

# DSTC: Direct Preference Learning with Only Self-Generated Tests and Code to Improve Code LMs

Zhihan Liu\*    Shenao Zhang\*    Yongfei Liu†  
Boyi Liu†    Yingxiang Yang†    Zhaoran Wang\*

## Abstract

Direct preference learning offers a promising and computation-efficient beyond supervised fine-tuning (SFT) for improving code generation in coding large language models (LMs). However, the scarcity of reliable preference data is a bottleneck for the performance of direct preference learning to improve the coding accuracy of code LMs. In this paper, we introduce **D**irect Preference Learning with Only **S**elf-Generated **T**ests and **C**ode (DSTC), a framework that leverages only self-generated code snippets and tests to construct reliable preference pairs such that direct preference learning can improve LM coding accuracy without external annotations. DSTC combines a minimax selection process and test-code concatenation to improve preference pair quality, reducing the influence of incorrect self-generated tests and enhancing model performance without the need for costly reward models. When applied with direct preference learning methods such as Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) and Kahneman-Tversky Optimization (KTO), DSTC yields stable improvements in coding accuracy (pass@1 score) across diverse coding benchmarks, including HumanEval, MBPP, and BigCodeBench, demonstrating both its effectiveness and scalability for models of various sizes. This approach autonomously enhances code generation accuracy across LLMs of varying sizes, reducing reliance on expensive annotated coding datasets.

## Contents

<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Contributions	4
1.2 Related Works	5

\*Northwestern University. {zhihanliu2027,shenaozhang2028}@u.northwestern.edu,zhaoranwang@gmail.com

†ByteDance Inc. {liuyongfei.0314,boyi.liu01,yingxiang.yang}@bytedance.com

<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminary</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback and Direct Policy Optimization	6
2.2	Kahneman-Tversky Optimization . . . . .	7
2.3	Large Language Models for Code Generation . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Experiments</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Experimental Setup . . . . .	12
4.2	DSTC Enhances Code LMs Across Diverse Benchmarks . . . . .	12
4.3	Ablation Study . . . . .	12
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Detailed Training Configurations</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Prompts for Generating Code Snippets and Tests</b>	<b>18</b>

# 1 Introduction

The recent advancement of large language models (LLMs) has significantly transformed numerous fields, including code generation. LLMs pre-trained on vast code corpora demonstrate substantial potential in generating code, and many studies have further enhanced these code models through supervised fine-tuning (SFT) to improve performance on coding tasks. Although SFT has shown promising results in improving code LMs, SFT focuses on replicating patterns within the dataset and often lacks the generalization needed to perform well on unseen instructions. This limitation has driven researchers to apply reinforcement learning (RL) to improve code LMs beyond the SFT stage by allowing them to adapt to more complex or variable inputs.

However, one of the main challenges in applying RL to code LMs is the scarcity of high-quality preference datasets tailored specifically to code generation tasks. Unlike standard language tasks, where user or human annotator feedback is widely available, a preference dataset for the code generation has unique requirements, including correctness and functional alignment, which complicates data collection and is much more expensive. Recent works, such as *Starcoder2-15b-instruct* (Wei et al., 2024a), leverage execution feedback from the compiler to create SFT training datasets from self-generated tests and code snippets, aiming to simulate preference signals without human annotations. However, this reliance on self-generated tests introduces risks: inaccuracies in these synthetic tests may result in unreliable annotations, which can negatively impact the effectiveness of the RL training process. For instance, in our experiments using the self-generated *oss-instruct-sd2-50k* dataset created by *Starcoder2-15b-instruct*, only 48% of responses are correct when evaluated with an external model, *Deepseek-coder-v2-instruct* (with 236 billion parameters), highlighting a significant failure rate that suggests the need for a more reliable approach to leverage these synthetic tests effectively.

In addition, direct preference learning methods, such as Direct Policy Optimization (DPO, Rafailov et al. (2023)) and Kahneman-Tversky Optimization (KTO, Ethayarajh et al. (2024)), offer advantages in terms of computational efficiency and simplicity compared to more complex RL methods like PPO (Schulman et al., 2017) as they bypass the training of a reward model and a critic model. Therefore, we select the direct preference learning method as the backbone of the RL training framework and analyze the following problem in this paper:

*With only self-generated code and tests, how can we generate reliable preference pairs to improve code generation accuracy for code LMs through direct preference learning?*

To address this question, we introduce a novel approach called **D**irect Preference Learning with Only **S**elf-Generated **T**ests and **C**ode (DSTC), which leverages only self-generated code snippets and tests to construct effective preference pairs. DSTC, as depicted in Figure 1, comprises two main components: (1) a minimax selection mechanism and (2) a concatenation of code snippets and tests. This framework aims to achieve two goals: (a) to enhance the quality of the chosen code-test pairs while enlarging the quality gap between the chosen




Figure 1: Illustration of our proposed mechanism DSTC to reduce the misleading effect of the low-quality test and generate a more reliable preference dataset.

and rejected code-test pair, and (b) to create more reliable preference pairs by training on concatenated code-test pairs that contain reliable binary execution feedback. By structuring the learning process in this way, DSTC reduces the noise from incorrect self-generated tests and establishes a more robust framework for preference learning in code generation tasks. By incorporating both DPO and KTO, we implement DSTC on the model *StarCoder2-15b-instruct* with 15 billion parameters and evaluate the trained model on various benchmarks involving HumanEval Base (Chen et al., 2021), HumanEval Plus (Liu et al., 2024a), Mostly Basic Python Problems (MBPP) Base (Austin et al., 2021), MBPP Plus (Liu et al., 2024a), and BigCodeBench (BCB) (Zhuo et al., 2024). Our results indicate that DSTC effectively increases the coding accuracy across multiple benchmarks, paving the way for designing an autonomous system to improve the ability of LM code generation. We also perform ablation studies to show the importance of each component in DSTC and demonstrate that DSTC can also improve the performance of the model *Deepseekcoder-33b* with 33 billion parameters.

## 1.1 Contributions

We summarize our contributions in two-folds.

- We propose a mechanism DSTC to generate the preference pair from the self-generated code and tests to perform direct preference learning algorithms like DPO and KTO. DSTC consists of a minimax selection procedure and concatenation of the code and test. As a result, DSTC constructs preference pairs with a reliable correct order and enlarges the quality gap between the chosen code and rejected code, which reduces the misleading effect of incorrect self-generated tests and aids the training of direct preference learning methods such as DPO and KTO.

- Experimental results demonstrate that combining our proposed DSTC mechanism with DPO and KTO improves coding accuracy (pass@1 score) in code LMs across multiple benchmarks and model sizes (15 billion and 33 billion parameters). Ablation studies further validate the importance of each component within DSTC.

## 1.2 Related Works

**Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback** Our work builds on a rich body of research on Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF), a framework that has become essential for training state-of-the-art large language models (LMs) such as ChatGPT (Achiam et al., 2023), Gemini (Team et al., 2023), and Claude (Anthropic, 2023). In the RLHF pipeline, LMs are fine-tuned to optimize a learned reward model using the Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) algorithm (Schulman et al., 2017). However, PPO is often criticized for its instability, sample inefficiency, and sensitivity to hyperparameter tuning (Engstrom et al., 2020), making it computationally expensive and less accessible for the open-source community.

To address these limitations, recent research in RLHF has explored alternatives to PPO-based methods, with direct preference learning algorithms emerging as a promising direction (Zhao et al., 2023; Rafailov et al., 2023). These approaches bypass the reward model training phase, aligning LMs directly with human preferences. Since the introduction of the original Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) algorithm (Rafailov et al., 2023), numerous variants of the direct preference learning framework have been proposed, each tackling specific challenges from different angles (Liu et al., 2023b; Azar et al., 2023; Xiong et al., 2023; Tang et al., 2024; Ji et al., 2024; Ye et al., 2024; Pal et al., 2024; Hong et al., 2024; Rosset et al., 2024; Liang et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024b,d,c; Xu et al., 2024; Tajwar et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024b).

One notable example is Kahneman-Tversky Optimization (KTO), proposed by Ethayarajh et al. (2024), which leverages the Kahneman-Tversky model of human utility to minimize a human-aware loss, in contrast to the standard Bradley-Terry model. While these methods prioritize improving LM general alignment abilities with human preferences, our work focuses on a different and specific goal: enhancing pass@1 scores in code generation.

**Large Language Models for Code Generation.** Besides the great achievements in Natural Language Processing, LMs exhibit great potential in several complex reasoning tasks like math (Ahn et al., 2024) and coding (Jiang et al., 2024). In particular, pre-training on code datasets has resulted in impressive performance from models such as StarCoder (Lozhkov et al., 2024), DeepSeekCoder (Zhu et al., 2024). Other models, like CodeQwen (Hui et al., 2024) and CodeLlama (Roziere et al., 2023), have further enhanced their capabilities through ongoing pre-training with additional code data. To further improve the coding performance, there exists a rich line of literature that study how to fine-tune the current pre-trained LMs for coding. Among them, Wei et al. (2024b) propose a mechanism to

enlighten LMs with open-source code snippets to generate diverse instruction and [Luo et al. \(2023\)](#) adapt the Evol-Instruct method in the model fine-tuning.

As another line of research to improve coding ability via RL, [Le et al. \(2022\)](#) first introduce the RL framework in the training of LMs for code generation. This RL framework is refined by PPOCoder ([Shojaee et al., 2023](#)) that incorporates the PPO algorithm in the training and [Liu et al. \(2023a\)](#) refine PPOCoder with a fine-grained feedback and a Critic Sampling mechanism. To tackle the exploration issue, [Dou et al. \(2024\)](#) propose StepCoder by decomposing the long sequences code generation task. [Shen and Zhang \(2024\)](#) introduce several variants of PPO by considering the policy filtration to improve the coding ability significantly.

Our work aligns with emerging research that applies Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) and Kahneman-Tversky Optimization (KTO) to train LMs using synthetic data. For instance, [Gee et al. \(2024\)](#) design a method to generate preference pairs from self-generated code based on correctness and efficacy, while [Zhang et al. \(2024a\)](#) explore how KTO can improve coding ability with tests generated by ChatGPT.

In contrast to these methods, our approach does not rely on ground-truth tests or correct solutions, which are expensive and difficult to obtain. Instead, our method leverages the current model without intervention from stronger models like ChatGPT. Furthermore, our method improves the pass@1 score after the supervised fine-tuning (SFT) phase by integrating direct preference learning methods such as DPO and KTO, which are more computationally efficient and stable than PPO-based approaches.

## 2 Preliminary

### 2.1 Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback and Direct Policy Optimization

Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) utilizes human preferences to guide the training of language models (LMs). A common approach involves pairwise preference modeling, where feedback is provided by comparing two model-generated responses to the same prompt. Consider a language model represented as a policy  $\pi_\theta(\cdot|\cdot)$ , parameterized by  $\theta$ . Given a prompt  $x$  from the state space  $\mathcal{X}$ , the model generates a response  $a$  from the distribution  $\pi_\theta(\cdot|x)$ . For a specific prompt  $x$ , the model generates two candidate responses  $a^1$  and  $a^2$  from the action space  $\mathcal{A}$ . Human evaluators, or a reward model approximating human preferences, provide feedback as a binary label  $y \in \{0, 1\}$ , indicating whether  $a^1 \succ a^2$  ( $y = 1$ ) or  $a^2 \succ a^1$  ( $y = 0$ ). This preference is modeled probabilistically using the Bradley-Terry (BT) model ([Bradley and Terry, 1952](#)) as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}_r(b = 1|x, a^1, a^2) = \sigma(r(x, a^1) - r(x, a^2)), \quad (2.1)$$

where  $r(x, a)$  is the human-provided score reflecting the quality of response  $a$  for prompt  $x$ , and  $\sigma(z) = 1/(1 + \exp(-z))$  is the sigmoid function.

The goal of RLHF is to learn a policy  $\pi_\theta$  that maximizes the KL-regularized expected reward:

$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}, a \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | x)} [r(x, a) - \beta \cdot \text{KL}(\pi_\theta(\cdot | x) | \pi_{\text{ref}}(\cdot | x))], \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$  is the reference policy (e.g., the initial SFT model),  $\beta$  is a hyperparameter, and  $\mathcal{D}$  represents the dataset. Standard RLHF methods to solve (2.2), such as Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO, (Schulman et al., 2017)), employ a two-stage process: first, a reward model is trained on preference data, and then the policy model is fine-tuned using the reward model. Recently, direct preference learning algorithms have emerged to address the RLHF problem (2.2) without training a reward model. As the most popular one, Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023) leverages (2.1) and (2.2) to reparameterize the policy through the reward model, enabling direct training of the policy model on preference data. Given the preference dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{DPO}} = \{(x_i, a_i^+, a_i^-)\}_{i=1}^N$  of  $N$  preference pairs, DPO loss has the following closed form

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{(x, a^+, a^-) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{DPO}}} [\log \sigma(r_\theta(x, a^+) - r_\theta(x, a^-))], \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$r_\theta(x, a) = \log \frac{\pi_\theta(a | x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(a | x)}. \quad (2.4)$$

## 2.2 Kahneman-Tversky Optimization

Instead of using the BT preference model (2.1) as DPO, Ethayarajh et al. (2024) proposed another direct preference learning algorithm Kahneman-Tversky optimization (KTO) from the view of Kahneman & Tversky’s prospect theory. In KTO, the preference dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{KTO}} = \{(x_i, a_i, b_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  contains  $N$  pairs of a prompt  $x_i$  and a response  $a_i$ , accompanied by a binary variable  $b_i$  that indicates whether  $a_i$  is desired. Given the preference dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{KTO}}$  and the reference policy  $\pi_{\text{ref}}$ , KTO loss is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{KTO}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x, a, b) \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{KTO}}} [\lambda_y - v(x, a)], \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$v(x, a) = \begin{cases} \lambda_D \sigma(\beta(r_\theta(x, a) - z_0)), & \text{if } b = 1 \\ \lambda_U \sigma(\beta(z_0 - r_\theta(x, a))), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

$$r_\theta(x, a) = \log \frac{\pi_\theta(a | x)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(a | x)}$$

$$z_0 = \mathbb{E}_{(x', a', b') \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{KTO}}} [\text{KL}(\pi_\theta(a' | x) || \pi_{\text{ref}}(a' | x))].$$

Compared with DPO, we remark that KTO allows an imbalance between the number of chosen and rejected responses.

## 2.3 Large Language Models for Code Generation

We formulate the code generation problem in the context of RLHF, where state  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  refers to some natural language instruction and action  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  refers to the response provided by the code LM  $\pi_\theta(\cdot | x)$  that contains a code snippet  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . To check the correctness of a code snippet, one common approach is to feed the concatenation of the code snippet  $y$  and a test  $z$  to a compiler and output the binary execution feedback. Here, test  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  can be either hand-crafted or generated by LMs, which can also be incomplete or even wrong. Since we can execute the concatenation of code and test in a compiler and receive the binary feedback (pass or fail), we define a binary reward function  $r(z, y) : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \{0, 1\}$  for any code snippet  $y$  and test  $z$ . Assume that there exists a ground-truth test  $z_x^*$  for the instruction  $x$  such that  $z_x^*$  can perfectly check the correctness of any code snippet for the instruction  $x$ . Similar to the RLHF objective in (2.2), the objective of code generation task can be formulated as

$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}, a \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | x)} [r(z_x^*, \text{Ex}(a)) - \beta \cdot \text{KL}(\pi_\theta(\cdot | x) | \pi_{\text{ref}}(\cdot | x))], \quad (2.7)$$

where  $\text{Ex}$  function extracts the code snippet  $y$  from the response  $a$ . The similarity between (2.2) and (2.7) motivates us to leverage the direct preference learning method like DPO and KTO to solve the code generation task while bypassing the training of a reward function.

## 3 Method

**Overview.** In this section, we introduce a novel mechanism called **D**irect Preference Learning with Only **S**elf-Generated **T**ests and **C**ode (DSTC), detailed in Algorithm 1 and illustrated in Fig. 1. DSTC begins with prompting the model to generate multiple code snippets and tests for each given instruction. Given self-generated code snippets and tests, DSTC comprises two key components: minimax selection and code-test concatenation. Intuitively, DSTC extracts more reliable preference pairs from self-generated code snippets and tests while mitigating the misleading effects of incorrect tests or code. Using the preference dataset constructed by DSTC, direct preference learning algorithms such as DPO and KTO can be effectively employed to train code LMs.

**Preprocess: Generating code snippets and tests.** (Lines 2-6 in Algorithm 1) In the preprocessing phase of DSTC, we prompt the model to generate  $J$  pairs of code snippets  $\{y_i^j\}_{j=1}^J$  and tests  $\{z_i^j\}_{j=1}^J$  for each instruction  $x_i$  in the instruction set. Here, we adapt the prompt template<sup>1</sup> from the *oss-instruct-sd2-50k* dataset (Wei et al., 2024a) to generate high-quality code and tests. We show the details of the prompt in Appendix B. To mitigate errors caused by mismatched entry points (e.g., function or class names) during the evaluation from a compiler, such as when assessing the correctness of a code snippet  $y_i^{j_1}$  with a test  $z_i^{j_2}$  where  $j_1 \neq j_2$ , we include entry points in the prompts. These entry points ensure the consistency

---

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/bigcode-project/starcoder2-self-align>



---

**Algorithm 1** Direct Preference Learning with Only Self-Generated Tests and Code (DSTC)

---

- 1: **Input:** Instruction set  $\mathcal{I} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^I$ , sampling time  $J$ , model  $\pi$ , pre-defined prompt `prompt` for concatenation, and a compiler for returning binary execution feedback.
- 2: Initialize the preference dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \emptyset$ .
- 3: **for**  $i = 1, \dots, I$  **do**
- 4:   **for**  $j = 1, \dots, J$  **do**
- 5:     Prompt the model  $\pi$  to sample the code  $y_i^j$  and test  $z_i^j$  given the instruction  $x_i$ .
- 6:   **end for**
- 7:   **for**  $j = 1, \dots, J$  **do**
- 8:     **for**  $k = 1, \dots, J$  **do**
- 9:       Concatenate the code  $y_i^j$  and test  $z_i^k$  to execute in the sandbox and receive the binary feedback  $r_{ijk} \in \{0, 1\}$ .
- 10:     **end for**
- 11:     Select  $j' = \arg \max_j \sum_{k=1}^J r_{ijk}$ . *(Select the chosen code)*
- 12:     Select  $k' = \arg \min_k \sum_{j=1}^J r_{ijk}$  s.t.  $r_{ij'k} = 1$ . *(Select the chosen test)*
- 13:     Select  $k^\dagger = \arg \max_k \sum_{j=1}^J r_{ijk}$  s.t.  $\sum_{j=1}^J r_{ijk} < J$ . *(Select the rejected test)*
- 14:     Select  $j^\dagger = \arg \min_j \sum_{k=1}^J r_{ijk}$  s.t.  $r_{ijk^\dagger} = 0$ . *(Select the rejected code)*
- 15:   **end for**
- 16:   **Option I (DPO):**
- 17:   **if**  $j^\dagger, k^\dagger$ , and  $k'$  are all not None **then**
- 18:     Concatenate code  $y_i^{j'}$ , pre-defined prompt `prompt`, and test  $z_i^{k'}$  to get the chosen response  $a_i^{\text{chosen}} = \text{Concat}(y_i^{j'}, \text{prompt}, z_i^{k'})$ .
- 19:     Concatenate code  $y_i^{j^\dagger}$ , pre-defined prompt `prompt`, and test  $z_i^{k^\dagger}$  to get the rejected response  $a_i^{\text{rejected}} = \text{Concat}(y_i^{j^\dagger}, \text{prompt}, z_i^{k^\dagger})$ .
- 20:     Add  $(x_i, a_i^{\text{chosen}}, a_i^{\text{rejected}})$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ .
- 21:   **end if**
- 22:   **Option II (KTO):**
- 23:   **if**  $k'$  is not None **then**
- 24:     Concatenate code  $y_i^{j'}$ , pre-defined prompt `prompt`, and test  $z_i^{k'}$  to get the chosen response  $a_i^{\text{chosen}} = \text{Concat}(y_i^{j'}, \text{prompt}, z_i^{k'})$ .
- 25:     Add  $(x_i, a_i^{\text{chosen}}, 1)$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ .
- 26:     **if**  $j^\dagger$  and  $k^\dagger$  are both not None **then**
- 27:       Concatenate code  $y_i^{j^\dagger}$ , pre-defined prompt `prompt`, and test  $z_i^{k^\dagger}$  to get the rejected response  $a_i^{\text{rejected}} = \text{Concat}(y_i^{j^\dagger}, \text{prompt}, z_i^{k^\dagger})$ .
- 28:       Add  $(x_i, a_i^{\text{rejected}}, 0)$
- 29:     **end if**
- 30:   **end if**
- 31: **end for**
- 32: **Output:** Preference dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ .

---

between the code snippets and tests during evaluation. After the preprocessing phase, the

entry points are removed to prevent potential information leakage that could lead to overfitting during training.

**Component I: Minimax selection.** (Lines 7-15 in Algorithm 1) For each self-generated code snippet  $y_i^j$  and test  $z_i^j$ , we concatenate them in pairs and record their binary execution feedback  $r_{ijk} \in \{0, 1\}$  from a compiler. This feedback determines which code snippets and tests are chosen or rejected based on the following criteria (if an optimization problem is infeasible, the solution defaults to `None`):

- **Selection of the chosen code snippet.** (Line 11 in Algorithm 1) For the chosen code, we wish to select the code snippet that is the **most likely to be correct**. By measuring the correctness via the number of passing tests, we formulate the selection of the chosen code snippet  $y_i^{j'}$  as the following optimization

$$j' = \arg \max_j \sum_{k=1}^J r_{ijk}. \quad (3.1)$$

- **Selection of the chosen test.** (Line 12 in Algorithm 1) For the chosen test, we wish to select the test that is the **most difficult to pass** that can be evaluated by the number of passing code snippets. We formulate the selection of the chosen test  $z_i^{k'}$  as the following constraint optimization

$$k' = \arg \min_k \sum_{j=1}^J r_{ijk} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad r_{ij'k} = 1, \quad (3.2)$$

where the constraint ensures that the chosen code snippet passes the chosen test.

- **Selection of the rejected test.** (Line 13 in Algorithm 1) For the rejected test, we wish to select the test that is the **easiest to pass**. In contrast to (3.2), we formulate the selection of the rejected test  $z_i^{k^\dagger}$  as the following constraint optimization

$$k^\dagger = \arg \max_k \sum_{j=1}^J r_{ijk} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j=1}^J r_{ijk} < J, \quad (3.3)$$

where the constraint ensures that at least one code snippet fails the rejected test.

- **Selection of the rejected code snippet.** (Line 14 in Algorithm 1) For the rejected code snippet, we wish to select the code snippet that is the **least likely to be correct**. In contrast to (3.1), we formulate the selection of the rejected code snippet  $y_i^{j^\dagger}$  as the following constraint optimization

$$j^\dagger = \arg \min_j \sum_{k=1}^J r_{ijk} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad r_{ijk^\dagger} = 0, \quad (3.4)$$

where the constraint ensures that the failed code snippet fails the rejected test.

**Component II: Concatenation between the code snippet and test.** (Lines 16-31 in Algorithm 1) After the phase of the minimax selection in Algorithm 1, we concatenate the chosen (resp. rejected) code snippet and test as the chosen (resp. rejected) response with the following prompt template for concatenation:

[selected code snippet]  
 The provided code should satisfy the following assertions:  
 [selected test]

The idea of this concatenation is to form a preference pair with a reliable order brought by the execution feedback. Depending on which specific preference learning algorithm we use, we consider different manners to construct the preference dataset. For DPO, the preference dataset involves chosen-rejected pairs, hence we filter out the data without both feasible chosen and rejected responses generated via the minimax selection. For KTO, we only filter out the data without feasible chosen responses, as KTO preference dataset permits an imbalance between the number of chosen and rejected responses. With the preference dataset generated by DSTC, we incorporate the corresponding direct preference learning algorithm to train the code LMs.

Method	Accuracy		Chosen Code > Rejected Code (%)
	Chosen Code (%)	Rejected Code (%)	
Baseline	45.1	23.1	26.2
DSTC	51.9	16.7	36.9

Table 1: Results on the preference dataset generated by *StarCoder2-15B-instruct*, where Chosen Code > Rejected Code means that the chosen code snippet passes the test but the rejected code snippet fails. We use *DeepSeek-Coder-V2* with 236 billion parameters to generate the tests for evaluation.

**DSTC generates more reliable preference pairs.** In Table 1, we show that our proposed method DSTC can improve the code quality and enlarge the quality gap between the chosen code and the rejected code, making the preference pair more reliable. Since there are still 36.9% pairs of chosen code and rejected code in DSTC that they both fail or pass the corresponding tests, it outlines the necessity to incorporate the code-test concatenation to generate a more reliable preference dataset.

## 4 Experiments

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to show the effectiveness of our proposed DSTC in improving LMs’ code generation ability.

## 4.1 Experimental Setup

We implement DSTC on two both open-resource fine-tuned models *StarCoder2-15b-Instruct*<sup>2</sup> and *Deepseek-coder-33b-instruct*<sup>3</sup>, respectively. We use the instructions from the *oss-instruct-sd2-50k* dataset<sup>4</sup> to form the instruction set, where all the instructions are generated and filtered by *StarCoder2-15b* given seed functions. Specifically, *StarCoder2-15b-Instruct* is supervised fine-tuned (SFT) on the *oss-instruct-sd2-50k* dataset without further RLHF training. We use the implementation of DPO and KTO in the OpenRLHF codebase<sup>5</sup> (Hu et al., 2024) as our training framework. The detailed training configurations are provided in Appendix A.

**Benchmarks.** We evaluate the LLM coding generation ability by five benchmarks: HumanEval Base (Chen et al., 2021), HumanEval Plus (Liu et al., 2024a), Mostly Basic Python Problems (MBPP) Base (Austin et al., 2021), MBPP Plus (Liu et al., 2024a), and BigCodeBench (BCB) (Zhuo et al., 2024). In particular, BCB consists of two splits: *instruct split* and *complete split*, where *instruct split* only involves NLP instructions and *complete split* uses structured docstring in prompts. For each split, *hard subset* in BCB contains the most challenging and user-centric fraction of the *full set*. During the evaluation of all these benchmarks, we use greedy decoding in the code generation and all results are reported as the pass@1 score. Here, the pass@1 score measures the accuracy of code LMs on their initial attempt at generating the correct code.

## 4.2 DSTC Enhances Code LMs Across Diverse Benchmarks

The results in Table 2 demonstrate that DSTC consistently enhances the performance of code LMs, surpassing baseline models by a stable margin across all benchmarks when combined with either DPO or KTO. Notably, DSTC achieves improvements in the pass@1 score without requiring additional resources, such as canonical solutions or synthetic tests generated by ChatGPT. This highlights its potential for developing automated systems to further advance code LMs effectively.

## 4.3 Ablation Study

**DSTC can improve code LM with a larger size.** Evaluation results in Table 3 showcase the effectiveness of DSTC when applied to the *DeepseekCoder-33b-instruct*, a large-scale code language model with 33 billion parameters. These findings underscore the scalability of DSTC, demonstrating its ability to improve performance even in substantially larger models.

---

<sup>2</sup><https://huggingface.co/bigcode/starcoder2-15b-instruct-v0.1>

<sup>3</sup><https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/deepseek-coder-33b-instruct>

<sup>4</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/bigcode/self-oss-instruct-sc2-exec-filter-50k>

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/OpenRLHF/OpenRLHF>

Model	HumanEval		MBPP		BCB (Complete)		BCB (Instruct)	
	Basic (%)	Plus (%)	Basic (%)	Plus (%)	Hard (%)	Full (%)	Hard (%)	Full (%)
Ref.	72.0	62.2	75.2	60.9	14.9	45.1	12.2	37.6
DSTC + DPO	<b>74.4</b>	<b>66.5</b>	76.4	61.9	<b>16.2</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>12.8</b>	37.9
DPO	70.1	62.2	<b>76.9</b>	<b>62.2</b>	14.2	46.6	12.2	<b>38.1</b>
DSTC + KTO	<b>73.8</b>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>75.9</b>	<b>61.4</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>47.1</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>38.9</b>
KTO	62.8	54.3	74.9	61.2	15.5	46.6	8.1	38.1

Table 2: Evaluation results of DSTC incorporated with DPO and KTO on *StarCoder2-15b-instruct*.

Model	HumanEval		MBPP		BCB (Complete)		BCB (Instruct)	
	Basic (%)	Plus (%)	Basic (%)	Plus (%)	Hard (%)	Full (%)	Hard (%)	Full (%)
Ref.	77.4	70.1	81.7	69.0	19.6	50.9	14.9	<b>42.0</b>
DSTC	<b>79.9</b>	<b>72.0</b>	<b>82.5</b>	<b>70.4</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>51.6</b>	<b>18.2</b>	41.0

Table 3: Evaluation results of DSTC incorporated with DPO on *DeepseekCoder-33b-instruct*.

**Both components in DSTC are necessary.** To study the effect of each component in DSTC, we perform an ablation study on DSTC and report the results in Table 4, which shows that removing any single component leads to a measurable decline in performance. These results highlight the integral role of each component of DSTC in boosting the model’s ability to generate accurate and reliable code.

Model	HumanEval		MBPP		BCB (Complete)		BCB (Instruct)	
	Basic (%)	Plus (%)	Basic (%)	Plus (%)	Hard (%)	Full (%)	Hard (%)	Full (%)
Ref.	72.0	62.2	75.2	60.9	14.9	45.1	12.2	37.6
DSTC	<b>74.4</b>	<b>66.5</b>	76.4	61.9	<b>16.2</b>	<b>47.5</b>	12.8	37.9
DSTC w/o Concatenation	72.0	65.2	<b>76.7</b>	<b>62.2</b>	15.5	47.0	12.8	<b>38.4</b>
DSTC w/o Minimax Selection	71.3	62.2	75.4	61.4	15.5	46.5	<b>14.2</b>	37.5

Table 4: Ablation study of DSTC incorporated with DPO on *StarCoder2-15b-instruct*.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel mechanism named DSTC to incorporate direct preference learning methods such as DPO and KTO to enhance the code generation capabilities of LMs using only self-generated code snippets and tests to create preference pairs, circumventing the need for costly annotated datasets. By employing a minimax selection process and concatenated test-code pairs, DSTC mitigates the impact of low-quality self-generated tests, enabling stable performance gains across multiple coding benchmarks. Applied with direct preference learning methods like DPO and KTO, DSTC consistently improves pass@1 scores,

showing both scalability and generalizability for models of different sizes. This work highlights DSTC’s potential to advance coding accuracy autonomously, marking a step forward in resource-efficient, high-performance code LM training. Future directions may explore additional mechanisms for refining self-generated tests and expanding DSTC’s applicability across broader coding tasks.

## References

- Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Altschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S. et al. (2023). Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Ahn, J., Verma, R., Lou, R., Liu, D., Zhang, R. and Yin, W. (2024). Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00157*.
- Anthropic (2023). Introducing claude. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/introducing-claude>.
- Austin, J., Odena, A., Nye, M., Bosma, M., Michalewski, H., Dohan, D., Jiang, E., Cai, C., Terry, M., Le, Q. et al. (2021). Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*.
- Azar, M. G., Rowland, M., Piot, B., Guo, D., Calandriello, D., Valko, M. and Munos, R. (2023). A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12036*.
- Bradley, R. A. and Terry, M. E. (1952). Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, **39** 324–345.
- Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., Pinto, H. P. D. O., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G. et al. (2021). Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.
- Dou, S., Liu, Y., Jia, H., Xiong, L., Zhou, E., Shan, J., Huang, C., Shen, W., Fan, X., Xi, Z. et al. (2024). StepCoder: Improve code generation with reinforcement learning from compiler feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01391*.
- Engstrom, L., Ilyas, A., Santurkar, S., Tsipras, D., Janoos, F., Rudolph, L. and Madry, A. (2020). Implementation matters in deep policy gradients: A case study on ppo and trpo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.12729*.
- Ethayarajh, K., Xu, W., Muennighoff, N., Jurafsky, D. and Kiela, D. (2024). Kto: Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01306*.
- Gee, L., Gritta, M., Lampouras, G. and Iacobacci, I. (2024). Code-optimise: Self-generated preference data for correctness and efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12502*.

- Hong, J., Lee, N. and Thorne, J. (2024). Orpo: Monolithic preference optimization without reference model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07691*.
- Hu, J., Wu, X., Wang, W., Xianyu, Zhang, D. and Cao, Y. (2024). Openrlhf: An easy-to-use, scalable and high-performance rlhf framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11143*.
- Hui, B., Yang, J., Cui, Z., Yang, J., Liu, D., Zhang, L., Liu, T., Zhang, J., Yu, B., Dang, K. et al. (2024). Qwen2. 5-coder technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12186*.
- Ji, H., Lu, C., Niu, Y., Ke, P., Wang, H., Zhu, J., Tang, J. and Huang, M. (2024). Towards efficient and exact optimization of language model alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00856*.
- Jiang, J., Wang, F., Shen, J., Kim, S. and Kim, S. (2024). A survey on large language models for code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00515*.
- Le, H., Wang, Y., Gotmare, A. D., Savarese, S. and Hoi, S. C. H. (2022). Coderl: Mastering code generation through pretrained models and deep reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, **35** 21314–21328.
- Liang, X., Chen, C., Wang, J., Wu, Y., Fu, Z., Shi, Z., Wu, F. and Ye, J. (2024). Robust preference optimization with provable noise tolerance for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04102*.
- Liu, J., Xia, C. S., Wang, Y. and Zhang, L. (2024a). Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, **36**.
- Liu, J., Zhu, Y., Xiao, K., Fu, Q., Han, X., Yang, W. and Ye, D. (2023a). Rlhf: Reinforcement learning from unit test feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04349*.
- Liu, T., Zhao, Y., Joshi, R., Khalman, M., Saleh, M., Liu, P. J. and Liu, J. (2023b). Statistical rejection sampling improves preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06657*.
- Liu, Z., Lu, M., Zhang, S., Liu, B., Guo, H., Yang, Y., Blanchet, J. and Wang, Z. (2024b). Provably mitigating overoptimization in rlhf: Your sft loss is implicitly an adversarial regularizer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16436*.
- Lozhkov, A., Li, R., Allal, L. B., Cassano, F., Lamy-Poirier, J., Tazi, N., Tang, A., Pykhtar, D., Liu, J., Wei, Y. et al. (2024). Starcoder 2 and the stack v2: The next generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19173*.
- Luo, Z., Xu, C., Zhao, P., Sun, Q., Geng, X., Hu, W., Tao, C., Ma, J., Lin, Q. and Jiang, D. (2023). Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08568*.

- Pal, A., Karkhanis, D., Dooley, S., Roberts, M., Naidu, S. and White, C. (2024). Smaug: Fixing failure modes of preference optimisation with dpo-positive. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13228*.
- Rafailov, R., Sharma, A., Mitchell, E., Manning, C. D., Ermon, S. and Finn, C. (2023). Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, **36**.
- Rosset, C., Cheng, C.-A., Mitra, A., Santacrose, M., Awadallah, A. and Xie, T. (2024). Direct nash optimization: Teaching language models to self-improve with general preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03715*.
- Roziere, B., Gehring, J., Gloeckle, F., Sootla, S., Gat, I., Tan, X. E., Adi, Y., Liu, J., Sauvestre, R., Remez, T. et al. (2023). Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*.
- Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A. and Klimov, O. (2017). Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- Shen, W. and Zhang, C. (2024). Policy filtration in rlhf to fine-tune llm for code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.06957*.
- Shojaee, P., Jain, A., Tipirneni, S. and Reddy, C. K. (2023). Execution-based code generation using deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13816*.
- Tajwar, F., Singh, A., Sharma, A., Rafailov, R., Schneider, J., Xie, T., Ermon, S., Finn, C. and Kumar, A. (2024). Preference fine-tuning of llms should leverage suboptimal, on-policy data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14367*.
- Tang, Y., Guo, Z. D., Zheng, Z., Calandriello, D., Munos, R., Rowland, M., Richemond, P. H., Valko, M., Pires, B. Á. and Piot, B. (2024). Generalized preference optimization: A unified approach to offline alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05749*.
- Team, G., Anil, R., Borgeaud, S., Wu, Y., Alayrac, J.-B., Yu, J., Soricut, R., Schalkwyk, J., Dai, A. M., Hauth, A. et al. (2023). Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*.
- Wei, Y., Cassano, F., Liu, J., Ding, Y., Jain, N., Mueller, Z., de Vries, H., Werra, L. V., Guha, A. and ZHANG, L. (2024a). Selfcodealign: Self-alignment for code generation. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.  
<https://openreview.net/forum?id=xXRnUU7xTL>
- Wei, Y., Wang, Z., Liu, J., Ding, Y. and Zhang, L. (2024b). Magicoder: Empowering code generation with oss-instruct. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Wu, Y., Sun, Z., Yuan, H., Ji, K., Yang, Y. and Gu, Q. (2024). Self-play preference optimization for language model alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00675*.



- Xiong, W., Dong, H., Ye, C., Zhong, H., Jiang, N. and Zhang, T. (2023). Gibbs sampling from human feedback: A provable kl-constrained framework for rlhf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11456*.
- Xu, R., Liu, Z., Liu, Y., Yan, S., Wang, Z., Zhang, Z. and He, X. (2024). Just say what you want: Only-prompting self-rewarding online preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.17534*.
- Ye, C., Xiong, W., Zhang, Y., Jiang, N. and Zhang, T. (2024). A theoretical analysis of nash learning from human feedback under general kl-regularized preference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07314*.
- Zhang, D., Diao, S., Zou, X. and Peng, H. (2024a). Plum: Preference learning plus test cases yields better code language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.06887*.
- Zhang, R., Lin, L., Bai, Y. and Mei, S. (2024b). Negative preference optimization: From catastrophic collapse to effective unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05868*.
- Zhang, S., Liu, Z., Liu, B., Zhang, Y., Yang, Y., Liu, Y., Chen, L., Sun, T. and Wang, Z. (2024c). Reward-augmented data enhances direct preference alignment of llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.08067*.
- Zhang, S., Yu, D., Sharma, H., Zhong, H., Liu, Z., Yang, Z., Wang, S., Hassan, H. and Wang, Z. (2024d). Self-exploring language models: Active preference elicitation for online alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19332*.
- Zhao, Y., Joshi, R., Liu, T., Khalman, M., Saleh, M. and Liu, P. J. (2023). Slic-hf: Sequence likelihood calibration with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10425*.
- Zhu, Q., Guo, D., Shao, Z., Yang, D., Wang, P., Xu, R., Wu, Y., Li, Y., Gao, H., Ma, S. et al. (2024). Deepseek-coder-v2: Breaking the barrier of closed-source models in code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11931*.
- Zhuo, T. Y., Vu, M. C., Chim, J., Hu, H., Yu, W., Widyasari, R., Yusuf, I. N. B., Zhan, H., He, J., Paul, I. et al. (2024). Bigcodebench: Benchmarking code generation with diverse function calls and complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15877*.

# A Detailed Training Configurations

We train all the models with 8 NVIDIA A100 GPUs and the OpenRLHF codebase (Hu et al., 2024). We report the hyperparameters for the training in Table 5.

Base models	<i>Starcoder2-15b-instruct</i>		<i>Deepseek-coder-33b-instruct</i>
Preference learning	KTO	DPO	DPO
Learning rate	5.0e-7	5.0e-7	5.0e-7
Learning scheduler type	cosine_with_min_lr	cosine_with_min_lr	cosine_with_min_lr
Batch size	512	256	256
Micro batch size	4	4	1
Training epoch	1	1	1
$\beta$	0.3	0.2	0.2
Optimizer	adamw	adamw	adamw
Precision	bfloat16	bfloat16	bfloat16
Warmup ratio	0.05	0.05	0.05

Table 5: Training configurations for all the models in this paper.

# B Prompts for Generating Code Snippets and Tests

In this section, we give details of the prompts used to generate code snippets and tests. We show an example of the full prompt as follows.

An example of the full prompt

```
Provide the best response to a given instruction. Follow the following steps to craft your response to fill Example 2:
```

1. First give a signal [Reasoning], then reason about the given instruction
2. First give a signal [Implementation], then provide a high-quality solution for the instruction.
3. First give a signal [Explanation], then offer a concise explanation.
4. First give a signal [Tests], write comprehensive and diverse tests carefully to verify the correctness your solution. Note that the tests should import all the required packages.

```
## Example 1
```

```
### Instruction
```

```
Create a Python function to encode an integer into a sequence of encoded characters, where each character represents a 5-bit chunk of the integer. The ASCII value of each chunk character is formed by adding 63 to the 5-bit chunk's value. For all chunks except the last one, set the 6th bit to 1 to indicate continuation. Employ bitwise operations for this encoding process.
```

```
The main function name is `encode_integer_to_chars`.
```

```
### Response
```

We will organize our response by four parts: [Reasoning], [Implementation], [Explanation], and [Tests].

#### [Reasoning]

To encode an integer into a sequence of encoded characters based on the specified criteria, let's follow these steps:

1. Break down the integer into 5-bit chunks: Extract 5-bit chunks from the integer using using `& 31` (`0x1F`), because the binary representation of `31` (`11111`) has the last five bits set, which will effectively extract the 5 bits we are interested in. We start from the least significant bits (LSB).
2. Set continuation bit: For all chunks except the last one, set the 6th bit to 1 using `| 32` (`0x20`) because the binary representation of `32` (`100000`) has the 6th bit set to 1. This indicates that there's another continuation chunk following.
3. Shift right: Right-shift the value by 5 to process the next 5 bits.
4. Convert to characters: Use `ord` and `chr` to convert each chunk (now effectively 6 bits due to the continuation bit) into a character by adding 63 to its value. This ensures that the character is within a printable ASCII range.
5. Assembly: Assemble these characters into the final encoded string while maintaining the order of the chunks through `reversed`.

#### [Implementation]

Here's how you can implement this function:

```
```python
def encode_integer_to_chars(value: int) -> str:
    # Base case for 0
    if value == 0:
        return chr(63)

    encoded_chars = []
    while value > 0:
        # Extract the 5-bit chunk and add 63 to its value
        chunk = (value & 31) + 63
        value >>= 5
        # If there's still more of the value left, set the continuation bit
        if value > 0:
            chunk |= 32
        encoded_chars.append(chr(chunk))

    # Reverse the list of characters to start with the least significant chunk
    # and join them into a single string
    return ''.join(reversed(encoded_chars))
```
```

#### [Explanation]

This function processes the integer bit by bit in 5-bit chunks, applying bitwise operations to extract and manipulate these chunks, then converts each chunk into a character using the specified encoding scheme. This approach efficiently handles the encoding in a loop until all bits of the integer have been processed.

Note that this function is designed for non-negative integers and does not support negative integers by default because negative numbers are represented in two's complement form, where the most significant bit (MSB) indicates the sign. In Python, right-shifting (`>>`) a negative integer preserves the sign bit, effectively making the never executed due to the `value > 0` condition. If you change it to `value != 0`, it will then lead to an infinite loop if the same encoding logic is applied to negative integers without modifications.

[Tests]

You can validate this function with a few test cases to ensure correctness:

```
```python
assert encode_integer_to_chars(31) == chr(63 + 31)
assert encode_integer_to_chars(32) == chr(63 + 1) + chr(63)
assert encode_integer_to_chars(1023) == chr(63 + 31) + chr(63 + 31)
assert encode_integer_to_chars(1048575) == chr(63 + 31) * 6
assert encode_integer_to_chars(33) == chr(63 + 1) + chr(63 + 1)
```
```

These tests cover scenarios from zero to a number requiring more than one chunk, ensuring the function operates as expected.

## Example 2

### Instruction

Write a Python function to format a list of tag objects (each with a `.name` attribute) and into a single string containing all tag names separated by commas (no spaces), where tag names containing commas are first enclosed in double quotes. The main function name is `format_tags`.

### Response

We will organize our response by four parts: [Reasoning], [Implementation], [Explanation], and [Tests].

In the prompt described above, we first craft system instructions to guide the model in generating high-quality code and tests while adhering to a specified format for easier parsing. From a pool of 10 high-quality examples (Wei et al., 2024a), we select one example to serve as the context for the generation. As discussed in Section 3, we include the entry point in the instruction (i.e., `The main function name is format_tags.`) to prevent compiler errors caused by mismatched entry points. Additionally, we conclude the prompt with the directive sentence `We will organize our response into four parts: [Reasoning], [Implementation], [Explanation], and [Tests].` This sentence ensures the model follows the required format, facilitating the parsing of code snippets and tests.