to be bidirectional: not only should the NL representation itself be adaptive, but the interaction model for navigating across

code regions must also be fluid. Using a map analogy, NATURALEDIT currently supports "zooming in and out" within a preselected code region, but cannot "pan" to adjacent regions or "drill down" to new regions directly from the NL view. To change focus, developers must return to the code editor and make a new selection, which disrupts the interaction flow.

Participants highlighted the need for integrated code navigation starting from NL representations (P1, P7, P8). As P7 envisioned, "*being able to select a single segment to generate a new, more detailed view for just that part, without re-selecting the corresponding code*", would make navigation much smoother. These findings open up a rich design space: How should code abstraction layers be defined and surfaced in NL? Should navigation be organized as a hierarchical tree or as a zoomable interface? And how can interactions support moving up and down the ladder of abstraction directly from the NL layer? Future design efforts could help explore these directions.

6.4 An Ecosystem of Tools for NL-Centric Programming

If NL representations are to evolve into a first-class medium for programming, they need to be supported by a robust ecosystem of tools. Our findings highlight two directions.

First, NL representations should serve as a surface for debugging and error surfacing during program execution. As P9 suggested, "*if the code produces an error, the system should be able to highlight the problematic logical segment on the NL summary*." This connection between runtime behavior and semantic representation would integrate comprehension and validation into a single workflow.

Second, the workflow requires a new form of history management tailored to the non-linear nature of cognitive exploration (P5, P8, P12). Participants noted that the current diff-based revert mechanism is insufficient for the iterative, non-linear nature of AI-assisted programming. Unlike Git, which is optimized for collaboration and production, developers need a lightweight, personal versioning system that supports exploratory branching, allowing them to pursue multiple modification paths, compare alternatives, and selectively merge results. Such support is particularly critical for vibe coding, where developers iteratively explore and refine large-scale code edits.

7 Limitations and Future Work

7.1 The Scope of the Representational Paradigm

Our work introduces and evaluates a specific interaction paradigm centered on interactive NL representations, which differs from the conversational approaches in many existing AI programming assistants. During the study, some participants, accustomed to conversational tools, expressed a desire to "*ask clarifying questions*" (P7) or "*enable chat*" (P11). This distinction was a deliberate design choice to ensure the internal validity of our findings. The goal of this research was to isolate and understand the cognitive impacts of our core design principles (Section 3.1). Incorporating an open-ended conversational workflow would have introduced confounding factors, yielding results that are difficult to interpret and reproduce.

We do not, however, view the representational paradigm as incompatible with conversational interaction. Rather, it can be complementary. NL representation can serve as an intermediate layer

between developer intent and formal code, and its intent-driven workflow design benefits from the feasibility of NL dialogue (Section 5.2.4). Moreover, design insights such as interactive mapping and adaptive summaries are broadly applicable to text-code interactions in conversational systems. We envision integrating this paradigm into existing conversational approaches to explore its combined effects in realistic developer tasks.

7.2 Implementation and Design Trade-offs

As a research prototype, NATURALEDIT is subject to several practical constraints. First, its interactive responsiveness is limited by the latency of the underlying LLM. Although we applied optimizations such as parallelizing requests, the feedback is not instantaneous and can disrupt the fluidity of the interaction loop. Second, our approach incurs significant computational costs that may be prohibitive for larger code bases. Future work should explore more efficient methodologies, such as using Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [43] to establish a coarse-grained alignment between code and summary before invoking a more expensive model for fine-grained mapping.

Furthermore, our design embodies the trade-off in visual clarity. When interactive mapping highlights overlap with colored diffs, the salience of NL updates is reduced (P1, P5). This reflects a broader challenge of balancing multiple notational layers, where competing visual cues demand limited developer attention and highlight the difficulty of designing information-rich interfaces [27].

7.3 Threats to User Study Validity

We acknowledge several threats to validity. The external validity of our study is limited by task scope and participant sample. Although participants rated the tasks as realistic, their scope was necessarily constrained to fit within a lab session and thus does not capture the complexity of long-term software maintenance, illustrating the trade-off between experimental control and ecological validity in programmer studies [36, 70]. Moreover, while our 12 participants varied in experience, the sample may not represent the broader developer population.

In addition, the controlled nature of our study constrains task design. By providing predefined modification goals, it bypassed the open-ended problem identification and diagnosis common in real-world development. Although we applied the Natural Programming Elicitation method [50] (visual targets and indirect language rather than explicit, copy-pasteable instructions) to encourage natural engagement, the tasks remain a simplification of authentic workflows.

Finally, part of our analysis relies on subjective self-reports (e.g., interviews and usability ratings). To mitigate this, we triangulated findings with quantitative data such as interaction logs.

Future work should evaluate our paradigm in more complex, longitudinal settings with a larger and more diverse participant pool.

8 Conclusion

We present NATURALEDIT, a novel system that reimagines static NL summaries as interactive representations for code modification. Grounded in the *Cognitive Dimensions of Notations*, NATURALEDIT introduces adaptive multi-faceted summaries, interactive code mapping, and intent-driven synchronization to reduce cognitive load

and enhance developer control throughout the modification workflow. Through a technical evaluation and a controlled user study with 12 developers, we demonstrate that our NL-mediated paradigm is both technically viable and effectively improves developer experiences. Our work contributes a set of actionable design principles for future NL programming tools and provides insights into richer, more structured, and multimodal representations of code.

Data and Code Availability

To support transparency and reproducibility, we have made our research artifacts publicly accessible in a replication package at <https://github.com/ND-SaNDwichLAB/naturaledit-replication-package>.

This package contains: (1) the source code for NATURALEDIT, *Baseline*, and the technical evaluation showcase website; (2) materials for technical evaluation, including the benchmark run and expert rating; (3) materials for user study, including study tasks (with CodeSandbox links), the compiled VS Code extensions, and all anonymized raw data (interaction logs and questionnaire responses); and (4) analysis artifacts, including the scripts for data analysis and visualization, and the coded interview segments from qualitative analysis. All figures, tables, and statistical results can be fully reproduced with the provided data and analysis scripts.

Acknowledgment

This research was supported in part by an AnalytiXIN Faculty Fellowship, an NVIDIA Academic Hardware Grant, a Google Cloud Research Credit Award, a Google Research Scholar Award, and NSF grants CCF-2211428, CCF-2315887, and CCF-2100035. Any opinions, findings, or recommendations expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsors.

References

- [1] Harold Abelson and Gerald Jay Sussman. 1996. *Structure and interpretation of computer programs*. The MIT Press.
- [2] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henry Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732* (2021).
- [3] Alberto Bacchelli and Christian Bird. 2013. Expectations, outcomes, and challenges of modern code review. In *2013 35th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 712–721.
- [4] Michel Beaudouin-Lafon and Wendy E Mackay. 2000. Reification, polymorphism and reuse: three principles for designing visual interfaces. In *Proceedings of the working conference on Advanced visual interfaces*. 102–109.
- [5] Benjamin B Bederson and James D Hollan. 1994. Pad++ a zooming graphical interface for exploring alternate interface physics. In *Proceedings of the 7th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology*. 17–26.
- [6] Tom Britton, Lisa Jeng, Graham Carver, Paul Cheak, and Tomer Katzenellenbogen. 2013. Reversible debugging software. *Judge Bus. School, Univ. Cambridge, Cambridge, UK, Tech. Rep* 229 (2013), 2013.
- [7] Ruven Brooks. 1983. Towards a theory of the comprehension of computer programs. *International journal of man-machine studies* 18, 6 (1983), 543–554.
- [8] Frederick P Brooks Jr. 1995. *The mythical man-month: essays on software engineering*. Pearson Education.
- [9] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [10] Yining Cao, Peiling Jiang, and Haijun Xia. 2025. Generative and Malleable User Interfaces with Generative and Evolving Task-Driven Data Model. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–20.
- [11] Federico Cassano, Luisa Li, Akul Sethi, Noah Shinn, Abby Brennan-Jones, Anton Lozhkov, Carolyn Jane Anderson, and Arjun Guha. 2024. Can It Edit? Evaluating the Ability of Large Language Models to Follow Code Editing Instructions. In *Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*.

[12] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374* (2021).

[13] William R Cook. 2007. Applescript. In *Proceedings of the third ACM SIGPLAN conference on History of programming languages*. 1–1.

[14] Richard A DeMillo, Richard J Lipton, and Frederick G Sayward. 2006. Hints on test data selection: Help for the practicing programmer. *Computer* 11, 4 (2006), 34–41.

[15] Françoise Détienne. 2001. *Software design—cognitive aspect*. Springer Science & Business Media.

[16] Yifeng Di and Tianyi Zhang. 2025. Enhancing Code Generation via Bidirectional Comment-Level Mutual Grounding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07768* (2025).

[17] Edsger W Dijkstra. 2005. On the foolishness of “natural language programming”. *Program Construction: International Summer School* (2005), 51–53.

[18] Rodrigo Duran, Albinia Zaygorodniaia, and Juha Sorva. 2022. Cognitive load theory in computing education research: A review. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE)* 22, 4 (2022), 1–27.

[19] Randal W Engle and Andrew RA Conway. 2004. Working memory and comprehension. In *Working memory and thinking*. Routledge, 73–97.

[20] İlker Eftikan, Sulaiman Abubakar Musa, Rukayya Sunusi Alkassim, et al. 2016. Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics* 5, 1 (2016), 1–4.

[21] Michael Fagan. 2011. Design and code inspections to reduce errors in program development. In *Software pioneers: contributions to software engineering*. Springer, 575–607.

[22] Alvan R Feinstein and Domenic V Cicchetti. 1990. High agreement but low kappa: I. The problems of two paradoxes. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 43, 6 (1990), 543–549.

[23] Scott D Fleming, Chris Scaffidi, David Piorkowski, Margaret Burnett, Rachel Bellamy, Joseph Lawrence, and Irwin Kwan. 2013. An information foraging theory perspective on tools for debugging, refactoring, and reuse tasks. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)* 22, 2 (2013), 1–41.

[24] Erich Gamma, Richard Helm, Ralph Johnson, and John Vlissides. 1995. *Design patterns: elements of reusable object-oriented software*. Pearson Deutschland GmbH.

[25] Francis Geng, Anshul Shah, Haolin Li, Nawab Mulla, Steven Swanson, Gerald Soosai Raj, Daniel Zingaro, and Leo Porter. 2025. Exploring Student-AI Interactions in Vibe Coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.22614* (2025).

[26] David J Gilmore. 1991. Models of debugging. *Acta psychologica* 78, 1–3 (1991), 151–172.

[27] Thomas RG Green. 1989. Cognitive dimensions of notations. *People and computers V* (1989), 443–460.

[28] David Gries. 2012. *The science of programming*. Springer Science & Business Media.

[29] Mark Halpern. 1966. Foundations of the case for natural-language programming. In *Proceedings of the November 7-10, 1966, fall joint computer conference*. 639–649.

[30] Sandra G Hart. 1986. NASA task load index (TLX). (1986).

[31] Ava Heinonen, Bettina Lehtelä, Arto Hellas, and Fabian Fagerholm. 2023. Synthesizing research on programmers’ mental models of programs, tasks and concepts—A systematic literature review. *Information and Software Technology* 164 (2023), 107300.

[32] Edwin L Hutchins, James D Hollan, and Donald A Norman. 1986. Direct manipulation interfaces. In *User centered system design*. CRC Press, 87–124.

[33] Kevin Jesse, Toufique Ahmed, Premkumar T Devanbu, and Emily Morgan. 2023. Large language models and simple, stupid bugs. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 20th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 563–575.

[34] Carlos E Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Swe-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06770* (2023).

[35] David Kirsh. 2010. Thinking with external representations. *AI & society* 25, 4 (2010), 441–454.

[36] Amy J Ko, Thomas D LaToza, and Margaret M Burnett. 2015. A practical guide to controlled experiments of software engineering tools with human participants. *Empirical Software Engineering* 20 (2015), 110–141.

[37] Amy J Ko, Brad A Myers, Michael J Coblenz, and Htet Htet Aung. 2006. An exploratory study of how developers seek, relate, and collect relevant information during software maintenance tasks. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering* 32, 12 (2006), 971–987.

[38] Herb Krasner. 2021. The cost of poor software quality in the US: A 2020 report. *Proc. Consortium Inf. Softw. QualityTM (CISQTM)* 2 (2021), 3.

[39] Jonathan Lazar, Jinjuan Heidi Feng, and Harry Hochheiser. 2017. *Research methods in human-computer interaction*. Morgan Kaufmann.

[40] Alexander LeClair, Sakib Haque, Lingfei Wu, and Collin McMillan. 2020. Improved code summarization via a graph neural network. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on program comprehension*. 184–195.

[41] Stanley Letovsky. 1987. Cognitive processes in program comprehension. *Journal of Systems and software* 7, 4 (1987), 325–339.

[42] James R Lewis, Brian S Utisch, and Deborah E Maher. 2013. UMUX-LITE: when there’s no time for the SUS. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 2099–2102.

[43] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 9459–9474.

[44] Kaixin Li, Qisheng Hu, James Zhao, Hui Chen, Yuxi Xie, Tiedong Liu, Michael Shieh, and Junxian He. 2024. Instructcoder: Instruction tuning large language models for code editing. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 4: Student Research Workshop)*. 50–70.

[45] Jenny T Liang, Chenyang Yang, and Brad A Myers. 2024. A large-scale survey on the usability of ai programming assistants: Successes and challenges. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM international conference on software engineering*. 1–13.

[46] Michael Xieyang Liu, Advait Sarkar, Carina Negreanu, Benjamin Zorn, Jack Williams, Neil Toronto, and Andrew D Gordon. 2023. “What it wants me to say”: Bridging the abstraction gap between end-user programmers and code-generating large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–31.

[47] Nora McDonald, Sarita Schoenebeck, and Andrea Forte. 2019. Reliability and inter-rater reliability in qualitative research: Norms and guidelines for CSCW and HCI practice. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction* 3, CSCW (2019), 1–23.

[48] Yutao Mou, Shikun Zhang, and Wei Ye. 2025. Can You Really Trust Code Copilots? Evaluating Large Language Models from a Code Security Perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.10494* (2025).

[49] Hussein Mozannar, Gagan Bansal, Adam Fourney, and Eric Horvitz. 2024. Reading between the lines: Modeling user behavior and costs in AI-assisted programming. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–16.

[50] Brad A Myers, Amy J Ko, Thomas D LaToza, and YoungSeok Yoon. 2016. Programmers are users too: Human-centered methods for improving programming tools. *Computer* 49, 7 (2016), 44–52.

[51] Brad A Myers, John F Pane, and Amy J Ko. 2004. Natural programming languages and environments. *Commun. ACM* 47, 9 (2004), 47–52.

[52] Glenford J Myers, Tom Badgett, Todd M Thomas, and Corey Sandler. 2004. *The art of software testing*. Vol. 2. Wiley Online Library.

[53] Kshirasagar Naik and Priyadarshi Tripathy. 2011. *Software testing and quality assurance: theory and practice*. John Wiley & Sons.

[54] Jakob Nielsen. 1994. *Usability engineering*. Morgan Kaufmann.

[55] Don Norman. 2013. *The design of everyday things: Revised and expanded edition*. Basic books.

[56] Ken Perlin and David Fox. 1993. Pad: an alternative approach to the computer interface. In *Proceedings of the 20th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques*. 57–64.

[57] Marco Piccioni, Carlo A Furia, and Bertrand Meyer. 2013. An empirical study of API usability. In *2013 ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement*. IEEE, 5–14.

[58] Strategic Planning. 2002. The economic impacts of inadequate infrastructure for software testing. *National Institute of Standards and Technology* 1, 2002 (2002), 1.

[59] John W Ratcliff, David E Metzener, et al. 1988. Pattern matching: The gestalt approach. *Dr. Dobb’s Journal* 13, 7 (1988), 46.

[60] Alexander Richter and Kai Riemer. 2013. Malleable end-user software. *Business & Information Systems Engineering* 5, 3 (2013), 195–197.

[61] Martin P Robillard. 2009. What makes APIs hard to learn? Answers from developers. *IEEE software* 26, 6 (2009), 27–34.

[62] Gregg Rothermel and Mary Jean Harrold. 2002. Analyzing regression test selection techniques. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering* 22, 8 (2002), 529–551.

[63] Jeffrey Rubin and Dana Chisnell. 2008. *Handbook of usability testing: How to plan, design, and conduct effective tests*. John Wiley & Sons.

[64] Jean E Sammet. 1966. The use of english as a programming language. *Commun. ACM* 9, 3 (1966), 228–230.

[65] Advait Sarkar and Ian Drosos. 2025. Vibe coding: programming through conversation with artificial intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.23253* (2025).

[66] Advait Sarkar, Andrew D Gordon, Carina Negreanu, Christian Poelitz, Sruti Srinivas Ragavan, and Ben Zorn. 2022. What is it like to program with artificial intelligence? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.06213* (2022).

[67] Amal Shargabi, Syed Ahmad Aljunid, Muthukkaruppan Annamalai, Shuhaida Mohamed Shuhidan, and Abdullah Mohd Zin. 2015. Program comprehension levels of abstraction for novices. In *2015 International Conference on Computer, Communications, and Control Technology (I4CT)*. IEEE, 211–215.

[68] Kensen Shi, Deniz Altnbükent, Saswat Anand, Mihai Christodorescu, Katja Grünwedel, Alexa Koenings, Sai Naidu, Anurag Pathak, Marc Rasi, Freddie Ribeiro, et al. 2024. Natural language outlines for code: Literate programming in the llm

era. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.04820* (2024).

[69] Ben Schneiderman and Richard Mayer. 1979. Syntactic/semantic interactions in programmer behavior: A model and experimental results. *International Journal of Computer & Information Sciences* 8, 3 (1979), 219–238.

[70] Janet Siegmund, Norbert Siegmund, and Sven Apel. 2015. Views on internal and external validity in empirical software engineering. In *2015 IEEE/ACM 37th IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering*, Vol. 1. IEEE, 9–19.

[71] Sean Stapleton, Yashmeet Gambhir, Alexander LeClair, Zachary Eberhart, Westley Weimer, Kevin Leach, and Yu Huang. 2020. A human study of comprehension and code summarization. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Program Comprehension*. 2–13.

[72] Ningzhi Tang, Meng Chen, Zheng Ning, Aakash Bansal, Yu Huang, Collin McMillan, and Toby Jia-Jun Li. 2024. Developer behaviors in validating and repairing llm-generated code using ide and eye tracking. In *2024 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*. IEEE, 40–46.

[73] Ningzhi Tang, Emory Smith, Yu Huang, Collin McMillan, and Toby Jia-Jun Li. 2025. Exploring Direct Instruction and Summary-Mediated Prompting in LLM-Assisted Code Modification. In *Proceedings of the 2025 IEEE Symposium on Visual Languages and Human-Centric Computing (VL/HCC)*. IEEE. arXiv:2508.01523 To appear.

[74] Yuan Tian, Jonathan K Kummerfeld, Toby Jia-Jun Li, and Tianyi Zhang. 2024. Sqlucid: Grounding natural language database queries with interactive explanations. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. 1–20.

[75] Yuan Tian, Zheng Zhang, Zheng Ning, Toby Jia-Jun Li, Jonathan K Kummerfeld, and Tianyi Zhang. 2023. Interactive text-to-SQL generation via editable step-by-step explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07372* (2023).

[76] Christoph Treude, Justin Middleton, and Thushari Atapattu. 2020. Beyond accuracy: Assessing software documentation quality. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 1509–1512.

[77] Bret Victor. 2011. Up and down the ladder of abstraction. *Retrieved September 2* (2011), 2015.

[78] Robert Wallace, Aakash Bansal, Zachary Karas, Ningzhi Tang, Yu Huang, Toby Jia-Jun Li, and Collin McMillan. 2025. Programmer visual attention during context-aware code summarization. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2025).

[79] Michael Williams and Tami Moser. 2019. The art of coding and thematic exploration in qualitative research. *International management review* 15, 1 (2019), 45–55.

[80] Jeannette M Wing. 2006. Computational thinking. *Commun. ACM* 49, 3 (2006), 33–35.

[81] Niklaus Wirth. 1971. Program development by stepwise refinement. *Commun. ACM* 14, 4 (1971), 221–227.

[82] Xin Xia, Lingfeng Bao, David Lo, Zhenchang Xing, Ahmed E Hassan, and Shanning Li. 2017. Measuring program comprehension: A large-scale field study with professionals. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 44, 10 (2017), 951–976.

[83] Stephen S Yau, James S Collofello, and T MacGregor. 1978. Ripple effect analysis of software maintenance. In *The IEEE Computer Society's Second International Computer Software and Applications Conference, 1978. COMPSAC'78*. IEEE, 60–65.

[84] Ryan Yen, Josh Pollock, Caroline Berger, and Arvind Satyanarayan. 2025. Something In Between: Formal Spec and Informal Representation. In *CHI'2025 Workshop on Tools for Thought: Research and Design for Understanding, Protecting, and Augmenting Human Cognition with Generative AI. Yokohama, Japan*.

[85] Yifan Zhang, Jiliang Li, Zachary Karas, Aakash Bansal, Toby Jia-Jun Li, Collin McMillan, Kevin Leach, and Yu Huang. 2024. Eyetrans: Merging human and machine attention for neural code summarization. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* 1, FSE (2024), 115–136.

A Prompt Templates

Listing 1: Prompts for Generating Multi-Faceted NL Representation

You are an expert code summarizer. For the following code, generate 6 summaries, one for each combination of detail level (low, medium, high) and structure (unstructured, i.e., paragraph, structured, i.e., bulleted):

- low_unstructured: One-sentence, low-detail, paragraph style.
- low_structured: 2-3 short bullet points, low-detail, as a single string. Each bullet must start with "•" and be separated by \n. Never return an array.

- medium_unstructured: 2-3 sentences, medium-detail, paragraph style.
- medium_structured: 3-5 bullet points, medium-detail, as a single string. Use "•" for first-level bullets, and ENCOURAGE the use of two-level bullets (use "◦" for the second level, and indent the second-level bullet with 2 spaces before the "◦") when logical groupings exist. Bullets must be separated by \n. Never return an array.
- high_unstructured: 3-4 sentences, high-detail, paragraph style.
- high_structured: 4-8 bullet points, high-detail, as a single string. Use "•" for first-level bullets, and ENCOURAGE the use of two-level bullets (use "◦" for the second level, and indent the second-level bullet with 2 spaces before the "◦") when logical groupings exist. Bullets must be separated by \n. Never return an array.

IMPORTANT:

- For medium_structured and high_structured, if there are logical groupings, you should use two-level bullets ("•" and "◦"). For the second-level bullet ("◦"), always indent with 2 spaces before the "◦".
- The file context below is provided ONLY for reference to help understand the code's environment.
- Your summary MUST focus ONLY on the specific code snippet provided.
- Return your response as a JSON object with keys: title, low_unstructured, low_structured, medium_unstructured, medium_structured, high_unstructured, high_structured.

File Context (for reference only):

```
 ${fileContext}
```

Code to summarize:

```
 ${code}
```

Listing 2: Prompts for Building Interactive Cross-Representation Mapping

You are an expert at code-to-summary mapping. Given the following code and summary, extract up to 10 key summary components (phrases or semantic units) from the summary.

IMPORTANT:

1. Each summaryComponent you extract MUST be a substring (exact part) of the summary text below.
2. Extract summaryComponents in the exact order they appear in the summary text.
3. Do NOT hallucinate or invent summary components that do not appear in the summary.

For each summaryComponent, extract one or more relevant code segments from the code that best match the meaning of the summary component.

- For each code segment, return both the code fragment (as a string) and its line number in the original code (1-based).
- Prefer to use a complete code statement (such as a full line, assignment, function definition, or block) as the code segment if it clearly represents the summary component's meaning.

- If a full statement is not appropriate or would be ambiguous, you should use a smaller, relevant fragment (such as a variable, function name, operator, or part of an expression).
- Only include enough code to make the mapping meaningful and unambiguous.
- If a code segment contains multiple lines, split them into separate objects in the codeSegments array.

Return as a JSON array of objects:

```
[  
  {  
    "summaryComponent": "...",  
    "codeSegments": [  
      { "code": "code fragment 1", "line": 12 },  
      { "code": "code fragment 2", "line": 15 }  
    ]  
  },  
  ...  
]
```

Code (with line numbers for reference):

\${codeWithLineNumbers}

Summary:
 \${summaryText}

Listing 3: Prompts for Applying Edit Instruction on Modifiable Summary

You are an expert at editing code summaries. In this scenario, a developer is using a summary-mediated approach to modify code:

1. Instead of directly editing the code, the developer modifies the summary to express their desired code behavior.
2. The modified summary will later be used to generate the actual code changes.
3. Your task is to integrate the developer's instruction into the summary, making it clear what the new code should do.

Given the following original summary and a direct instruction, update the summary to incorporate the developer's intent:

- The code context below is provided ONLY for reference to help understand the summary's environment.
- Preserve the parts of the original summary that are not affected by the instruction.
- Maintain the original summary format (sentence, bullet points, etc.).
- Make it easy to identify what changed by keeping unchanged parts exactly as they were.
- Integrate the instruction seamlessly into existing sentences or bullet points as much as possible.
- However, add new sentences or bullet points if the instruction cannot be naturally integrated into existing ones.
- The updated summary MUST clearly express what the new code should do, incorporating ALL information from the instruction.
- Output only the updated summary, nothing else.

Code Context (for reference only):
 \${originalCode}

Original summary:
 \${originalSummary}

Developer's instruction (integrate this intent FULLY into the updated summary):
 \${instruction}

Updated summary:

Listing 4: Prompts for Code Modification via Edited NL Summary

You are an expert code editor. Given the following original code and an updated summary (detail level: \${detailLevel}, structure: \${structuredType}), update the code to reflect the changes in the new summary.

- The file context below is provided ONLY for reference to help understand the code's environment, and your code changes MUST focus ONLY on the specific code snippet provided.
- Only change the code as needed to match the new summary, and keep the rest of the code unchanged.
- Preserve the leading whitespace (indentation) of each line from the original code in the updated code. For any modified or new lines, match the indentation style and level of the surrounding code.
- Pay close attention to the differences between the original summary and the edited summary, which reflects developer's intent of what the new code should be.
- Output only the updated code, nothing else.

File Context (for reference only):
 \${fileContext}

Original code:
 \${originalCode}

Original summary (detail level: \${detailLevel}, structure: \${structuredType}):
 \${originalSummary}

Updated summary (detail level: \${detailLevel}, structure: \${structuredType}):
 \${editedSummary}

Updated code:

Listing 5: Prompts for Generating NL Representation with Incremental Diffs

You are an expert code summarizer. Your task is to generate a new summary for the MODIFIED code below, using the original code and its previous summary as reference.

Instructions:

- Your new summary MUST focus on the code differences (addition, deletion) between the original and modified code and clearly reflect those changes, even if they are small, such as inline comments.

- Make the changed parts of the summary easy to identify (e.g., by being explicit about what changed, or by using wording that highlights the update). I mean, rather than describing the change itself (e.g., updated the function to ...), seamlessly integrate the changes into the new summary in one coherent, descriptive sentence.
- The new summary should be close to the old summary, only updating the parts that are affected by the code change: If a part of the summary is still accurate for the new code, keep it unchanged; If a part of the summary is no longer accurate, change only that part to reflect the new code. Do not add unnecessary changes or rephrase unchanged parts.
- For all structured (bulleted) summaries, return as a single string. Each bullet must start with "•" and be separated by \\n. For medium_structured and high_structured, if there are logical groupings, you should use two-level bullets ("•" and "◦"). For the second-level bullet ("◦"), always indent with 2 spaces before the "◦". Never return an array.
- Return your response as a JSON object with keys: title, low_unstructured, low_structured, medium_unstructured, medium_structured, high_unstructured, high_structured.

File Context (for reference only):
 \${fileContext}

Original code:
 \${originalCode}

Old summary:
 {
 "title": "\${oldSummary.title}",
 "low_unstructured": "\${oldSummary.low_unstructured}",
 "low_structured": "\${oldSummary.low_structured}",
 "medium_unstructured": "\${oldSummary.medium_unstructured}",
 "medium_structured": "\${oldSummary.medium_structured}",
 "high_unstructured": "\${oldSummary.high_unstructured}",
 "high_structured": "\${oldSummary.high_structured}"
 }

MODIFIED code:
 \${newCode}

B Technical Evaluation Materials

B.1 Expert Rating Guide

Overview. This document provides the definitions and criteria for evaluating the quality of the intermediate artifacts generated by the NATURALEDIT system. The goal is to systematically assess the quality of the NL summaries, their mapping to the source code, and the diffs between summary versions. All items will be rated on a 5-point scale, where the meaning of each point is defined for the specific dimension being evaluated. As a general guide:

- **5: Excellent / Strongly Agree** - The artifact is of very high quality, with no significant issues.
- **4: Good / Agree**
- **3: Acceptable / Neutral** - The artifact is adequate for its purpose but has noticeable room for improvement.

- **2: Poor / Disagree**

- **1: Very Poor / Strongly Disagree** - The artifact is of low quality and has significant, potentially misleading, flaws.

Part A: Summary Quality. (This is rated for each of the 36 buggy code summaries and the 36 ground-truth code summaries.)

A.1. Accuracy: Does the summary correctly describe the functionality and logic of the corresponding code?

- **5 (Excellent):** Perfectly accurate. It correctly captures all key logic, operations, and outcomes without any errors or misinterpretations.
- **3 (Acceptable):** Mostly accurate. It captures the main purpose of the code but may contain minor omissions or slight inaccuracies that do not fundamentally mislead the reader.
- **1 (Very Poor):** Inaccurate. It contains significant factual errors, describes functionality that doesn't exist, or completely misses the core purpose of the code.

A.2. Clarity: Is the summary written in clear, unambiguous, and easy-to-understand language for a developer?

- **5 (Excellent):** Very clear, concise, and well-written. A developer could understand the code's function almost instantly.
- **3 (Acceptable):** Generally understandable, but the language might be slightly awkward, verbose, or contain jargon that could be simplified.
- **1 (Very Poor):** Unclear, confusing, grammatically incorrect, or so full of jargon that it is difficult to parse.

Part B: Segmentation & Mapping Quality. (This part has two components: ratings for each segmentation as a whole for 72 summaries, and ratings for each of the 478 individual mapping highlights.)

B.1. Segmentation Granularity: Is the code broken down into segments of an appropriate and useful size?

- **5 (Excellent):** The granularity is perfect. Each segment is a meaningful, well-sized logical chunk.
- **3 (Acceptable):** The granularity is mostly fine, but some segments might be slightly too large (coarse-grained) or too small and fragmented.
- **1 (Very Poor):** The segmentation is not useful. It is either one giant, monolithic block or is excessively fragmented into meaningless single lines or tokens.

B.2. Mapping Accuracy (Precision): Is this specific link that connects the summary segment to the code correct?

- **5 (Correct):** The link is perfectly correct. The code highlight is directly relevant to the summary segment.
- **1 (Incorrect):** The link is wrong. The code highlight is irrelevant to the summary segment.

B.3. Mapping Coverage (Recall): Does this summary segment successfully link to all the relevant parts of the code that implement the concept it describes?

- **5 (Complete Coverage):** Yes. The summary segment is linked to every piece of relevant code. No relevant code segments are missed.
- **3 (Minor Omissions):** Mostly. The main, most critical code blocks are linked, but a minor, less important part might be missing (e.g., a related variable declaration or a peripheral logging statement).

- **1 (Major Omissions):** No. Key code blocks that directly implement the summary segment's description are completely unlinked.

Part C: Summary Diff Quality. (This is rated for each of the 36 diffs between the before-and-after summary pairs.)

C.1. Faithfulness: Does the change in the summary accurately represent the change that occurred in the code?

- **5 (Excellent):** A perfect representation. The summary diff mirrors the semantic code change exactly.
- **3 (Acceptable):** Mostly faithful. It captures the main idea of the code change but might misrepresent a minor detail or nuance of the implementation.
- **1 (Very Poor):** Unfaithful. The summary diff is misleading, inaccurate, or completely unrelated to the actual change in the code.

C.2. Completeness: Does the summary diff capture all of the important semantic changes from the code diff?

- **5 (Excellent):** Fully complete. No important aspect of the code change is missing from the summary diff.
- **3 (Acceptable):** Mostly complete. It captures the primary functional change but might omit a secondary change (e.g., a change to a variable name or a log message that accompanies a logic change).
- **1 (Very Poor):** Incomplete. It completely misses one or more significant functional changes made in the code.

C.3. Salience: Does the summary diff make the most important aspects of the change stand out clearly and effectively?

- **5 (Excellent):** Highly salient. The change is presented clearly and concisely, making the core of the modification immediately obvious (e.g., a single, clear bullet point is added).
- **3 (Acceptable):** Moderately salient. The change is correctly represented, but it might be buried in other minor textual edits or phrased in a way that requires careful reading to understand the key point.
- **1 (Very Poor):** Not salient. The important change is obscured, minimized, or lost in a sea of trivial rewording, making it hard for a user to spot the key difference.

C Controlled User Study Materials

C.1 Programming Tasks

C.2 Questionnaires

C.2.1 NASA-TLX. (1=Very low, 7=Very high) unless otherwise noted

1. **Mental Demand:** How mentally demanding was the task?
2. **Physical Demand:** How physically demanding was the task?
3. **Temporal Demand:** How hurried or rushed was the pace of the task?
4. **Performance:** How successful were you in accomplishing what you were asked to do? (1=Perfect, 7=Failure)

Note: Participants were informed that a lower score means perfect, while a higher score indicates failure.

C.2.2 UMUX-LITE. (1=Strongly disagree, 7=Strongly agree)

1. This system's capabilities meet my requirements.

2. This system is easy to use.

C.2.3 Self-Defined Likert Scale Items. (1=Strongly disagree, 7=Strongly agree)

Post-Task Questions (Asked immediately after each task, alongside the NASA-TLX)

1. I have a high level of understanding of the original code before it was modified.
2. I have a high level of understanding of the code modifications made by the system.

Task Realism (Asked once at the end of the entire session, the same applies below)

1. The study tasks felt as realistic as my daily programming.

Evaluation of both systems (NATURALEDIT and Baseline)

1. I could quickly learn how to use the system.
2. I would use this system in my real development work if it were available.
3. The system helps me comprehend the original code.
4. The system supports me in specifying my intentions.
5. The system helps me understand and validate the modified code.
6. The system assists with the iterative refinement of code.
7. The natural language representation is useful for achieving the task goal.
8. I felt a good sense of control over the system's behavior.
9. I am generally satisfied with the code modifications produced by the system.

Evaluation of NATURALEDIT's specific features

1. The adaptive and multifaceted summaries helped in understanding the code at different levels.
2. The interactive mapping between summary and code made their relationship explicit and easy to follow.
3. By applying direct instructions to the summary, I was able to express my intentions flexibly and efficiently.
4. The auto-updated summary with visual diffs helped me validate the changes in a consistent workflow.

C.3 Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

The following questions served as a guide for our semi-structured interviews. This protocol was used flexibly; we often prioritized follow-up questions based on direct observations of a participant's behavior and their real-time commentary over strictly adhering to this script.

Specific Observations

- “I observed you did [action] when [situation]. Could you elaborate on your thought process there?”

General Code Modification Workflow

- What are your main challenges when modifying existing, unfamiliar code (e.g., understanding its logic, validating changes)?
- What is your typical workflow for modifying existing code, and what are your main concerns during that process (e.g., introducing hidden bugs)?

Feedback on NATURALEDIT's Core Features

- Compare the experience of modifying code via its NL representation to your usual workflow of editing code directly.

Task 1: Finance Dashboard

Overview

A web development project that visualizes stock prices using a combination of a `Node.js` backend, which retrieves data from Yahoo Finance, and a `React` frontend, which displays the data in a line chart.

How to Run

1. Frontend: `cd frontend && npm run dev`
2. Backend: `cd server && node index.js`

Subtasks




Figure 1. Current interface awaiting modification.

A. X-axis Tick Marks

`frontend/src/StockChart.jsx` Implement the helper function `formatDateString` and apply it!

B. Current Price Data

`server/index.js` → `/api/stock/:symbol` The frontend also wants to know the `current stock price`!

C. Current Price Line

`frontend/src/StockChart.jsx` Create a `ReferenceLine` for it and match the `expected style`!



Figure 2. Expected result interface for your tasks!

(a) Task 1: Finance Dashboard

Figure 15: Screenshots of task descriptions used in the study.

- How did the different summary views (in terms of structure and granularity) affect your workflow? Did you have a preference?
- How useful was the interactive mapping between NL and code for understanding or modification?
- Did the automatically updated NL summary, with its visual diff, help you validate code changes?

Perception of Output Quality and Control

- Did you notice any quality differences between the modified code and the generated NL summaries?

Task 2: MVP Predictor

Overview

A machine learning pipeline ranks NBA players. The data, scraped from basketball-reference.com, is processed and then used to train a gradient boosting model that outputs predicted MVP rankings.

How to Run

Directly run `scraper.py`, `preprocess.py`, and `rank_model.py` in order.

You should see a folder called `data` with the statistics and graphs.

Subtasks

A. + Advanced Metrics

`scraper.py` → `scrape_season_stats` `Scrap` (existing) basic stats + advanced stats & `Merge` them!

- Basic (2025): https://www.basketball-reference.com/leagues/NBA_2025_per_game.html
- Advanced (2025): https://www.basketball-reference.com/leagues/NBA_2025_advanced.html

Merge Keys		Basic Stats	Advanced Stats
1	Year, Name, MP, Points, FG%, 3P%, FT%, TRB, AST, STL, BLK, TO, PF, PER		Rank
2	2019,LeBron James,800,27.5,49.1,46.6,342.8,7.4,221.0,631.6,214.6,28.6,2.0		
4	2018,Anthony Davis,445.28,1.2,31.1,0.534,6.7,0,243.0,613.5,9,13.7,28.6,3.0		
5	2018,Daniel Lillard,287.26,9.6,4.5,0.339,7.2,0,222.0,594.6,3,12.6,25,2.4,0		
6	2018,Russell Westbrook,76,25.4,10.1,0.449,6.3,0,166.0,524.6,1,19.1,24.7,5.5,0		
7	2018,Giannis Antetokounmpo,75,26.9,4.8,10.8,0.529,6.2,0,207.0,598.5,7,11.9,27.3,6.0		
8	2018,Kevin Durant,66,26.4,5.4,6.8,0.516,7.3,0,215.0,64.5,5.5,10.4,26,0,7.0		
9	2018,Dosier DeRozan,32,23.8,5.2,9.0,0.456,2.8,0,17.0,551.3,2,9.6,21,0,8.0		
10	2018,DeMarcus Cousins,6,23.1,2.0,0.5,0.51,3.9,0,209.0,57.3,7,10.5,25,0,9.0		

Figure 3. Example of scraped and pre-processed data `data/merged_data.csv`

Please rerun `scraper.py` and `preprocess.py` now.

B. Tune Model Parameters

`rank_model.py` → `main` Which `n_estimators` is best for XGBRanker from `100`, `1000`, `2000`? Use it to make the final prediction and create visualizations!

+ workspace git:(main) ✘ /usr/local/bin/python /project/workspace/rank_model.py					
Training XGBRanker with 100 estimators...					
NDCG Score with 100 estimators: 0.7428					
Training XGBRanker with 1000 estimators...					
NDCG Score with 1000 estimators: 0.7508					
Training XGBRanker with 2000 estimators...					
NDCG Score with 2000 estimators: 0.7482					
Best n_estimators: 1000					
93	2024	Nikola Jokić	1.0	-12.622600	9.0
94	2024	Shai Gilgeous-Alexander	2.0	-10.613235	7.0
95	2024	Luka Dončić	3.0	-5.107751	5.0
96	2024	Giannis Antetokounmpo	4.0	-10.803287	8.0

Figure 4. Example output of running XGBRanker

C. Better Visualization

`rank_model.py` → `plot_ranking_predictions` `Regular` → `Grouped` bar chart (color palette `coolwarm`)




Figure 5. Example visualization `data/ranking_predictions_2025.png`

(b) Task 2: MVP Predictor

- Describe any moments where you felt more or less in control of the system's output.

Contextual Factors

- How did your familiarity with the codebase affect your interaction with the system?
- Did the type of modification or the clarity of your goal influence how you used the system?
- When might NL-based features be most or least useful, depending on the code's complexity?

Special Role (For industry professionals)

- How might this NL-based approach fit into your daily work, and what impact could it have?

Concerns and Future Work

- What are the main drawbacks of NATURALEDIT, and what would prevent you from using it in your real work?
- Did anything about the study tasks feel artificial or unrealistic?
- How would this approach need to evolve to support large, multi-file projects?

C.4 Qualitative Codebook

This appendix presents the full codebook used for qualitative analysis.

Codes are organized into thematic categories.

Comprehension Strategies for AI Code

- Developers have different needs for understanding code semantics
- Avoid comprehension of AI-generated code due to cognitive workload
- Preference for concise and clear summaries
- Reading the summary helps understanding
- Reading the summary involves a high workload
- Macro-level comprehension prioritized over line-level
- Top-down workflow: start with macro-level, then narrow to details

Validation Strategies for AI Modifications

- Read the code to validate AI edits
- Run the code to validate AI edits
- Summarize edits with AI to assist validation
- Use AI to refine or fix edits directly
- Run tests to validate AI edits

Direct Edit Instructions for AI Modification

- Direct instructions are natural and convenient
- Direct instructions are usually vague and casual
- Distrust in the accuracy of direct instructions

Modifiable Code Summaries for AI Modification

- Manually editing summaries is a high workload
- Manual edits are more prone to error
- Summaries lack intuitive edit points
- Editing decisions depend on the simplicity of modifications

Applying Edit Instruction to the Summary

- Instructions on summaries make editing intuitive and reduce workload
- Intermediate edited summaries pre-validate modifications
- Summaries help refine or clarify vague intent
- Summaries help understand LLM edits
- Summaries increase sense of control over edits
- Less trust in LLM's ability to focus on summary differences
- Preference for automation without manual confirmation
- Trade-off between controlling logic and trusting instructions

Adjustable Granularity and Structure

- Different granularity supports varied comprehension levels
- More granularity levels give more edit points and keywords
- Low granularity: easy to skim, useful for large-scale edits
- High granularity: detailed understanding, contains edit points, useful for modification

- Medium granularity balances detail and efficiency
- Granularity should align with code units (line, block, func)
- Structured summaries align with program logic and are easier to read
- Structured summaries support hierarchy and skim reading
- Structured summaries help locate edit points
- Structured summaries help with large-scale edits
- Paragraph summaries are cohesive and easy to read
- Paragraph summaries are lengthy, jumbled together, and harder to parse
- Hierarchy and indentation keep summaries structured
- Summaries should be context-aware or customizable
- Content of different granularities needs careful design
- Order mismatches between summary and code structures

Interactive Mapping Between Summaries and Code

- Mapping helps understand code more effectively
- Mapping provides evidence for edits and builds trust
- Mapping works as auto-generated comments
- Mapping helps locate modification points
- Mapping reduces cognitive workload
- Mapping supports focus from code to summaries on demand
- Mapping may be better for structural blocks than lines
- Visualizing mappings in summary input area is helpful
- Structured summaries with mappings benefit non-English speakers
- Need mappings between code diffs and summary diffs

Auto-Updated New Summaries with Diffs

- Auto-updated summaries maintain workflow consistency
- New summaries with diffs help iterative modification
- Diffs support validation
- Low trust in diff quality
- Highlight colors may blend with mapping colors

Factors Impacting System Usability

- Familiar code requires only direct instructions
- Unfamiliar code increases reliance on summaries
- Imperative programming favors instructions, declarative favors summaries
- Code needing more control benefits from summaries
- Reliance on AI may hinder coding skill learning
- Scoping AI modifications improves control and testability

Future Improvements for NATURALEDIT

- Support for multiple files
- Large projects need structured overview and cross-file connections
- Multi-file requires coarser mapping
- Code diffs should allow accept/reject options
- Support search and locating modification points
- Auto-summarize opened file without manual selection
- Jupyter Notebook support
- Code edit history management
- Alternative representations (dependency graph, data flow)
- Add debugging feature
- Include multimodal support, e.g., images
- Runtime sandbox to catch errors early