

SEED: Customize Large Language Models with Sample-Efficient Adaptation for Code Generation

Xue Jiang, Yihong Dong, Zhi Jin, Ge Li

Key Laboratory of High Confidence Software Technologies (Peking University),
Ministry of Education; School of Computer Science, Peking University, Beijing, China
{jiangxue, dongyh}@stu.pku.edu.cn, {zhijin, lige}@pku.edu.cn

Abstract—Although Large Language Models (LLMs) have made significant progress in code generation, they still struggle with code generation tasks in specific scenarios. These scenarios usually necessitate the adaptation of LLMs to fulfill specific needs, but the limited training samples available in practice lead to poor code generation performance. Therefore, how to effectively adapt LLMs to new scenarios with few training samples is a major challenge for current code generation. In this paper, we propose a novel adaptation approach named SEED, which stands for Sample-Efficient adaptation with Error-Driven learning for code generation. SEED leverages the errors made by LLMs as learning opportunities, using error revision to overcome its own shortcomings, thus achieving efficient learning. Specifically, SEED involves identifying error code generated by LLMs, employing SELF-REVISE for code revision, optimizing the model with revised code, and iteratively adapting the process for continuous improvement. Experimental results show that, compared to other mainstream fine-tuning approaches, SEED achieves superior performance with few training samples, showing an average relative improvement of 54.7% in Pass@1 on multiple code generation benchmarks. We also validate the effectiveness of SELF-REVISE, which generates revised code that optimizes the model more efficiently compared to the code samples from datasets. Moreover, SEED consistently demonstrates strong performance across various LLMs, underscoring its generalizability.

Index Terms—Code Generation, Sample-Efficient Adaptation, Large Language Model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Code generation is an important technology that can improve the efficiency and quality of software development. Given the human requirement expressed in natural language, code generation allows machines to generate executable programs that satisfy this requirement. Code generation has been a research hot topic in the fields of artificial intelligence, software engineering, and natural language processing. Recently, code generation technologies have made significant advancements in both academia and industry [1]–[3]. In particular, large language models (LLMs) demonstrate great potential in code generation tasks [4]–[9]. However, LLMs still face significant challenges in code generation for some specific scenarios or domains [10], [11].

For specific code generation scenarios, fine-tuning is an essential adaptation approach to ensure LLMs fulfill particular needs [12]–[15]. However, in these specific scenarios, it is difficult to obtain sufficient training samples for fine-tuning LLMs, due to common reasons such as industry secrecy and




Fig. 1. The performance of direct generation, fine-tuning, and our proposed SEED on MBPP dataset with few training samples. The numbers on the bars indicate the training samples used by different approaches.

scarcity of resources. For example, in safety-critical scenarios like aerospace, medical devices, transportation, and financial industries, the generated code must adhere to specific security specifications, and accessing relevant data is often extremely difficult due to high confidentiality and strict access control. Under the circumstance of limited data, mainstream fine-tuning approaches might not enable LLMs to achieve the desired code generation performance and may even lead to a degradation in model performance [16]–[18], as shown in Figure 1. Consequently, how to effectively adapt LLMs to specific scenarios with limited data available is a major challenge for code generation in practice.

The mainstream fine-tuning approaches use a large number of samples gathered under specific scenarios for training [19]. They enable model to exhaustively learn the features present in these samples and thus adapt to the specific scenarios. However, they have two disadvantages. First, compelling LLMs to relearn the entire code data of these new scenarios is inefficient. Considering that LLMs are pre-trained on large-scale and diverse data, it’s reasonably assumed that they possess a certain level of general knowledge, lacking only particular information for application in specific scenarios. Second, when faced with insufficient data volume or data drift, model may learn certain undesirable features (such as

inaccurate or irrelevant programming knowledge and patterns), thereby affecting its learning efficiency and negatively impacting its final performance.

To overcome the disadvantages of these mainstream fine-tuning approaches, we take inspiration from the error-driven learning observed in humans. First, error-driven learning requires learners to identify their errors through testing. It helps learners to identify what they have mastered and what they still need to learn, allowing them to narrow the scope of learning and avoid wasting efforts on irrelevancies. Second, through error revision, learners can understand their deficiencies and make targeted improvements, thus enhancing learning efficiency and effectiveness. This motivates us to explore approaches to achieve sample-efficient adaptation of LLMs for code generation guided by error-driven learning.

In this paper, we propose SEED, a **Sample-Efficient** adaptation based on **Error-Driven** learning for code generation. SEED aims to alleviate the problem of poor code generation performance of fine-tuning LLMs in scenarios with few training samples. Following the error-driven learning, our approach proceeds in four steps: ❶ **Error Code Collection**. We identify and collect error codes generated by LLMs, aiming to mine the weaknesses of LLMs. ❷ **Automatic Code Revision**. To obtain revisions of error codes in a low-cost way, we design SELF-REVISE to realize automatic revision leveraging information in the original dataset and code execution feedback. ❸ **Model Optimization**. We optimize the LLMs using the revised code, making them focus on learning the revision of these critical errors, thereby improving the learning efficiency of LLMs. ❹ **Iterative Adaptation**. We adopt an iterative strategy, which involves repeating the preceding three steps, to continuously optimize and improve the performance of LLMs. Extensive experimental results demonstrate the superiority and generalizability of SEED in the sample-efficient adaptation of LLMs for specific code generation scenarios.

To summarize, the main contributions of this paper are:

- We introduce error-driven learning for LLMs. It utilizes revisions of model’s erroneous outputs for training and has higher training efficiency compared to using samples in the dataset.
- We propose a sample-efficient adaptation approach of LLMs for code generation, named SEED. Based on the principle of error-driven learning, SEED continuously optimizes model by identifying and revising error codes generated by LLMs, enabling effective adaptation to specific code generation scenarios with limited samples.
- SEED outperforms other mainstream fine-tuning approaches on three public code generation benchmarks across various LLMs with few training samples.

II. MOTIVATION EXAMPLE

Aligning LLMs with specific scenarios and addressing their unique challenges by learning samples in the dataset is difficult, especially when training samples are limited. We present a motivation example in Figure 2 to clarify the advantages of




Fig. 2. A motivation example of SEED.

using error-driven learning in the LLMs adaptation process of code generation.

By observing the output (a) generated by LLMs, we can find that LLMs generate a basically correct code that adopts a commonly-used function ‘reduce’ [20]. However, this code still fails due to a critical error: it does not take dependencies into account, i.e., without importing the correct libraries and functions. This observation demonstrates that LLMs have most of the capabilities to solve the problem, but also reveals a shortcoming in dealing with dependencies, which is related to the code generation scenario¹. This shortcoming can be overcome just by bootstrapping LLMs to import the correct dependencies, as shown in revision (b). However, in traditional fine-tuning approaches, it is challenging to overcome the shortcoming through learning samples in the dataset. Because sample (c) in the dataset proposed a different solution from output (a), it did not use the ‘reduce’ function. LLM needs to put in more effort to learn the new solution from scratch and also misses the opportunity to overcome its shortcomings. Furthermore, there is a potential risk when training LLMs with sample (c): LLMs may incorrectly infer that sample (c) is the optimal solution for this requirement, resulting in the omission of the Guard Clause “if not numbers\n return 0” in output (a). Omitting the Guard Clause is an inadvisable

¹Making LLMs generate code with dependencies that match the development environment can be viewed as a code generation scenario. The required dependencies are usually different in different development environments. For example, if the development environment is Python2, “reduce” is a built-in function, but if it is Python3, it must be imported from the standard library “functools” in order to be used.




Fig. 3. An overview of the proposed SEED and its differences from traditional fine-tuning approaches.

programming pattern, which is undesirable to learn. Due to the absence of the Guard Clause as a safeguard for handling edge cases, an error could occur in the edge case where the input list is empty. **Therefore, using revision (b) to train LLMs is a better choice, which allows LLMs to focus on and learn to solve the critical error, while simultaneously maintaining the advantages of LLM’s original output.**

Further, we explore the effectiveness of adopting error-driven learning from the perspective of model optimization. We consider the potential significant discrepancy between the model-generated output and the sample in the dataset. By learning the revisions of the model’s erroneous outputs, we can find more effective navigation in the optimization process. This might provide a shorter, smoother path to a good local minimum compared to learning from samples in the dataset, rather than attempting to direct it toward a distant area that may not align well with its existing knowledge or biases. We conduct the statistical analysis of the discrepancies in the model’s latent representations². The findings reveal that the average distance between the model’s erroneous outputs and the dataset’s samples is 12.35, whereas the average distance between the erroneous outputs and their revisions is significantly lower, at 6.39. **These experimental results suggest that within the model’s representation space, revised codes are closer and similar to the erroneous output codes than the original code samples. This evidence lends support to our hypothesis of why the error-driven learning method is more efficient.**

Therefore, our work is determined to explore the use of error-driven learning to achieve a sample-efficient adaptation

²Specifically, on MBPP dataset, we obtain erroneous outputs of CodeGen-2B, revisions of the outputs, and samples in MBPP. We concatenate the requirements with their code, input them into CodeGen-2B, and extract the hidden representations from the model’s final layer. Then, we compute the Euclidean distances within the model’s representational space to quantify the disparities between these three elements.

approach, aimed at enhancing the performance of LLMs in specific code generation scenarios.

III. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we present the detailed methodology of SEED. Specifically, given a code generation scenario/domain with a limited-sample training dataset $\mathcal{D}_{train} = \{(r, c)\}$, where each sample pair (r, c) consists of an input requirement r and an associated example of desired output code c . For a pre-trained LLM \mathcal{M}_θ with parameter θ , we aim to adapt \mathcal{M}_θ to the specific scenario of \mathcal{D}_{train} . SEED achieves sample-efficient adaptation of LLMs through four steps: Error Code Collection (§III-A), Automatic Code Revision (§III-B), Model Optimization (§III-C), and Iterative Adaptation (§III-D). The overview of SEED and its differences from traditional fine-tuning are demonstrated in Figure 3.

A. Error Code Collection

In this step, we systematically identify and collect erroneous output of LLMs using testing as criteria.

We employ rejection sampling [21] to draw error code samples from the distribution produced by \mathcal{M}_θ . For each requirement $r \in \mathcal{D}_{train}$, we sample

$$c' \sim \mathcal{M}_\theta(r) \mid \neg f, \quad (1)$$

where we sample multiple times and employ the criterion function f to determine the retention of the code sample. Specifically, the error code sample c' is retained when $f(r, c') = 0$, where $f(r, c') = 0$ if the rejection condition is satisfied, otherwise 1.

We define f as a test evaluation function since testing is the criterion for judging the correctness of code in practice:

$$\text{TESTEVAL}(r, c') = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } c' \text{ fails } S_r, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where S_r is a suit of test cases under the requirement r and is equipped by the code generation dataset. When collecting the




Fig. 4. Illustration of automatic code revision

error codes for test failures, we can keep the failed test cases and error messages simultaneously for further error diagnosis.

To gain insights into the propensity of \mathcal{M}_θ to make certain errors, it is advisable to select error code sample c' for which the model demonstrates relatively high confidence. Therefore, among multiple error codes collected for the same r , we select the one with the highest generation probability³.

B. Automatic Code Revision

In this step, we perform automatic revision for error codes using our SELF-REVISE approach. Based on the LLM \mathcal{M}_θ itself, SELF-REVISE revises the error code by providing the information in the original dataset and pointing out the error with code execution feedback. Our objective is to derive a revised code that is as close as possible to the error code. Note that although there is already a correct code c in the dataset, it may differ significantly from the error code, as illustrated by examples (a), (b), and (c) in Figure 3. The pipeline of automatic code revision is shown in Figure 4.

Specifically, we leverage the following parts as the input of SELF-REVISE:

- **Requirement (r):** Clarify the requirement that need to be addressed;

³We determine the probability of the generated code by averaging the probabilities of each generated token.

- **Correct Solution (g):** Provide a type of correct solution as a reference to reduce the difficulty of revision. The correct solution used here is the code sample c in the training dataset;
- **Error Code (c')**: Give the error code that needs to be revised. The error code is generated by \mathcal{M}_θ under r ;
- **Error Messages (m) and Failed Test Cases (t):** Point out the error messages received during execution and the specific test cases where the error code fails, allowing for more focused troubleshooting and revision.

These parts are combined as the input of SELF-REVISE according to the template:

$$T = \text{Template}(r, g, c', m, t) \quad (3)$$

where Template is shown in Figure 4.

Following previous work [22], [23], we use two settings for SELF-REVISE, i.e., fine-tuning (FT) and few-shot prompting (FSP), to get the model $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$ for revising error codes.

SELF-REVISE (FT) entails the process of fine-tuning \mathcal{M}_θ with a small number of samples for the purpose of automatic code revision. The training objective is to minimize the following loss function:

$$L(\theta) = \sum_i l_{ce}(\mathcal{M}_\theta(T_i), c_i^*) \quad (4)$$

where l_{ce} represents the standard cross-entropy loss, and we update the parameters initialized with \mathcal{M}_θ to obtain the model $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$ in SELF-REVISE (FT).

SELF-REVISE (FSP) adopts the few-shot prompting technique and leverages k examples of T_i and c_i^* to construct the prompt P for aligning \mathcal{M}_θ to automatic code revision. In SELF-REVISE (FSP), $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}(\cdot)$ is defined as $\mathcal{M}_\theta(P \parallel \cdot)$, where \parallel denotes the concatenation operation.

In contrast to the previous error code collection step, for each error code c' , we construct T and use acceptance sampling to obtain the revised code c^* :

$$c^* \sim \mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}(T) \mid f. \quad (5)$$

where c^* is retained if $\text{TESTEVAL}(r, c^*) = 1$ in Eq. (2), i.e., the revised code c^* passes its test cases. We sample multiple times and it is sufficient if $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$ could correctly revise the error code once. To prevent $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$ from simply replicating the provided correct solution g , we exclude the output identical to g . Subsequently, for each requirement r , and select the version that is most similar to the error code among the remaining code revisions.

C. Model Optimization

In this step, we employ pairs of the requirement r and its revised code c^* to further fine-tune the model \mathcal{M}_θ . This process leads to the enhanced version of \mathcal{M}_θ , referred to as \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} , in the specific scenario of dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$.

For fine-tuning [24], we update the entire parameter θ of LLMs as

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_{(r, c^*)} l_{ce}(\mathcal{M}_\theta(r), c^*), \quad (6)$$

Algorithm 1 Pseudocode of the proposed SEED.**Require:** Few-sample Dataset $\mathcal{D}_{train} = \{(r, c)\}$, initial LLM \mathcal{M}_θ .**Ensure:** LLM \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} .

```
1: Initial iteration index  $l = 0$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_{l+1}} = \mathcal{M}_\theta$ .
2: # Iterative Adaptation
3: repeat
4:   Update  $l = l + 1$ .
5:   # Error Code Collection
6:   Perform rejection sampling to collect error codes  $\{c'\}_l$  based
   on  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_l}$  via Eq. (1) and (2).
7:   # Automatic Code Revision
8:   Perform acceptance sampling to collect revised codes  $\{c^*\}_l$ 
   based on  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_l}$  and SELF-REVISE via Eq. (2), (3), and (5).
9:   Calculate the union of  $\{(r, c^*)\}_{1:l}$  via Eq. (10).
10:  # Model Optimization
11:  Fine-tune  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_l}$  to yield  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_l}^*$  via Eq. (6) if the computational
   resources are sufficient, otherwise via Eq. (7), (8), and (9).
12:  Update  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_{l+1}} = \mathcal{M}_{\theta_l}^*$ .
13: until End condition is satisfied
14: return  $\mathcal{M}_{\theta^*}$ 
```

When the computational resources are insufficient, we employ Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) [25] to fine-tune LLMs. For a weight matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$, LoRA represents its update with a low-rank decomposition:

$$W + \Delta W = W + \Delta\alpha W_{\text{down}}W_{\text{up}}, \quad (7)$$

where α is a tunable scalar hyperparameter, $W_{\text{down}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$, $W_{\text{up}} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times k}$, and $r \ll \min(r, k)$. In LoRA, we update parameter θ^* as

$$\theta^* = \theta + \Delta\theta, \quad (8)$$

$$\Delta\theta = \arg \min_{\Delta\theta} \sum_{(r, c^*)} l_{ce}(\mathcal{M}_{\theta + \Delta\theta}(r), c^*). \quad (9)$$

D. Iterative Adaptation

The preceding three steps can go through multiple iterations until a certain number of rounds is reached or the performance no longer improves.

For l -th iteration that $l > 1$, we initialize its initial model \mathcal{M}_{θ_l} as the enhanced model of the previous iteration $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_{l-1}^*}$. Based on \mathcal{M}_{θ_l} , we repeat the process in steps of error code collection and automatic code revision to sample error codes $\{c'\}_l$ and revised codes $\{c^*\}_l$, respectively. We use the union of $\{(r, c^*)\}_{1:l}$, that is,

$$\{(r, c^*)\}_1 \cup \dots \cup \{(r, c^*)\}_i \dots \cup \{(r, c^*)\}_l, \quad (10)$$

to update parameters in the model optimization step, thereby yielding the enhanced model of the l -th iteration $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_l^*}$. At each iteration, the model is trained to convergence.

This iteration is a step-by-step optimization designed to continuously improve the adaptability of models to the specific scenario. The complete process of SEED is summarized in Algorithm 1.

IV. EVALUATION

We present extensive experiments that span three representative code generation datasets, two fine-tuning settings, and five different LLMs of varying sizes or series. We aim to investigate six research questions:

- RQ1: How does SEED perform compared to the main-stream adaptation approaches?
- RQ2: How does SEED perform when applied to various LLMs?
- RQ3: What kind of training sample has the better training effect?
- RQ4: How does the number of iterations affect the effectiveness of SEED?
- RQ5: What is the impact of implementing the automatic code revision component of SEED in conjunction with alternative LLMs?
- RQ6: How does each input component of SELF-REVISE contribute to the effectiveness?

A. Datasets

MBPP [26] contains crowd-sourced Python programming problems, covering programming fundamentals. We selected the version in the work [27], which consists of 276 problems and some generated error codes alongside their human-revised counterparts, thus facilitating subsequent experiments.

HumanEval [1] is a widely-used code generation benchmark, containing 164 handwritten programming problems, proposed by OpenAI. Each programming problem includes a function signature, a natural language description, use cases, a correct solution in Python, and several test tests.

DS-pandas [28] comprises 291 data science problems utilizing Pandas libraries, sourced from real-world problems posted by developers on StackOverflow. This dataset can evaluate the ability of LLMs to utilize specific data-analysis libraries for code generation.

Due to the scarcity and privacy of domain data, it becomes difficult to obtain these data, and there are no available datasets. Therefore, we use the MBPP, HumanEval, and DS-pandas to simulate the specific scenario with limited samples. We choose the first 100 problems from all datasets as test dataset \mathcal{D}_{test} . The remaining problems (up to 200 problems) serve as training dataset \mathcal{D}_{train} . The statistics of all datasets are presented in Table I.

TABLE I
STATISTICS OF MBPP, HUMAN-EVAL, AND DS-PANDAS.

Dataset	Num of Problems		Avg. Length		Avg. Num
	\mathcal{D}_{train}	\mathcal{D}_{test}	Requirement	Code	Test Case
MBPP	176	100	15.7	32.5	3
HumanEval	64	100	23.0	30.5	8
DS-pandas	191	100	184.8	26.2	2

B. Implementation Details

We use a single A6000 GPU to conduct all experiments. We select CodeGen-2B [5] as our base model by default, which is a well-known open-source LLM for code and is suitable for full fine-tuning within our computational resource constraints. \mathcal{M}_θ is initialized to our base model, and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$ is derived from \mathcal{M}_θ through SELF-REVISE (§III-B).

For full parameter fine-tuning, i.e., Fine-tuning (Full) [24], we use the AdamW optimizer [29], with hyperparameters $\beta_1 = 0.9$ and $\beta_2 = 0.9$, accompanied by a linear learning rate schedule. The initial learning rate is set to $5e-6$, with a batch size of 1 and gradient accumulation of 32 steps for training across 10 epochs. For parameter-efficient fine-tuning, i.e., Fine-tuning (LoRA) [25], the learning rate is set to $2e-4$. Additionally, the rank r is adjusted to 128, and the scaling factor α is set at 8. All other hyperparameters remain aligned with Fine-tuning (Full). For few-shot prompting [30], we set the number of examples in prompt to 4. All baselines in the experiments use consistent settings.

In the error code collection step (§III-A) and the automatic code revision step (§III-B), we use temperature [31], [32] sampling to generate multiple samples: 5 samples in the former and 30 in the latter, with the temperature set to 0.8. To obtain the final revised code in the automatic code revision step, we choose the one of revised code exhibiting the minimum Levenshtein distance [33] to the error code. The number of iterative adaptations is set to 2. The maximum generation length is uniformly limited to 256 tokens.

C. Metrics

Following the practice of real software development which utilizes testing for evaluation [34], [35], we employ the Pass@k [36] metric to measure the functional correctness of the generated code by executing test cases. We use the unbiased version [1] of Pass@k, where $n \geq k$ samples are generated for each problem, count the number of correct samples $c \leq n$ which pass test cases and calculate the following estimator,

$$\text{Pass@k} = \mathbb{E}_{\text{Problems}} \left[1 - \frac{\binom{n-c}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \right]. \quad (11)$$

For automatic code revision, we add the pass@any metric which refers to the percentage of tasks for which the model generates at least one correct code that passed all test cases.

In the final evaluation of this paper, we set the temperature to 0.8 and generate $n = 50$ samples, which are then used to calculate unbiased Pass@k [1] via Eq. (11) in all experiments. All evaluation results are averaged over five test runs.

D. RQ1: Comparison of SEED and mainstream adaptation approaches

Baselines. In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of SEED by comparing it against other four mainstream approaches used as baselines:

- **Direct Generation:** We evaluate the LLM directly to demonstrate the performance of the original LLM.
- **Fine-tuning (Full):** We employ full-parameter fine-tuning for the LLM on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$.
- **Fine-tuning (LoRA):** We fine-tune the LLM on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ using LoRA [25], which greatly reduces the number of trainable parameters.
- **Few-shot Prompting:** We use 4-shot prompt [30] to align LLMs with the input-output format of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, where 4 examples in prompt are randomly selected from $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$.

Considering the baselines involve full-parameter fine-tuning, CodeGen-2B is uniformly selected as the base model in this experiment. For SEED, we use 30% data of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ for SELF-REVISE (FT)⁴, while the remaining 70% data of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ is employed for model optimizing, where we use full-parameter fine-tuning.

TABLE II
PASS@K (%) OF SEED AND BASELINES ON MBPP, HUMANEVAL, AND DS-PANDAS BENCHMARKS, AND THE TEAL NUMBER AFTER \uparrow DENOTES THE RELATIVE IMPROVEMENT OF SEED OVER FINE-TUNING (FULL).

Benchmark	Approach	Pass@1	Pass@5	Pass@10
MBPP	Direct Generation	15.6%	31.4%	40.2%
	Fine-tuning (Full)	25.8%	46.2%	57.6%
	Fine-tuning (LoRA)	19.8%	39.8%	55.2%
	Few-shot Prompting	24.4%	38.0%	49.4%
	SEED	32.8% ($\uparrow 27.2\%$)	46.8%	64.0%
HumanEval	Direct Generation	24.8%	44.7%	51.8%
	Fine-tuning (Full)	29.8%	47.9%	56.4%
	Fine-tuning (LoRA)	27.4%	46.9%	53.9%
	Few-shot Prompting	25.2%	45.8%	53.1%
	SEED	38.6% ($\uparrow 32.9\%$)	54.7%	62.2%
DS-pandas	Direct Generation	0.8%	3.1%	5.6%
	Fine-tuning (Full)	2.6%	6.5%	9.6%
	Fine-tuning (LoRA)	2.2%	6.0%	8.9%
	Few-shot Prompting	1.9%	4.5%	5.7%
	SEED	5.3% ($\uparrow 103.9\%$)	9.5%	12.3%

Results. We conducted experiments on three public benchmarks, i.e., MBPP, HumanEval, and DS-pandas. The experimental results are summarized in Table II. This comparison yielded three insightful observations: **1) Significant superiority of SEED:** Our proposed SEED performs significantly better than the other four baselines on the three benchmarks. Notably, SEED exhibits significant relative improvements of 27.2%, 32.9%, and 103.9%, respectively, when compared to the best-performing baseline Fine-tuning (Full). **2) Worst performance of Direct Generation:** The performance of Direct Generation is significantly lower than the Fine-tuning (Full), Fine-tuning (LoRA), and Prompt baselines. This result suggests that directly applying LLMs for evaluation may be less suitable for specific scenarios, resulting in performance differences. **3) Fine-tuning (LoRA) is less effective than Fine-tuning (Full):** Although Fine-tuning (LoRA) offers the advantage of reduced computational resource requirements for fine-tuning LLMs, it trades off the performance. **4) Less**

⁴In addition to MBPP dataset, for other two datasets (i.e., HumanEval and DS-pandas), we generate one error code per sample in a subset comprising 30% of the training set, using CodeGen-2B. Subsequently, authors collaboratively apply the minimal necessary revisions to correct these error codes.

improvement of Few-shot Prompting: Few-shot Prompting generally underperforms compared to the Fine-tuning approaches. It only outperforms Fine-tuning (LoRA) in the MBPP benchmark’s Pass@1 metric. However, in other situations, the efficacy of Few-shot Prompting is the lowest, with the exception of Direct Generation.

Summary of RQ1: In code generation scenarios with limited training samples, SEED exhibits improvements compared to the mainstream adaptation approaches, achieving relative improvements between 27.2% and 103.9%.

E. RQ2: SEED with Different LLMs

Baselines. We use the following types of well-known LLMs to perform SEED, including

- **CodeGen-2B and CodeGen-6B** [5] are code LLMs trained on natural language and programming data for conversation-based program synthesis.
- **Llama-7B** [37] is a general-purpose foundational LLM that has been trained on diverse data to handle a wide range of tasks, which is developed by Meta.
- **CodeLlama-7B** [3] is an open foundational LLM for code generation tasks, derived from continuous training and fine-tuning based on Llama architecture [37].

Among them, CodeGen-2B uses full fine-tuning, and the remaining LLMs use parameter-efficient fine-tuning with LoRA. Each LLM has the same baselines as RQ1 (§IV-D), i.e., **Direct Generation, Fine-tuning, and Few-shot Prompting.**

TABLE III

PASS@K (%) OF SEED AND BASELINES WITH DIFFERENT LLMs, AND THE TEAL NUMBER AFTER \uparrow DENOTES THE RELATIVE IMPROVEMENT OF SEED OVER FINE-TUNING.

Model	Approach	Pass@1	Pass@5	Pass@10
CodeGen-2B	Direct Generation	15.6%	31.4%	40.2%
	Fine-tuning (Full)	25.8%	46.2%	57.6%
	Few-shot Prompting	24.4%	38.0%	49.4%
	SEED (Full)	32.8% \uparrow 27.2%	46.8%	64.0%
CodeGen-6B	Direct Generation	19.6%	40.2%	60.8%
	Fine-tuning (LoRA)	26.6%	46.8%	63.0%
	Few-shot Prompting	26.2%	45.2%	60.2%
	SEED (LoRA)	33.4% \uparrow 25.6%	47.4%	67.6%
Llama-7B	Direct Generation	13.4%	29.8%	37.4%
	Fine-tuning (LoRA)	15.2%	27.4%	34.0%
	Few-shot Prompting	16.6%	26.2%	33.8%
	SEED (LoRA)	22.0% \uparrow 44.7%	30.4%	40.8%
CodeLlama-7B	Direct Generation	20.4%	43.8%	52.8%
	Fine-tuning (LoRA)	19.9%	42.4%	53.2%
	Few-shot Prompting	27.8%	46.6%	64.8%
	SEED (LoRA)	34.8% \uparrow 74.9%	49.2%	65.8%

Results. The results of applying SEED to different LLMs are shown in Table III. The results demonstrate that SEED consistently achieves significant improvements across all these LLMs, outperforming the Direct Generation, Fine-tuning, and Few-shot Prompting baselines. Moreover, we also find that the performances of Code LLMs are better than pure LLMs, and there is a clear trend indicating that as the number of parameters in the LLMs increases, the efficacy of the Direct Generation and Few-shot Prompting approaches increases

steadily. In contrast, the effectiveness of SEED on these LLMs is also continuously improving.

Summary of RQ2: SEED consistently enhances performance across all LLMs, outperforming Direct Generation, Fine-tuning, and Few-shot Prompting baselines, showcasing the generalizability of SEED.

F. RQ3: The Effect of Training Sample Variants

Baselines. We investigate the influence of different training samples on the final adapted model \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} to validate the effectiveness of using revisions of model’s erroneous output for training. The different variants of training samples include:

- **W/o Training:** Direct generation without without any training samples.
- **Raw \mathcal{D}_{train} :** All samples in \mathcal{D}_{train} , which are the raw requirement and code sample pairs in the dataset.
- **$\mathcal{D}_{train} \cap$ SEED:** The samples of the same problem as SEED in \mathcal{D}_{train}
- **$\text{SEED} \cup \mathcal{D}_{train}$:** Include not only samples of problems obtained through SELF-REVISE, but also samples of other problems in \mathcal{D}_{train} .
- **Human-revised \mathcal{D}_{train} :** Samples obtained human revision, which are the pairs of requirement and revised code of LLM’s erroneous output.
- **SEED:** Samples obtained through SELF-REVISE, which are the pairs of requirement and revised code of LLM’s erroneous output.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF THE EFFECT OF DIFFERENT TRAINING SAMPLE VARIANTS.

Variants	Pass@1	Pass@5	Pass@10
W/o Training	15.6%	31.4%	40.2%
Raw \mathcal{D}_{train}	25.8%	46.2%	57.6%
$\mathcal{D}_{train} \cap$ SEED	22.4%	33.8%	42.8%
$\text{SEED} \cup \mathcal{D}_{train}$	29.2%	44.2%	58.0%
Human-revised \mathcal{D}_{train}	28.0%	46.2%	59.8%
SEED	32.8%	46.8%	64.0%

Results. As shown in Table IV, we discover that: **1) SEED exceeds Raw \mathcal{D}_{train} , despite Raw \mathcal{D}_{train} having more training samples.** This proves that training using revisions produced by SELF-REVISE is more efficient compared to using samples in the dataset. **2) The effect of $\mathcal{D}_{train} \cap$ SEED is comparatively weaker,** which reveals that SEED is not simply improved by selecting better problems. **3) $\text{SEED} \cup \mathcal{D}_{train}$ is not as effective as SEED,** which shows that some samples in \mathcal{D}_{train} have negative effects with limited samples. **4) The performance of SEED surpasses that of the Human-revised \mathcal{D}_{train} .** This finding may be attributed to a disconnect between the revision made by humans and the model’s learning expectations. While human revisions are applied to all code samples in \mathcal{D}_{train} , some samples may inherently be challenging for the current model. As such, forced learning from these samples may have counterpro-

ductive effects, highlighting a potential limitation in human-revised D_{train} .

Summary of RQ3: The revisions of error code through SELF-REVISE surpass other training sample variants, including both samples in the dataset and the samples revised by humans, in terms of training efficiency and effectiveness.

G. RQ4: The Effect of Iterations

Baselines. We study the effect of iterations on SEED. We analyze the progression of SEED’s effectiveness across different iterations, starting from 0 iterations (i.e., generated directly with LLMs) and extending to one, and up to four iterations.

TABLE V

PERFORMANCE OF SEED WITH THE DIFFERENT NUMBER OF ITERATIONS.

Iterations	Pass@1	Pass@5	Pass@10	Num. of Revised Code
0	15.6%	31.4%	40.2%	-
1	31.6%	46.3%	60.6%	31 (+31)
2	32.8%	46.8%	64.0%	41 (+10)
3	33.0%	46.7%	62.6%	43 (+2)
4	33.2%	47.1%	64.0%	44 (+1)

Results. We conduct this experiment on MBPP dataset and its results are displayed in Table V. From the results we can observe a trend: as the number of iteration rounds increases, the performance of SEED first shows an increasing trend and then gradually stabilizes. At the same time, the amount of revised code in each iteration is also increasing, indicating that errors are continuously discovered, corrected, and learned. Considering that Pass@10 has oscillations from the 2nd iteration to the 4th iteration, we choose to end after the second iteration as the final performance of SEED.

Summary of RQ4: As iteration rounds increase, the performance of SEED initially improves and then stabilizes, and over 98% performance can be achieved in two iteration.

H. RQ5: Automatic Code Revision Based on Other Models

Baselines.

We evaluate the performance of automatic code revision and the impact on the final model \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} , which is obtained through SEED, when using alternative LLMs to substitute the base model as $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$. The base model and alternative LLMs are as follows:

- **Base Model:** We use CodeGen-2B [5] as the base model for automatic code revision, i.e., SELF-REVISE.
- **CodeGen-6B** [5]: A variant in the same series as our base model but with a larger parameter count.
- **Llama-7B** [37]: A LLM with different training data and architectures of the base model.
- **CodeLlama-7B** [3]: A code LLM with different training data and architectures of the base model.
- **ChatGPT** [38]: A powerful AI chatbot developed based on LLMs. Since ChatGPT is close-sourced and cannot be fine-tuned, we employ ChatGPT for SELF-REVISE (FSP).

We obtain $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$ in both fine-tuning and few-shot prompting settings for comparison. In this experiment, \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} is consistently fixed as CodeGen-2B.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF AUTOMATIC CODE REVISION BASED ON DIFFERENT LLMs IN BOTH FINE-TUNING AND FEW-SHOT PROMPTING SETTINGS, WHERE $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$ IS REPORTED THE RAW RESULTS AND \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} IS FINE-TUNED WITH FILTERED RESULTS AS DESCRIBED IN §III-A.

Approach	$\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$			\mathcal{M}_{θ^*}	
	Pass@1	Pass@10	Pass@any	Pass@1	Pass@10
Few-shot Prompting					
CodeGen-6B	19.4%	60.1%	70.8%	26.8%	59.0%
Llama-7B	23.5%	67.7%	81.9%	20.8%	54.2%
CodeLlama-7B	20.2%	64.9%	75.0%	25.2%	59.6%
ChatGPT	61.4%	87.3%	92.1%	27.0%	62.4%
Base Model (SELF-REVISE (FSP))	18.9%	57.1%	69.4%	26.2%	58.2%
Fine-tuning					
CodeGen-6B	5.0%	20.3%	26.6%	29.4%	64.2%
Llama-7B	2.7%	8.5%	12.6%	23.2%	58.4%
CodeLlama-7B	5.1%	21.0%	34.6%	24.0%	60.2%
Base Model (SELF-REVISE (FT))	3.9%	18.9%	24.6%	32.8%	64.0%

Results. Table VI illustrates the experimental results of automatic code revision based on different models, and we can observe that: **1) SELF-REVISE (FT) employing the same model as the base model yields the best performance of \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} .** For baselines using other LLMs in fine-tuning, CodeLlama exhibits superior performance in terms of Pass@k in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$, but its final effectiveness is somewhat compromised. This limitation is attributed to the divergence in training data and architectural frameworks between CodeLlama and the base model, leading to inconsistencies in the revised code with the base model’s expectations. In contrast, CodeGen-6B, which is the same series of the base model with a large parameter, demonstrates slightly lower Pass@k in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$ than CodeLlama but still achieves commendable results for \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} . **2) Although the Pass@k of SELF-REVISE (FSP) is higher than SELF-REVISE (FT) in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$, it does not perform as well on the ultimate \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} .** We find this discrepancy may be due to the SELF-REVISE (FSP)’s tendency to learn superficial forms, i.e., it often resorts to directly copying code from the correct solution provided in the prompt, even when explicitly instructed not to in the prompt. Using ChatGPT as $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$ results in substantially higher Pass@k compared to using the base model, does not significantly enhance the final model \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} .

Qualitative Examples. We use the case study to qualitatively assess the effectiveness of automatic code revision (§III-B), i.e., SELF-REVISE (FSP) and SELF-REVISE (FT) employed by SEED, examples of which are presented in Figure 5. Upon manual inspection of the outcomes produced by SELF-REVISE (FSP), two prevalent modification patterns are identified. First, the removal of redundant code is a common alteration. This includes the deletion of unnecessary blocks such as “if name == ‘main’ ” and other test codes, which are often extraneous in the context of the desired output. Second, SELF-REVISE (FSP) exhibits a tendency to directly copy correct code samples from

Self-Revise (FSP)	<p>Case I</p> <p>Requirement</p> <p>Write a function to perform index wise addition of tuple elements in the given two nested tuples.</p> <hr/> <p>Revision of error code</p> <pre>def add_nested_tuples(test_tup1, test_tup2): - return tuple(map(lambda x, y: (x[0] + y[0], x[1] + y[1]), test_tup1, - test_tup2)) - - if __name__ == "__main__": - import doctest - doctest.testmod() + return tuple(tuple(map(sum, zip(tup1, tup2))) for tup1, tup2 in + zip(test_tup1, test_tup2))</pre> <hr/> <p>Sample code in dataset</p> <pre>def add_nested_tuples(test_tup1, test_tup2): res = tuple(tuple(a + b for a, b in zip(tup1, tup2)) for tup1, tup2 in zip(test_tup1, test_tup2)) return (res)</pre>	<p>Case II</p> <p>Requirement</p> <p>Write a function to check if the common elements between two given lists are in the same order or not.</p> <hr/> <p>Revision of error code</p> <pre>def same_order(l1, l2): - if len(l1) != len(l2): - return False - for i in range(len(l1)): - if l1[i] != l2[i]: - return False - return True + common_elements = set(l1) & set(l2) + l1 = [e for e in l1 if e in common_elements] + l2 = [e for e in l2 if e in common_elements] + return l1 == l2</pre> <hr/> <p>Sample code in dataset</p> <pre>def same_order(l1, l2): common_elements = set(l1) & set(l2) l1 = [e for e in l1 if e in common_elements] l2 = [e for e in l2 if e in common_elements] return l1 == l2</pre> <p style="text-align: right; color: red;">COPY</p>
	Self-Revise (FT)	<p>Case I</p> <p>Requirement</p> <p>Write a function to extract all the pairs which are symmetric in the given tuple list.</p> <hr/> <p>Revision of error code</p> <pre>def extract_symmetric(test_list): symmetric_pairs = set() for i in range(len(test_list)): - for j in range(i+1, len(test_list)): - if test_list[i] == test_list[j]: - symmetric_pairs.add((test_list[i], test_list[j])) + if test_list[i][::-1] in test_list: + symmetric_pairs.add(tuple(sorted(test_list[i]))) return symmetric_pairs</pre> <hr/> <p>Sample code in dataset</p> <pre>def extract_symmetric(test_list): temp = set(test_list) & {(b, a) for a, b in test_list} res = {(a, b) for a, b in temp if a < b} return (res)</pre>

Fig. 5. Cases for two settings of self-revise, where “-” and “+” respectively indicate lines of code before and after revision.

the prompt. In contrast, SELF-REVISE (FT) is capable of making minimal yet effective modifications to the model’s initial error code outputs, thereby generating the correct code. Based on the observations, SELF-REVISE (FT) is recommended as the more preferable approach for automatic code revision within SEED.

Summary of RQ5: The effectiveness of automatic code revision improves with the use of more powerful LLMs. However, using the LLM consistent with the final optimized LLM and under the fine-tuning setting is most beneficial for the final performance.

I. RQ6: Ablation Study on SELF-REVISE Input

Baselines. We further perform the ablation study to investigate the effectiveness of each input component in SELF-REVISE. Requirements and error codes are the indispensable basic inputs for performing automatic code revision. Therefore, we perform ablation experiments on the remaining three com-

ponents, i.e., **correct solution**, **failed test cases**, and **error messages**. By removing these components individually, we observe their specific impact on the performance of automatic code revision and the final model, and thus evaluate the effectiveness of these components.

TABLE VII
RESULTS OF THE ABLATION STUDY ON SELF-REVISE INPUT.

Approach	$\mathcal{M}_{\text{Revise}}$			\mathcal{M}_{θ^*}	
	Pass@1	Pass@10	Pass@any	Pass@1	Pass@10
SEED	3.9%	18.9%	24.6%	32.8%	64.0%
- Correct Solution	3.4%	15.4%	19.8%	30.1%	61.9%
- Error Messages	3.1%	14.2%	17.3%	28.6%	58.7%
- Failed Test Cases	2.3%	5.1%	6.3%	26.1%	47.6%

Results. We conduct the ablation study on MBPP dataset as shown in Table VII. First, we find that removing the failed test cases resulted in the largest drop in performance of all metrics. Failed test cases can demonstrate the inconsistency between the model-generated code output and the desired

output, allowing LLMs to reason about and correct erroneous operations. Experimental results show that this point is most helpful for automatic code revision. Second, removing error messages or the correct code solution also results in a loss of performance. Error messages directly indicate surface errors in the generated code (such as syntax errors and runtime errors) and the location of the errors, which is also helpful for LLMs to revise the code. The correct code samples in the dataset can provide some reference for revising errors of LLMs, thus further reducing the difficulty of correction.

Summary of RQ6: The analysis of the ablation study indicates that all of the input components in SELF-REVISE positively contribute to the effectiveness of automatic code revision and the final model.

V. RELATED WORK

A. Adaption of LLMs

Many tasks rely on adapting LLMs to multiple downstream applications. Such adaptation is usually done via fine-tuning, which updates all the parameters of the pre-trained model. Since LLMs contain a large number of model parameters and performing full parameter tuning would be very expensive [39], a number of parameter-efficient fine-tuning approaches have been developed, including Adapter Tuning [40], [41], Prompt Tuning [42], [43], Prefix Tuning [44], [45], and Low-rank adaptation [25]. These lightweight tuning approaches typically achieve near-full fine-tuning performance while reducing the number of parameters required for training. They primarily optimize the efficiency of training the model parameters but are not directly targeted at improving the efficiency of data sample usage.

Another approach of adaptation that does not require training is prompting [46], which depends on in-context learning [47], [48]. By utilizing natural language instructions and a few examples of a task, this approach enables LLMs to recognize and execute new tasks without explicit gradient updates. However, a limitation of this approach is that the models often merely mimic the surface form of the prompt, struggling to deeply understand or adapt to complex and abstract task requirements.

Our approach is orthogonal to the aforementioned adaptation techniques, allowing for its concurrent application with these approaches to enhance overall effectiveness.

B. Code Generation

In the era of deep learning, the field of code generation has undergone significant evolution. Initially, these technologies treated code similar to natural language [49]–[51], then gradually integrated structure specific to code, such as Abstract Syntax Trees (AST) [52]–[56] and API calls [57]–[59]. Notably, Mukherjee et al. [60] proposed a code generation model that incorporates static analysis tools. Concurrently, Dong et al. [61] devised a PDA-based methodology to ensure the syntactic correctness of code generation.

The rise of pre-training techniques has brought new momentum to the field of code generation. Against this backdrop, LLMs such as Codex [1], InCoder [6], CodeGen [62], AlphaCode [36], and CodeGeeX [4] have emerged, greatly enhancing the performance of code generation. For LLMs-based code generation, there are some approaches to correct the LLMs’ errors, such as Self-edit [22], Self-debug [63], and Self-collaboration [23], which use error correction to improve the predictions of the LLM without making any improvement to the model itself. Recently, Chen et al. [27] propose an ILF approach focused on using human feedback to refine model results. However, this approach necessitates continuous human involvement and the provision of feedback throughout the model’s training phase, which incurs significant costs in practical applications. Further, Chen et al. [64] propose a distillation approach that employs ChatGPT [38] to generate a large amount of refinement to train small models. However, this approach presents two primary limitations. Firstly, it necessitates a highly performant “teacher” model, significantly surpassing the capabilities of the “student” model. Secondly, commercial constraints and other factors likely prohibit its implementation.

In contrast, our work is an adaption approach, focusing on obtaining a better model adapted to specific domains with limited data. By exploiting the inherent potential of LLMs to achieve error-driven learning, we significantly improve the learning efficiency of LLMs.

VI. THREATS TO VALIDITY

There are three major threats to the validity of our work.

1) Threats to external validity concern the quality of experimental datasets and the generalizability of our results. First, we simulate specific code generation scenarios with three public code generation datasets, which are mainstream benchmarks and have been used in many related works [65]–[70]. Second, SEED can be applied to any LLMs, and we choose four well-known LLMs [71]–[74] of different sizes, training data, and architectures for our experiments.

2) Threats to internal validity involve the impact of hyperparameters. Deep learning models are known to be sensitive to hyperparameters. For our proposed SEED, we only do a small-range grid search on hyper-parameters, including iterations of SEED, learning rates, and training epochs, leaving other hyperparameters the same as those in previous studies [3], [5], [25], [30], [37], [75], which has explored effective settings of the hyperparameters through extensive experiments. For the baselines, their settings are consistent with our approach.

3) Threats to construct validity pertain to the reliability of evaluation metrics. To address this threat, we employ Pass@k [36] as the evaluation metric, which leverages test cases to gauge the functional correctness of code. Additionally, we employ the unbiased version of Pass@k [1] to diminish evaluation errors that arise from sampling. Pass@k is the mainstream metric for code generation and is widely used in previous studies [4], [76]–[81]. On this basis, each experiment is run five times, and its average result is reported.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have proposed SEED, a Sample-Efficient adaptation with Error-Driven learning for code generation, improving the code generation performance of LLMs in specific scenarios with limited samples. SEED outperforms mainstream adaptation approaches (e.g., full-parameter fine-tuning, LoRA, few-shot prompting) with limited training samples on three public code generation benchmarks. Our analysis indicates that LLMs can learn more efficiently by learning from the revisions of their error than by traditionally learning from code examples in datasets. Extensive results show that the SEED can enhance largely on five different LLMs of varying sizes or series, which proves its generalizability. We believe that training LLMs adaptively with few samples may have broader application scenarios. We leave this area of exploration for future work.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Chen, J. Tworek, H. Jun, Q. Yuan, H. P. de Oliveira Pinto, J. Kaplan, H. Edwards, Y. Burda, N. Joseph, G. Brockman, A. Ray, R. Puri, G. Krueger, M. Petrov, H. Khlaaf, G. Sastry, P. Mishkin, B. Chan, S. Gray, N. Ryder, M. Pavlov, A. Power, L. Kaiser, M. Bavarian, C. Winter, P. Tillet, F. P. Such, D. Cummings, M. Plappert, F. Chantzis, E. Barnes, A. Herbert-Voss, W. H. Guss, A. Nichol, A. Paino, N. Tezak, J. Tang, I. Babuschkin, S. Balaji, S. Jain, W. Saunders, C. Hesse, A. N. Carr, J. Leike, J. Achiam, V. Misra, E. Morikawa, A. Radford, M. Knight, M. Brundage, M. Murati, K. Mayer, P. Welinder, B. McGrew, D. Amodei, S. McCandlish, I. Sutskever, and W. Zaremba, "Evaluating large language models trained on code," *CoRR*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374>
- [2] S. Shen, X. Zhu, Y. Dong, Q. Guo, Y. Zhen, and G. Li, "Incorporating domain knowledge through task augmentation for front-end javascript code generation," in *ESEC/SIGSOFT FSE*. ACM, 2022, pp. 1533–1543.
- [3] B. Rozière, J. Gehring, F. Gloeckle, S. Sootla, I. Gat, X. E. Tan, Y. Adi, J. Liu, T. Remez, J. Rapin, A. Kozhevnikov, I. Evtimov, J. Bitton, M. Bhatt, C. Canton-Ferrer, A. Grattafiori, W. Xiong, A. Défossez, J. Copet, F. Azhar, H. Touvron, L. Martin, N. Usunier, T. Scialom, and G. Synnaeve, "Code llama: Open foundation models for code," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2308.12950, 2023.
- [4] Q. Zheng, X. Xia, X. Zou, Y. Dong, S. Wang, Y. Xue, Z. Wang, L. Shen, A. Wang, Y. Li, T. Su, Z. Yang, and J. Tang, "Codegeex: A pre-trained model for code generation with multilingual evaluations on humaneval-x," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2303.17568, 2023.
- [5] E. Nijkamp, B. Pang, H. Hayashi, L. Tu, H. Wang, Y. Zhou, S. Savarese, and C. Xiong, "Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis," in *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2023.
- [6] D. Fried, A. Aghajanyan, J. Lin, S. Wang, E. Wallace, F. Shi, R. Zhong, W. Yih, L. Zettlemoyer, and M. Lewis, "InCoder: A generative model for code infilling and synthesis," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2204.05999, 2022.
- [7] B. Chen, F. Zhang, A. Nguyen, D. Zan, Z. Lin, J. Lou, and W. Chen, "CodeT: Code generation with generated tests," in *ICLR*, 2023.
- [8] T. Zhang, T. Yu, T. Hashimoto, M. Lewis, W. Yih, D. Fried, and S. Wang, "Coder reviewer reranking for code generation," in *ICML*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 202. PMLR, 2023, pp. 41 832–41 846.
- [9] X. Jiang, Y. Dong, L. Wang, Q. Shang, and G. Li, "Self-planning code generation with large language model," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2303.06689, 2023.
- [10] T. Ahmed, C. Bird, P. Devanbu, and S. Chakraborty, "Studying llm performance on closed-and open-source data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15100*, 2024.
- [11] M. Chen, H. Zhang, C. Wan, Z. Wei, Y. Xu, J. Wang, and X. Gu, "On the effectiveness of large language models in domain-specific code generation," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2312.01639, 2023.
- [12] E. Shi, Y. Wang, H. Zhang, L. Du, S. Han, D. Zhang, and H. Sun, "Towards efficient fine-tuning of pre-trained code models: An experimental study and beyond," in *ISSSTA*. ACM, 2023, pp. 39–51.
- [13] S. Liu, J. Keung, Z. Yang, F. Liu, Q. Zhou, and Y. Liao, "Delving into parameter-efficient fine-tuning in code change learning: An empirical study," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2402.06247, 2024.
- [14] S. Chakraborty, T. Ahmed, Y. Ding, P. T. Devanbu, and B. Ray, "Natgen: generative pre-training by "naturalizing" source code," in *ESEC/SIGSOFT FSE*. ACM, 2022, pp. 18–30.
- [15] M. Ciniselli, N. Cooper, L. Pascarella, A. Mastropaolo, E. Aghajani, D. Poshyanyk, M. D. Penta, and G. Bavota, "An empirical study on the usage of transformer models for code completion," *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 4818–4837, 2022.
- [16] A. Aghajanyan, A. Shrivastava, A. Gupta, N. Goyal, L. Zettlemoyer, and S. Gupta, "Better fine-tuning by reducing representational collapse," in *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- [17] R. Xu, F. Luo, Z. Zhang, C. Tan, B. Chang, S. Huang, and F. Huang, "Raise a child in large language model: Towards effective and generalizable fine-tuning," in *EMNLP (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021, pp. 9514–9528.
- [18] H. Zhang, G. Li, J. Li, Z. Zhang, Y. Zhu, and Z. Jin, "Fine-tuning pre-trained language models effectively by optimizing subnetworks adaptively," in *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [19] H. Xu, S. Ebner, M. Yarmohammadi, A. S. White, B. Van Durme, and K. Murray, "Gradual fine-tuning for low-resource domain adaptation," in *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Domain Adaptation for NLP*, 2021, pp. 214–221.
- [20] J. Dean and S. Ghemawat, "Mapreduce: simplified data processing on large clusters," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 107–113, 2008.
- [21] G. Casella, C. P. Robert, and M. T. Wells, "Generalized accept-reject sampling schemes," *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, pp. 342–347, 2004.
- [22] K. Zhang, Z. Li, J. Li, G. Li, and Z. Jin, "Self-edit: Fault-aware code editor for code generation," in *ACL (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023, pp. 769–787.
- [23] Y. Dong, X. Jiang, Z. Jin, and G. Li, "Self-collaboration code generation via chatgpt," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2304.07590, 2023.
- [24] J. Devlin, M. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," in *NAACL-HLT (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019, pp. 4171–4186.
- [25] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, "Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models," in *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- [26] J. Austin, A. Odena, M. I. Nye, M. Bosma, H. Michalewski, D. Dohan, E. Jiang, C. J. Cai, M. Terry, Q. V. Le, and C. Sutton, "Program synthesis with large language models," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2108.07732, 2021.
- [27] A. Chen, J. Scheurer, T. Korbak, J. A. Campos, J. S. Chan, S. R. Bowman, K. Cho, and E. Perez, "Improving code generation by training with natural language feedback," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2303.16749, 2023.
- [28] Y. Lai, C. Li, Y. Wang, T. Zhang, R. Zhong, L. Zettlemoyer, W. Yih, D. Fried, S. I. Wang, and T. Yu, "DS-1000: A natural and reliable benchmark for data science code generation," in *ICML*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 202. PMLR, 2023, pp. 18 319–18 345.
- [29] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter, "Fixing weight decay regularization in adam," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1711.05101, 2017.
- [30] T. B. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D. M. Ziegler, J. Wu, C. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, and D. Amodei, "Language models are few-shot learners," in *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [31] A. Holtzman, J. Buys, L. Du, M. Forbes, and Y. Choi, "The curious case of neural text degeneration," in *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- [32] D. H. Ackley, G. E. Hinton, and T. J. Sejnowski, "A learning algorithm for boltzmann machines," *Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 147–169, 1985.
- [33] V. I. Levenshtein *et al.*, "Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions, and reversals," in *Soviet physics doklady*, vol. 10, no. 8. Soviet Union, 1966, pp. 707–710.
- [34] N. B. Ruparelia, "Software development lifecycle models," *ACM SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. years*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 8–13, 2010.
- [35] P. Abrahamsson, O. Salo, J. Ronkainen, and J. Warsta, "Agile software development methods: Review and analysis," 2002.
- [36] Y. Li, D. Choi, J. Chung, N. Kushman, J. Schrittwieser, R. Leblond, T. Eccles, J. Keeling, F. Gimeno, A. Dal Lago *et al.*, "Competition-

- level code generation with alphacode,” *Science*, vol. 378, no. 6624, pp. 1092–1097, 2022.
- [37] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale, D. Bikel, L. Blecher, C. Canton-Ferrer, M. Chen, G. Cucurull, D. Esiobu, J. Fernandes, J. Fu, W. Fu, B. Fuller, C. Gao, V. Goswami, N. Goyal, A. Hartshorn, S. Hosseini, R. Hou, H. Inan, M. Kardas, V. Kerkez, M. Khabsa, I. Kloumann, A. Korenev, P. S. Koura, M. Lachaux, T. Lavril, J. Lee, D. Liskovich, Y. Lu, Y. Mao, X. Martinet, T. Mihaylov, P. Mishra, I. Molybog, Y. Nie, A. Poulton, J. Reizenstein, R. Rungta, K. Saladi, A. Schelten, R. Silva, E. M. Smith, R. Subramanian, X. E. Tan, B. Tang, R. Taylor, A. Williams, J. X. Kuan, P. Xu, Z. Yan, I. Zarov, Y. Zhang, A. Fan, M. Kambadur, S. Narang, A. Rodriguez, R. Stojnic, S. Edunov, and T. Scialom, “Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2307.09288, 2023.
- [38] OpenAI. (2022) ChatGPT. [Online]. Available: <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>
- [39] N. Ding, Y. Qin, G. Yang, F. Wei, Z. Yang, Y. Su, S. Hu, Y. Chen, C. Chan, W. Chen, J. Yi, W. Zhao, X. Wang, Z. Liu, H. Zheng, J. Chen, Y. Liu, J. Tang, J. Li, and M. Sun, “Parameter-efficient fine-tuning of large-scale pre-trained language models,” *Nat. Mac. Intell.*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 220–235, 2023.
- [40] N. Hounsby, A. Giurghi, S. Jastrzebski, B. Morrone, Q. de Laroussilhe, A. Gesmundo, M. Attariyan, and S. Gelly, “Parameter-efficient transfer learning for NLP,” in *ICML*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 97. PMLR, 2019, pp. 2790–2799.
- [41] Z. Hu, L. Wang, Y. Lan, W. Xu, E. Lim, L. Bing, X. Xu, S. Poria, and R. K. Lee, “Llm-adapters: An adapter family for parameter-efficient fine-tuning of large language models,” in *EMNLP*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023, pp. 5254–5276.
- [42] B. Lester, R. Al-Rfou, and N. Constant, “The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning,” in *EMNLP (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021, pp. 3045–3059.
- [43] X. Liu, Y. Zheng, Z. Du, M. Ding, Y. Qian, Z. Yang, and J. Tang, “GPT understands, too,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2103.10385, 2021.
- [44] X. L. Li and P. Liang, “Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation,” in *ACL/IJCNLP (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021, pp. 4582–4597.
- [45] X. Liu, K. Ji, Y. Fu, Z. Du, Z. Yang, and J. Tang, “P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2110.07602, 2021.
- [46] P. Liu, W. Yuan, J. Fu, Z. Jiang, H. Hayashi, and G. Neubig, “Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing,” *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 55, no. 9, pp. 195:1–195:35, 2023.
- [47] Q. Dong, L. Li, D. Dai, C. Zheng, Z. Wu, B. Chang, X. Sun, J. Xu, L. Li, and Z. Sui, “A survey for in-context learning,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2301.00234, 2023.
- [48] T. B. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D. M. Ziegler, J. Wu, C. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, and D. Amodei, “Language models are few-shot learners,” in *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [49] W. Ling, P. Blunsom, E. Grefenstette, K. M. Hermann, T. Kociský, F. Wang, and A. W. Senior, “Latent predictor networks for code generation,” in *ACL (1)*. The Association for Computer Linguistics, 2016.
- [50] R. Jia and P. Liang, “Data recombination for neural semantic parsing,” in *ACL (1)*. The Association for Computer Linguistics, 2016.
- [51] B. Wei, G. Li, X. Xia, Z. Fu, and Z. Jin, “Code generation as a dual task of code summarization,” in *NeurIPS*, 2019, pp. 6559–6569.
- [52] M. Rabinovich, M. Stern, and D. Klein, “Abstract syntax networks for code generation and semantic parsing,” in *ACL (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2017, pp. 1139–1149.
- [53] P. Yin and G. Neubig, “A syntactic neural model for general-purpose code generation,” in *ACL (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2017, pp. 440–450.
- [54] Z. Sun, Q. Zhu, L. Mou, Y. Xiong, G. Li, and L. Zhang, “A grammar-based structural CNN decoder for code generation,” in *AAAI*. AAAI Press, 2019, pp. 7055–7062.
- [55] Z. Sun, Q. Zhu, Y. Xiong, Y. Sun, L. Mou, and L. Zhang, “Treegen: A tree-based transformer architecture for code generation,” in *AAAI*. AAAI Press, 2020, pp. 8984–8991.
- [56] P. Yin and G. Neubig, “TRANX: A transition-based neural abstract syntax parser for semantic parsing and code generation,” in *EMNLP (Demonstration)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2018, pp. 7–12.
- [57] V. Raychev, M. T. Vechev, and E. Yahav, “Code completion with statistical language models,” in *PLDI*. ACM, 2014, pp. 419–428.
- [58] X. Gu, H. Zhang, D. Zhang, and S. Kim, “Deep API learning,” in *SIGSOFT FSE*. ACM, 2016, pp. 631–642.
- [59] —, “Deepam: Migrate apis with multi-modal sequence to sequence learning,” in *IJCAI*. ijcai.org, 2017, pp. 3675–3681.
- [60] R. Mukherjee, Y. Wen, D. Chaudhuri, T. W. Reps, S. Chaudhuri, and C. M. Jermaine, “Neural program generation modulo static analysis,” in *NeurIPS*, 2021, pp. 18 984–18 996.
- [61] Y. Dong, G. Li, and Z. Jin, “CODEP: grammatical seq2seq model for general-purpose code generation,” in *ISSTA*. ACM, 2023, pp. 188–198.
- [62] E. Nijkamp, B. Pang, H. Hayashi, L. Tu, H. Wang, Y. Zhou, S. Savarese, and C. Xiong, “Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474*, 2022.
- [63] X. Chen, M. Lin, N. Schärli, and D. Zhou, “Teaching large language models to self-debug,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2304.05128, 2023.
- [64] H. Chen, A. Saha, S. C. H. Hoi, and S. Joty, “Personalised distillation: Empowering open-sourced llms with adaptive learning for code generation,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2310.18628, 2023.
- [65] Z. Luo, C. Xu, P. Zhao, Q. Sun, X. Geng, W. Hu, C. Tao, J. Ma, Q. Lin, and D. Jiang, “Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2306.08568, 2023.
- [66] R. Li, L. B. Allal, Y. Zi, N. Muennighoff, D. Kocetkov, C. Mou, M. Marone, C. Akiki, J. Li, J. Chim, Q. Liu, E. Zheltonozhskii, T. Y. Zhuo, T. Wang, O. Dehaene, M. Davaadorj, J. Lamy-Poirier, J. Monteiro, O. Shliakhko, N. Gontier, N. Meade, A. Zebaze, M. Yee, L. K. Umaphathi, J. Zhu, B. Lipkin, M. Oblukulov, Z. Wang, R. M. V. J. Stillerman, S. S. Patel, D. Abulhanov, M. Zocca, M. Dey, Z. Zhang, N. Moustafa-Fahmy, U. Bhattacharyya, W. Yu, S. Singh, S. Luccioni, P. Villegas, M. Kunakov, F. Zhdanov, M. Romero, T. Lee, N. Timor, J. Ding, C. Schlesinger, H. Schoelkopf, J. Ebert, T. Dao, M. Mishra, A. Gu, J. Robinson, C. J. Anderson, B. Dolan-Gavitt, D. Contractor, S. Reddy, D. Fried, D. Bahdanau, Y. Jernite, C. M. Ferrandis, S. Hughes, T. Wolf, A. Guha, L. von Werra, and H. de Vries, “Starcoder: may the source be with you!” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2305.06161, 2023.
- [67] J. P. Inala, C. Wang, M. Yang, A. Cotas, M. Encarnación, S. K. Lahiri, M. Musuvathi, and J. Gao, “Fault-aware neural code rankers,” in *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [68] D. Huang, Q. Bu, J. Zhang, X. Xie, J. Chen, and H. Cui, “Bias assessment and mitigation in llm-based code generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14345*, 2023.
- [69] S. Zhang, Z. Chen, Y. Shen, M. Ding, J. B. Tenenbaum, and C. Gan, “Planning with large language models for code generation,” in *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2023.
- [70] X. Wei, S. K. Gonugondla, S. Wang, W. U. Ahmad, B. Ray, H. Qian, X. Li, V. Kumar, Z. Wang, Y. Tian, Q. Sun, B. Athiwaratun, M. Shang, M. K. Ramanathan, P. Bhatia, and B. Xiang, “Towards greener yet powerful code generation via quantization: An empirical study,” in *ESEC/SIGSOFT FSE*. ACM, 2023, pp. 224–236.
- [71] D. Zan, B. Chen, Z. Lin, B. Guan, Y. Wang, and J. Lou, “When language model meets private library,” in *EMNLP (Findings)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022, pp. 277–288.
- [72] Y. Wen, P. Yin, K. Shi, H. Michalewski, S. Chaudhuri, and A. Polozov, “Grounding data science code generation with input-output specifications,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2402.08073, 2024.
- [73] J. Liu, C. S. Xia, Y. Wang, and L. Zhang, “Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation,” in *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [74] D. Zan, B. Chen, D. Yang, Z. Lin, M. Kim, B. Guan, Y. Wang, W. Chen, and J. Lou, “CERT: continual pre-training on sketches for library-oriented code generation,” in *IJCAI*. ijcai.org, 2022, pp. 2369–2375.
- [75] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, A. Rodriguez, A. Joulin, E. Grave, and G. Lample, “Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2302.13971, 2023.

- [76] Y. Dong, J. Ding, X. Jiang, Z. Li, G. Li, and Z. Jin, "Codescore: Evaluating code generation by learning code execution," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2301.09043, 2023.
- [77] G. Orlanski, K. Xiao, X. Garcia, J. Hui, J. Howland, J. Malmaud, J. Austin, R. Singh, and M. Catasta, "Measuring the impact of programming language distribution," in *ICML*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 202. PMLR, 2023, pp. 26 619–26 645.
- [78] X. Wang, X. Liu, P. Zhou, Q. Liu, J. Liu, H. Wu, and X. Cui, "Test-driven multi-task learning with functionally equivalent code transformation for neural code generation," in *ASE*. ACM, 2022, pp. 188:1–188:6.
- [79] F. Cassano, J. Gouwar, D. Nguyen, S. Nguyen, L. Phipps-Costin, D. Pinckney, M. Yee, Y. Zi, C. J. Anderson, M. Q. Feldman, A. Guha, M. Greenberg, and A. Jangda, "Multipl-e: A scalable and polyglot approach to benchmarking neural code generation," *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 3675–3691, 2023.
- [80] A. Ni, S. Iyer, D. Radev, V. Stoyanov, W. Yih, S. I. Wang, and X. V. Lin, "LEVER: learning to verify language-to-code generation with execution," in *ICML*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 202. PMLR, 2023, pp. 26 106–26 128.
- [81] Y. Dong, X. Jiang, H. Liu, G. Li, and Z. Jin, "Generalization or memorization: Data contamination and trustworthy evaluation for large language models," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2402.15938, 2024.