

# Does Few-Shot Learning Help LLM Performance in Code Synthesis?

Derek Xu<sup>1\*</sup>, Tong Xie<sup>1\*</sup>, Botao Xia<sup>1\*</sup>, Haoyu Li<sup>2\*</sup>

Yunsheng Bai<sup>3</sup>, Yizhou Sun<sup>1</sup>, Wei Wang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of California Los Angeles

<sup>2</sup>University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

<sup>3</sup>Nvidia

\* Equal Contribution

## Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have made significant strides at code generation through improved model design, training, and chain-of-thought. However, prompt-level optimizations remain an important yet under-explored aspect of LLMs for coding. This work focuses on the few-shot examples present in most code generation prompts, offering a systematic study on whether few-shot examples improve LLM’s coding capabilities, which few-shot examples have the largest impact, and how to select impactful examples. Our work offers 2 approaches for selecting few-shot examples, a model-free method, CODEEXEMPLAR-FREE, and a model-based method, CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE. The 2 methods offer a trade-off between improved performance and reliance on training data and interpretability. Both methods significantly improve CODELLAMA’s coding ability across the popular HUMANEVAL+ coding benchmark. In summary, our work provides valuable insights into how to pick few-shot examples in code generation prompts to improve LLM code generation capabilities.

## 1 Introduction

Recently, large language models (LLMs) (Radford et al., 2019) have demonstrated impressive capabilities outside of natural language processing, including in mathematics (Touvron et al., 2023; Luo et al., 2023), time series forecasting (Ansari et al., 2024; Woo et al., 2024; Das et al., 2023), tabular data understanding (Hegselmann et al., 2023; Hollmann et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2024), and multi-modal understanding (Liu et al., 2024a). Among these capabilities, LLMs’ application to software engineering is particularly exciting. In just a few months, LLMs exhibit zero-shot abilities in code completion (Peng et al., 2023), code generation (Roziere et al., 2023; Guo et al., 2024; Dubey et al., 2024), test case generation (Vikram et al., 2023; Lemieux et al., 2023; Schäfer et al., 2023), debugger interaction (Islam

et al., 2024; Ho et al., 2024), and repository-level generation (Shrivastava et al., 2023; Bui et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024a).

In this work, we study the important task of code generation (Roziere et al., 2023), where an LLM agent generates code described by a prompt consisting of a natural language function description and few-shot input-output examples. Current LLMs exhibit code generation capabilities through improved model design (Guo et al., 2024), training (Roziere et al., 2023), and chain-of-thought (Li et al., 2023). Our work aims to enhance existing LLMs for code generation by improving the prompt itself, which remains an under-explored research problem. In fact, existing techniques evaluate on predefined prompt templates with little to no modifications (Austin et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2024b).

To improve the prompt itself, we break down the prompt template into 2 components: (1) a natural language description, providing a high-level description of the code, and (2) few-shot input-output examples, describing function input outputs to disambiguate the natural language description. For example, the description “return a list with elements incremented by 1” can be disambiguated by the example “incr\_list([1,2,3]) == [2,3,4],” which shows that each numerical element of the list should be incremented by 1.

Inspired by existing work (Liu et al., 2021, 2024c) that show LLM’s in-context learning (ICL) ability is shaped by which examples are included in the ICL prompt, we hypothesize LLM’s coding ability is also shaped by which few-shot examples are included in the code generation prompt<sup>1</sup>. We confirm our hypothesis on several language models: T5-SMALL, T5-BASE, MISTRAL, and CODELLAMA on the HUMANEVAL+ benchmark.

<sup>1</sup>Unlike in-context learning (ICL), few-shot examples in code synthesis prompts are not in the same input output space. Hence, existing ICL techniques for example selection (Liu et al., 2021) does not work in our setting.

Furthermore, we provide analysis on which examples contribute most to LLM’s coding capabilities.

Given few-shot examples greatly affect LLM coding capability, we provide two methods for selecting few-shot examples: (1) a model-free algorithm, CODEEXEMPLAR-FREE, that picks examples based on an input metric, and (2) a model-based algorithm, CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE that picks examples based on a bootstrapped training dataset. The former offers an interpretable data-agnostic algorithm, and the latter offers a better performing data-driven model. Both approaches support arbitrary token cost constraints. Both approaches substantially improve CODELLAMA’s coding capabilities on the HUMANEVAL+ benchmark under fixed token constraints. We summarize our contributions:

- We demonstrate that choice of few-shot examples in the LLM prompt has a significant effect on LLM coding capabilities across 5 different LLMs.
- We propose an interpretable model-free algorithm, requiring no training, that improves LLM code generation ability by only modifying the input prompt.
- We propose a data-driven neural network, trained on a dataset of code generation prompts, that improves LLM code generation by only modifying the input prompt. Both algorithms are gray-box: they do not require access to ground-truth weights of the model, only the logits for given input.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Code LLMs

Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) have led to significant progress in code generation and understanding. State-of-the-art models like GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023), Claude 3.5 (Anthropic, 2024), Llama 3 (Dubey et al., 2024), and Mixtral (AI, 2023) have demonstrated remarkable code synthesis capabilities across various programming languages. These models leverage vast amounts of code data and natural language descriptions to generate contextually relevant and syntactically correct code snippets. More specialized code LLMs, such as CodeT5 (Wang et al., 2021), InCoder (Fried et al., 2022), DeepSeek-Coder (Guo et al., 2024), StarCoder2 (Lozhkov et al., 2024),

Qwen2.5-coder (Hui et al., 2024), Magicoder (Wei et al., 2023), Artigenz-Coder (Agarwal et al., 2024) etc. have been fine-tuned specifically for programming tasks, showing improved performance in code completion and bug fixing. Recent work has also explored the use of LLM-powered agents for more complex coding tasks. For instance, AgentCoder (Huang et al., 2023) and OpenCodeInterpreter (Zheng et al., 2024) introduce frameworks that decompose coding problems into subtasks or leverage execution feedback and iterative refinement, tackling challenging programming problems more effectively.

### 2.2 In-Context Learning

In-context learning enables LLMs to adapt to new tasks by providing examples within the input prompt (Brown, 2020). Research focuses on optimizing example selection and ordering (Lu et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2024b; Peng et al., 2024), including using curriculum learning (Liu et al., 2024d) and comparing it with fine-tuning (Mosbach et al., 2023). This has driven advances in example construction (Chan et al., 2022), mechanism exploration (Rubin et al., 2021), and reliability improvement (Gao and Das, 2024). However, challenges persist in performance stability and prompt sensitivity (Zhao et al., 2021), motivating research on meta-learning (Coda-Forno et al., 2023) and model scale effects (Sun et al., 2024). To enhance inductive reasoning, researchers are developing techniques like Case2Code (Shao et al., 2024) and SolverLearner (Cheng et al., 2024) to evaluate and improve LLMs’ ability to learn from input-output examples. These efforts, along with frameworks like Modelizer (Mammadov et al., 2024) and AcTracer (Huang et al., 2024), underscore the importance of selecting informative input-output pairs for strong reasoning and generalization.

## 3 Problem Setting

Our work studies how to generate effective prompts for large language model (LLM) code generation. We denote the textual prompt as  $x_m^{(j)} \in \mathcal{X}_m$  and corresponding code (in text form) as  $y_m^{(j)} \in \mathcal{Y}_m$ . Each prompt consists of a natural language description,  $u_{NL}^{(j)} \in \mathcal{U}_{NL}$ , and  $N$  few-shot demonstration examples,  $D_j = [(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})]_{i=0}^N$ , where  $y_c^{(j,i)} \in \mathcal{Y}_c$  is the expected output object when the code is run on example input object  $x_c^{(j,i)} \in \mathcal{X}_c$ . A template,  $\mathcal{T}$ , converts the natural language descrip-




Figure 1: Overview of MetaNet Ranker and Perplexity Ranker. We use a ranking algorithm,  $f_p$ , to select the top  $N = 2$  examples to form a prompt that is fed to the LLM testing its coding capabilities.

tion and few shot examples into said textual prompt:  $x_M^{(j)} = \mathcal{T}(u_{NL}^{(j)}, D_j)$ . The LLM,  $f_m : \mathcal{X}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_m$ , generates code (in text form) provided the input prompt. To evaluate the LLM’s coding ability, we check the Pass@1 metric (Roziere et al., 2023) of the code (executable),  $f_c : \mathcal{X}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_c$  generated from the code (in text form) using a compiler,  $\mathcal{C}$ , as follows:  $f_c^{(j)} = \mathcal{C}(x_m^{(j)}, y_m^{(j)})$ .

Our work focuses on the different input output pairs,  $D_j$ , included in the prompt,  $x_M^{(j)}$ . Specifically, given a larger pool of  $M \gg N$  demonstration examples,  $\hat{D}_j = [(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})]_{i=0}^M$ , we propose a sorting algorithm that ranks examples by how much they would improve the Pass@1 score,  $f_p : \mathcal{U}_{NL} \times (\mathcal{X}_c \times \mathcal{Y}_c)^M \rightarrow S_m$ , where  $S_n$  denotes the space of indices i.e. permutations of  $\{0, 1, \dots, M - 1\}$ . Our algorithm construct new prompts by selecting the top  $N$  example prompts:  $\tilde{D}_j = [(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})]_{i \in f_p(D_j)[:N]}^2$ . Directly including all  $M$  examples from the larger pool,  $\hat{D}_j$ , into the prompt is infeasible, due to LLM’s high compute costs on very long context prompts. In practice, large pools of test cases,  $\hat{D}_j$ , can either originate from human generated documentation (Nasif et al., 2021; Lemieux et al., 2023) or GPT-generated unit tests (Austin et al., 2021).

Compared to existing work which uses few human defined examples,  $D_j$ , our work algorithmically filters the best  $N$  few-shot examples,  $\tilde{D}_j$ , from a larger pool of  $M$  examples,  $\hat{D}_j$ , through

<sup>2</sup>Note, our model design assumes each example is added independently, where the  $(K + 1)$ th best example is not dependent on which example is the  $K$ th best. The independence assumption allows us to efficiently select an arbitrary cutoff  $N$ . We leave dependent example selection to future work.

a sorting algorithm,  $f_p^3$ . We make the important distinction that our work focuses on **filtering** the best test cases to fit into a prompt, **not generating** said test cases from scratch, because large quantities of test cases are often readily available in real-world applications (Lemieux et al., 2023), and generation from scratch entails ensuring input-output pairs both describe ground truth code and maximize Pass@1. Nonetheless, our filtered examples,  $\tilde{D}_j$ , would benefit from better pool of demonstration examples,  $\hat{D}_j$ , from improved generation algorithms.

## 4 Methodology

The goal of our work is to find demonstration examples,  $\tilde{D}_j$ , that outperforms the human defined prompts in HUMANEVAL+ (Liu et al., 2024b),  $D_j$ . We accomplish this by proposing 2 algorithms for  $f_p$  that approximates the Pass@1 metric when an example,  $[(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})]$ , is added to the prompt:  $\mathcal{T}(u_{NL}^{(j)}, [(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})])$ . Because Pass@1 is a discrete metric, we optimize a more granular surrogate objective: the perplexity of generating the ground truth code, PERPLEXITY (TARGET), as described in Equation 1, where perplexity is defined as  $PP(y; f_m, x) = Pr_{f_m} [y|x]^{-\frac{1}{|y|}}$  (Jelinek et al., 1977). We show that PERPLEXITY (TARGET)’s ranking is a good estimator for Pass@1’s ranking in Section 5.3.1.

$$PP_{target}(y_m^{(j)}; f_m, (x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})) = PP(y_m^{(j)}; f_m, \mathcal{T}(u_{NL}^{(j)}, [(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})])) \quad (1)$$

<sup>3</sup>We propose both a model-free and a model-based version of the sorting algorithm

LLM	No Example	Best Example	Average Example	Median Example
T5-SMALL	$(6.62 \pm 1.68) \cdot 10^8$	$(1.38 \pm 0.41) \cdot 10^6$	$(3.09 \pm 1.01) \cdot 10^8$	$(2.77 \pm 1.08) \cdot 10^8$
T5-BASE	$(4.09 \pm 2.37) \cdot 10^6$	$(1.62 \pm 0.99) \cdot 10^6$	$(4.34 \pm 1.49) \cdot 10^6$	$(3.72 \pm 1.48) \cdot 10^6$
MISTRAL	$4.73 \pm 0.26$	$2.31 \pm 0.09$	$4.67 \pm 0.27$	$4.33 \pm 0.22$
LLAMA	$3.20 \pm 0.27$	$2.15 \pm 0.09$	$2.80 \pm 0.14$	$2.65 \pm 0.13$
CODELLAMA	$3.21 \pm 0.11$	$1.76 \pm 0.04$	$3.35 \pm 0.15$	$3.15 \pm 0.12$

Table 1: Studying the performance (i.e.  $PP_{target}(y_m^{(j)}; f_m, [(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})])$ ) by adding a single few-shot example to each prompt. We report the average and best performance gain from adding single examples. Standard error is computed across different prompts.




Figure 2: Studying the performance gain (i.e.  $PP_{target}(y_m^{(j)}; f_m, \hat{D}_j) - PP_{target}(y_m^{(j)}; f_m, \emptyset)$ ) from adding multiple examples,  $\hat{D}_j$  to each prompt. Each example is chosen randomly from a larger pool of candidate examples,  $\hat{D}_j$ . Deviations are computed across different prompts.

#### 4.1 Model-Free Ranker

As mentioned in Section 4, the goal of  $f_p$  is to approximately rank the Pass@1 metric by ranking the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) metric. Inspired by recent work showing foundation models learn more from data they cannot generate (Shumailov et al., 2024), our model-free ranker makes the following qualitative assumptions: (1) all few-shot examples will improve performance by disambiguating the natural language prompt, and (2) few-shot examples that the LLM cannot generate are more effective at disambiguating the natural language prompt. We show the degree to which these assumptions hold in Section 5.2.

Under these assumptions, the model-free algorithm selects few-shot examples that the LLM cannot self-generate, which we measure with PERPLEXITY (SOURCE) as described in Equation 2.

$$PP_{source}((x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)}); f_m) = PP\left(\mathcal{T}(u_{NL}^{(j)}, [(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})]); f_m, \emptyset\right) \quad (2)$$

We show that PERPLEXITY (SOURCE)’s ranking is a good estimator for PERPLEXITY (TAR-

GET)’s ranking in Section 5.3.2. Intuitively, if the LLM does not expect to read a certain few-shot example, then this example will have a large effect on the LLM’s generated output. As long as this effect is positive (the model does not hallucinate), PERPLEXITY (SOURCE) remains a reliable metric for selecting impactful few-shot examples. CODEEXEMPLAR-FREE,  $f_p^{(free)}$ , ranks the examples based on descending PERPLEXITY (SOURCE).

#### 4.2 Model-Based Ranker

To generate rankings with less assumptions, we introduce a model-based algorithm for  $f_p$ . Our model-based algorithm determines whether examples improve or deteriorate performance by directly learning trends from a labelled training dataset. Specifically, we collect a dataset of few-shot example,  $[(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})]$ , to PERPLEXITY (TARGET) pairs and train a neural network,  $f_b$ , to predict the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) based on LLM representations of the labelled example:  $f_b(f_m(\cdot); \theta)$ . CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE,  $f_p^{(based)}$  ranks the examples based on descending outputs of the neural network.

**Collecting the Dataset:** We collect the training dataset by splitting the HUMANEVAL+ dataset into the training and testing splits in a 80:20 split, ensuring prompts in the test set do not leak into the training set. For each training set prompt, we form new labelled pairs from each few-shot example, where inputs are  $x_b^{(j,i)} = (u_{NL}^{(j)}, [(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})])$  and outputs are  $y_b^{(j,i)} = PP_{target}(y_m^{(j)}; f_m, (x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)}))$ .

**Extracting Embeddings:** We pass the input prompt to CODELLAMA (Roziere et al., 2023) to obtain hidden representations. Because intermediate layers of LLMs contain more semantic information, we extract the [EOS] token from the 16th layer, which we denote as  $h_b^{(j,i)} = f_m(\mathcal{T}(u_{NL}^{(j)}, [(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})]))$ . This embedding contains rich semantic information on each test case, as shown in Section 5.3.3.

	Pass@1=0.0	Pass@1=1.0
PERPLEXITY (TARGET)	0.21 $\pm$ 0.19	0.64 $\pm$ 0.15

Table 2: Average PERPLEXITY (TARGET) of test cases that have Pass@1 score of 1.0 and of test cases that have Pass@1 score of 0.0. Results are aggregated across all coding problems. Deviation reported is standard error.

**Model:** We use a simple 4-layer multi-layer perceptron (MLP) model,  $f_b$ , to decode the CODELLAMA embedding. We train the MLP using mean squared error on the training dataset with the LLM being frozen:  $MSE(f_b(h_b^{(j,i)}), y_b^{(j,i)})$ . Unlike CODEXEMPLAR-FREE, CODEXAMPLAR-BASE is directly trained on the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) metric, hence can better distinguish cases where when the example hurts or improves the LLM’s coding capabilities.

## 5 Motivational Experiments

### 5.1 Models, Datasets, and Metrics

We evaluate the effect of adding few-shot examples on 5 language models: T5-SMALL (60M) (Raffel et al., 2020), T5-BASE (220M) (Raffel et al., 2020), MISTRAL (7B) (Jiang et al., 2023), LLAMA (8B) (Dubey et al., 2024), and CODELLAMA (7B) (Roziere et al., 2023). We evaluate CODEXEMPLAR-FREE ( $f_p^{(free)}$ ) and CODEXAMPLAR-BASE ( $f_p^{(based)}$ ) on the best LLM among the above choices, CODELLAMA ( $f_m$ ) on the popular HUMANEVAL+ benchmark (Liu et al., 2024b). As described in Section 4.2, we divide the prompts into 2 sets, one for training CODEXAMPLAR-BASE and one for validation/testing in an 60:20:20 split. In this work, we adopt GPT (Radford et al., 2019) to generate new few-shot examples for each test prompt. However, because the HUMANEVAL+ benchmark (Liu et al., 2024b) already uses GPT to generate its test cases, to prevent data leakage, the large pool of examples is obtained from HUMANEVAL+ benchmark. Specifically, we split the unit tests into (1) few-shot examples used for prompt optimizations ( $\hat{D}_j = [(x_c^{(j,i)}, y_c^{(j,i)})]_{i=0}^M$ ) and (2) few-show examples used for benchmarking in an 60:20:20 split.

We note that the Pass@1 metric is too coarse for our use-case. Specifically, state-of-the-art models (Guo et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2023) show minimal performance differences between different algorithms. To better measure the effect of

prompt design, we use the more finegrained PERPLEXITY (TARGET) metric, described in Section 4. We show the correlation between Pass@1 and PERPLEXITY (TARGET) in Section 5.3.1. We show that few-shot example selection improves Pass@1 results in Section 6.

### 5.2 Whether Few-Shot Examples Help

We first evaluate **whether** few-shot example help or hurt downstream performance. First, we test whether adding **single** few-shot examples improves the LLM’s probability of generating the ground truth solution, PERPLEXITY (TARGET), by iterating through *all* possible single test cases,  $PP_{target}(y_m^{(j)}; f_m, [(x_c^{(i,j)}, y_c^{(i,j)})]) \forall i \forall j$ . Next, we test whether adding **multiple** few-shot examples improves the LLM’s probability of generating the ground truth solution,  $\Delta$ PERPLEXITY (TARGET), formally defined as  $PP_{target}(y_m^{(j)}; f_m, \hat{D}_j) - PP_{target}(y_m^{(j)}; f_m, \emptyset)$ .

Our study shows prompt design has a large influence on the downstream performance. Specifically, **by adding just a single one-shot example, LLM coding capabilities can improve by the same margin as model architecture or training dataset design choices (Table 1)**. Following neural scaling laws (Kaplan et al., 2020), larger models, such as MISTRAL, LLAMA, and CODELLAMA, exhibit much better zero-shot coding capabilities than T5-SMALL and T5-BASE. We find **most examples improve PERPLEXITY (TARGET)**, because the median test case improves PERPLEXITY (TARGET). However, not all test cases are created equal. **The best test case for a given problem improves PERPLEXITY (TARGET) much more than the median test case**, motivating a need to rank candidate examples,  $f_p$ , by their helpfulness. Among the LLMs tested, CODELLAMA (Roziere et al., 2023) benefits the most from good test case selection, hence we focus this work around CODELLAMA.

Given the improvement from single few-shot examples, we extend our analysis to multiple test cases. By adding more few-shot examples, **CODELLAMA coding performance significantly improves then saturates** around a log perplexity improvement of around 5.0 after 6 examples (Figure 2). While performance monotonically improves, longer prompts require much more compute costs (Dao et al., 2022). Specifically, **the LLM is approximately 2 $\times$  slower on prompts including 10 few-shot examples compared to**




Figure 3: t-SNE Plots of the hidden representation of the prompt with given examples,  $h_b^{(j,i)}$ . Colors denote the change in PERPLEXITY (TARGET). As shown, the embeddings naturally encode the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) score.




Figure 4: Correlation between PERPLEXITY (SOURCE) and PERPLEXITY (TARGET) on some randomly chosen examples across some randomly chosen problems.




Figure 5: Main Results using PERPLEXITY (TARGET). We compare the perplexity improvement gained from adding a  $N$  examples to the prompt, where each example is chosen by a different  $f_p$  ranker function.

prompts with no examples (only the natural language). Thus, there is a natural tradeoff between performance and compute costs in terms of the number of examples.

Because **both single and multiple few-shot examples improves LLM’s coding performance**, we showed prompt optimization on its own can improve the LLM’s code generation abilities without any additional LLM training, model design, or model alignment. As mentioned previously, LLM compute costs are determined by the prompt token length, motivating a need to select the best  $N \ll M$  few-shot examples from the larger pool of  $M$  many-shot examples.

### 5.3 Which Few-Shot Examples Help

Because most few-shot examples improve CODEL-LAMA coding capabilities, we shift our focus to studying **which** examples improve its coding capabilities the most.

#### 5.3.1 Target Perplexity

As explained in Section 4, Pass@1 is a discrete metric, hence cannot capture the more fine-grained performance gains from different design choices. Specifically, **the Pass@1 metric is binary on a single coding problem**. Thus, Pass@1 does not effectively measure the effect of including individual one-shot examples in the prompt of a single problem. Hence, we propose a more fine-grained surrogate metric, PERPLEXITY (TARGET),




Figure 6: Main Results using Pass@1. We compare the perplexity improvement gained from adding a  $N$  examples to the prompt, where each example is chosen by a different  $f_p$  ranker function.




Figure 7: Measuring the effect in-distribution and out-of-distribution training has on the model’s performance. All other experiments in this work adopt the harder out-of-distribution training, where the prompts are split in to train test sets that are never seen in training. In contrast, the in-distribution training splits the examples within a prompt. Hence, the sample natural language prompt can appear in both training and test sets. The “Actual Ranks” is the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) ranking and the “Predicted Ranks” is the CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE ranking.

to measure code performance. **Our analysis (Table 2) confirms Pass@1 scores correlate with the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) scores, since successful prompts have higher mean perplexity.** Unlike Pass@1, PERPLEXITY (TARGET) is a more granular evaluation metric that measures the effect of few-shot examples on individual problems.

### 5.3.2 Source Perplexity

CODEEXEMPLAR-FREE estimates the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) ranking by few-shot examples by their PERPLEXITY (SOURCE) scores. Following the one-shot experimental setup from Section 5.2, **our analysis verifies PERPLEXITY (SOURCE) somewhat approximates the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) scores (Figure 4).** We highlight the benefit of PERPLEXITY (SOURCE) is it does *not* require access to any ground truth code to compute. Hence this metric can directly be used for model-free inference, as elaborated in Section 4.1.

### 5.3.3 Embedding-Level Signals

While PERPLEXITY (SOURCE) roughly correlates PERPLEXITY (TARGET), we discover LLM embeddings themselves also provides a reliable signal on a prompt’s PERPLEXITY (TARGET) score. Specifically, we plot the t-SNE 2D visualization of the 16th layer of CODELLAMA. **Our investigation (Figure 3) reveals LLM embeddings themselves are a suitable signal to measure PERPLEXITY (TARGET).** These results motivate for our learning-based approach, CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE, which encodes semantic representations of one-shot examples to estimate PERPLEXITY (TARGET).

## 5.4 Case Study Analysis

To understand which examples boost LLMs coding capabilities, we plot the top 3 most informative and least informative prompts for 2 random

	Prompt: Find the factors	Prompt: Find the largest divisor
Best Example	factorize(1000) == [2, 2, 2, 5, 5, 5]	largestDivisor(42) == 21
2nd Best Example	factorize(2147483647) == [2147483647]	largestDivisor(55) == 11
3rd Best Example	factorize(1024) == [2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2]	largestDivisor(44) == 22
...	...	...
3rd Worst Example	factorize(79) == [79]	largestDivisor(79) == 1
2nd Worst Example	factorize(67) == [67]	largestDivisor(53) == 1
Worst Example	factorize(83) == [83]	largestDivisor(71) == 1

Table 3: Case Studies showing which one-shot examples most improve PERPLEXITY (TARGET).

prompts. We observe that **prompts with more complex inputs tend to be informative (Table 3), while simple or edge case examples provide little benefit.** As shown in Section 6, CODEEXEMPLAR-FREE and CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE boost model performance by selecting these informative few-shot examples quantitatively and automatically.

## 6 Main Experiments

Given the motivating results in Section 5, we now evaluate whether our proposed **ranking function**,  $f_p$  improves model performance. We adopt the same dataset splitting strategy as in Section 5.1.

### 6.1 Main Results

Our experiments show **both CODEEXEMPLAR-FREE and CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE improves CODELLAMA’s likelihood of generating ground truth code by up to 5.0 through solely optimizing the prompt (Figure 5).** Specifically, under the fixed  $N$ -shot setting, CODEEXEMPLAR-FREE extracts more effective prompts than both the original prompt (Human Eval), randomly selecting few-shot examples (Random). Figure 5 also demonstrates our methods improve perplexity over the natural language prompt on its own.

Not only does our approach improve the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) score, but **both CODEEXEMPLAR-FREE and CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE improves CODELLAMA’s raw Pass@1 coding performance by  $5.70 \pm 2.17\%$  and  $5.05 \pm 1.70\%$  on average respectively through solely optimizing the prompt (Figure 6).** We highlight CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE performs better than the random choice under all settings of  $N$ . These results indicate that our prompt optimization techniques have practical application.

### 6.2 Distribution Shift Bottleneck

We provide further analysis into future directions for CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE. Specifically, we find CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE can be improved by a better training dataset. We arrive at this conclusion by splitting across all few-shot examples instead of splitting across all prompts. Under this setting, the same prompt can occur between training and testing. Hence, the model only needs to learn the importance of individual examples, rather than learn the importance of individual examples and generalize to new prompts. By removing the need to generalize to new prompts, CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE greatly improves in its ranking predictions (Figure 7). This indicates better dataset design which improves the prompt generalization of CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE can further improve its performance, encouraging development of larger coding datasets. We highlight all the experiments in this work adopt the harder setting, where the train and test set have disjunct natural language descriptions .

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we analyzed the effects of few-shot examples on the coding capabilities of large language models (LLMs). Our work identified interesting properties of few-shot examples, including the example complexity, embedding representation, and perplexity. To this end, we proposed 2 effective strategies of picking in-context examples, a model-free algorithm based on perplexity, CODEEXEMPLAR-FREE, and a model-based algorithm trained on data, CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE. We show that both CODEEXEMPLAR-FREE and CODEEXAMPLAR-BASE meaningfully improves CODELLAMA’s coding capabilities.

## 8 Limitations

This work studies several aspects of few-shot examples in the prompt. The main experiments are performed on CODELLAMA (Roziere et al., 2023). For future work, we wish to extend to more state-of-the-art models such as DeepSeeker (Guo et al., 2024). This work does not tackle chain of thought prompting, only the original prompt in a zero-shot manner. This work focuses on code generation. While the techniques are applicable to general in-context learning, we leave such study to future work. This work tests on the HUMANEVAL+ (Liu et al., 2024b) benchmark. We leave incorporating harder benchmarks, such as BigCodeBech (Zhuo et al., 2024), to future work.

## References

- Nikita Agarwal, Vivek Verma, Nalin Abrol, Manish Srivastava, Manas Kumar Verma, and Nikhil Tadigoppula. 2024. Artigenz-coder-ds-6.7b. <https://huggingface.co/Artigenz/Artigenz-Coder-DS-6.7B>. Accessed: 2024-10-15.
- Mistral AI. 2023. Mixtral-8x22b-instruct-v0.1. <https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mixtral-8x22B-Instruct-v0.1>. Accessed: 2024-10-15.
- Abdul Fatir Ansari, Lorenzo Stella, Caner Turkmen, Xiyuan Zhang, Pedro Mercado, Huibin Shen, Oleksandr Shchur, Syama Sundar Rangapuram, Sebastian Pineda Arango, Shubham Kapoor, et al. 2024. Chronos: Learning the language of time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07815*.
- Anthropic. 2024. Claude 3.5 sonnet. <https://www.anthropic.com>. AI language model, accessed on October 15, 2024.
- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk 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*.
- Tom B Brown. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*.
- Tuan-Dung Bui, Duc-Thieu Luu-Van, Thanh-Phat Nguyen, Thu-Trang Nguyen, Son Nguyen, and Hieu Dinh Vo. 2024. Rambo: Enhancing rag-based repository-level method body completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.15204*.
- Stephanie Chan, Adam Santoro, Andrew Lampinen, Jane Wang, Aaditya Singh, Pierre Richemond, James McClelland, and Felix Hill. 2022. Data distributional properties drive emergent in-context learning in transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:18878–18891.
- 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*.
- Kewei Cheng, Jingfeng Yang, Haoming Jiang, Zhengyang Wang, Binxuan Huang, Ruirui Li, Shiyang Li, Zheng Li, Yifan Gao, Xian Li, et al. 2024. Inductive or deductive? rethinking the fundamental reasoning abilities of llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00114*.
- Julian Coda-Forno, Marcel Binz, Zeynep Akata, Matt Botvinick, Jane Wang, and Eric Schulz. 2023. Meta-in-context learning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:65189–65201.
- Tri Dao, Dan Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. 2022. Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:16344–16359.
- Abhimanyu Das, Weihao Kong, Rajat Sen, and Yichen Zhou. 2023. A decoder-only foundation model for time-series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10688*.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Wen-tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2022. Incoder: A generative model for code infilling and synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05999*.
- Xiang Gao and Kamalika Das. 2024. Customizing language model responses with contrastive in-context learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18039–18046.
- Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Yu Wu, YK Li, et al. 2024. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming—the rise of code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196*.
- Charles R. Harris, K. Jarrod Millman, Stéfan J. van der Walt, Ralf Gommers, Pauli Virtanen, David Cournapeau, Eric Wieser, Julian Taylor, Sebastian Berg, Nathaniel J. Smith, Robert Kern, Matti Picus, Stephan Hoyer, Marten H. van Kerkwijk, Matthew Brett, Allan Haldane, Jaime Fernández del Río, Mark

- Wiebe, Pearu Peterson, Pierre Gérard-Marchant, Kevin Sheppard, Tyler Reddy, Warren Weckesser, Hameer Abbasi, Christoph Gohlke, and Travis E. Oliphant. 2020. *Array programming with NumPy. Nature*, 585(7825):357–362.
- Stefan Hegselmann, Alejandro Buendia, Hunter Lang, Monica Agrawal, Xiaoyi Jiang, and David Sontag. 2023. Tabllm: Few-shot classification of tabular data with large language models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5549–5581. PMLR.
- Chia-Tung Ho, Haoxing Ren, and Brucek Khailany. 2024. Verilogcoder: Autonomous verilog coding agents with graph-based planning and abstract syntax tree (ast)-based waveform tracing tool. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.08927*.
- Noah Hollmann, Samuel Müller, Katharina Eggenberger, and Frank Hutter. 2022. TabPFN: A transformer that solves small tabular classification problems in a second. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.01848*.
- Dong Huang, Qingwen Bu, Jie M Zhang, Michael Luck, and Heming Cui. 2023. Agentcoder: Multi-agent-based code generation with iterative testing and optimisation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13010*.
- Yuheng Huang, Jiayang Song, Qiang Hu, Felix Juefei-Xu, and Lei Ma. 2024. Active testing of large language model via multi-stage sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03573*.
- Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Kai Dang, et al. 2024. Qwen2. 5-coder technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12186*.
- J. D. Hunter. 2007. *Matplotlib: A 2d graphics environment. Computing in Science & Engineering*, 9(3):90–95.
- Md Ashraf Islam, Mohammed Eunus Ali, and Md Rizwan Parvez. 2024. Mapcoder: Multi-agent code generation for competitive problem solving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11403*.
- Fred Jelinek, Robert L Mercer, Lalit R Bahl, and James K Baker. 1977. Perplexity—a measure of the difficulty of speech recognition tasks. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 62(S1):S63–S63.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- Caroline Lemieux, Jeevana Priya Inala, Shuvendu K Lahiri, and Siddhartha Sen. 2023. Codamosa: Escaping coverage plateaus in test generation with pre-trained large language models. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 919–931. IEEE.
- Jia Li, Ge Li, Yongmin Li, and Zhi Jin. 2023. Structured chain-of-thought prompting for code generation. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024a. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36.
- Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. What makes good in-context examples for gpt-3? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.06804*.
- Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. 2024b. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Shengcai Liu, Caishun Chen, Xinghua Qu, Ke Tang, and Yew-Soon Ong. 2024c. Large language models as evolutionary optimizers. In *2024 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, pages 1–8. IEEE.
- Yinpeng Liu, Jiawei Liu, Xiang Shi, Qikai Cheng, and Wei Lu. 2024d. Let’s learn step by step: Enhancing in-context learning ability with curriculum learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10738*.
- Anton Lozhkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Federico Cassano, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Nouamane Tazi, Ao Tang, Dmytro Pykhtar, Jiawei Liu, Yuxiang Wei, et al. 2024. Starcoder 2 and the stack v2: The next generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19173*.
- Yao Lu, Max Bartolo, Alastair Moore, Sebastian Riedel, and Pontus Stenetorp. 2021. Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08786*.
- Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianguang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, and Dongmei Zhang. 2023. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09583*.
- Tural Mammadov, Dietrich Klakow, Alexander Koller, and Andreas Zeller. 2024. Learning program behavioral models from synthesized input-output pairs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08597*.
- Wes McKinney. 2010. Data structures for statistical computing in python. In *Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference*, pages 51 – 56.

- Marius Mosbach, Tiago Pimentel, Shauli Ravfogel, Dietrich Klakow, and Yanai Elazar. 2023. Few-shot fine-tuning vs. in-context learning: A fair comparison and evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16938*.
- Mathieu Nassif, Alexa Hernandez, Ashvitha Sridharan, and Martin P Robillard. 2021. Generating unit tests for documentation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 48(9):3268–3279.
- OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. 2019. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Keqin Peng, Liang Ding, Yancheng Yuan, Xuebo Liu, Min Zhang, Yuanxin Ouyang, and Dacheng Tao. 2024. Revisiting demonstration selection strategies in in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12087*.
- Sida Peng, Eirini Kalliamvakou, Peter Cihon, and Mert Demirer. 2023. The impact of ai on developer productivity: Evidence from github copilot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06590*.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*.
- Ohad Rubin, Jonathan Herzig, and Jonathan Berant. 2021. Learning to retrieve prompts for in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.08633*.
- Max Schäfer, Sarah Nadi, Aryaz Eghbali, and Frank Tip. 2023. An empirical evaluation of using large language models for automated unit test generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*.
- Yunfan Shao, Linyang Li, Yichuan Ma, Peiji Li, Demin Song, Qinyuan Cheng, Shimin Li, Xiaonan Li, Pengyu Wang, Qipeng Guo, et al. 2024. Case2code: Learning inductive reasoning with synthetic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12504*.
- Disha Shrivastava, Hugo Larochelle, and Daniel Tarrow. 2023. Repository-level prompt generation for large language models of code. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 31693–31715. PMLR.
- Iliia Shumailov, Zakhar Shumaylov, Yiren Zhao, Nicolas Papernot, Ross Anderson, and Yarin Gal. 2024. Ai models collapse when trained on recursively generated data. *Nature*, 631(8022):755–759.
- Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Xiaosong Zhang, Fan Zhang, Qiyang Yu, Yueze Wang, Yongming Rao, Jingjing Liu, Tiejun Huang, and Xinlong Wang. 2024. Generative multimodal models are in-context learners. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14398–14409.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Vasudev Vikram, Caroline Lemieux, and Rohan Padhye. 2023. Can large language models write good property-based tests? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04346*.
- Jicheng Wang, Yifeng He, and Hao Chen. 2024a. Repogenreflex: Enhancing repository-level code completion with verbal reinforcement and retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.13122*.
- Xinyi Wang, Wanrong Zhu, Michael Saxon, Mark Steyvers, and William Yang Wang. 2024b. Large language models are latent variable models: Explaining and finding good demonstrations for in-context learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven Hovy. 2021. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8696–8708.
- Michael L. Waskom. 2021. [seaborn: statistical data visualization](#). *Journal of Open Source Software*, 6(60):3021.
- Yuxiang Wei, Zhe Wang, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, and Lingming Zhang. 2023. [Magicoder: Source code is all you need](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.02120.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin

Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. 2020. **Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Gerald Woo, Chenghao Liu, Akshat Kumar, Caiming Xiong, Silvio Savarese, and Doyen Sahoo. 2024. Unified training of universal time series forecasting transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02592*.

Derek Xu, Olcay Cirit, Reza Asadi, Yizhou Sun, and Wei Wang. 2024. Mixture of in-context prompters for tabular pfns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16156*.

Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 12697–12706. PMLR.

Tianyu Zheng, Ge Zhang, Tianhao Shen, Xueling Liu, Bill Yuchen Lin, Jie Fu, Wenhua Chen, and Xiang Yue. 2024. Opencodeinterpreter: Integrating code generation with execution and refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14658*.

Terry Yue Zhuo, Minh Chien Vu, Jenny Chim, Han Hu, Wenhao Yu, Ratnadira Widayarsi, Imam Nur Bani Yusuf, Haolan Zhan, Junda He, Indraneil Paul, et al. 2024. Bigcodebench: Benchmarking code generation with diverse function calls and complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15877*.

## A Distribution Plots across Language Models

Figure 8 compares the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) between different models. As expected the larger models (MISTRAL and CODELLAMA) have lower perplexity generating the test prompts compared to the smaller models (T5-BASE and T5-SMALL). Furthermore CODELLAMA is more specialized in coding tasks thus yielding slightly lower PERPLEXITY (TARGET) score compared to MISTRAL despite their comparable sizes.

## B Hyperparameter Settings

Because CODEXEMPLAR-FREE is a model-free algorithm with no hyperparameters. For CODEXAMPLAR-BASE, we use the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of  $1e-4$  for 1000 epochs. CODEXAMPLAR-BASE uses a 4-layer neural network with hidden dimension sizes 256, 128, 64, and 1, batch normalization, and ReLU activation. We also considered 2- and 3-layer neural networks. CODEXAMPLAR-BASE uses the 16th layer’s EOS token. We also considered the average token embedding or BOS token embedding from any other




Figure 8: Comparing the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) distribution between T5-BASE, T5-SMALL, MISTRAL, and CODELLAMA. The x axis is the PERPLEXITY (TARGET) in log scale.

layer. We chose our settings by evaluating on the validation set.

## C Machine and Compute Times

All experiments were conducted across 8 Nvidia V100 GPU and an AMD EPYC 7402 CPU. CODEXEMPLAR-FREE and the random baseline takes around 15 minutes to run through the whole benchmark of 7000 test cases. CODEXAMPLAR-BASE trains in under 5 minutes and takes around 15 minutes to run through the whole benchmark of 7000 test cases. Collecting the training dataset, specifically the prompt embedding takes the longest time, at around 11 hours. Our work is built using pyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019), Transformers (Wolf et al., 2020), Numpy (Harris et al., 2020), Pandas (McKinney, 2010), Matplotlib (Hunter, 2007), and Seaborn (Waskom, 2021).

## D Dataset

All experiments are conducted on the popular HUMAN-EVAL+ (Liu et al., 2024b) benchmark. This dataset augments the original HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) dataset with GPT-generated test cases and further test cases from mutation genetic algorithms. We split the test cases into evaluation test cases and those used for few-shot examples in an 80:20 split. We split the prompts into training and testing in an 80:20 split. We follow the intended usage of the datasets.

## E Large Language Models

We considered several large language models in this work. Our experiments are primarily performed on CODELLAMA (Roziere et al., 2023),

which is a 7B decoder-only model trained on code synthesis. We also explore T5-SMALL and T5-BASE (Raffel et al., 2020), which are 60M and 220M encoder-decoder models trained on many different tasks, MISTRAL (Jiang et al., 2023), which is an 7B decoder-only model trained for language generation, and LLAMA (Dubey et al., 2024), which is a 8B decoder-only model also trained for language generation. We follow the intended usage of the LLMs.