

Leveraging Metamemory Mechanisms for Enhanced Data-Free Code Generation in LLMs

Shuai Wang
Wuhan University
Wuhan, China
wangshuai123@whu.edu.cn

Liang Ding
The University of Sydney
Sydney, Australia
liangding.liam@gmail.com

Yibing Zhan
JD Explore Academy
Beijing, China
zybjy@mail.ustc.edu.cn

Yong Luo
Wuhan University
Wuhan, China
luoyong@whu.edu.cn

Zheng He
Wuhan University
Wuhan, China
hezhen@whu.edu.cn

Dapeng Tao
Yunnan University
Kunming, China
dapeng.tao@gmail.com

Abstract

Automated code generation using large language models (LLMs) has gained attention due to its efficiency and adaptability. However, real-world coding tasks or benchmarks like HumanEval and StudentEval often lack dedicated training datasets, challenging existing few-shot prompting approaches that rely on reference examples. Inspired by human metamemory—a cognitive process involving recall and evaluation—we present a novel framework (namely M^2WF) for improving LLMs' one-time code generation. This approach enables LLMs to autonomously generate, evaluate, and utilize synthetic examples to enhance reliability and performance. Unlike prior methods, it minimizes dependency on curated data and adapts flexibly to various coding scenarios. Our experiments demonstrate significant improvements in coding benchmarks, offering a scalable and robust solution for data-free environments. The code and framework will be publicly available on GitHub and HuggingFace.

CCS Concepts

• **Computing methodologies** → **Neural networks**; • **Software and its engineering** → *Automatic programming*.

Keywords

Code Generation, Large Language Models, Metamemory

ACM Reference Format:

Shuai Wang, Liang Ding, Yibing Zhan, Yong Luo, Zheng He, and Dapeng Tao. 2018. Leveraging Metamemory Mechanisms for Enhanced Data-Free Code Generation in LLMs. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation emai (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Recently, large language models (LLMs) have made significant strides in understanding, generation, reasoning, and translation [22,

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>




Figure 1: A comparison of AceCoder method [18] (top) and M^2WF (bottom). We can clearly see that the AceCoder method requires retrieving relevant examples from the training set to guide the LLM's code generation, whereas our M^2WF method uses the knowledge of the LLM itself to provide guidance.

30, 32, 38, 51, 52]. By pretraining on vast amounts of textual data, the general LLMs can process language in ways that closely resemble human abilities, enabling them to perform a wide range of tasks, e.g., answering questions [34], writing [40], translation [50], and summarizing documents [41]. In many instances, general LLM's performance has matched or even exceeded human capabilities [23, 36].

In the field of code generation, general LLMs have also shown great potential [13, 19]. The general LLMs can generate code from natural language descriptions or complete and optimize existing code. This capability makes them a valuable tool for developers, particularly for tasks like automating scripts, designing algorithms, or adding code annotations [12, 16]. Since the pretraining data for the general LLMs is predominantly natural language text, with

relatively little code data, they exhibit notable limitations in specialized coding scenarios [43]. To improve performance, pretraining or fine-tuning LLMs specifically for code generation is a widely adopted approach [6, 31]. Nonetheless, pretraining or fine-tuning requires considerable computational resources, posing challenges for many organizations and individuals. Conversely, in-context learning prompting has emerged as a more cost-effective and efficient alternative for adapting LLMs to code generation tasks [9, 18, 28]

[Problem] Recently, few-shot methods [4, 18, 25, 47] based on in-context learning prompting have been widely proven to significantly improve code generation tasks for LLMs (including general LLMs and code LLMs). Few-shot prompting typically adds a few examples to the normal prompting (i.e., the user’s requirement description) to guide LLMs in addressing the requirements or problems presented in the normal prompting. Although there are extensive researches on few-shot prompting methods [11, 18, 29, 46], most of them focus on retrieving the best matching examples from a training set to pair with the normal prompting, thereby improving the generation code performance of LLMs, as illustrated in Figure 1. Using few-shot prompting for LLM inference is particularly difficult for real-world data-free coding scenarios.

[Motivation] Therefore, *we are considering generating relevant examples from the LLM’s own knowledge rather than relying on examples retrieved from the training set or external sources to guide the LLM in addressing the current problem.* Our preliminary research shows that existing methods can directly prompt LLMs to generate relevant examples, but they do not guarantee the authenticity and accuracy of the recited [37] or analogized [48] content. It is worth noting that this is especially important for programming problems. Unlike natural language, programming languages have strict syntax and semantic rules [3, 39] that must be precisely followed for the computer to correctly understand and execute the code. *So, how can we ensure the reliability of the examples generated by the LLM?* This issue advances our research on metamemory [8]. Metamemory refers to an individual’s awareness and regulation of their own memory processes, including the ability to recall, evaluate, and control their memory content.

[Method] To better improve the performance of the one-time code generation of LLMs, especially for real-world data-free coding scenarios, we propose a metamemory workflow (M^2WF) framework inspired by the flow of human metamemory. Our M^2WF framework consists of four main stages: **Recall**, **Evaluation**, **Planning**, and **Guidance**, as illustrated in Figure 1. Initially, the recall stage prompts the LLM to recall K relevant programming problems and provide their corresponding implementation steps and code. Subsequently, the evaluation stage assesses the confidence level of each recalled programming problem and its associated code, selecting the top M examples with the highest confidence. Following this selection, the planning stage utilizes the top M examples to formulate an implementation plan for the original problem. Ultimately, the implementation plan guides the LLM in solving the original programming problem.

[Contributions] The main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We have proposed a novel metamemory workflow (M^2WF) framework by considering the flow of human metamemory.

This is particularly beneficial for real-world data-free coding scenarios or benchmark tasks without training sets.

- Our proposed M^2WF framework has strong versatility and flexibility and can be easily plug-and-played. Moreover, the M^2WF ensures reliability by carefully evaluating the recalled examples and adaptively tailoring such recall&evaluation process for each programming problem.
- Extensive experimental results have demonstrated that M^2WF framework can significantly improve the quality of code generation by LLMs, with the *pass@1* score sometimes increasing by over 29.43%.

2 Related Work

2.1 Metamemory

Metamemory, a concept introduced by John Flavell in the 1970s, refers to an individual’s awareness and understanding of their own memory processes [8]. This cognitive ability to monitor and regulate memory emphasizes the efficient management of recalled information [21, 26, 27]. It involves three key aspects: recall memory information, evaluating the accuracy of recall content, and adjusting memory strategies based on the evaluations. Through this dynamic process, individuals can improve information acquisition, enhance learning outcomes, and effectively solve complex problems [24, 33], as illustrated in Figure 2.

Inspired by the flow of human metamemory, we propose a novel metamemory workflow (M^2WF) framework to improve the performance of one-time code generation in LLMs.




Figure 2: Metamemory workflow.

2.2 Code Generation for LLMs

The rise of LLMs has significantly advanced the development of automated code generation. However, due to programming languages’ unique syntax and semantic structures, it is particularly challenging for LLMs to generate high-quality code. To improve the performance of automated code generation, existing research has primarily focused on pre-training or fine-tuning code LLMs [6, 31], post-processing methods [7, 49], advanced decoding [44], and in-context learning prompting [9, 11, 18, 46].

Pre-training or fine-tuning LLMs usually use hundreds of millions or even tens of billions of parameters within the transformer [42] architecture or its variants to train. Post-processing (i.e., code repair) methods primarily use secondary or multiple corrections to the code generated by LLMs. Compared to pre-training or fine-tuning LLMs and post-processing methods, in-context learning




Figure 3: Analysis of the performance of the ChatGPT based on analogical prompting on the HumanEval benchmark [6]. We can clearly observe that due to the incorrect analogy examples, the proportion of errors in the code generated by ChatGPT has reached 15.24%. Moreover, analogical prompting is not specifically tailored for code generation tasks.

prompting methods are simpler and more flexible and do not require secondary or multiple operations. Researchers [4, 18, 25, 47] have explored various in-context learning prompting to improve generation results in one pass, e.g., AceCoder [18]. However, these in-context learning prompts rely on manually crafting or retrieving a few reference examples from the training set.

Unlike the in-context learning prompting mentioned above, our proposed M²WF framework doesn't require retrieving or manually crafting examples. Instead, it generates relevant examples through the LLM's recall and ensures their reliability via internal evaluation.

3 Background

In this section, we first define some symbols. Then, we formalize some related code generation methods (i.e., normal prompting, few-shot prompting [4, 18, 25, 47], analogical prompting [48]) and analyze their drawbacks.

• **Symbol definition.** We denote the reasoning layer of the pre-trained LLM with parameters θ as P , and lowercase letters $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \dots$ to denote a language sequence, i.e., $\mathbf{x} = (x[1], \dots, x[n])$, where each $x[i]$ is a token. Note: in the formalization process, we omit the representation of the encoding and decoding processes, focusing solely on the representation of the reasoning process in LLMs.

• **Normal prompting (NP).** The normal prompting is using the LLM to map the input \mathbf{x} (i.e., the user's requirements) to \mathbf{y} . This process can be formalized as: $\mathbf{y} \sim P_{\theta}^{NP}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$. Although LLMs can directly meet user's requirements by inputting \mathbf{x} , their understanding is far less profound than that of humans. Especially, in complex coding scenarios or when clear prompts are lacking, the LLM's output may remain superficial and fail to address the core of the programming problem [45].

• **Few-shot prompting (FSP).** Few-shot prompting uses a few examples retrieved from the training set (or manually created examples) as references to guide an LLM in generating responses that meet the user's requirements. This process can be formalized as: $\mathbf{y} \sim P_{\theta}^{FSP}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x})$, where \mathbf{c} represents a small number of examples. Although few-shot prompting is highly flexible and effective [4, 18, 25, 47], it is especially challenging to use for LLM

inference in real-world data-free coding scenarios or benchmark tasks without training sets.

• **Analogical prompting (AP).** The analogical prompting uses manually designed instructions \mathbf{d} to help the LLM identify relevant examples $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n$ to the user's requirements. Then, the analogous examples $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n$ are used to guide the LLM in generating results that meet the user's requirements. This process can be formalized as: $\mathbf{y} \sim P_{\theta}^{AP}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n, \mathbf{x})$. Although analogical prompting can generate relevant examples to the user's requirements, it cannot guarantee the accuracy of the analogized content, as illustrated in Figure 3.

4 Method

To improve the quality of one-time code generation in real-world data-free scenarios or benchmark tasks without training sets, we propose a novel metamemory workflow (M²WF) framework inspired by the metamemory mechanism in section 2.1. Our proposed M²WF framework mainly consists of four stages: recall, evaluation, planning and guidance, with its overall framework demonstrated in Figure 4.

4.1 Recalling

Recalling is the psychological process by which humans retrieve past information from their recollections, and it sometimes refers to the information that has been retrieved. The method of recollection involves two steps: retrieval and extraction. First, humans make decisions or identifications based on new information, extracting relevant content from the retrieved information. In the M²WF framework, *recalling relevant examples* is the initial step, akin to how humans retrieve related memories when faced with new information. This process enhances the LLM's understanding of the recalled content and provides relevant experiential insights or solutions for new information. When presented with a new programming problem \mathbf{x} (i.e., the input content), the M²WF directs the LLM to identify K -related programming problems from its memory based on the given programming problem \mathbf{x} . Additionally, our recall examples expand on the principle of analogical method [48] by guiding the LLM to provide implementation steps for these recall-related programming problems, e.g.,

$$\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i, \hat{\mathbf{s}}^i, \hat{\mathbf{y}}^i\} \sim P_{\theta}^{re}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i, \hat{\mathbf{s}}^i, \hat{\mathbf{y}}^i | \mathbf{d}_{re}, \mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{i-1}, \hat{\mathbf{s}}^{i-1}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{i-1}), i \in [1, K] \quad (1)$$

Where, re is an abbreviation for *recalling*; $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^i$ represents the relevant programming problem of the i -th recollection; $\hat{\mathbf{s}}^i$ represents the implementation steps for the i -th related programming problem; $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^i$ represents the Python3 code for the i -th related programming problem; \mathbf{d}_{re} represents the instruction requirements for recalling related programming problems. More specifically, our instruction \mathbf{d}_{re} for recalling related examples is:

Recall related examples:

Recall K -related examples of programming problems. For each related programming problem, provide a detailed explanation of the solution and steps to implement it, and then write the correct Python3 code.

4.2 Evaluation

After extracting the recalled content, humans evaluate their memory ability, specifically judging the accuracy of the retrieved information. This evaluation is often based on factors such as personal experience and the use of memory strategies. During the evaluation stage, we mimic human metamemory assessment processes by prompting the LLM to assess its confidence in the recalled relevant programming problems, including their implementation steps and the corresponding Python3 code. We set relevant instructions, established the confidence score range from 0 to 100, and selected the top M ($M \leq K$) examples with the highest confidence, e.g.,

$$C^i \sim P_{\theta}^{ev}(C^i | \mathbf{d}_{ev}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^i, \hat{\mathbf{s}}^i, \hat{\mathbf{y}}^i), i \in [1, K], C^i \in [0, 100] \quad (2)$$

$$\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}^j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}^j\} \sim P_{\theta}^{se}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}^j | \mathbf{d}_{se}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^i, \hat{\mathbf{s}}^i, C^i), j \in [1, M] \quad (3)$$

Where, *ev* is an abbreviation for *evaluation*; *se* is an abbreviation for *selection*; C^i represents the confidence score for the i -th related programming problem; \mathbf{d}_{ev} and \mathbf{d}_{se} represent the evaluation instruction requirements and the selected instruction requirements, respectively. Our evaluation instruction $[\mathbf{d}_{ev}, \mathbf{d}_{se}]$ can be described in detail as follows:

Evaluation examples:

Evaluate each recalled related programming problem, implementation steps, and corresponding code, and assign a confidence score between 0 and 100. Select the top M examples with the highest confidence.

4.3 Planning

The planning stage is the third key step in the M^2WF framework. At this stage, the LLM can use past successful experiences and steps to formulate a detailed plan for the new programming task. Specifically, we prompt the LLM to provide an implementation plan \mathbf{s} for the original programming problem based on the implementation steps $\{\hat{\mathbf{s}}^j, j \in M\}$ from the selected M examples, e.g.,

$$\mathbf{s} \sim P_{\theta}^{pl}(\mathbf{s} | \mathbf{d}_{pl}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^j, \hat{\mathbf{s}}^j, \mathbf{x}) \quad (4)$$

Where, *pl* is an abbreviation for *planning*; \mathbf{d}_{pl} represents the planning instruction requirements. Our evaluation instruction \mathbf{d}_{pl} can be described in detail as follows:

Tutorial and implementation steps:

Identify the core concepts or algorithms of the original programming problem, and based on the tutorial and implementation steps of selected M examples, provide the tutorial and implementation plan for the original programming problem.

4.4 Guidance

The guidance phase is the final step in the M^2WF framework and a crucial part of solving the original programming problem. During this phase, the provided implementation plans \mathbf{s} guide the LLM in

writing correct Python3 code \mathbf{y} to solve the original programming problem \mathbf{x} , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{y} \sim P_{\theta}^{gu}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{d}_{in}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \quad (5)$$

Where, *gu* is an abbreviation for *guidance*; \mathbf{d}_{gu} represents the instruction requirements for writing the Python3 code for the original programming problem. The instruction requirement \mathbf{d}_{gu} for our guidance phase is as follows:

Solving the original programming problem:

Write the correct Python3 code to solve the original programming problem.

5 Experiments

In this section, we will explore the effectiveness of the M^2WF framework and compare it with few-shot prompting methods. Our experiments aim to answer the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** What impact does increasing the number of recalled related examples have on the performance of the M^2WF framework?
- **RQ2:** What impact does select multiple recalled examples with higher confidence have on the performance of our proposed M^2WF framework?
- **RQ3:** What is the impact of each stage of our proposed M^2WF framework on overall performance?
- **RQ4:** How do the open-source and closed-source LLMs based on our proposed M^2WF framework perform in real-world data-free coding scenarios or benchmark tasks without training sets?
- **RQ5:** How do larger parameter LLMs and smaller parameter LLMs based on the M^2WF framework perform in real-world data-free coding scenarios or benchmark tasks without training sets?
- **RQ6:** How does our proposed M^2WF framework perform in real-world data-free coding scenarios or benchmark tasks without training sets compared to other methods (e.g., CoT prompting [14], Analogical prompting [48])?
- **RQ7:** How does the our proposed M^2WF framework perform in comparison to few-shot retrieval method (i.e., AceCoder [18])?
- **RQ8:** Can the our proposed M^2WF framework be applied to multilingual benchmarks?

5.1 Datasets

To better evaluate the performance of the M^2WF framework, we selected four benchmarks, i.e., HumanEval [6], StudentEval [2], codeforces [19, 48], MultiPL-E [5].

HumanEval [6] benchmark was manually constructed by OpenAI researchers in 2021 and only includes 164 test samples.

HumanEval+ [20] benchmark, introduced in 2023, enhances the original HumanEval benchmark by incorporating additional test cases and addressing some of the errors.

StudentEval [2] benchmark, released in 2023, is a test benchmark containing 1,675 prompts across 48 questions, written by 80 students who had completed only one semester of a Python programming course. The StudentEval benchmark identifies four key disjoint subsets for each question participant: first success (the correct code was generated on the first attempt), first failure (the first attempt was unsuccessful, and the participant moved on to the




Figure 4: The overall framework of metamemory workflow (M²WF). Our M²WF framework is divided into four stages: 1) recalling related examples of programming problems; 2) evaluating the recalled examples of programming problems; 3) providing an implementation plan for original programming problem; 4) and Guiding LLMs to solve original programming problems based on implementation plans.

next problem), final success (the correct code was generated on the final attempt), and final failure (the final attempt was unsuccessful, and the participant moved on to the next problem).

MultiPL-E benchmark [5], released in 2022, is derived from the HumanEval benchmark by translating it into sixteen other programming languages (e.g., C++, JAVA, PHP, etc).

Codeforces [48] benchmark is a dataset collected by Michihiro et al., [48] based on prior work [15, 19], from the *codeforces.com* website. It covers multiple difficulty levels, including *A, B, ...*. In the experiment, we followed [48] and used level-A problems as the test set for evaluation.

5.2 Models

To better validate the performance of the M²WF framework, we select two open-source LLMs (Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, DeepSeek-Coder-V2) and two closed-source LLMs (ChatGPT and GPT-4).

ChatGPT (GPT-3.5-turbo, [1]) is a language model developed by OpenAI based on a generative pre-trained transformer model.

ChatGPT can understand and generate natural language text, supporting a variety of applications, including dialogue generation, text composition, and creative writing.

GPT-4 (GPT-4-turbo-2024-04-09, [1]) is the fourth-generation generative pre-trained transformer model developed by OpenAI. Compared to GPT-3 and ChatGPT, GPT-4 has improvements in language understanding, generation quality, and several other aspects. **Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2**¹ is a seven billion parameter model distributed under the Apache License, and it is available for instruction-following and text completion tasks.

DeepSeek-Coder-V2 [10] is an open-source mixture of expert (MoE) code language models that achieves performance comparable to GPT-4 Turbo on specific coding tasks. Specifically, DeepSeek-Coder-V2 was further pre-trained from intermediate checkpoints of DeepSeek-V2 with an additional 60 trillion tokens. This ongoing pre-training significantly enhances DeepSeek-V2's coding and mathematical reasoning abilities while maintaining strong performance on general language tasks.

¹<https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2>

The detailed description of the LLMs for ChatGPT, GPT-4, Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 and DeepSeek-Coder-V2 are shown in Table 1.

5.3 Baselines

To demonstrate that the M²WF framework can significantly improve the performance of LLMs in generating code on one-time, especially for benchmark tasks (e.g., HumanEval, HumanEval+, and StudentEval) without training sets, we have compared the M²WF framework with several baselines and state-of-the-art approaches. **Normal prompting** (i.e., the user’s requirements) instructs the LLM to generate the corresponding code directly without adding any extra instructions.

CoT prompting [14] adds “Let’s think step by step” after the normal prompting, instructing the LLM to generate the final code step by step.

Analogical prompting [48] instruct LLMs to provide multiple relevant examples based on the original question, and then use these relevant examples to solve the original problem.

5.4 Evaluation Metric

We follow the evaluation metric $pass@k$ used in reference [6, 17, 35] to assess the performance of the M²WF framework. The calculation method for $pass@k$ is:

$$pass@k := \mathbb{E}_{Problems} \left[1 - \frac{\binom{n-c}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \right] \quad (6)$$

In Eq. (6), n represents the number of code generations for a given problem; c represents the number of generated n codes that passed the test. In the experiment, we evaluated the performance of M²WF framework on four A100 GPUs with 80GB of memory each.

5.5 Ablation Studies

In this subsection, we investigate the effects of recalling K -related examples, selecting the top M recall examples with the highest confidence, and three stages (i.e., recalling stage, evaluation stage, planning stage). The experimental results are shown in Figure 5 and Table 2.

(Answer to RQ1) the impact of models using M²WF framework on recalling K -related examples in the HumanEval benchmark. In Figure 5, we kept the value of M constant to analyze the performance of recalling K -related examples. When $M = 1$, and 3, the scores of the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model exhibit a trend of initially increasing and then decreasing. When $M = 2$, the scores of the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model show a decreasing trend. The DeepSeek-Coder-V2 model and GPT-4 model display a similar trend. This indicates that recalling a larger number of examples does not necessarily lead to the best results with the M²WF method. Note: In the experiment, we do not analyze the performance of recalling K examples when $M = 4, 5, 6$, and 7. This is due to the token length limitations of the LLMs used in the experiment, which prevented us from conducting experiments with more recall related examples.

(Answer to RQ2) the impact of using M²WF method for selecting the top M recall examples with the highest confidence on the HumanEval benchmark. In Figure 5, we kept K constant

to analyze the performance of selecting the top M recall examples with the highest confidence. When $K = 5, 6, 7$, and 8, it is clear that the scores of the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model exhibit a trend of initially increasing and then decreasing. The scores of the DeepSeek-Coder-V2 model and GPT-4 model show a similar pattern. Therefore, we can conclude that selecting either a higher or lower number of recall examples with the highest confidence does not lead to better performance with the M²WF framework. Note: In the experiment, we do not analyze the cases for $K = 2, 3$, and 4 because selecting only a few of the top M recall examples with the highest confidence does not sufficiently demonstrate the reliability of the experiment.

(Answer to RQ3) The performance of the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model based on M²WF framework at different stages.

Since the M²WF framework involves inputting all instructions at once and producing results for each stage at one-time, to investigate the performance of each stage (mainly the recall stage, evaluation stage, and guidance stage), we divided the M²WF framework into two steps. For example, when exploring the impact of the recall stage, we first input recall instructions to prompt the LLM to recall relevant programming problems. After obtaining the recalled results, we introduce random noise to the recalled programming problems. Specifically, we add noise every 10 characters, with a noise level set to 0.5. We then instruct the LLM to evaluate the recalled programming problems (i.e., the programming problems with noise) and provide a corresponding implementation plan for the original programming problems to guide the LLM in solving them. Using a similar approach, we assessed the performance of each stage, with specific results shown in Table 2. From Table 2, it is clear that each stage plays a crucial role. If one of the stages is affected by noise, the performance of the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model based on M²WF method will decline, e.g., when the recall stage is affected, the performance of the model drops by 11.97%. Similarly, the performance of the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model based on M²WF method is affected in other stages (i.e., evaluation stage and planning stage) as well.

5.6 Results

We validated the effectiveness of the M²WF framework on benchmark tasks without training sets. The experimental results on the HumanEval, StudentEval, and HumanEval+ benchmarks are shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5, leading to the following conclusions:

(Answer to RQ4) whether in open-source or closed-source models, our M²WF framework consistently achieves good performance. In Tables 3, 4, and 5, we can see that the M²WF framework based on the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 (open-source model) achieves average results of 54.29, 29.38, and 35.62 on HumanEval, StudentEval, and HumanEval+, respectively. This represents improvements of 5.66%, 19.38%, and 8.86% compared to the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model using normal prompting. The M²WF framework also shows similar improvements on the DeepSeek-Coder-V2 model. The M²WF framework based on ChatGPT achieves average results of 84.65, 37.38, and 79.88 on HumanEval, StudentEval, and HumanEval+, respectively, while the average results for ChatGPT with normal prompting are 76.79, 28.88, and 64.74. Compared to

Table 1: Overview of the evaluated models.

Model	Organization	Time	Open-source	Size	Source
ChatGPT	OpenAI	2021	✗	-	https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3-5-turbo
GPT-4	OpenAI	2024	✗	-	https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4-and-gpt-4-turbo
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	Mistral	2023	✓	7b	https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2
DeepSeek-Coder-V2	DeepSeek-AI	2024	✓	236b	https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-Coder-V2-Instruct




Figure 5: The performance of the models (i.e., Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, DeepSeek-Coder-V2, and GPT-4) based on M^2WF method in recalling K examples and selecting the top M confidence recall examples. During the experiment, we use a temperature of 0.8, $top-p=0.95$, and $n = 1$.

normal prompting, the M^2WF framework based on ChatGPT improves results by 10.24%, 29.43%, and 23.39%, respectively. A similar improvement is observed with the closed-source GPT-4 model. This demonstrates that the M^2WF can achieve significant improvements in both open-source and closed-source models.

(Answer to RQ5) the M^2WF framework performs well on both larger and smaller parameter models. As shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5, the M^2WF based on the DeepSeek-Coder-V2 of the

Table 2: Performance of the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model with M^2WF framework across three different stages (i.e., recalling stage, evaluation stage, planning stage) on the HumanEval benchmark. During the experiment, we use a temperature of 0.8, $top-p=0.95$, and $n = 1$.

Recalling	Evaluation	Planning	Pass@1	Δ (\downarrow)
✓	✗	✗	26.12	19.18%
✗	✓	✗	23.65	26.83%
✗	✗	✓	28.01	13.35%
✓	✓	✗	28.24	12.62%
✓	✗	✓	30.11	6.84%
✗	✓	✓	28.45	11.97%
✓	✓	✓	32.32	-




Figure 6: Performance of the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model with different methods on the MultiPL-E benchmark [5].

larger parameter achieves results of 93.49, 55.20, and 84.01 on HumanEval, StudentEval and HumanEval+, respectively. Compared to the DeepSeek-Coder-V2 with normal prompting, the M^2WF framework improves performance by 5.52%, 5.38%, and 9.35%. Similarly, the M^2WF framework also performs well on the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 of the smaller parameter. This indicates that the M^2WF framework achieves significant improvements across LLMs with both larger and smaller parameters.

Table 3: The performance of LLMs (e.g., Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, etc) using different methods on the HumanEval benchmark. Bold text shows the best result. During the experiment, we use a temperature of 0.8, top-p=0.95, and n = 15.

Model	Method	Pass@k							Avg	Δ (\uparrow)
		k = 1	k = 3	k = 5	k = 8	k = 10	k = 12	k = 15		
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	Normal	29.72	45.06	50.90	55.51	57.59	59.31	61.59	51.38	-
	CoT	31.22	46.22	51.16	56.83	60.17	62.38	66.02	53.43	3.99%
	Analogical	26.46	43.54	50.00	54.99	56.97	59.18	61.36	50.36	-1.99%
	M ² WF	32.32	48.42	52.10	57.90	60.55	62.69	66.07	54.29	5.66%
DeepSeek-Coder-V2	Normal	82.48	86.83	88.44	89.79	90.38	90.85	91.46	88.60	-
	CoT	84.85	89.63	92.21	94.54	95.26	95.78	96.34	92.66	4.58%
	Analogical	76.59	89.96	92.57	93.90	94.51	95.05	95.92	91.21	2.95%
	M ² WF	85.98	90.65	94.21	95.21	95.61	95.94	96.85	93.49	5.52%
ChatGPT	Normal	49.73	66.07	73.54	83.18	86.15	88.61	90.24	76.79	-
	CoT	60.57	74.45	82.11	87.21	88.70	90.65	91.46	82.16	6.99%
	Analogical	62.32	76.49	83.37	87.56	88.14	90.94	92.37	83.04	8.14%
	M ² WF	66.22	80.19	84.37	87.68	89.02	91.19	93.90	84.65	10.24%
GPT-4	Normal	81.22	91.78	92.71	93.27	93.84	94.65	95.19	91.81	-
	CoT	82.31	92.16	93.11	94.17	94.77	95.54	96.06	92.59	0.85%
	Analogical	79.88	89.57	91.71	93.07	93.64	94.05	94.53	90.92	-0.97%
	M ² WF	85.37	93.17	94.61	95.45	95.73	96.21	96.90	93.92	2.30%

Table 4: The performance of LLMs (e.g., Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, etc) using different methods on the StudentEval benchmark. Bold text shows the best result. During the experiment, we use a temperature of 0.1, top-p=0.95, and n = 1.

Model	Method	First Failure	First Success	Last Failure	Last Success	Avg	Δ (\uparrow)
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	Normal	9.30	41.18	10.11	37.84	24.61	-
	CoT	10.66	49.74	11.61	39.32	27.83	13.08%
	Analogical	8.93	49.20	11.80	37.85	26.95	9.51%
	M ² WF	11.41	52.94	12.32	40.83	29.38	19.38%
DeepSeek-Coder-V2	Normal	24.07	83.42	24.72	77.30	52.38	-
	CoT	23.33	85.56	25.84	80.54	53.82	2.75%
	Analogical	23.82	84.49	26.97	77.84	53.29	1.74%
	M ² WF	24.84	86.11	27.16	82.70	55.20	5.38%
ChatGPT	Normal	10.86	44.84	12.41	47.40	28.88	-
	CoT	12.19	51.87	15.73	52.97	33.19	14.92%
	Analogical	13.35	57.01	15.79	54.05	35.05	21.36%
	M ² WF	13.90	62.57	16.29	56.76	37.38	29.43%
GPT-4	Normal	20.60	77.01	27.53	78.39	50.88	-
	CoT	22.33	77.14	24.72	74.32	49.63	-2.46%
	Analogical	22.83	73.26	26.97	78.92	50.50	-0.75%
	M ² WF	23.09	78.07	28.72	79.37	52.31	2.82%

(Answer to RQ6) compared to other related strategies, the M²WF framework shows significant performance improvements. From the results in Tables 3, 4, and 5, it is clear that the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model using the CoT method achieves average results of 53.43, 27.83, and 33.74 on HumanEval, StudentEval, and HumanEval+, respectively. However, our proposed M²WF framework improves these results by 1.61%, 5.57%, and 5.57%, respectively, compared to the CoT method on the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model. The Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model using the analogical method achieves average results of 50.36, 27.83, and 34.15 on HumanEval, StudentEval, and HumanEval+, respectively. However, our proposed M²WF framework improves these results by 7.80%,

9.02%, and 4.30% compared to the analogy method on the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model. In addition, other models (e.g., ChatGPT, GPT-4, etc) also show significant improvement.

6 Discussion

In this section, we will explore a performance comparison between the M²WF framework and few-shot retrieval method (i.e., AceCoder [18]), and analyze whether LLMs based on the M²WF framework can demonstrate performance improvements in other programming languages.

(Answer to RQ7) performance comparison between M²WF framework and few-shot retrieval method. The AceCoder [18] method is one of the representatives of few-shot retrieval theory in

Table 5: The performance of LLMs (e.g., Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, DeepSeek-Coder-V2, etc) using different prompting methods on the StudentEval benchmark. Bold text shows the best result. During the experiment, we use a temperature of 0.8, top-p=0.95, and n = 3.

Method	Normal	CoT	Analogical	M ² WF	
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2					
Pass@k	k = 1	25.20	26.24	26.83	27.00
	k = 3	40.24	41.24	41.46	44.24
Avg		32.72	33.74	34.15	35.62
Improvement		-	3.12%	4.37%	8.86%
DeepSeek-Coder-V2					
Pass@k	k = 1	73.78	79.89	79.67	80.65
	k = 3	79.88	85.37	84.76	87.37
Avg		76.83	82.63	82.22	84.01
Improvement		-	7.55%	7.02%	9.35%
ChatGPT					
Pass@k	k = 1	58.13	69.91	70.41	73.78
	k = 3	71.34	77.07	82.93	85.98
Avg		64.74	73.49	76.67	79.88
Improvement		-	13.52%	18.43%	23.39%
GPT-4					
Pass@k	k = 1	79.07	82.45	76.63	83.02
	k = 3	85.37	87.93	84.76	88.76
Avg		82.22	85.19	80.70	85.89
Improvement		-	3.61%	-1.85%	4.46%

Table 6: Performance of the GPT-4 model with different prompting methods (e.g., AceCoder) on the Codeforces benchmark [19, 48]. The results in blue font are from [48]. * represents our replicated results. Bold text shows the best result. Level B and Level C are different levels of data in the Codeforces benchmark. During the experiment, we used Level B and Level C as the AceCoder retrieval data, with a temperature of 0.7, top-p=0.95, and n = 10. In addition, we also used the n@k evaluation metric [19, 48].

Model	Method	Acc@k		Avg
		k = 1	k = 10	
GPT-4	Normal	16%	30%	23.00
	CoT	16%	29%	22.50
	3-shot CoT	17%	31%	24.00
	Analogical	19%	37%	28.00
	AceCoder* (1-shot, Level B)	16%	30%	23.00
	AceCoder* (2-shot, Level B)	17%	32%	24.50
	AceCoder* (3-shot, Level B)	19%	36%	27.50
	AceCoder* (1-shot, Level B & C)	17%	30%	23.50
	AceCoder* (2-shot, Level B & C)	19%	35%	27.00
	AceCoder* (3-shot, Level B & C)	22%	43%	32.50
	M ² WF	20%	39%	29.50

code generation tasks. In the experiment, we compared the M²WF framework with the AceCoder method from two aspects: retrieval range and the number of retrieval examples. The results are shown in Table 6. From the experimental results in Table 6, it can be seen that the performance of the AceCoder method is significantly affected by the retrieval range and the number of retrieval examples. However, our proposed M²WF framework is not limited by the retrieval range. Additionally, the GPT-4 model based on the M²WF framework achieved a score of 29.50, which is higher than the AceCoder method with a retrieval range of Level B and retrieval 3-shot examples.

(Answer to RQ8) Do LLMs with M²WF framework exhibit improved performance across multiple languages? Based on the TIOBE² ranking for programming languages, we selected six currently popular programming languages from the MultiPL-E benchmark [5]. In the experiments, we used the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model as a baseline, with a temperature setting of 0.1, top-p = 0.95, and n = 1. The results are shown in Figure 6. From the C++ language, we can see that the Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model with the M²WF framework achieved a score of 17.39, which is 3.70% higher than that of the normal prompting method. The Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 model with the M²WF framework also demonstrated significant improvement across other programming languages. This indicates that LLMs using the M²WF framework exhibit improved performance across multiple languages.

7 Conclusion

Existing few-shot retrieval methods have achieved good results in one-time code generation tasks in LLMs. However, few-shot retrieval methods are particularly challenging for real-world data-free coding scenarios or benchmark tasks without training sets. In this work, inspired by human meta-memory processes, we propose a metamemory workflow (M²WF) framework to improve the performance of one-time code generation in LLMs. This framework not only eliminates the need to retrieve relevant examples from the training set but also ensures the reliability of the LLM’s recalled content. Through extensive experimental results, we can see that M²WF framework significantly improves performance. In the future, we plan to apply the M²WF framework to actual software development to enhance development efficiency.

8 Limitations

Although our proposed M²WF framework has shown significant improvements in code generation tasks, it also has some limitations: 1) When using the LLM’s API, the LLM may refuse to recall programming problems; 2) For benchmarks that lack function names, the code generated by the M²WF framework may not conform to the evaluation format; 3) The M²WF framework involves four stages and is based on one-time input and output, which significantly increases the number of tokens for both input and output, as shown in Table 7.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal

²<https://www.tiobe.com/tiobe-index/>

Table 7: An overview of input and output tokens for LLMs using different methods on the HumanEval benchmark.

Model	Method	API Calls	Input Token	Δ (\uparrow)	Output Token	Δ (\uparrow)
ChatGPT	Normal	1	142.35	-	188.65	-
	COT	1	150.15	5.48%	214.17	13.53%
	Analogical	1	275.37	93.45%	833.24	341.69%
	M ² WF	1	452.97	218.21%	911.93	383.40%
GPT-4	Normal	1	142.34	-	435.23	-
	COT	1	149.34	4.92%	501.85	15.31%
	Analogical	1	274.48	92.83%	991.91	127.90%
	M ² WF	1	449.48	215.78%	1036.60	138.17%

- Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [2] Hannah McLean Babe, Sydney Nguyen, Yangtian Zi, Arjun Guha, Molly Q Feldman, and Carolyn Jane Anderson. 2023. StudentEval: a benchmark of student-written prompts for large language models of code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04556* (2023).
- [3] John Backus. 1973. Programming language semantics and closed applicative languages. In *Proceedings of the 1st annual ACM SIGACT-SIGPLAN symposium on principles of programming languages*. 71–86.
- [4] Patrick Bareiß, Beatriz Souza, Marcelo d'Amorim, and Michael Pradel. 2022. Code generation tools (almost) for free? a study of few-shot, pre-trained language models on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.01335* (2022).
- [5] Federico Cassano, John Gouwar, Daniel Nguyen, Sydney Nguyen, Luna Phipps-Costin, Donald Pinckney, Ming-Ho Yee, Yangtian Zi, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Molly Q Feldman, et al. 2023. MultiPL-E: a scalable and polyglot approach to benchmarking neural code generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 49, 7 (2023), 3675–3691.
- [6] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374* (2021).
- [7] Yanguibo Ding, Marcus J Min, Gail Kaiser, and Baishakhi Ray. 2024. Cycle: Learning to self-refine the code generation. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 8, OOPSLA1 (2024), 392–418.
- [8] John H Flavell and Henry M Wellman. 1975. Metamemory. (1975).
- [9] Mingyang Geng, Shangwen Wang, Dezun Dong, Haotian Wang, Ge Li, Zhi Jin, Xiaoguang Mao, and Xiangke Liao. 2024. Large language models are few-shot summarizers: Multi-intent comment generation via in-context learning. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–13.
- [10] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, YK Li, et al. 2024. DeepSeek-Coder: When the Large Language Model Meets Programming—The Rise of Code Intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196* (2024).
- [11] SU Hongjin, Jungo Kasai, Chen Henry Wu, Weijia Shi, Tianlu Wang, Jiayi Xin, Rui Zhang, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A Smith, et al. 2022. Selective annotation makes language models better few-shot learners. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [12] Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Yue Liu, Zhou Yang, Kailong Wang, Li Li, Xiapu Luo, David Lo, John Grundy, and Haoyu Wang. 2023. Large language models for software engineering: A systematic literature review. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* (2023).
- [13] Xue Jiang, Yihong Dong, Lecheng Wang, Zheng Fang, Qiwei Shang, Ge Li, Zhi Jin, and Wenpin Jiao. 2024. Self-planning code generation with large language models. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology* 33, 7 (2024), 1–30.
- [14] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 22199–22213.
- [15] Sumith Kulal, Panupong Pasupat, Kartik Chandra, Mina Lee, Oded Padon, Alex Aiken, and Percy S Liang. 2019. Spoc: Search-based pseudocode to code. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [16] Hongxin Li, Jingran Su, Yuntao Chen, Qing Li, and ZHAO-XIANG ZHANG. 2024. SheetCopilot: Bringing software productivity to the next level through large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [17] Jia Li, Ge Li, Yongmin Li, and Zhi Jin. 2023. Structured chain-of-thought prompting for code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06599* (2023).
- [18] Jia Li, Yunfei Zhao, Yongmin Li, Ge Li, and Zhi Jin. 2023. Acecoder: Utilizing existing code to enhance code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17780* (2023).
- [19] Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, et al. 2022. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science* 378, 6624 (2022), 1092–1097.
- [20] Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. 2024. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [21] Eugene A Lovelace. 1984. Metamemory: monitoring future recallability during study. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 10, 4 (1984), 756.
- [22] Ali Madani, Ben Krause, Eric R Greene, Subu Subramanian, Benjamin P Mohr, James M Holton, Jose Luis Olmos, Caiming Xiong, Zachary Z Sun, Richard Socher, et al. 2023. Large language models generate functional protein sequences across diverse families. *Nature Biotechnology* 41, 8 (2023), 1099–1106.
- [23] Justin M Mittelstädt, Julia Maier, Panja Goerke, Frank Zinn, and Michael Hermes. 2024. Large language models can outperform humans in social situational judgments. *Scientific Reports* 14, 1 (2024), 27449.
- [24] Kentaro Miyamoto, Takahiro Osada, Rieko Setsuie, Masaki Takeda, Keita Tamura, Yusuke Adachi, and Yasushi Miyashita. 2017. Causal neural network of metamemory for retrospection in primates. *Science* 355, 6321 (2017), 188–193.
- [25] Noor Nashid, Mifta Sintaha, and Ali Mesbah. 2023. Retrieval-based prompt selection for code-related few-shot learning. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2450–2462.
- [26] Thomas O Nelson. 1990. Metamemory: A theoretical framework and new findings. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*. Vol. 26. Elsevier, 125–173.
- [27] Jasmeet K Pannu and Alfred W Kaszniak. 2005. Metamemory experiments in neurological populations: A review. *Neuropsychology review* 15 (2005), 105–130.
- [28] Arkil Patel, Siva Reddy, Dzmitry Bahdanau, and Pradeep Dasigi. 2023. Evaluating In-Context Learning of Libraries for Code Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09635* (2023).
- [29] 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* (2024).
- [30] Keqin Peng, Liang Ding, Qihuang Zhong, Li Shen, Xuebo Liu, Min Zhang, Yuanxin Ouyang, and Dacheng Tao. 2023. Towards Making the Most of ChatGPT for Machine Translation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*. 5622–5633.
- [31] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950* (2023).
- [32] 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* (2023).
- [33] Bennett L Schwartz and Anastasia Efklides. 2012. Metamemory and memory efficiency: Implications for student learning. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition* 1, 3 (2012), 145–151.
- [34] Zhenwei Shao, Zhou Yu, Meng Wang, and Jun Yu. 2023. Prompting large language models with answer heuristics for knowledge-based visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 14974–14983.
- [35] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. 2024. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [36] James WA Strachan, Dalila Albergro, Giulia Borghini, Oriana Pansardi, Eugenio Scaliti, Saurabh Gupta, Krati Saxena, Alessandro Rufo, Stefano Panzeri, Guido

- Manzi, et al. 2024. Testing theory of mind in large language models and humans. *Nature Human Behaviour* (2024), 1–11.
- [37] Zhiqing Sun, Xuezi Wang, Yi Tay, Yiming Yang, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Recitation-Augmented Language Models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=-cqvvb-NkI>
- [38] Alex Tamkin, Miles Brundage, Jack Clark, and Deep Ganguli. 2021. Understanding the capabilities, limitations, and societal impact of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.02503* (2021).
- [39] Robert D. Tennent. 1976. The denotational semantics of programming languages. *Commun. ACM* 19, 8 (1976), 437–453.
- [40] Eva AM Van Dis, Johan Bollen, Willem Zuidema, Robert Van Rooij, and Claudi L Bockting. 2023. ChatGPT: five priorities for research. *Nature* 614, 7947 (2023), 224–226.
- [41] Dave Van Veen, Cara Van Uden, Louis Blankemeier, Jean-Benoit Delbrouck, Asad Aali, Christian Bluethgen, Anuj Pareek, Malgorzata Polacin, Eduardo Pontes Reis, Anna Seehofnerová, et al. 2024. Adapted large language models can outperform medical experts in clinical text summarization. *Nature medicine* 30, 4 (2024), 1134–1142.
- [42] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [43] Shuai Wang, Liang Ding, Li Shen, Yong Luo, Bo Du, and Dacheng Tao. 2024. OOP: Object-Oriented Programming Evaluation Benchmark for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06628* (2024).
- [44] Shuai Wang, Liang Ding, Li Shen, Yong Luo, Zheng He, Wei Yu, and Dacheng Tao. 2024. USCD: Improving Code Generation of LLMs by Uncertainty-Aware Selective Contrastive Decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.05923* (2024).
- [45] Zejun Wang, Jia Li, Ge Li, and Zhi Jin. 2023. ChatCoder: Chat-based Refine Requirement Improves LLMs' Code Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00272* (2023).
- [46] Zhiyong Wu, Yaoxiang Wang, Jiacheng Ye, and Lingpeng Kong. 2023. Self-Adaptive In-Context Learning: An Information Compression Perspective for In-Context Example Selection and Ordering. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 1423–1436.
- [47] Zhen Yang, Jacky Wai Keung, Zeyu Sun, Yunfei Zhao, Ge Li, Zhi Jin, Shuo Liu, and Yishu Li. 2024. Improving domain-specific neural code generation with few-shot meta-learning. *Information and Software Technology* 166 (2024), 107365.
- [48] Michihiro Yasunaga, Xinyun Chen, Yujia Li, Panupong Pasupat, Jure Leskovec, Percy Liang, Ed H. Chi, and Denny Zhou. 2024. Large Language Models as Analogical Reasoners. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=AgDlCX1h50>
- [49] Xiao Yu, Baolin Peng, Michel Galley, Jianfeng Gao, and Zhou Yu. 2024. Teaching Language Models to Self-Improve through Interactive Demonstrations. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 5127–5149.
- [50] Biao Zhang, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2023. Prompting large language model for machine translation: A case study. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 41092–41110.
- [51] Qihuang Zhong, Liang Ding, Juhua Liu, Bo Du, and Dacheng Tao. 2023. Can chatgpt understand too? a comparative study on chatgpt and fine-tuned bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10198* (2023).
- [52] Qihuang Zhong, Kang Wang, Ziyang Xu, Juhua Liu, Liang Ding, Bo Du, and Dacheng Tao. 2024. Achieving > 97% on GSM8K: Deeply Understanding the Problems Makes LLMs Perfect Reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14963* (2024).