

# RefineCoder: Iterative Improving of Large Language Models via Adaptive Critique Refinement for Code Generation

Changzhi Zhou<sup>1\*</sup>, Xinyu Zhang<sup>1\*</sup>, Dandan Song<sup>1†</sup>, Xiancai Chen<sup>2</sup>, Wanli Gu<sup>3</sup>,  
Huipeng Ma<sup>1</sup>, Yuhang Tian<sup>1</sup>, Mengdi Zhang<sup>3</sup>, Linmei Hu<sup>1†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science and Technology,  
Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing, China

<sup>2</sup>Peking University <sup>3</sup>Meituan

zhouchangzhi97@gmail.com {sdd,hulinmei}@bit.edu.cn

## Abstract

Code generation has attracted increasing attention with the rise of Large Language Models (LLMs). Many studies have developed powerful code LLMs by synthesizing code-related instruction data and applying supervised fine-tuning. However, these methods are limited by teacher model distillation and ignore the potential of iterative refinement by self-generated code. In this paper, we propose Adaptive Critique Refinement (ACR), which enables the model to refine itself by self-generated code and external critique, rather than directly imitating the code responses of the teacher model. Concretely, ACR includes a composite scoring system with LLM-as-a-Judge to evaluate the quality of code responses and a selective critique strategy with LLM-as-a-Critic to critique self-generated low-quality code responses. We develop the RefineCoder series by iteratively applying ACR, achieving continuous performance improvement on multiple code generation benchmarks. Compared to the baselines of the same size, our proposed RefineCoder series can achieve comparable or even superior performance using less data.

## 1 Introduction

Code generation, also called program synthesis, is a key application area of Large Language Models (LLMs) and has attracted significant attention from the research community (Gulwani et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2021). Numerous studies focus on developing code-specific pre-trained models, such as CodeLlama (Roziere et al., 2023), DeepSeek-Coder (Guo et al., 2024), and Qwen-Coder (Hui et al., 2024). These LLMs demonstrate strong capabilities in code understanding owing to their pre-training on large-scale code corpus. However, they must undergo post-training to become user-friendly and effective for code-related tasks.

\* Work done during internship at Meituan. Equal contribution.

† Corresponding Author.




Figure 1: Comparison of two fine-tuning paradigms. DFT uses code distilled by teacher model, whereas ACR adaptively constructs distinct data formats infusing self-generated code and external critique.

As a popular post-training technology, Distillation-based Fine-Tuning (DFT) leverages code instruction data synthesized by powerful teacher models (often proprietary LLMs like GPT-4) to fine-tune code LLMs, as shown in Figure 1. Many works (Zhang et al., 2024b) based on this paradigm have been proposed recently. For example, Code Alpaca (Chaudhary, 2023) initially establishes this synthesis paradigm using Self-Instruct (Wang et al., 2023). Subsequently, Code-related Evol-Instruct (Luo et al., 2024) prompts LLMs to evolve more intricate code instructions, while OSS-Instruct (Wei et al., 2024b) generates more realistic code instructions based on open-source code snippets from The Stack (Kocetkov et al., 2022). In contrast, OpenCodeInterpreter (Zheng et al., 2024a) enables code LLMs to learn from compiler diagnostics and human feedback by constructing multi-turn feedback data. These diverse synthesis strategies have significantly advanced the development of code LLMs. However, this paradigm of *teacher model distillation* inevitably suffers from a critical limitation: the performance of the student model largely relies on the teacher model, ignoring the potential of iterative refinement by self-generated code.

Apart from the research on code instruction fine-tuning, some studies (Chen et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023a; Chen et al., 2024, 2025) have explored the ability of LLMs to refine self-generated code during inference. For example, Self-Debugging (Chen et al., 2024) iteratively debugs self-generated code using feedback from the code executor. However, these methods that freeze parameters are essentially a form of *prompt engineering with external feedback*. They cannot improve the intrinsic one-off code generation ability of LLMs. Besides, multiple calls to LLMs increase the inference latency.

In this paper, we propose Adaptive Critique Refinement (ACR), a novel fine-tuning paradigm to enhance the intrinsic one-shot code generation ability of LLMs, and on the basis of which we develop a series of code LLMs named RefineCoder. ACR goes beyond traditional teacher distillation by using both self-generated code and external critique to refine the model. Specifically, ACR tailors the distinct new fine-tuning dataset by first scoring and critiquing the self-generated multiple code responses, and then adaptively forms new samples according to the scoring and critiquing results. The two types of samples are shown in Figure 1. Based on the new dataset, we fine-tune RefineCoder models. Finally, we iteratively applying the above ACR process to achieve continuous improvement in code generation capabilities of RefineCoder. Notably, in ACR, we design a composite scoring system and a selective critiquing strategy to better score code responses and selectively critique low-quality code. The former combines LLM-as-a-Judge, an Elo rating mechanism (Elo and Sloan, 1978), and a code executor for accurate and comprehensive evaluation. The latter adaptively constructs two types of data by comparing the scores of self-generated code with those of original code. When self-generated code performs worse than the original code, an LLM-as-a-Critic is introduced to provide specific critiques.

We conduct iterative ACR based on DS-Coder-6.7B-Base (Guo et al., 2024) and Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Base (Hui et al., 2024), resulting in the RefineCoder series. After three iterations, RefineCoder-DS-6.7B and RefineCoder-QW-7B achieve average pass@1 improvements of 2.4 and 3.0, respectively, on the HumanEval (+), MBPP (+), LiveCodeBench, and the BigCodeBench-hard benchmark (Chen et al., 2021; Austin et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2023; Jain et al., 2024; Zhuo et al., 2024).

The key contributions of this paper are as follows:

- 1) We propose Adaptive Critique Refinement (ACR), a novel fine-tuning paradigm that refines code LLMs with self-generated code and external critique, on the basis of which we develop a series of strong code LLMs (RefineCoder).

- 2) To ensure the efficacy of ACR, we design a composite scoring system with LLM-as-a-Judge and a selective critique strategy with LLM-as-a-Critic to score and critique self-generated code.

- 3) Experimental results from the RefineCoder series show that iterative ACR continuously enhances code generation performance. After three iterations, the RefineCoder series achieves comparable or even superior performance than baselines of the same size while requiring less data.

## 2 Related Work

**LLMs for Code Generation** LLMs have shown exceptional code understanding abilities due to extensive pre-training on code-related corpora. Numerous models like GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024a), Gemini (Google, 2024), Claude-3.5 (Anthropic, 2024), Qwen2.5-Coder (Hui et al., 2024), and DeepSeek-Coder (Guo et al., 2024) exhibit strong performance on code generation benchmarks. Recently, the release of OpenAI o1 (OpenAI, 2024b) and DeepSeek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI, 2025) has spurred a surge in research on deep reasoning LLMs, achieving expert-level performance on competitive programming problems (e.g., CodeForces) and further advancing LLMs in the code domain.

**Distillation-based Code Fine-Tuning** Unlike proprietary models, many studies focus on fine-tuning open-source code pre-trained models, which has greatly contributed to the rapid development of the code generation field. A key technique for achieving this is distilling data from teacher models. Code Alpaca (Chaudhary, 2023) introduces Self-Instruct (Wang et al., 2023) to distill GPT-3. Following this, WizardCoder (Luo et al., 2024) evolves more complex code instruction data using Evol-Instruct (Xu et al., 2024). MagiCoder (Wei et al., 2024b) proposes OSS-Instruct, where the model generates instructions and code responses sequentially based on open-source code snippets, thus creating more practical code data. In contrast to OSS-Instruct, InverseCoder (Wu et al., 2024) reverses the order of instruction and code response generation. WaveCoder (Yu et al., 2024) constructs a multi-task code dataset, enhancing the model’s




Figure 2: **Overview of ACR in the  $t$ -th iteration.** (1) **Sampling:** The model  $M_t$  samples  $n$  code responses  $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^n$  with high temperature for a programming instruction  $x$  in the dataset  $D_t$ . (2) **Ranking:** A composite scoring system scores the  $n + 1$  code responses (including  $y^0$  from origin dataset) and ranks them, identifying a winner  $y^w$  and  $n$  losers  $\{y^{l^i}\}_{i=1}^n$ . (3) **Refining:** Depending on the identity of the  $y^w$ , the selective critique strategy constructs a new single-round data  $(x, y^w)$  or two-round critique data  $(x, y^{l^1}, c, y^w)$ , where  $y^{l^1}$  is the highest-scoring loser,  $c$  is critique. The original data  $(x, y)$  is replaced with new data and all the new data form a new dataset  $D_{t+1}$ . (4) **Training:** The new model  $M_{t+1}$  is fine-tuned using  $D_{t+1}$ .

versatility. Besides, OpenCodeInterpreter (Zheng et al., 2024a) builds multi-turn code data, enabling the model to learn from execution feedback and human feedback. However, these methods aim to enable the model to learn by imitating the teacher, overlooking the potential for refinement through self-generated code.

**Iterative Self-Refinement of LLMs** Iterative self-refinement refers to LLMs enhancing themselves iteratively by utilizing self-generated responses with the help of external signals. One line of research (Huang et al., 2023b; Madaan et al., 2023; Hu et al., 2024) focuses on enabling self-correction during the inference stage by iteratively calling LLMs and incorporating external signals. In the code domain, CodeT (Chen et al., 2023), Self-Debugging (Chen et al., 2024), and LDB (Zhong et al., 2024) follow this approach. However, these prompt engineering methods with external feedback cannot improve the intrinsic capabilities. Another line of research focuses on iteratively training the model using self-generated outputs to enhance its intrinsic capabilities (Dong et al., 2025; Yuan et al., 2024; Kim et al., 2025). These methods typically rely on preference learning, such as DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023). CodeLutra (Tao et al., 2024) has successfully applied this approach to the code domain, but it heavily depends on golden labels, which limits its applicability. In contrast to the works above, we propose the ACR method, which achieves iterative self-refinement by only using a simple Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) loss. This approach is orthogonal to prompt engineering

methods like Self-Debugging and is more efficient and generalizable than CodeLutra.

### 3 Methodology

#### 3.1 Overview

Adaptive Critique Refinement (ACR) aims to improve code LLMs by refining existing dataset with self-generated code and external critiques. The iterative application of ACR facilitates continuous improvement in code generation performance. As illustrated in Figure 2, ACR starts with an existing dataset and a code model fine-tuned on it. The method updates the existing dataset through a process of sampling, ranking, and refining. The updated dataset is used for the next round of fine-tuning, iteratively improving the model’s code generation capabilities.

In the following sections, we will introduce two key components of the aforementioned pipeline: the composite scoring system for ranking and the selective critiquing strategy for data refining. Finally, we will introduce the iterative training and the resulting RefineCoder model.

#### 3.2 Composite Scoring System with LLM-as-a-Judge

A comprehensive and accurate evaluation of code response quality is the foundation for effective ACR. Previous works (Chen et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024a) rely on generating test cases to evaluate code quality. However, this method has issues with inaccurate test case generation (Jain et al., 2024), inability to handle *special judge* (Quan et al.,

2025), and failure to evaluate non-code content in response such as code comments and explanations.

Drawing on the judgment and evaluation abilities of LLMs (Dong et al., 2025; Li et al., 2024), we employ an LLM-as-a-Judge as the backbone of the scoring system, supplemented by the Elo mechanism (Elo and Sloan, 1978) and a code executor to ensure effective evaluation. Specifically, given a programming question  $x$  from the existing dataset  $D_t$  and the corresponding code response list  $\{y^i\}_{i=0}^n$ , the Judge assigns pairwise relative scores for all code response pairs by identifying their differences and evaluating these discrepancies:

$$\text{score}_{judge}^{ij}, \text{score}_{judge}^{ji} = \text{Judge}(x, y^i, y^j), \quad (1)$$

where  $i, j \in [0, n]$ ,  $i \neq j$ , and  $\text{score}_{judge}^{ij} \in [1, 10]$  denotes the relative score of the  $i$ -th response when compared to the  $j$ -th response. The prompt for LLM-as-a-Judge is shown in Figure 7. Next, we use Elo mechanism, a ranking algorithm that adjusts scores based on pairwise comparisons, to compute the pointwise score of each code response:

$$\text{score}_{judge}^i = \text{Elo} \left( \left\{ \text{score}_{judge}^{ij} \mid j \in [0, n], j \neq i \right\} \right), \quad (2)$$

where  $i \in [0, n]$  and  $\text{score}_{judge}^i \in [0, 1]$ . For more details on Elo in the appendix A. In addition to the model scores provided by Judge and Elo, we also use a code executor to evaluate the executability of the code:

$$\text{score}_{exec}^i = \text{Executor}(y^i), \quad (3)$$

where  $i \in [0, n]$  and  $\text{score}_{exec}^i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Finally, we rank all code responses based on the composite score of them:

$$\text{score}^i = \text{score}_{judge}^i + \text{score}_{exec}^i, \quad (4)$$

$$y^w, y^{l1}, \dots, y^{ln} = \text{Sort}(\{y^i\}_{i=0}^n \mid \{\text{score}^i\}_{i=0}^n), \quad (5)$$

where  $\text{score}^i \in [0, 2]$ ,  $y^w$  and  $y^{l1}$  denote the code responses with the highest and second-highest scores, respectively.

### 3.3 Selective Critiquing Strategy with LLM-as-a-Critic

After obtaining the sorted code responses, we design the selective critiquing strategy as data construction engine of ACR. It effectively utilizes high-quality and low-quality self-generated code in distinct ways, while further providing external critiques for the low-quality data. This strategy resembles the process of a student first solving problems and then critiquing their answers based on provided solutions, rather than directly imitating the solutions (Wang et al., 2025).

Concretely, when all self-generated code responses are of lower quality than the original code in the existing dataset, namely  $y^w$  is  $y^0$  and  $y^{l1}$  is the self-generated code, LLM-as-a-Critic is used to critique  $y^{l1}$ , using  $y^0$  as a reference (The prompt is shown in Figure 8):

$$c = \text{Critic}(x, y^w, y^{l1}). \quad (6)$$

Otherwise, if  $y^w$  is the self-generated code response, we directly construct new single-round data. The data update rules are as follows:

$$(x, y) \longrightarrow \begin{cases} (x, y^{l1}, c, y^w), & \text{if } y^w \text{ is } y^0, \\ (x, y^w), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

If the data to be updated comes from a two-round critique rather than a single-round one, only the instruction and the final code response will be considered. Selective refining strategy updates all data to comprise a new instruction dataset  $D_{t+1}$ .

### 3.4 Iterative Training

The previous sections describes the process of a single ACR in Figure 2. Next, we describe the iterative ACR process and define RefineCoder:

- **RefineCoder Iter0** ( $M_0$ ): The code model trained using the initial SFT dataset  $D_0$ .

- **RefineCoder Iter1** ( $M_1$ ): The code model trained using dataset  $D_1$ , where  $D_1$  is obtained by refining  $D_0$  using  $M_0$ .

- **RefineCoder Itert** ( $M_t$ ): The code model trained using dataset  $D_t$ , where  $D_t$  is obtained by refining  $D_{t-1}$  using  $M_{t-1}$ .

We fine-tune the original base model from scratch in each iteration to prevent overfitting, consistent with previous iterative training works (Zelikman et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2024a; Dong et al., 2025).



## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Benchmarks

We use **HumanEval (+)** (Chen et al., 2021) and **MBPP(+)** (Austin et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2023) to assess the **fundamental coding ability** of code model. Meanwhile, we use **LiveCodeBench** (Jain et al., 2024) and **BigCodeBench-hard** (Zhuo et al., 2024) to measure the **advanced coding ability** of code model. We restrict data usage to the range from 240701 to 250201 of the LiveCodeBench to maintain its contamination-free nature.

### 4.2 Baselines

- **Proprietary Models:** Gemini-1.5-Pro-002 (Google, 2024), Claude-3.5-Sonnet-20240620 (Anthropic, 2024), and GPT-4o-20240806 (OpenAI, 2024a).
- **Open-source Models 7B+ Scale:** Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct (Hui et al., 2024), DeepSeek-V3 (DeepSeek-AI, 2024), and Llama3.3-70B-Instruct (Grattafiori et al., 2024).
- **Open-source Models  $\sim$ 7B Scale:** DSCoder-6.7B Series (Guo et al., 2024), MagiCoder-S-DS-6.7B (Wei et al., 2024b), OpenCodeInterpreter-DS-6.7B (Zheng et al., 2024a), WaveCoder-Ultra-6.7B (Yu et al., 2024), and Qwen2.5-Coder-7B Series (Hui et al., 2024).

### 4.3 Initial SFT Dataset $D_0$

The existing datasets vary in quality and carry the risk of data leakage (Wang et al., 2024b; Yu et al., 2024). To ensure the accuracy and reliability of the experimental results, we constructed a high-quality SFT dataset by combining the Evol-Instruct and SelfCodeAlign (Wei et al., 2024a). Concretely, we first prompt GPT-4o to generate code-related concepts and corresponding programming instructions from Python code snippets. These code snippets have been preprocessed to ensure high quality and contamination-free. Then, we prompt GPT-4o again to iteratively evolve these instructions using Evol-Instruct strategy. Finally, we prompt GPT-4o to generate code responses for the instructions. Through this pipeline, we obtained an 80K high-quality and diverse python instruction dataset. See Appendix C for detailed data construction prompts.

### 4.4 Implement Details

**Iterative Training** We employ DSCoder-6.7B-Base and Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Base as the base pre-trained models. To obtain an initial code model

$M_0$ , we fine-tune DSCoder-6.7B-Base on the 80K initial SFT dataset, resulting in RefineCoder-DS-6.7B (*Iter0*). Furthermore, since Qwen2.5-Coder-Base exhibits strong code understanding and generation capabilities, we accelerate our experimental iterations by randomly sampling 20K examples from the same dataset for fine-tune it, yielding RefineCoder-QW-7B (*Iter0*). The two RefineCoder models undergo three iterative training using their respective datasets under our ACR framework. In the ACR pipeline, the model self-samples 5 code responses with a temperature of 0.7. We use Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct (Hui et al., 2024) as the Judge and Critic. We set the number of training epochs to 2, the global batch size to 64, and the learning rate to 5e-6, employing the AdamW optimizer with a cosine learning rate decay strategy. All our training is performed using 16 A100-80G GPUs, utilizing the LLaMA-Factory (Zheng et al., 2024b).

**Evaluation** We use the Pass@1 metric to evaluate the performance of model on the benchmark. For baseline results, we prioritize those from the benchmark leaderboard<sup>5 6 7</sup> or the original papers. If unavailable, we evaluate them locally using the same settings as the RefineCoder series.

### 4.5 Experimental Results

As shown in Table 1, the RefineCoder series achieves impressive performance gains on various code generation benchmarks. While the initial RefineCoder-DS-6.7B and RefineCoder-QW-7B exhibit moderate performance, the two models achieve an average Pass@1 improvement of 2.4 and 3.0, respectively, on all benchmarks after three iterations of refinement. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the RefineCoder series is fine-tuned with a very limited amount of data (80K or 20K). Despite this, the RefineCoder models (*Iter3*) still outperform or match baselines of the same size, which are fine-tuned with more extensive data.

Concretely, data refinement improves the fundamental programming abilities of the RefineCoder series, as demonstrated by continuous performance gains over iterations on HumanEval, HumanEval+, and MBPP+. Notably, RefineCoder-QW-7B shows a remarkable 7.9 point increase (*Iter0*  $\rightarrow$  *Iter3*) in

<sup>5</sup><https://evalplus.github.io/leaderboard.html>

<sup>6</sup><https://livecodebench.github.io/leaderboard.html>

<sup>7</sup><https://huggingface.co/spaces/bigcode/bigcodebench-leaderboard>





Models	Dataset	HumanEval		MBPP		LCB	BCB-hard		Average
		Base	Plus	Base	Plus	2407-2502	Inst	Comp	
<b>Proprietary Models</b>									
Gemini-1.5-Pro-002	/	89.0	79.3	89.7	74.6	30.9	20.9	32.4	59.5
Claude-3.5-Sonnet-20240620	/	87.2	81.7	89.4	74.3	32.0	25.7	33.1	60.5
GPT-4o-20240806	/	92.7	87.2	87.6	72.2	30.5	25.0	36.5	61.7
<b>Open-source Models 7B+ Scale</b>									
Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct	/	92.1	87.2	90.5	77.0	29.5	27.7	33.8	62.5
DeepSeek-V3	/	91.5	86.6	87.6	73.0	36.3	27.7	39.9	63.2
Llama3.3-70B-Instruct	/	84.1	80.5	87.6	73.5	29.1	28.4	28.4	58.8
<b>Open-source Models ~7B Scale</b>									
 DSCoder-6.7B-Base	/	47.6	39.6	72.0	58.7	/	/	13.5	/
DSCoder-6.7B-Instruct	2BT	74.4	71.3	74.9	65.6	12.8	10.1	15.5	46.4
MagiCoder-S-DS-6.7B	185K	76.8	71.3	79.4	<b>69.0</b>	13.4	13.5	12.8	48.0
OpenCodeInterpreter-DS-6.7B	178K	<b>77.4</b>	<b>72.0</b>	76.5	66.4	7.3	13.5	<b>16.9</b>	47.1
WaveCoder-Ultra-6.7B	130K	75.0	69.5	74.9	63.5	12.9	12.8	<b>16.9</b>	46.5
<b>RefineCoder-DS-6.7B</b> <i>Iter0</i>	80K	73.8	67.7	77.5	65.1	13.6	18.2	10.1	46.6
<b>RefineCoder-DS-6.7B</b> <i>Iter1</i>	80K	74.4	68.9	77.0	66.4	14.1	18.9	14.2	47.7 <sup>+1.1</sup>
<b>RefineCoder-DS-6.7B</b> <i>Iter2</i>	80K	74.4	70.3	79.6	66.9	<b>14.3</b>	19.6	14.2	48.5 <sup>+1.9</sup>
<b>RefineCoder-DS-6.7B</b> <i>Iter3</i>	80K	75.0	70.7	<b>80.2</b>	67.2	14.2	<b>20.3</b>	15.5	<b>49.0</b> <sup>+2.4</sup>
 Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Base	/	61.6	53.0	76.9	62.9	/	/	16.2	/
Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct	Millions	<b>88.4</b>	<b>84.1</b>	83.5	71.7	18.1	20.3	20.3	55.2
<b>RefineCoder-QW-7B</b> <i>Iter0</i>	20K	85.4	78.0	79.4	65.1	18.2	18.2	<b>20.9</b>	52.2
<b>RefineCoder-QW-7B</b> <i>Iter1</i>	20K	86.0	79.3	84.7	71.4	17.4	16.2	18.9	53.4 <sup>+1.2</sup>
<b>RefineCoder-QW-7B</b> <i>Iter2</i>	20K	86.6	80.5	84.7	72.0	<b>19.2</b>	18.2	19.6	54.4 <sup>+2.2</sup>
<b>RefineCoder-QW-7B</b> <i>Iter3</i>	20K	87.2	81.1	<b>85.2</b>	<b>73.0</b>	19.1	<b>19.6</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>55.2</b> <sup>+3.0</sup>

Table 1: Main Results. LCB/BCB denotes LiveCodeBench/BigCodeBench. Inst/Comp denote Instruct/Complete.  and  denotes the two base models, and the rest are the instruction models. 2BT denotes 2B tokens.

Dataset	Size	HumanEval (+)	MBPP (+)	LCB	BCB-hard
Magic-OSS-Instruct (Wei et al., 2024b) <sup>1</sup>	75K	4.45	9.40	2.63	4.84
Magic-Evol-Instruct (Wei et al., 2024b) <sup>2</sup>	110K	43.20	19.40	2.91	4.46
Evol-CodeAlpaca-v1 (Luo et al., 2024) <sup>3</sup>	110K	47.04	19.46	2.91	4.46
Code-FeedBack (Zheng et al., 2024a) <sup>4</sup>	68K	30.50	17.67	3.16	4.78
Ours	80K	4.97	7.00	1.54	5.43

Table 2: The Test Leakage Indicator (TLI) quantifies data leakage by measuring the average maximum n-gram overlap between dataset samples and benchmark samples. The larger the TLI value, the more severe the data leakage. Values in red indicate severe data leakage.

Pass@1 on MBPP+, highlighting the efficacy of this approach. In the more challenging benchmarks, LiveCodeBench and BigCodeBench-hard, the performance of the RefineCoder also improves after iterations. Compared to the baseline OpenCodeInterpreter, RefineCoder-DS-6.7B (*Iter2*) outperforms it by 7 points on LiveCodeBench, illustrating the strong competitive programming abilities of the RefineCoder series. These results demonstrate that the model can iteratively enhance code generation capabilities by self-generated code and critique with the help of our ACR method.

## 5 Further Study

### 5.1 Data Leakage Analysis

In Table 1, we observe that while the RefineCoder (*Iter3*) surpasses or matches the baselines on average pass@1, it still lags behind the state-of-the-art baseline of the same size on HumanEval (+) and MBPP+. To better explore this performance gap, we investigate potential data leakage in the datasets used by the baselines.

Concretely, we collect the open-source datasets used by MagiCoder-S-DS-6.7B, OpenCodeInterpreter-DS-6.7B, and WaveCoder-Ultra-6.7B (the datasets for the other baselines are not public) and evaluate data leakage using the

HumanEval+ (%)	Best	Worst	Error Rate
RefineCoder-DS-6.7B <i>Iter3</i>	76.2	60.4 $-15.8$	4.3
RefineCoder-QW-7B <i>Iter3</i>	81.7	75.0 $-6.7$	3.0

MBPP+ (%)	Best	Worst	Error Rate
RefineCoder-DS-6.7B <i>Iter3</i>	65.3	60.1 $-5.2$	6.3
RefineCoder-QW-7B <i>Iter3</i>	70.4	69.6 $-0.8$	5.8

Table 3: Best and Worst denote the performance of code with the highest and lowest scores. Error rate denotes the proportion of cases where the best code fails the test cases, but the worst code passes.

TLI metric proposed by Wang et al. (2024b). The results are shown in Table 2, Magic-OSS-Instruct and our dataset are entirely free from data leakage. In contrast, Magic-Evol-Instruct, Evol-CodeAlpaca-v1, and Code-FeedBack demonstrate severe data leakage with respect to HumanEval (+) and MBPP (+). These datasets are used by the three aforementioned baselines, making it challenging for RefineCoder to surpass these baselines. We also present an intuitive scatter plot of similarity scores in the appendix E for a more detailed analysis.

## 5.2 The effectiveness of Composite Scoring System

The performance improvement through iterative training preliminarily validates the effectiveness of the scoring system. In this section, we further verify it by enabling the model sampling 10 code responses for each programming question in benchmarks and scoring them. As shown in Table 3, the performance of the highest-scoring code far exceeds that of the lowest-scoring code, while the scoring system maintains a low error rate. This clearly validates its effectiveness.

## 5.3 The effectiveness of Selective Critique Strategy

To validate the effectiveness of the selective critique strategy in ACR, we conduct ablation experiments. As shown in Figure 3, for each iteration, we construct two variants of the RefineCoder without the 3.1 module in Figure 2, and another without the 3.2 module. During the iteration process, ablating either module leads to a performance drop in both RefineCoder-QW-7B and RefineCoder-DS-6.7B, indicating the effectiveness of our strategy. Furthermore, removing the second-round critique data has a greater impact on performance. We believe this action prevents the model from reflecting on self-




Figure 3: Ablation Study. The y-axis denotes the average pass@1 value on all benchmarks.

generated low-quality codes and external critiques, thereby hindering performance improvement.

## 5.4 Multilingual Code Generation

As shown in Table 4, we also evaluate the out-of-distribution (OOD) code generation performance on multilingual benchmark MultiPL-E (Cassano et al., 2022), despite fine-tuning on a Python-only dataset. After one and three iterations, RefineCoder-DS-6.7B and RefineCoder-QW-7B achieve optimal average performance, surpassing the initial model by 1.0 and 1.9 points, respectively. In particular, RefineCoder-QW-7B (*Iter3*) achieves best results among half of the programming languages. This demonstrates that the effectiveness of our ACR method generalizes well to the OOD code generation domain.

## 5.5 Evaluation with External Feedback

Iterative ACR not only improves the one-off code generation performance of RefineCoder but also endows it with the ability to correct errors based on feedback. Following Zheng et al. (2024a), we design two types of external feedback to evaluate this ability of RefineCoder: 1) **Execution Feedback**: Model refines its self-generated erroneous code based on execution results from the executor. 2) **Human Feedback**: GPT-4o first analyzes the programming question, initial error code, and execution results to generate improvement suggestions that mimic human thinking. Model then re-




Figure 4: Evaluation with feedback using RefineCoder-QW-7B.

Models		C++	C#	Java	Bash	TypeScript	JavaScript	AVG
<b>RefineCoder-DS-6.7B</b>	<i>Iter0</i>	56.5	58.9	<b>58.9</b>	<b>40.5</b>	62.3	64.6	57.2
<b>RefineCoder-DS-6.7B</b>	<i>Iter1</i>	62.1	<b>61.4</b>	55.1	35.4	<b>65.4</b>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>58.2</b>
<b>RefineCoder-DS-6.7B</b>	<i>Iter2</i>	<b>63.4</b>	56.2	56.2	38.6	<b>65.4</b>	65.8	57.5
<b>RefineCoder-DS-6.7B</b>	<i>Iter3</i>	<b>63.4</b>	58.2	57.0	39.2	62.9	65.8	57.8
<b>RefineCoder-QW-7B</b>	<i>Iter0</i>	60.2	73.4	68.4	49.4	78.0	<b>78.3</b>	68.7
<b>RefineCoder-QW-7B</b>	<i>Iter1</i>	62.7	74.1	65.2	51.3	76.1	77.0	68.6
<b>RefineCoder-QW-7B</b>	<i>Iter2</i>	<b>63.8</b>	74.1	69.6	48.7	78.0	77.6	69.4
<b>RefineCoder-QW-7B</b>	<i>Iter3</i>	60.2	<b>75.3</b>	<b>73.4</b>	<b>53.2</b>	<b>79.2</b>	77.6	<b>70.6</b>

Table 4: Performance of RefineCoder on the MultiPL-E.

Models	HumanEval		MBPP	
	Base	Plus	Base	Plus
<b>Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Base</b>	61.6	53.0	76.9	62.9
+DPO	59.8	52.4	44.2	32.6
+ORPO	<b>85.4</b>	<b>79.9</b>	<b>84.4</b>	<b>70.4</b>
<b>RefineCoder-QW-7B</b> <i>Iter0</i>	85.4	78.0	79.4	65.1
+DPO	61.0	50.0	60.6	42.3
+ORPO	<b>86.6</b>	<b>79.3</b>	<b>81.7</b>	<b>69.3</b>

Table 5: Performance comparison of different preference optimization strategies in reinforcement learning.

finer the code based on these suggestions. The results of RefineCoder-QW-7B on HumanEval (+) and MBPP (+) are shown in Figure 4. It can be observed that external feedback improves performance on all benchmarks, with human feedback yielding a more significant enhancement. Surprisingly, with the help of human-like improvement suggestions, RefineCoder-QW-7B (*Iter1* and *Iter3*) outperforms GPT-4o on three benchmarks, demonstrating its ability to understand feedback and refine code.

## 5.6 Preference Optimization

During the iterative process, a substantial amount of preference data is generated. For each programming instruction, we select the top-1 and bottom-1 ranked responses to form preference pairs, thereby exploring the potential of preference learning. As shown in Table 5, we use DPO (Rafailov et al.,

2023) and ORPO (Hong et al., 2024) to optimize the base and SFT models. We observe the opposite results due to the differences in preference strategies. DPO leads to a significant performance decline due to the intrinsic risk of reducing the likelihood of correct code during training (Feng et al., 2024; Tao et al., 2024; Pal et al., 2024). In contrast, ORPO builds upon the SFT loss to maximize the likelihood of correct code, resulting in improved performance. The results are consistent with those presented in the CodeLutra (Tao et al., 2024), reflecting the indispensability of SFT loss and the critical impact of preference strategy design on performance.

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper, we propose the Adaptive Critique Refinement (ACR) method to iteratively refine code LLMs using self-generated code and external critique, which breaks away from the traditional teacher distillation paradigm and improves the intrinsic one-off code generation ability. We design a composite scoring system and a selective critiquing strategy. These two components are centred around LLM-as-a-Judge and LLM-as-a-Critic to evaluate and critique self-generated code. This simulates the process where a student solves a problem independently and then refines it by comparing it with the reference answer. We develop the RefineCoder-DS-6.7B and RefineCoder-



QW-7B models and demonstrate the effectiveness of iterative ACR on HumanEval (+), MBPP (+), LiveCodeBench, and BigCodeBench-hard. Further studies reveal the impact of the components in ACR and demonstrate its OOD code generation ability.

## 7 Limitations

Although Adaptive Critique Refinement (ACR) and the associated RefineCoder demonstrate significant improvements in the code generation task, several limitations remain. First, ACR is primarily designed to refine code responses based on programming instructions, necessitating an initial set of high-quality and diverse instructions. Therefore, a specialized code instruction generator is still required to make ACR more automated. Furthermore, while ACR can apply to other reasoning-intensive tasks, such as mathematics, this paper has not fully explored these domains.

## References

- Anthropic. 2024. Introducing computer use, a new claude 3.5 sonnet, and claude 3.5 haiku. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/3-5-models-and-computer-use>.
- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, and Charles Sutton. 2021. [Program synthesis with large language models](#). Preprint, arXiv:2108.07732.
- 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. 2022. [Multipl-e: A scalable and extensible approach to benchmarking neural code generation](#). arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.08227.
- Sahil Chaudhary. 2023. Code alpaca: An instruction-following llama model for code generation. <https://github.com/sahil280114/codealpaca>.
- Bei Chen, Fengji Zhang, Anh Nguyen, Daoguang Zan, Zeqi Lin, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. [Codet: Code generation with generated tests](#). In The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations.
- 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.
- Xiancai Chen, Zhengwei Tao, Kechi Zhang, Changzhi Zhou, Wanli Gu, Yuanpeng He, Mengdi Zhang, Xunliang Cai, Haiyan Zhao, and Zhi Jin. 2025. [Revisit self-debugging with self-generated tests for code generation](#). Preprint, arXiv:2501.12793.
- Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. 2024. [Teaching large language models to self-debug](#). In The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations.
- DeepSeek-AI. 2024. [Deepseek-v3 technical report](#). Preprint, arXiv:2412.19437.
- DeepSeek-AI. 2025. [Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning](#). Preprint, arXiv:2501.12948.
- Qingxiu Dong, Li Dong, Xingxing Zhang, Zhifang Sui, and Furu Wei. 2025. [Self-boosting large language models with synthetic preference data](#). In The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations.
- Arpad E Elo and Sam Sloan. 1978. The rating of chess-players: Past and present. (No Title).
- Duanyu Feng, Bowen Qin, Chen Huang, Zheng Zhang, and Wenqiang Lei. 2024. [Towards analyzing and understanding the limitations of dpo: A theoretical perspective](#). Preprint, arXiv:2404.04626.
- Google. 2024. Gemini. <https://deepmind.google/technologies/gemini/>.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, and et al. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). Preprint, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Sumit Gulwani, Oleksandr Polozov, Rishabh Singh, et al. 2017. Program synthesis. *Foundations and Trends® in Programming Languages*, 4(1-2):1–119.
- Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Yu Wu, YK Li, et al. 2024. [Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming—the rise of code intelligence](#). arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196.
- Jiwoo Hong, Noah Lee, and James Thorne. 2024. [ORPO: Monolithic preference optimization without reference model](#). In Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 11170–11189, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chi Hu, Yimin Hu, Hang Cao, Tong Xiao, and JingBo Zhu. 2024. [Teaching language models to self-improve by learning from language feedback](#). In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024, pages 6090–6101, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dong Huang, Qingwen Bu, Jie M Zhang, Michael Luck, and Heming Cui. 2023a. [Agentcoder: Multi-agent-based code generation with iterative testing and optimisation](#). arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13010.

- Jiaxin Huang, Shixiang Gu, Le Hou, Yuexin Wu, Xuezhi Wang, Hongkun Yu, and Jiawei Han. 2023b. [Large language models can self-improve](#). In Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 1051–1068, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Kai Dang, et al. 2024. Qwen2.5-coder technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12186.
- Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. 2024. Live-codebench: Holistic and contamination free evaluation of large language models for code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07974.
- Dongyoung Kim, Jaehyung Kim, Kimin Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. 2025. [Spread preference annotation: Direct preference judgment for efficient LLM alignment](#). In The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations.
- Denis Kocetkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Jia Li, Chenghao Mou, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Yacine Jernite, Margaret Mitchell, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, et al. 2022. The stack: 3 tb of permissively licensed source code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.15533.
- Dawei Li, Bohan Jiang, Liangjie Huang, Alimohammad Beigi, Chengshuai Zhao, Zhen Tan, Amrita Bhat-tacharjee, Yuxuan Jiang, Canyu Chen, Tianhao Wu, Kai Shu, Lu Cheng, and Huan Liu. 2024. From generation to judgment: Opportunities and challenges of llm-as-a-judge. arXiv preprint arXiv: 2411.16594.
- Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and LINGMING ZHANG. 2023. [Is your code generated by chatGPT really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation](#). In Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems.
- Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. 2024. [Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct](#). In The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations.
- Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhunoye, Yiming Yang, Shashank Gupta, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Katherine Hermann, Sean Welleck, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, and Peter Clark. 2023. [Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback](#). In Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems.
- OpenAI. 2024a. Hello gpt-4o. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>.
- OpenAI. 2024b. Learning to reason with llms. <https://openai.com/index/learning-to-reason-with-llms/>.
- Arka Pal, Deep Karkhanis, Samuel Dooley, Manley Roberts, Siddhartha Naidu, and Colin White. 2024. Smaug: Fixing failure modes of preference optimisation with dpo-positive. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13228.
- Shanghaoran Quan, Jiayi Yang, Bowen Yu, Bo Zheng, Dayiheng Liu, An Yang, Xuancheng Ren, Bofei Gao, Yibo Miao, Yunlong Feng, et al. 2025. Codeelo: Benchmarking competition-level code generation of llms with human-comparable elo ratings. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.01257.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model](#). In Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950.
- Leitian Tao, Xiang Chen, Tong Yu, Tung Mai, Ryan Rossi, Yixuan Li, and Saayan Mitra. 2024. Codelutra: Boosting llm code generation via preference-guided refinement. arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.05199.
- Tianlu Wang, Ilya Kulikov, Olga Golovneva, Ping Yu, Weizhe Yuan, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Maryam Fazel-Zarandi, Jason Weston, and Xian Li. 2024a. [Self-taught evaluators](#). Preprint, arXiv:2408.02666.
- Yejie Wang, Keqing He, Dayuan Fu, Zhuoma GongQue, Heyang Xu, Yanxu Chen, Zhexu Wang, Yujia Fu, Guanting Dong, Muxi Diao, Jingang Wang, Mengdi Zhang, Xunliang Cai, and Weiran Xu. 2024b. [How do your code LLMs perform? empowering code instruction tuning with really good data](#). In Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 14027–14043, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions](#). In Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 13484–13508, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yubo Wang, Xiang Yue, and Wenhua Chen. 2025. Critique fine-tuning: Learning to critique is more effective than learning to imitate. arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17703.

- Yuxiang Wei, Federico Cassano, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, Naman Jain, Zachary Mueller, Harm de Vries, Leandro Von Werra, Arjun Guha, and LINGMING ZHANG. 2024a. [Selfcodealign: Self-alignment for code generation](#). In The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems.
- Yuxiang Wei, Zhe Wang, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, and LINGMING ZHANG. 2024b. [Magicoder: Empowering code generation with OSS-instruct](#). In Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning.
- Yutong Wu, Di Huang, Wenxuan Shi, Wei Wang, Lingzhe Gao, Shihao Liu, Ziyuan Nan, Kaizhao Yuan, Rui Zhang, Xishan Zhang, Zidong Du, Qi Guo, Yewen Pu, Dawei Yin, Xing Hu, and Yunji Chen. 2024. [Inversecoder: Self-improving instruction-tuned code llms with inverse-instruct](#). Preprint, arXiv:2407.05700.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. 2024. [WizardLM: Empowering large pre-trained language models to follow complex instructions](#). In The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations.
- Zhaojian Yu, Xin Zhang, Ning Shang, Yangyu Huang, Can Xu, Yishujie Zhao, Wenxiang Hu, and Qiufeng Yin. 2024. [WaveCoder: Widespread and versatile enhancement for code large language models by instruction tuning](#). In Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 5140–5153, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Xian Li, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason E Weston. 2024. [Self-rewarding language models](#). In Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning.
- Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah Goodman. 2022. [STar: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning](#). In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems.
- Kechi Zhang, Ge Li, Yihong Dong, Jingjing Xu, Jun Zhang, Jing Su, Yongfei Liu, and Zhi Jin. 2024a. [Codedpo: Aligning code models with self generated and verified source code](#). arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05605.
- Ziyin Zhang, Chaoyu Chen, Bingchang Liu, Cong Liao, Zi Gong, Hang Yu, Jianguo Li, and Rui Wang. 2024b. [Unifying the perspectives of nlp and software engineering: A survey on language models for code](#). Preprint, arXiv:2311.07989.
- Tianyu Zheng, Ge Zhang, Tianhao Shen, Xueling Liu, Bill Yuchen Lin, Jie Fu, Wenhui Chen, and Xiang Yue. 2024a. [OpenCodeInterpreter: Integrating code generation with execution and refinement](#). In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024, pages 12834–12859, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yaowei Zheng, Richong Zhang, Junhao Zhang, Yanhan Ye, Zheyang Luo, Zhangchi Feng, and Yongqiang Ma. 2024b. [Llamafactory: Unified efficient fine-tuning of 100+ language models](#). In Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 3: System Demonstrations), Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Li Zhong, Zilong Wang, and Jingbo Shang. 2024. [Debug like a human: A large language model debugger via verifying runtime execution step by step](#). In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024, pages 851–870, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Terry Yue Zhuo, Minh Chien Vu, Jenny Chim, Han Hu, Wenhao Yu, Ratnadira Widayarsi, Imam Nur Bani Yusuf, Haolan Zhan, Junda He, Indraneil Paul, et al. 2024. [Bigcodebench: Benchmarking code generation with diverse function calls and complex instructions](#). arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15877.

## A Elo Algorithm

Firstly, we initialize Elo score  $E^i = 1000$  for each code response  $y^i$ . Then, we iteratively update the Elo scores by using the relative scores between any two responses. Taking the response pair  $y^i$  and  $y^j$  as an example, we obtain their match results  $S^i$  and  $S^j$ :

$$S^i = \frac{\text{score}_{judge}^{ij}}{\text{score}_{judge}^{ij} + \text{score}_{judge}^{ji}}, \quad (8)$$

$$S^j = \frac{\text{score}_{judge}^{ji}}{\text{score}_{judge}^{ij} + \text{score}_{judge}^{ji}}. \quad (9)$$

Then we obtain the expected probabilities of winning  $P^{ij}$  and  $P^{ji}$  for  $y^i$  and  $y^j$ :

$$P^{ij} = \frac{1}{1 + 10^{\frac{E^j - E^i}{400}}}, \quad (10)$$

$$P^{ji} = 1 - P^{ij}. \quad (11)$$

Finally, we update the Elo score:

$$E_{new}^i = E^i + K \times (S^i - P^{ij}), \quad (12)$$

$$E_{new}^j = E^j + K \times (S^j - P^{ji}). \quad (13)$$

where  $K = 32$  is a adjustment factor. After the iteration, we obtain the Elo score for each code response and then normalize it to derive the final judge score:

$$\text{score}_{judge}^i = \frac{E_i - \min(E)}{\max(E) - \min(E)}, \quad (14)$$

where  $i \in [0, n]$  and  $\text{score}_{judge}^i \in [0, 1]$ .

## B Prompts for Judge and Critic

The prompt for pairwise LLM-as-a-Judge and LLM-as-a-Critic are shown in Figure 7 and 8.

## C Prompts for constructing SFT Dataset

We called GPT-4o three times to create the SFT dataset, with the following prompts used:

- Prompt for generating code-related concepts and programming instructions, as shown in Figure 9.
- Prompts for evolving existing instructions, as shown in Figures 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.
- For generating code responses, We directly feed the instructions to the model.

## D Prompts for Evaluation

For Humaneval (+) and MBPP (+), we use the prompts designed by OpenCodeInterpreter (Zheng et al., 2024a); for Livecodebench and Bigcodebench-hard, we use the official prompts. When conducting evaluations with execution feedback, we have designed a prompt as illustrated in Figure 19. When executing human feedback, following OpenCodeInterpreter, we generate two prompts: one for generating improvement suggestions and the other for refine code according to human feedback, as shown in Figures 21 and 20.

## E Data Leakage Analysis

We use 4-grams and 5-grams to compute the similarity between the instructions in the training set and the questions in the benchmark. And then we draw scatter plots by selecting the top-200 data points with the highest similarity from each dataset, as shown in Figure 5. The scatter plot visually illustrates the data leakage phenomenon in the dataset, primarily concentrated in the HumanEval (+) and the latter half of the MBPP (+). This makes it difficult for our model to surpass baselines on these two benchmarks. In contrast, on the leakage-free LiveCodeBench and BigCodeBench-hard benchmarks, our model can outperform all baselines.

## F Scaling Law of Iterative ACR

We study the performance trends of RefineCoder-DS-6.7B obtained using ACR and the standard SFT method as the dataset size increases. For the SFT method, we directly trained the model using four datasets of different sizes. For RefineCoder series, we employ an iterative training strategy. For example, after obtaining RefineCoder-DS-10k by fine-tuning on the 10k dataset, we apply ACR to update this 10k dataset, and then randomly sample another 10k from the data pool to form a 20k dataset. The model is fine-tuned again to obtain RefineCoder-DS-20k. The experimental results are shown in Figure 6, as the dataset size increases, our model achieves greater performance improvements compared to the SFT model on HumanEval and MBPP. Moreover, the performance gap between the two models does not show any signs of narrowing, underscoring the impressive scaling capabilities of the iterative ACR method.






Figure 5: Scatter plot of similarity scores between the datasets and four benchmarks, with average similarity scores for different datasets indicated by horizontal dashed lines. We selected the top 200 data points with the highest similarity from each dataset. Different y-axis ranges are set for better visualization.




Figure 6: Performance curves of RefineCoder obtained using iterative ACR and the standard SFT model as the dataset size increases.

### Prompt for Pairwise LLM-as-a-Judge

[System]

Please act as an impartial judge and evaluate the quality of the code responses provided by two AI assistants to the programming question displayed below (QUESTION and RESPONSE).

You will be given assistant A's answer, and assistant B's answer. Your job is to evaluate which assistant's answer is better. Avoid any position biases and ensure that the order in which the responses were presented does not influence your decision. Do not allow the length of the responses to influence your evaluation. Do not favor certain names of the assistants. Be as objective as possible. After providing a fine-grained analysis of the differences between the two code responses, output your final verdict and score by strictly following this format:

Rating A: [[1-10]]

Rating B: [[1-10]]

Better: [[A or B or tie]]

[QUESTION]

{Programmin Question}

[The start of Assistant A's RESPONSE]

{The Response of Assistant A}

[The end of Assistant A's RESPONSE]

[The start of Assistant B's RESPONSE]

{The Response of Assistant B}

[The end of Assistant B's RESPONSE]

You need to use the following output format:

<<<OUTPUT>>>

Explanation: Here is a explanation

Rating A: [[1-10]]

Rating B: [[1-10]]

Better: [[A or B or tie]]

<<</OUTPUT>>>

Figure 7: The prompt template for pairwise LLM-as-a-Judge.

### Prompt for Pairwise LLM-as-a-Critic

[System]

Given a programming instruction ([Instruction]) and two response ([Response 1], [Response 2], and [Response 2] is better than [Response 1]), please simulate human-computer interaction to generate logical and coherent two-round dialogue:

1. Round1\_from\_User: The user asks a programming question, namely [Instruction];

2. Round1\_from\_Assistant: AI assistant give response, but the response is not a perfect code solution, namely [Response 1];

3. Round2\_from\_User: The user analyzes whether the code meets the instruction and executes the code using the code interpreter. The executive results of the code interpreter and suggestions for improvement are then sent to the AI assistant, and ask AI to generate better responses.

4. Round2\_from\_Assistant: AI assistant give a better response, namely [Response 2].

**\*\*Note\*\***: You must focus on whether the code conforms to the instruction and the correctness of the code. Do not change instruction. To keep the conversation flowing and logical, you can rewrite or polish the natural language in the response, but you can't change the code in the response.

[QUESTION]

{[Programmin Question](#)}

[The start of RESPONSE 1]

{[The Response 1](#)}

[The end of RESPONSE 1]

[The start of RESPONSE 2]

{[The Response 2](#)}

[The end of RESPONSE 2]

[OUTPUT]

You need to use the following output format:

<<<OUTPUT>>>

Round1\_from\_User:

Round1\_from\_Assistant:

Round2\_from\_User:

Round2\_from\_Assistant:

<<</OUTPUT>>>

Figure 8: The prompt template for pairwise LLM-as-a-Critic.

### Prompt for Generating Concepts and Instructions

Extract key programming concepts from a given code snippet collected from the open source repositories and gain inspiration to create a practical, diverse and high-quality code instruction.

```
## Example 1
### Code Snippet
isprime = n >= 2 and 1 or 0
for prime in prime_list:      # Check for factors with all primes
    if prime * prime > n: break # ... up to sqrt(n)
    if not n % prime:
        isprime = 0
        break
if isprime: prime_dict[n] = 1   # Maintain a dictionary for fast lookup
return isprime
def prime(x):
    """ Returns the xth prime """
    lastn = prime_list[-1]
    while len(prime_list) <= x: # Keep working until we've got the xth prime
        lastn = lastn + 1      # Check the next number

### Response
[Concepts]
prime number memoization, n-th prime calculation, efficiency in prime checks

[Instruction]
Implement a Python class with a method `find_nth_prime_memoized(n)` that returns the nth prime number, where n is a positive integer. Utilize memoization to store already found prime numbers in a list within the class to avoid recalculating primes for multiple method calls. Ensure the method efficiently updates and references this list to find new primes as needed. Additionally, enhance performance by avoiding unnecessary prime checks.

## Example 2
### Code Snippet
{seed}

### Response
```

Figure 9: The prompt template for generating code-related concepts and instructions.

### Prompt for Instruction Evolution: Addition

Please increase the difficulty of the given programming test question a bit.  
You can increase the difficulty using, but not limited to, the following methods:  
If the original problem can be solved with only a few logical steps, please add more reasoning steps.

```
#Given Prompt#:
{{ prompt }}

#Created Prompt#:
```

Figure 10: The prompt template for Addition evolution.

### Prompt for Instruction Evolution: Breath

I want you act as a Prompt Creator. Your goal is to draw inspiration from the #Given Prompt# to create a brand new prompt.  
This new prompt should belong to the same domain as the #Given Prompt# but be even more rare. The LENGTH and difficulty level of the #Created Prompt# should be similar to that of the #Given Prompt#.  
The #Created Prompt# must be reasonable and must be understood and responded by humans. '#Given Prompt#', '#Created Prompt#', 'given prompt' and 'created prompt' are not allowed to appear in #Created Prompt#.

```
#Given Prompt#:
{{ prompt }}

#Created Prompt#:
```

Figure 11: The prompt template for Breath evolution.



### Prompt for Instruction Evolution: Complexity

Please increase the difficulty of the given programming test question a bit.  
You can increase the difficulty using, but not limited to, the following methods:  
Propose higher time or space complexity requirements, but please refrain from doing so frequently.

#Given Prompt#:  
{{prompt}}

#Created Prompt#:

Figure 12: The prompt template for Complexity evolution.

### Prompt for Instruction Evolution: Concretizing

I want you act as a Prompt Rewriter. Your objective is to rewrite a given prompt into a more complex version to make those famous AI systems (e.g., ChatGPT and GPT4) a bit harder to handle. But the rewritten prompt must be reasonable and must be understood and responded by humans.

Your rewriting cannot omit the non-text parts such as the table and code in #Given Prompt#. Also, please do not omit the input in #Given Prompt#. You SHOULD complicate the given prompt using the following method: Please replace general concepts with more specific concepts. or You should try your best not to make the #Rewritten Prompt# become verbose, #Rewritten Prompt# can only add 10 to 20 words into #Given Prompt#. '#Given Prompt#', '#Rewritten Prompt#', 'given prompt' and 'rewritten prompt' are not allowed to appear in #Rewritten Prompt#

#Given Prompt#:  
{{prompt}}

#Rewritten Prompt#:

Figure 13: The prompt template for Concretizing evolution.

### Prompt for Instruction Evolution: Deepening

I want you act as a Prompt Rewriter.

Your objective is to rewrite a given prompt into a more complex version to make those famous AI systems (e.g., ChatGPT and GPT4) a bit harder to handle.

But the rewritten prompt must be reasonable and must be understood and responded by humans.

Your rewriting cannot omit the non-text parts such as the table and code in #Given Prompt#.

Also, please do not omit the input in #Given Prompt#.

You SHOULD complicate the given prompt using the following method: If #Given Prompt# contains inquiries about certain issues, the depth and breadth of the inquiry can be increased. or You should try your best not to make the #Rewritten Prompt# become verbose, #Rewritten Prompt# can only add 10 to 20 words into #Given Prompt#. '#Given Prompt#', '#Rewritten Prompt#', 'given prompt' and 'rewritten prompt' are not allowed to appear in #Rewritten Prompt#

#Given Prompt#:  
{{prompt}}

#Rewritten Prompt#:

Figure 14: The prompt template for Deepening evolution.

### Prompt for Instruction Evolution: Diversion

Please increase the difficulty of the given programming test question a bit.

You can increase the difficulty using, but not limited to, the following methods:

Add new constraints and requirements to the original problem, adding approximately 10 additional words.

#Given Prompt#:  
{{ prompt }}

#Created Prompt#:

Figure 15: The prompt template for Diversion evolution.

### Prompt for Instruction Evolution: Increase

Please increase the difficulty of the given programming test question a bit.  
You can increase the difficulty using, but not limited to, the following methods:  
Replace a commonly used requirement in the programming task with a less common and more specific one.

#Given Prompt#:  
{{ prompt }}

#Created Prompt#:

Figure 16: The prompt template for Increase evolution.

### Prompt for Instruction Evolution: Misdirection

Please increase the difficulty of the given programming test question a bit.  
You can increase the difficulty using, but not limited to, the following methods:  
Provide a piece of erroneous code as a reference to increase misdirection.

#Given Prompt#:  
{{ prompt }}

#Created Prompt#:

Figure 17: The prompt template for Misdirection evolution.

### Prompt for Instruction Evolution: Reasoning

I want you act as a Prompt Rewriter. Your objective is to rewrite a given prompt into a more complex version to make those famous AI systems (e.g., ChatGPT and GPT4) a bit harder to handle. But the rewritten prompt must be reasonable and must be understood and responded by humans.

Your rewriting cannot omit the non-text parts such as the table and code in #Given Prompt#.

Also, please do not omit the input in #Given Prompt#. You SHOULD complicate the given prompt using the following method: If #Given Prompt# can be solved with just a few simple thinking processes, you can rewrite it to explicitly request multiple-step reasoning. You should try your best not to make the #Rewritten Prompt# become verbose, #Rewritten Prompt# can only add 10 to 20 words into #Given Prompt#. '#Given Prompt#', '#Rewritten Prompt#', 'given prompt' and 'rewritten prompt' are not allowed to appear in #Rewritten Prompt#

#Given Prompt#:  
{{ prompt }}

#Rewritten Prompt#:

Figure 18: The prompt template for Reason evolution.

### Prompt for Evaluation with Feedback: Execution Feedback

Given a programming instruction and responding python code solution wrapped by ``` . However, this code has bugs and does not pass all test cases. Please fix the bugs and return a perfect code in one code block.

@@ Programming Instruction:  
{}

@@ Imperfect Code Solution:  
```python  
{}  
```

@@ Failed Test Cases:  
{}

Return a perfect code in one code block. This code block should be in the following format:

```
```python  
# Your codes here  
```
```

Figure 19: The prompt template for Execution Feedback.

### Prompt for Evaluation with Feedback: Human Feedback

Given a programming instruction and responding python code solution wrapped by `````. However, this code has bugs and does not pass all test cases. Please fix the bugs according to the improvement suggestions and return a perfect code.

@@ Programming Instruction:

```
{}
```

@@ Imperfect Code Solution:

```
```python
```

```
{}
```

```
```
```

@@ Improvements Suggestions:

```
{}
```

Return a perfect code in one code block. This code block should be in the following format:

```
```python
```

```
# Your codes here
```

```
```
```

Figure 20: The prompt template for Human Feedback.

### Prompt for Evaluation with Feedback: Generating Suggestions

You are tasked with providing guidance to a programmer who has drafted a code for a programming problem. Your role is to mimic human-like responses and offer suggestions for modifying the code based on the observed execution results.

You should refrain from directly writing code.

Begin by thoroughly examining the existing code and its functionality.

Analyze the @@Execution Result obtained from running the @@Existing Code. Identify any errors, unexpected behavior, or deviations from the expected output.

Consider potential edge cases, optimization opportunities, or alternative approaches based on insights from the @@Execution Result.

Offer guidance in a clear and understandable manner, explaining the rationale behind each suggestion.

Refrain from providing actual code solutions, but instead focus on conceptual modifications or strategies.

Provide constructive feedback to help the programmer improve their coding skills.

Remember, your role is to simulate human-like guidance and expertise in programming without directly implementing solutions.

Please respond in no more than three sentences.

@@Problem

```
{}
```

@@Existing Code

```
{}
```

@@Execution Result

```
{}
```

@@Guidance

Figure 21: The prompt template for generating improvement suggestions.