
Tree-of-Code: A Hybrid Approach for Robust Complex Task Planning and Execution

Yifan Li*

Global Innovation Exchange Institution, Tsinghua University
Beijing, China, 100084
yifan-li23@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

Ziyi Ni*

Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China, 100190
niziyi2021@ia.ac.cn

Daxiang Dong[†]

Baidu, Inc.
Beijing, China, 100193
dongdaxiang@baidu.com

Abstract

The exceptional capabilities of large language models (LLMs) have substantially accelerated the rapid rise and widespread adoption of agents. Recent studies have demonstrated that generating Python code to consolidate LLM-based agents' actions into a unified action space (CodeAct) is a promising approach for developing real-world LLM agents. However, this step-by-step code generation approach often lacks consistency and robustness, leading to instability in agent applications, particularly for complex reasoning and out-of-domain tasks. In this paper, we propose a novel approach called Tree-of-Code (ToC) to tackle the challenges of complex problem planning and execution with an end-to-end mechanism. By integrating key ideas from both Tree-of-Thought and CodeAct, ToC combines their strengths to enhance solution exploration. In our framework, each final code execution result is treated as a node in the decision tree, with a breadth-first search strategy employed to explore potential solutions. The final outcome is determined through a voting mechanism based on the outputs of the nodes. Experimental results on complicated task datasets demonstrate that our method provides more stable results compared to Tree-of-Thought and achieves higher accuracy than CodeAct.

1 Introduction

In recent years, the application of code generation techniques to complex task planning and execution has garnered significant attention [11, 22, 24], particularly with the emergence of CodeAct [20] approaches. CodeAct has demonstrated remarkable efficiency in generating executable code for complex tasks, improving overall performance in terms of speed and accuracy. However, the lack of consistent reasoning in CodeAct leads to frequent interruptions during multi-step generation, causing fragmented and stalled thinking. Additionally, this process accumulates significant model

*The first two authors contributed equally to this work. † Corresponding author. dongdaxiang@baidu.com

hallucinations [13], with increasing randomness, which ultimately undermines the robustness required for reliably solving complex problems.

To address this challenge, we developed an end-to-end thought-code-execution pipeline that enables models to autonomously generate plans and decompositions for complex tasks, with clear reasoning. Post planning, the model produces implementation code that references earlier reasoning and leverages its innate code processing capabilities, making implicit reasoning explicit through code. Execution of this code yields results. Inspired by the Tree-of-Thought paradigm, our approach emphasizes structured solution exploration using decision trees and incorporates continuous code reflection. The main approach can be summarized into three parts:

1. **End-to-End Code Generation:** By producing complete code solutions end-to-end, we minimize the need for intermediate reflection on execution results, thus enhancing stability, and design a long thought-code reasoning process. We introduce ‘llm-function’ to enable large models to generate prompts and summarize corresponding outcomes.
2. **Exploration of Incomplete Nodes:** Leveraging the Tree-of-Thought methodology, we explore nodes with incomplete execution results by varying prompts, large language models, and model temperatures to improve result stability.
3. **Majority Voting for Final Results:** large language models perform majority voting on all successfully executed nodes to determine the outcome.

The contribution of this paper: 1) We propose the Tree-of-Code method, enhancing stability in complex task execution through efficient model integration. 2) Our approach can integrate various large language models without the need to do fine-tuning. 3) empirical validation of improved problem-solving performance.

2 Related Work

LLM Reasoning: Enhancing reasoning capabilities is a crucial step toward improving general LLMs. The current mainstream approaches focus on training techniques—such as pretraining [10], SFT [6], prompt-tuning [10], model editing [18], and reinforcement learning [17, 26]—as well as the widely used method of prompt engineering to reduce output hallucinations and improve reasoning [5]. The latter primarily involves designing various frameworks for structured chains of thought. Longer thought chains seem to always yield better results [26, 21]. The recent success of GPT-o1 has also highlighted the importance of extended chains of thought (CoT) [21]. Notably, existing CoT method, even with simple prompts like "let’s think step by step," can achieve over a 30% improvement. The Tree of Thoughts (ToT) framework [25] further enhances LLM reasoning by generating and evaluating intermediate steps, employing search algorithms to systematically explore and backtrack thought paths, enabling more effective problem-solving. Other emerging frameworks, like Graph-of-Thought [4] and Algorithm-of-Thought [16], are also contributing to this area of research. **Code Generation:** It is widely accepted that training LLMs with codes can significantly enhance their reasoning abilities [6, 1, 7, 9, 27]. Furthermore, research has shown that code, as a formal programming language, closely mirrors logical structures, inherently containing flow control mechanisms that can stimulate reasoning capabilities. For instance, [20, 9, 19] argue that code serves as an effective medium for representing reasoning processes. Recent works combining code with agents have mainly focused on task completion in purely programming-related domains, such as software development [19, 14] and assisting humans in competitive programming tasks [23, 12]. However, these models do not use code as a scalable language, such as JSON, for direct communication in everyday tasks. CodeAct [20] attempted to use code directly to solve entire tasks, but the granularity of each step was too small, leading to error accumulation during function calls.

3 Tree-of-Code: Code Generation Through Tree-Structured Reflection

The Tree-of-Code (ToC) method combines the structured exploration of Tree-of-Thought with the efficient task planning of CodeAct. ToC introduces a tree-based generation and exploration mechanism that utilizes various code generation strategies and models, enhancing the robustness of execution results. By treating code as a form of reasoning, ToC capitalizes on the unique characteristics of code, such as consistency and determinism, to develop a more effective agent




Figure 1: An Overview of our method **ToC** and **CodAct** comparisons. (a) CodeAct receives input and performs a cycle of execution and correction, but the process is carried out in an iterative, round-by-round manner. (b) ToC applies execution-level reflection in the decision-tree structure. At each layer, different nodes are executed in parallel; if executed correctly, they are stored in the candidate pool for voting, if a node fails, it requires further reflection. Yellow blocks mean continued reflection. Both red and green blocks are done: red blocks are discarded by LLM voting, while green blocks are collected and accepted.

system with improved interpretability and reduced AI hallucinations. This approach acknowledges that well-structured planning does not inherently ensure correct code execution. Unlike traditional reasoning methods, which rely on pre-organized plans, code necessitates a distinct methodology. Therefore, the code-reasoning process is decomposed into a structured framework that emphasizes reflection from post-execution feedback to inform iterative improvements. However, this direct treatment of code as logical reasoning introduces two significant challenges. 1) Limited diversity: Code generation tends to follow a single path, lacking exploration of alternative branches due to the inertia of models. 2) Limited strategy: Code generation lacks a systematic approach to evaluate various options or apply feedback to refine them.

To address these shortcomings, we introduce the Tree of Code (ToC), a framework that allows models to explore multiple solution paths using a variety of strategies and models, with reflection on post-generation execution built into the process.

3.1 Overview the Tree-of-Code System

The Tree-of-Code (ToC) framework presents a comprehensive code reasoning process comprising four key stages: thought, code generation, execution, and reflection. We represent this reasoning process as a tree $T = (N, L)$. In contrast to the thought chain series, where thought steps are organized into nodes (N), our approach emphasizes end-to-end generation. Here, we define nodes as the combination of code generation and its corresponding execution. This tight coupling between code and execution results ensures logical consistency and correctness while facilitating high-quality outcomes for subsequent model training. To enhance post-generation reflection through iterative refinement, we model the reflection process as lines (L), which can encompass various strategies for improvement: 1) System-level reflection: Sampling from diverse models to explore multiple solutions. 2) Operation-level reflection: Modifying evaluation and reflection strategies to iterative enhance output. This structured approach guarantees that the final output is both accurate and diverse, striking a balance between correctness and a variety of reasoning pathways to yield robust solutions.

3.2 Thought And Code Generator

Code generation is a critical component of code-as-reasoning. In our framework, the thought and code generation stage integrates interactions between the user, environment, and agent: The user provides the task queries. The environment executes the generated code, providing execution feedback. The agent synthesizes information from the user, environment, and history, translating this into codes, which it then executes. The process of transforming thought into executable codes can be formalized as:

$$\text{Execution}(i) = \text{Code}(\text{FC}(i), \text{FR}(i), \text{Thought}(i), \text{Functions}) \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (1)$$

where $\text{Thought}(i)$ represents the agent’s internal reasoning at step i , and $\text{Code}(\text{FC}(i), \text{FR}(i)$ and $\text{Thought}(i), \text{Functions})$ converts that reasoning into Python code for execution. $\text{FC}(i)$ represents the code of father node of the current node. $\text{FR}(i)$ represents the code execution result of father node of the current node. Functions represent all the tools that current task can use.

To generate an end-to-end solution for current task, we add a llm-function tool into Functions set. With llm-function, our code generation LLMs will generate prompt from the current context and call llm-function to generate final results.

3.3 Tree Expansion and State Evaluation

We initialize from a root node and do tree expansion recursively based on termination criteria. Every time a node’s code is executed, state evaluation will be executed based on the code execution results. The process is as follows: 1) The process starts at the root node, expanding the tree incrementally, with each node representing generated thoughts, code, and execution results. 2) Generated codes of each leaf node will be executed in a Python environment. When errors are detected, child nodes are expanded from the erroneous node to analyze specific issues and explore alternative solutions. 3) This expansion continues until all leaf nodes execute successfully or a maximum depth is reached. This strategy effectively manages complexity and ensures correct and efficient code execution results.

3.4 Final Result Generator

After candidate outputs from all executed nodes are collected, these results undergo a majority vote and tragic summarization process to determine the most likely single answer. Explanations of the final answer are not included, just the precise answer to the question is shown.

4 Experiment and Analysis

Our experiments evaluated the effectiveness of the ToC framework, comparing its performance primarily against the CodeAct framework. We used the M³ToolEval, a newly curated benchmark for evaluating performance across complex multi-scene tasks, the same used in CodeAct [20], to benchmark ToC. We evaluated the input samples from M³ToolEval. The context window was fixed at 3k tokens, and the generation depth was set at 3 for consistency in computational costs. To highlight the superiority of our method, we directly compared it to the best-performing model in CodeAct, which is based on GPT-4. In the tests, ToC achieved a 7.2% higher accuracy than CodeAct in tasks, and it reduced interaction steps significantly, demonstrating overall effectiveness and robustness in task completion, as Table 1 shows.

To ensure diverse outputs, we applied a multi-level sampling strategy: 1) Model Diversity: A range of generative models (e.g., GPT-4 [2], ERNIE-4.0-Turbo [15], DeepSeek Coder [8], and Claude 3.5 [3]) was utilized to introduce variability at the model level. 2) Temperature Variability: Adjustments to generation temperatures were made within specified bounds to encourage content variation. 3) Prompt Variation: Different role instructions and adaptive strategies were explored to further enhance adaptive diversity.

Further analysis compared ToC against both the JSON-based and thought-based modes of CodeAct. Across all criteria, ToC consistently outperformed other traditional reasoning frameworks, particularly in managing complex reasoning tasks.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced the Tree-of-Code (ToC) method, which combines the strengths of Tree-of-Thought and CodeAct to enhance model robustness and accuracy. Both thought and code

Table 1: Performance Comparison

| Model Name | Action Mode | Average Turns | Correct % |
|----------------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------|
| ToC ¹ | code_as_reasoning | 2.3 | 81.60% |
| CodeAct ² | code_as_reasoning | 5.5 | 74.40% |
| | json_as_reasoning | 7.6 | 52.40% |
| | text_as_reasoning | 7.7 | 53.70% |

¹ Mix-modal sampling for Toc.

² GPT-4, best performance model for CodeAct.

generation in our approach might intrigue internal processes of reasoning, while the decision-tree structured exploration enables reflection based on external execution. With efficient model integration and prompt optimization, we achieved results significantly surpassing the baselines on complex task datasets. Furthermore, our ongoing, yet unpublished, work suggests that this approach will yield similarly promising results in real-world applications and better performance after few-shot SFT. These results will be shared in future work—stay tuned.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [3] Anthropic. Claude 3.5, 2023. URL <https://www.anthropic.com>.
- [4] Maciej Besta, Nils Blach, Ales Kubicek, Robert Gerstenberger, Michal Podstawski, Lukas Gianinazzi, Joanna Gajda, Tomasz Lehmann, Hubert Niewiadomski, Piotr Nyczyk, et al. Graph of thoughts: Solving elaborate problems with large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 17682–17690, 2024.
- [5] Banghao Chen, Zhaofeng Zhang, Nicolas Langrené, and Shengxin Zhu. Unleashing the potential of prompt engineering in large language models: a comprehensive review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14735*, 2023.
- [6] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(70):1–53, 2024.
- [7] Team GLM, Aohan Zeng, Bin Xu, Bowen Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Diego Rojas, Guanyu Feng, Hanlin Zhao, Hanyu Lai, et al. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12793*, 2024.
- [8] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Yu Wu, YK Li, et al. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming—the rise of code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196*, 2024.
- [9] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Yu Wu, YK Li, et al. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming—the rise of code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196*, 2024.
- [10] Rujun Han, Xiang Ren, and Nanyun Peng. Econet: Effective continual pretraining of language models for event temporal reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15283*, 2020.
- [11] Samuel Holt, Max Ruiz Luyten, and Mihaela van der Schaar. L2mac: Large language model automatic computer for extensive code generation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [12] Md Ashraful Islam, Mohammed Eunos Ali, and Md Rizwan Parvez. Mapcoder: Multi-agent code generation for competitive problem solving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11403*, 2024.

- [13] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38, 2023.
- [14] Chen Qian, Wei Liu, Hongzhang Liu, Nuo Chen, Yufan Dang, Jiahao Li, Cheng Yang, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Xin Cong, et al. Chatdev: Communicative agents for software development. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15174–15186, 2024.
- [15] Chengxiang Ren, Yingbo Li, and Yucong Duan. Evaluation on agi/gpt based on the dikwp for ernie bot. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
- [16] Bilgehan Sel, Ahmad Al-Tawaha, Vanshaj Khattar, Ruoxi Jia, and Ming Jin. Algorithm of thoughts: Enhancing exploration of ideas in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10379*, 2023.
- [17] Charlie Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, and Aviral Kumar. Scaling llm test-time compute optimally can be more effective than scaling model parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03314*, 2024.
- [18] Thomas Thum, Don Batory, and Christian Kastner. Reasoning about edits to feature models. In *2009 IEEE 31st International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 254–264. IEEE, 2009.
- [19] Xingyao Wang, Hao Peng, Reyhaneh Jabbarvand, and Heng Ji. Leti: Learning to generate from textual interactions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10314*, 2023.
- [20] Xingyao Wang, Yangyi Chen, Lifan Yuan, Yizhe Zhang, Yunzhu Li, Hao Peng, and Heng Ji. Executable code actions elicit better llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01030*, 2024.
- [21] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [22] Jiaxin Wen, Ruiqi Zhong, Pei Ke, Zhihong Shao, Hongning Wang, and Minlie Huang. Learning task decomposition to assist humans in competitive programming. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2024.
- [23] Jiaxin Wen, Ruiqi Zhong, Pei Ke, Zhihong Shao, Hongning Wang, and Minlie Huang. Learning task decomposition to assist humans in competitive programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04604*, 2024.
- [24] Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardlm: Empowering large pre-trained language models to follow complex instructions. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [25] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [26] Eric Zelikman, Georges Harik, Yijia Shao, Varuna Jayasiri, Nick Haber, and Noah D Goodman. Quiet-star: Language models can teach themselves to think before speaking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09629*, 2024.
- [27] Qihao Zhu, Daya Guo, Zhihong Shao, Dejian Yang, Peiyi Wang, Runxin Xu, Y Wu, Yukun Li, Huazuo Gao, Shirong Ma, et al. Deepseek-coder-v2: Breaking the barrier of closed-source models in code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11931*, 2024.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

The checklist is designed to encourage best practices for responsible machine learning research, addressing issues of reproducibility, transparency, research ethics, and societal impact. Do not remove the checklist: **The papers not including the checklist will be desk rejected.** The checklist should follow the references and follow the (optional) supplemental material. The checklist does NOT count towards the page limit.

Please read the checklist guidelines carefully for information on how to answer these questions. For each question in the checklist:

- You should answer [Yes], [No], or [NA].
- [NA] means either that the question is Not Applicable for that particular paper or the relevant information is Not Available.
- Please provide a short (1–2 sentence) justification right after your answer (even for NA).

The checklist answers are an integral part of your paper submission. They are visible to the reviewers, area chairs, senior area chairs, and ethics reviewers. You will be asked to also include it (after eventual revisions) with the final version of your paper, and its final version will be published with the paper.

The reviewers of your paper will be asked to use the checklist as one of the factors in their evaluation. While "[Yes]" is generally preferable to "[No]", it is perfectly acceptable to answer "[No]" provided a proper justification is given (e.g., "error bars are not reported because it would be too computationally expensive" or "we were unable to find the license for the dataset we used"). In general, answering "[No]" or "[NA]" is not grounds for rejection. While the questions are phrased in a binary way, we acknowledge that the true answer is often more nuanced, so please just use your best judgment and write a justification to elaborate. All supporting evidence can appear either in the main paper or the supplemental material, provided in appendix. If you answer [Yes] to a question, in the justification please point to the section(s) where related material for the question can be found.

IMPORTANT, please:

- **Delete this instruction block, but keep the section heading "NeurIPS paper checklist".**
- **Keep the checklist subsection headings, questions/answers and guidelines below.**
- **Do not modify the questions and only use the provided macros for your answers.**

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The paper claims main contributions and scope in the abstract and introduction.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Yes, the paper discusses the limitations of the work.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our paper mainly works on method and experiments and do not include complete proof about the method.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental Result Reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: the paper will open source code on github for other researchers to reproduce experiments.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.

- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: the paper will provide the open source code.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).

- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental Setting/Details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Yes, the paper used open sourced dataset and include all the details of the datasets.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment Statistical Significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Yes, the paper reported error bars properly.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments Compute Resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Yes, the paper includes all the computational resources information.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.

- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines?>

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Yes, the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader Impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Yes, the paper discussed the issue.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: We mainly use open sourced models and commercialized model API. These models commonly have safeguards in their own license description.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: Yes, our open sourced code will be licensed properly.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

13. New Assets

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: We introduced a new method for the problem and will release our code on github if accepted.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our paper does experiment on existing open sourced dataset and the evaluation code of the method is on github.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human Subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: We did not crowdsourcing our research experiments.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.