
Unveiling the Impact of Coding Data Instruction Fine-Tuning on Large Language Models Reasoning

Xinlu Zhang^{1*}, Zhiyu Zoey Chen², Xi Ye³, Xianjun Yang¹, Lichang Chen⁴,
William Yang Wang¹, Linda Ruth Petzold¹

¹University of California, Santa Barbara

²The University of Texas at Dallas

³The University of Texas at Austin

⁴University of Maryland, College Park

Abstract

Instruction Fine-Tuning (IFT) significantly enhances the zero-shot capabilities of pretrained Large Language Models (LLMs). While coding data is known to boost reasoning abilities during LLM pretraining, its role in activating internal reasoning capacities during IFT remains understudied. This paper investigates a key question: *How does coding data impact LLMs' reasoning capacities during the IFT stage?* To explore this, we thoroughly examine the impact of coding data across different coding data proportions, model families, sizes, and reasoning domains, from various perspectives. Specifically, we create three IFT datasets with increasing coding data proportions, fine-tune six LLM backbones across different families and scales on these datasets, evaluate the tuned models' performance across twelve tasks in three reasoning domains, and analyze the outcomes from three broad-to-granular perspectives: overall, domain-level, and task-specific. Our holistic analysis provides valuable insights in each perspective. First, coding data tuning enhances the overall reasoning capabilities of LLMs across different model families and scales. Moreover, the effect of coding data varies among different domains but shows consistent trends across model families and scales within each domain. Additionally, coding data generally yields comparable task-specific benefits across different model families, with the optimal coding data proportions in IFT datasets being task-specific.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have significantly advanced in generalization across various tasks, facilitated by training on diverse text data sources [Touvron et al., 2023a,b, Brown et al., 2020, Jiang et al., 2023, Albalak et al., 2022]. Instruction-finetuning (IFT) enhances LLMs by tuning them on instruction-response pairs to elicit intrinsic abilities in a zero-shot manner [Ouyang et al., 2022, Longpre et al., 2023, Wei et al., 2022a, Li et al., 2024], enabling them to meet various user intents [OpenAI, 2022, 2023, Anthropic, 2023]. Previous studies [Peng et al., 2023, Taori et al., 2023, Xu et al., 2023, Chiang et al., 2023] have focused on improving IFT dataset diversity to better align the LLM with human needs, but the impact of specific data types during IFT remains underexplored.

Coding data, characterized by its logical consistency and reduced ambiguity compared to natural text, has empirically been shown to enhance LLM reasoning capabilities from multiple perspectives during the pretraining stage [Liang et al., 2023, Fu and Khot, 2022, Ma et al., 2023, Guo et al., 2024]. This enhancement enables LLMs to acquire advanced intrinsic knowledge which lays a foundation for complex reasoning across a variety of real-world applications, including text summarization

*Corresponding Author: xinluzhang@ucsb.edu




Figure 1: **Pipeline Overview.** The process utilizes ShareGPT data as a starting point. **1. Data Category Classification:** Using ChatGPT to classify code instances within ShareGPT to obtain a code-centric IFT dataset. **2. IFT Data Mixture:** Constructing three IFT mixture datasets with increasing proportions of coding data. **3. Instruction Finetuning:** Fine-tuning LLMs from six families across various scales with these three IFT datasets, respectively. **4. Evaluation:** Evaluating the fine-tuned models’ reasoning capacities across three domains. **5. Analysis:** Conducting a comprehensive analysis from three broad-to-granular perspectives.

[Yang et al., 2023], numerical problem solving [Luo et al., 2023a, Yue et al., 2023], and knowledge-intensive tasks [Chen et al., 2024, Dowling and Lucey, 2023, Choi et al., 2021]. However, at the IFT stage, previous research primarily indicates that coding data tuning improves LLMs’ coding-related in-domain reasoning performance [Yuan et al., 2023, Luo et al., 2023b, Ma et al., 2023]. The impact of coding data on **out-of-domain general reasoning capabilities** remains underexplored, with complexity arising from variations in coding data proportions within the tuning data, model backbones, and reasoning task types [Wei et al., 2022b, Ma et al., 2023, Liang et al., 2023]. Therefore, we raise a natural question: *How does coding data impact LLMs’ reasoning capacities during the IFT stage?*

To thoroughly answer this research question, we propose an analysis pipeline aimed at comprehensively investigating the impact of coding data on the reasoning capacities of LLMs during IFT from various analysis perspectives, considering different coding data proportions, model families and scales, and reasoning domains. To initiate this process, we construct IFT datasets using the ShareGPT [Sharegpt, 2023] as the dataset source. By utilizing ChatGPT [OpenAI, 2022] as a classifier, we categorize instruction-response pairs involving actual coding within ShareGPT, resulting in a code-centric dataset. We then create IFT datasets by randomly selecting instances from this dataset and mixing them with instances from another dataset containing solely general textual instruction-response pairs, varying the coding data proportions. To consider the effect of coding data proportions, *three IFT datasets with increasing proportions of coding data: 0%, 50%, and 100%*, are obtained, while ensuring consistent dataset sizes. For a holistic assessment, we fine-tune *six base models from different families and of varying scales*—Llama-1 [Touvron et al., 2023a], Llama-2 [Touvron et al., 2023b], Llama-3 [AI@Meta, 2024], Mistral [Jiang et al., 2023], Qwen-1.5 [Bai et al., 2023], and Gemma [Team et al., 2024] on these datasets, and evaluate the performance of the tuned models across *three distinct groups of reasoning tasks*: symbolic, logical, and arithmetic. Finally, to comprehensively study the influence of coding data, we analyze results from *three broad-to-granular perspectives*: overall effectiveness, domain-level influence, and task-specific performance, as shown in Figure 1.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to thoroughly analyze the influence of coding data on the reasoning capacities of LLMs at the IFT stage from broad-to-granular perspectives, considering various coding data proportions, model families and scales, and reasoning types. We obtain significant insights within each analysis perspective and summarize the main findings.

Overall effectiveness. A consistent and gradual enhancement in overall performance is observed across different model families and scales as the proportion of coding data used for tuning increases. The extent of improvements attained with coding data tuning varies among different model backbones. The greatest overall improvement, up to a 10.3 percentage points absolute gain, is achieved when using Mistral-7B as the base model, compared to solely tuning with the natural textual IFT dataset. Conversely, Llama-3 yields a more modest absolute gain of 1.5 percentage points. Notably, further analysis of the models’ responses reveals that coding data tuning successfully enhances overall reasoning capacities for problem-solving, extending beyond in-domain programming skills.

Domain-level influence. The influence of coding data varies on different reasoning abilities. We note a marked improvement in the symbolic domain, which encompasses foundational reasoning skills. Conversely, in arithmetic reasoning, which involves real-world math problems with diverse intentions, performance gaps emerge when compared to models tuned with a textual dataset covering a wide range of real-world user needs. Additionally, we reveal consistent performance trends across different model backbones and sizes within each reasoning domain, showing the potential for transferability of the effects of coding data across these variations at the IFT stage. Further response analysis indicates that models tuned with coding data can adeptly apply appropriate skills for solving questions tailored to different domain properties.

Task-specific performance. Coding data typically yields comparable task-specific benefits across different model families, with a similar number of tasks showing improvement in two out of three reasoning domains. However, obtaining optimizing strategies for mixing coding and natural textual data presents a challenge. While the majority of optimal coding data proportions for improving task performance remain consistent across model families, there is no single coding data proportion setting that consistently enhances task-specific reasoning abilities better than another.

2 Related Work

IFT. IFT has proven effective in enhancing pretrained language models (LLMs) for zero-shot tasks [Ouyang et al., 2022, Longpre et al., 2023, Wei et al., 2022a]. Models like FLAN, Flan-T5, and T0 are fine-tuned on IFT datasets from NLP benchmarks, improving generalization but failing to fully align with real-world user intentions due to simpler instructions [Wei et al., 2022a, Chung et al., 2022, Sanh et al., 2022]. In contrast, Ouyang et al. [2022] collected a diverse dataset of real-world instructions and responses to train InstructGPT, showing promising results in aligning with actual user needs. Open-source models [Taori et al., 2023, Xu et al., 2023, Chiang et al., 2023, Peng et al., 2023, Zhang et al., 2024] fine-tuned on IFT datasets derived from strong teacher models have also shown that improving IFT data diversity and quality enhances alignment with complex user intents [Chen et al., 2023]. However, the impact of different IFT data types on LLM effectiveness is underexplored. We investigate the effect of coding data, known for its logical clarity and structure, on LLM reasoning capacities, which are crucial for addressing complex real-world intents.

Code in LLMs. Code has become integral to building LLMs [Touvron et al., 2023a,b, OpenAI, 2023, 2022], enhancing performance in domains like programming [Ma et al., 2023], complex reasoning [Liang et al., 2023, Fu and Khot, 2022], and structural knowledge capture [Wang et al., 2023, Madaan et al., 2022]. Ma et al. [2023] shows that LLMs pretrained with coding data outperform those trained solely with natural language in both code-related and general tasks. Liang et al. [2023] demonstrates that OpenAI’s Codex, further trained on code, excels in complex mathematical reasoning tasks. Madaan et al. [2022] shows that coding data pretraining enables LLMs to rival or exceed their natural language counterparts in structural reasoning tasks. During IFT, Ma et al. [2023] reveals that coding data enhances in-domain abilities, such as code generation and question-answering. Despite its importance, systematic studies of the impact of coding data on out-of-domain reasoning are lacking. To bridge this gap, we fine-tune pretrained LLMs with increased coding data across different families and scales, and evaluate their performance on various reasoning tasks.

Reasoning in LLMs. Reasoning involves logically analyzing a subject, using evidence and prior knowledge to reach conclusions [Wason and Johnson-Laird, 1972, Wason, 1968, McHugh and Way, 2018]. It has been seen as one of LLMs’ emergent behaviors, shown as models are large enough

[Wei et al., 2022c,b]. Although improving models’ reasoning capacities shows promising results in different applications [Li et al., 2022, Zhang et al., 2023], comprehensively evaluating these capacities remains challenging due to their complex nature, requiring different fine-grained abilities within different subdomains [Wei et al., 2022b, Ma et al., 2023, Liang et al., 2023, Qiu et al., 2023, Yue et al., 2023]. Our work aims to thoroughly evaluate models across the subdomains of symbolic, logical, and arithmetic reasoning to enhance our understanding of LLMs’ reasoning capabilities at the IFT stage.

3 Experimental Setting

3.1 IFT data construction

We use ShareGPT [Sharegpt, 2023], which collects real-world user inquiries, as our data source. After deduplication and extraction of the initial round of Human-AI conversations, we obtain a dataset of 45,742 instances. Using GPT-3.5-turbo [OpenAI, 2022], we categorize these conversations into three groups: Code, Math, and Others. Conversations involving coding data are classified as Code, those related to mathematical concepts and problems as Math, and all other general natural language texts as Others. The categorization results in 10,196 Code, 1,481 Math, and 34,065 Others instances. We exclude the Math category to prevent its potential influence on the model’s reasoning capabilities during tuning. For further experimentation, we select a random subset from the Others category, termed General, equal in size to the Code category, to facilitate fair analysis. Additionally, we establish a Half-half setting by mixing equal portions of data from the Code and General categories. This setup produces three equal-size IFT datasets: General, Half-half, and Code, containing 0%, 50%, and 100% coding data, respectively. This arrangement enables us to explore how increasing the proportion of coding data impacts LLMs’ reasoning abilities in the IFT stage. The detailed categorization prompts for ShareGPT and coding data are in Table 5 and Table 6 in Appendix A.1, and the corresponding code category diversity analysis is in Appendix A.2.

3.2 Task Description

To thoroughly assess the models’ reasoning capabilities, we evaluate them across twelve generative tasks, spanning three distinct types of reasoning: symbolic, logical, and arithmetic, shown in Table 1. **Symbolic:** We focus on four tasks [Wei et al., 2022b]: (1) First Letter Concatenation, (2) Last Letter Concatenation, (3) Reverse List, and (4) Coin Flip. **Logical:** We utilize four tasks, requiring strong logical ability, for evaluation: (1) Cluttr [Sinha et al., 2019], (2) List Functions [Rule, 2020], (3) Babi-Induction and (4) Babi-Deduction [Weston et al., 2015]. **Arithmetic:** Four arithmetic benchmarks are involved to comprehensive evaluating the mathematics world problem-solving ability (1) GSM8K [Cobbe et al., 2021], (2) SVAMP [Patel et al., 2021], (3) ASDiv [Miao et al., 2020], and (4) MAWPS [Koncel-Kedziorski et al., 2016]. For symbolic reasoning, we generate synthetic datasets following Fortes [2023]. We ensure a balanced representation of difficulty levels for each task. For example, we generate 500 instances for names containing 2 to 4 words in letter concatenation tasks. For other tasks, we evaluate the models with the test sets for each task when publicly available. Otherwise, we use the development sets instead. We defer detailed information on the reasoning domain selection and synthetic datasets generation to the Appendix A.3.

Table 1: Task data statistics.

Symbolic				
Task	First Letter	Last Letter	Reverse List	Coin Flip
No. instances	1500	1500	1000	600
Logic				
Task	List Functions	Cluttr	Babi- Inductive	Babi-Deductive
No. instances	1000	2000	1000	1000
Arithmetic				
Task	GSM8K	SVAMP	MAWPS	ASDIV
No. instances	1319	1000	2065	2167

3.3 Instruction Fine-tuned LLMs

To systematically assess the impact of coding data on LLMs during the IFT stage, we conduct experiments with six distinct LLM families: Llama-1 [Touvron et al., 2023a], Llama-2 [Touvron et al., 2023b], Llama-3 [AI@Meta, 2024], Mistral-v0.1 [Jiang et al., 2023], Qwen-1.5 [Bai et al., 2023], and Gemma [Team et al., 2024]. Each model is fine-tuned on the three uniquely composed IFT datasets—General, Half-half, and Code, respectively. Each fine-tuned model is evaluated on the twelve reasoning tasks in three reasoning domains, which require varying reasoning abilities. The hyperparameter settings of each model are available in the Appendix A.4.

3.4 Evaluation Setup

Our evaluation operates in a *zero-shot* setting, where models are prompted to generate responses to corresponding questions without additional context, minimizing external influences. We standardize experimental conditions by limiting the maximum token length to 1024 and employing greedy decoding for all model outputs. Given the variability in output styles, we utilize GPT-3.5-turbo

Table 2: **Overall reasoning comparison of models tuned on General, Half-half, and Code with increasing coding data proportion, across different families.** Results show average scores (%) across 12 reasoning tasks. The **Best** setting per model family is in bold. Δ and η indicate absolute and relative gains, respectively, between the best-performing coding data setting and General.

Coding data prop.(%)	Llama-1-7B	Llama-2-7B	Llama-3-8B	Mistral-7B-v0.1	Qwen-1.5-7B	Gemma-7B
General (0%)	23.2	26.7	41.4	42.0	42.2	22.3
Half-half (50%)	25.0	29.2	42.9	43.9	44.9	23.7
Code (100%)	27.9	30.6	42.6	52.3	47.4	30.0
Δ	+4.6	+3.9	+1.5	+10.3	+ 5.5	+ 7.7
η	+20.0%	+14.5%	+3.6%	+24.6%	+13.0%	+34.7%




Figure 2: **Overall comparison across different model scales.** Results show the overall performance of models using Llama-1 and Llama-2 with 7B and 13B parameters as backbones.

Figure 3: **Overall performance comparison across different coding data percentages.**

[OpenAI, 2022] as an extractor to parse predictions from the generated text. These predictions are subsequently compared to the ground truth using accuracy (%) as the evaluation metric. The answer extraction prompt is provided in Table 7 of the Appendix.

4 Experimental Results

4.1 Results on Overall Performance

We first compare the average results of 12 reasoning tasks between models tuned with different proportions of coding data across 6 different LLM families. Results are shown in Table 2.

Coding data successfully enhances LLM reasoning capacities in the IFT stage. Overall, we observed a gradual improvement in average accuracy as the proportion of coding data increased during the IFT stage. These consistent gains across different model families clearly demonstrate the benefits of the specialized knowledge that coding data provides, effectively enhancing the reasoning capabilities of language models. Notably, for using Mistral-7B-v0.1 as the base model, tuning with the 100% coding data dataset, Code, achieves a significant absolute performance gain of 10.3 compared to tuning with pure natural text datasets, General. This underscores that datasets rich in code are crucial for enhancing the advanced reasoning abilities of LLMs.

The improvements brought by coding data are divergent across model families. Although different model families show positive effects on tuning with coding data in the IFT stage, the improvements are varied in different model families. For example, the Mistral-7B-v0.1 and Gemma-7B exhibit substantial benefits, achieving 24.6% and 34.7% relative gains, respectively, when fine-tuning with Code compared to General. In contrast, the Llama-3-8B model shows a more modest improvement, with a 3.6% relative gain under similar conditions. This disparity could be due to differences in the pretraining stage of LLMs, during which models primarily acquire intrinsic knowledge, rather than the IFT stage [Zhou et al., 2023, Albalak et al., 2024].

Consistent gain is obtained by coding data as the LLM scales up. To examine the impact of coding data on increasing LLM size, we tune Llama-1 and Llama-2 models with 7B and 13B parameters under the three coding proportion settings. The results are in Figure 2.

Tuning with coding data consistently enhances the overall reasoning capacities of LLMs across different model families as we scale up the model size to 13B. This reaffirms the conclusion drawn

from smaller model comparisons: coding data can effectively improve LLMs’ reasoning capacities during the IFT stage, helping LLMs align better with user needs and handle complex logical intents. Additionally, the improvement trends brought by coding data are similar between 13B models and their corresponding 7B models. These results further emphasize the potential of using coding data to improve the performance of instruction fine-tuned models on reasoning tasks for larger models.

Tuning with more coding data can better improve the overall reasoning capacities of LLMs.

To emphasize the impact of coding data proportions on overall reasoning capacities, we introduce another IFT dataset with 25% coding and 75% natural text, tune Llama-1 and Llama-2 models (7B and 13B parameters) on it, and evaluate each model on all reasoning tasks. Performance trends across 0%, 25%, 50%, and 100% coding data are shown in Figure 3.

Across different model families and scales, the overall trend of gradual improvement persists after introducing the new 25% coding data setting, reinforcing the findings from Table 4.1 that coding data plays a key role in evoking the reasoning capabilities of pretrained LLMs. We also observe that performance at 50% coding data is not always better than at 25%, and vice versa, likely due to variance among different backbones.

Coding data tuning enhances reasoning in natural text responses.

To investigate if code data tuning helps solve these reasoning tasks by merely relying on producing better code, we examine the presence of code in each response under the condition where the model tuned on Code corrects the wrong outcomes of the model tuned on General. We utilize GPT-3.5-turbo to detect the presence of code in responses and count the number of different answer format transitions (e.g., General outputs text and Code outputs code). The results with Llama-1-13B and Llama-2-13B as backbone are shown in Table 3. The prompt for determining the response format is in Table 8 in the Appendix.

Table 3: **Response format transition statistics.** Count of instances where the General-tuned model provides incorrect answers in either text or code format (upper header) and the Code-tuned model corrects them (lower header), using Llama-1-13B and Llama-2-13B backbones.

General Output	text		code		total
	text	code	text	code	
Code Output					
Llama-1	1778	359	83	67	2287
Llama-2	2591	224	63	49	2927

The Code-tuned model *primarily uses pure text responses* to correct answers where the General-tuned model is wrong across both model families instead of relying solely on programming skills. Specifically, Code-tuned models successfully resolve $\frac{1778+83}{2287} = 81.4\%$ of questions in Llama-1 and $\frac{2591+63}{2927} = 90.7\%$ of questions in Llama-2 using natural text responses. Additionally, Code-tuned models do not always use the same answer format as the General-tuned model. They automatically choose different formats to obtain correct answers in $\frac{359+83}{2287} = 19.3\%$ and $\frac{224+63}{2927} = 9.8\%$ of cases using Llama-1 and Llama-2, respectively. These results further illustrate that tuning with coding data successfully elicits logical thinking in LLMs beyond just in-domain skills, enabling them to answer complex questions in proper formats and improve reasoning task performance.

4.2 Results of Different Reasoning Domains

Previous discussions have focused on overall performance across reasoning tasks, but distinct domains require specific skills. For example, symbolic reasoning tasks like letter concatenation need tokenization skills, which could directly benefit from coding data tuning. In contrast, logical reasoning requires multi-hop contextual analysis, and arithmetic tasks need enhanced quantitative reasoning [Yue et al., 2023]. To pinpoint the capabilities and limitations of coding data tuning for diverse reasoning domains, we analyze the per-domain performance using Llama-1 [Touvron et al., 2023a] and Llama-2 [Touvron et al., 2023b] across various model sizes. Average results across four datasets per domain are shown in Figure 4.

Coding data affects each reasoning ability differently. We observe distinct performance patterns in symbolic, logical, and arithmetic reasoning tasks. For **symbolic reasoning** in Figure 4 (a), the performance improvement from General to Code tuning is significant and steadily increases. This highlights the effectiveness of code-specific data tuning in enhancing the models’ foundational reasoning ability. In **logical reasoning** tasks shown in Figure 4 (b), while all models benefit from more coding data in the IFT dataset, the gains from increasing coding data from 50% to 100% are minor compared to the jump from 0% to 50%. This diminishing return indicates that while coding data enhances reasoning skills, its utility is limited for tasks requiring advanced cognitive functions. For **Arithmetic reasoning** (Figure 4 (c)): The best performance is seen with either General or Half-half, likely due to the need for models to understand diverse intentions in real-world math




Figure 4: **Results comparison under each reasoning domain across different model families.**

problems [Cobbe et al., 2021]. Tuning with a diverse IFT dataset better meets these needs than using coding data alone. Despite this, the performance of Code-tuned models remains appealing given the limited data diversity, emphasizing the importance of incorporating coding data during IFT.

Within each reasoning domain, models demonstrate similar performance trends. We find that the performance trend within each reasoning domain tends to be consistent across different model families, despite variations in architecture and pretraining datasets. This alignment of performance trajectories across various families suggests that the underlying factors to elicit pretrained models’ capabilities could be similar within each domain. Moreover, our analysis reveals that the trend of larger models parallels that of their smaller counterparts within the same family. This uniformity suggests that the scalability factor does not disrupt the effect of coding data during the IFT stage. These two findings underscore the potential for transferability of coding data’s effect across various LLM backbones and scales at the fine-tuning stage.

Table 4: **Proportions (%) of response transitions across reasoning domains.** Transition types from General-tuned to Code-tuned models, represented as ‘General (text/code) → Code (text/code)’, across different reasoning domains for Llama-1-13B and Llama-2-13B.

	Llama-1				Llama-2			
	text → text	text → code	code → text	code → code	text → text	text → code	code → text	code → code
Symbolic	58.9	30.4	4.8	5.9	85.5	10.1	1.1	3.3
Logic	93.2	4.8	0.9	1.1	96.4	3.0	0.5	0.1
Arithmetic	88.0	6.5	4.9	0.6	85.1	8.6	0.8	5.5

Code-tuned models prefer enhancing reasoning with pure text when the General-tuned models output pure text, but preferences diverge across domains when they output coding. We further investigated response transitions where the Code-tuned model corrects errors from the General-tuned model. Table 4 shows the proportions of transition types from General to Code for each domain, using Llama-1-13B and Llama-2-13B as backbones.

We find that for both model families, the proportions of ‘text → text’ transitions are consistently and significantly higher than those of ‘text → code’ across different domains. This reinforces the finding in section 4.1 that coding data tuning enhances reasoning task performances by truly improving reasoning capacities rather than merely using in-domain programming skills. Conversely, when General-tuned models output wrong answers involving coding data, Code-tuned models do not consistently prefer one format over the other. ‘code → text’ is preferred in 2 out of 6 settings and ‘code → code’ is preferred in 4. These results demonstrate that Code-tuned models can automatically apply appropriate skills to successfully answer questions based on domain properties.

4.3 Task-specific Reasoning Capabilities Analysis

The previous subsection highlights domain-level similarities and divergences, which may become more complex at the task level. To investigate this, we delve into each dataset to explore how coding




Figure 5: **Results comparison for each dataset across on (a) Llama-1-13B and (b) Llama-2-13B.** The best results of each dataset are highlighted with a black frame.

data impacts task-specific reasoning capabilities in different LLM families at the IFT stage. Results for models tuned using Llama-1-13B and Llama-2-13B backbones are presented in Figure 5.

Coding data benefits task-specific abilities in Llama-1 and Llama-2 comparatively in symbolic and logic reasoning, but diverges in arithmetic. We observe that models fine-tuned on datasets incorporating coding elements (Half-half and Code) demonstrate similar levels of superiority on task-specific abilities across different model families in symbolic and logic reasoning. Specifically, in symbolic tasks, these models either outperform or match their counterparts, General, in all four tasks on the Llama-1 and three out of four tasks on the Llama-2, respectively. For logical reasoning, the inclusion of coding data benefits all tasks in both model families. However, the impact of coding data on arithmetic reasoning presents more variation. In the Llama-1, the incorporation of coding data yields better or comparable results across all tasks. Conversely, this benefit is observed in 2 tasks, SVAMP and ASDIV, in the Llama-2. These results show that the benefits of coding data on different LLM backbones share more similarities than differences, and these differences emerge based on the nature of the tasks within each subdomain.

The optimal proportion and impact of code varies across tasks. We dig into tasks that are benefited by coding data in each model family, revealing that no single coding data proportion setting consistently enhances task-specific reasoning abilities better than another. Specifically, for Llama-1, eight tasks with the Half-half achieve or are on par with the best performance, while four tasks excel with the Code setting. For Llama-2, the Half-half and Code configurations perform best in five and four tasks, respectively. Notably, although models tuned with Code don’t surpass those tuned with Half-half in task quantity across both families, they often deliver greater performance improvements in the tasks where Code is most advantageous. For example, in the Llama-1 model, the Code setting shows a remarkable absolute gain of up to 16.7 in the Babi-Inductive task, far exceeding the 3.5 gain observed in the Babi-Deductive task where the Half-half setting is most effective. Similarly, in the Llama-2 model, when the Code setting is optimal, it achieves an impressive absolute gain of up to 25.6 in the First Letter task, which is considerably higher than the 7.0 achieved with the Half-half setting in the Babi-Deductive. These findings highlight the importance of strategically considering code proportions to maximize model effectiveness for specific goals at the IFT stage.

The majority of optimal coding data proportions are consistent across model families. When investigating tasks that benefit from coding data in both model families, we find that the optimal strategies for most tasks are consistent. Specifically, out of 8 tasks analyzed, 5 exhibit the same optimal coding data proportions across model families, while 3 require different strategies. This suggests that the proportion of coding data in IFT datasets can similarly enhance task-specific

<p>Symbolic Question: Reverse the sequence "chewing gum, magazine".</p> <p>General-only: To reverse the order of the words in the given sequence "chewing gum, magazine", we need to follow these steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the first word: "chewing". 2. Insert a comma after the first word. 3. Repeat step 1 for the second word: "gum, magazine". 4. Insert a comma after the second word. 5. Combine the two words into a single string: "gum, magazine". 6. Return the final string: "gum, magazine". Thus, the final answer in a string format with each word separated by a comma is: "gum, magazine". <p>Code-only: To reverse the sequence "chewing gum, magazine", we can use the following steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initialize a string variable to store the final answer. 2. Split the input string into a list of words using the comma as a delimiter. 3. Reverse the order of the words in the list using the built-in <code>reversed()</code> function. 4. Join the reversed words back into a string using commas as delimiters. Here's the code to implement this algorithm: <pre>python input_str = "chewing gum, magazine" final_str = ", ".join(reversed(input_str.split(","))) print(final_str) </pre> <p>Output: magazine, chewing gum</p>	<p>Arithmetic Question: Ryan plants 2 flowers a day in his garden. After 15 days, how many flowers does he have if 5 did not grow?</p> <p>General-only:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given that Ryan plants 2 flowers a day, we can represent this as a daily growth pattern as follows: <pre> Day Flowers --- --- 1 2 2 2 15 5 Total = 5 flowers that have grown after 15 days. </pre> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. However, we are told that 5 flowers did not grow. Therefore, we need to subtract the daily growth pattern from day 1-14 from the total pattern. <pre> Day Flowers --- --- 1 2 2 2 9 5 10 0 14 0 Total = 0 flowers that have grown after 15 days. </pre> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Therefore, the final answer is 0 flowers that have grown after 15 days. <p>Code-only: To answer this question, we need to set up an equation that represents the number of flowers Ryan has after 15 days. We know that at the end of the 15th day, Ryan has planted a total of $2 \times 15 = 30$ flowers. However, 5 of these flowers did not grow, so he only has 25 flowers left in his garden.</p> <pre> Initially, x = 25 x + 25 = 30 x + 25 - 5 = 30 - 5 = 30 - x x = 30 - 5 = 25 </pre>
<p>Logic Question: Julius is a lion. Julius is yellow. Brian is a rhino. Brian is gray. Bernhard is a swan. Bernhard is green. Greg is a lion. Lily is a rhino. Greg is white. What color is Lily?</p> <p>General-only: It is not possible for me to accurately determine the color of Lily based solely on the provided information. The description of Julius being "yellow" and Bernhard being "green" suggests that the color of an animal is linked to its name, but there is no mention of a similar pattern for Lily or any other animal. Without further information, it is not possible to make a logical inference about the color of Lily or any other animal.</p> <p>Code-only: Lily is a rhino, and the only description we have for a rhino is that it is gray. Therefore, I can conclude that Lily is also gray.</p>	

Figure 6: **Case study on each reasoning domain (not cherry-picked).** We underline the final answer of each model for clarity.

reasoning abilities across different model families, indicating a foundational influence of coding data that is generally model-agnostic. However, variability in the remaining tasks underscores the need for flexible adaptation strategies for each model family.

4.4 Case Study

To showcase how coding data tuning corrects response for different reasoning tasks, we focus on instances where the model tuned with Code obtains the correct answer while the General does not, using Llama-1-13B as the backbone. We randomly select one instance from each reasoning domain, as shown in Figure 6.

For the symbolic task, the Code-tuned model uses Python code to answer the reversing sequence question, successfully executing the code to obtain the correct final answer. In contrast, the General-tuned model is confused by phrase construction and does not execute the reverse action, leading to a wrong answer. In the logic task, the General-tuned model fails to follow the inductive reasoning path needed to answer the question correctly. However, the Code-tuned model provides a concise and correct answer, demonstrating improved logical capacity due to coding data tuning. For the arithmetic question, both models use structural outputs to answer, but the General-tuned model generates an incorrect structural reasoning path, resulting in a wrong answer. Conversely, the Code-tuned model leverages its in-domain coding capacity by outputting structural math equations to obtain the correct final answer. These case studies showcase how coding data tuning enhances LLM reasoning capacities to properly answer diverse questions.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have holistically studied the critical but underexplored question: *How does coding data impact LLMs' reasoning capacities during the IFT stage?* Our study uses a multi-perspective approach to analyze experiments while considering variations in coding data proportions, backbones, and reasoning domains. Our findings indicate that tuning with coding data enhances the overall reasoning capacities of LLMs. Additionally, the effects of coding data on different reasoning domains vary but show consistent trends within each domain. Furthermore, IFT coding data mixing strategies are more task-specific rather than generally applicable.

Resource limitations prevented examining larger models like Llama-2/3 70B. Our evaluations focus on generative benchmark tasks within the three domains. Additional work can be done on other tasks and domains more aligned with real-world needs. We also focused on the general effects of coding data tuning rather than fine-grained perspectives. Future research could explore more detailed aspects, such as the impact of diverse coding data types, different content formats, and low-quality coding data like incorrect code. We hope this work inspires further research on LLMs’ reasoning from various perspectives, including instruction fine-tuning, evaluation, and analysis.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge financial support by the National Institutes for Health (NIH) grant NIH 7R01HL149670.

References

- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023a.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023b.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners, 2020.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- Alon Albalak, Yi-Lin Tuan, Pegah Jandaghi, Connor Pryor, Luke Yoffe, Deepak Ramachandran, Lise Getoor, Jay Pujara, and William Yang Wang. FETA: A benchmark for few-sample task transfer in open-domain dialogue. In Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10936–10953, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.751. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.751>.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback, 2022.

- Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, and Adam Roberts. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning, 2023.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners, 2022a.
- Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Zheng Tang, Xiang Ren, Vijay Srinivasan, and Hongxia Jin. Instruction-following evaluation through verbalizer manipulation, 2024.
- OpenAI. Introducing chatgpt, 2022. URL <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>. Accessed: 2023-05-11.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- Anthropic. Claude 2, 2023. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/index/claude-2>.
- Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Pengcheng He, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Instruction tuning with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03277*, 2023.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca, 2023.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions, 2023.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality, March 2023. URL <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/>.
- Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Cosgrove, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Ré, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew A. Hudson, Eric Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue Wang, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yuksekgonul, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri Chatterji, Omar Khattab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Surya Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. Holistic evaluation of language models, 2023.
- Hao Fu, Yao; Peng and Tushar Khot. How does gpt obtain its ability? tracing emergent abilities of language models to their sources. *Yao Fu's Notion*, Dec 2022. URL <https://yaofu.notion.site/How-does-GPT-Obtain-its-Ability-Tracing-Emergent-Abilities-of-Language-Models-to-their-Sources-b9a>
- Yingwei Ma, Yue Liu, Yue Yu, Yuanliang Zhang, Yu Jiang, Changjian Wang, and Shanshan Li. At which training stage does code data help llms reasoning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16298*, 2023.
- Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y. Wu, Y. K. Li, Fuli Luo, Yingfei Xiong, and Wenfeng Liang. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming – the rise of code intelligence, 2024.
- Xianjun Yang, Yan Li, Xinlu Zhang, Haifeng Chen, and Wei Cheng. Exploring the limits of chatgpt for query or aspect-based text summarization, 2023.
- Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianguang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, and Dongmei Zhang. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct, 2023a.
- Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhui Chen. Mammoth: Building math generalist models through hybrid instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05653*, 2023.

- Zhiyu Zoey Chen, Jing Ma, Xinlu Zhang, Nan Hao, An Yan, Armineh Nourbakhsh, Xianjun Yang, Julian McAuley, Linda Petzold, and William Yang Wang. A survey on large language models for critical societal domains: Finance, healthcare, and law, 2024.
- Michael Dowling and Brian Lucey. Chatgpt for (finance) research: The bananarama conjecture. *Finance Research Letters*, 53:103662, 2023.
- Jonathan H Choi, Kristin E Hickman, Amy B Monahan, and Daniel Schwarcz. Chatgpt goes to law school. *J. Legal Educ.*, 71:387, 2021.
- Zhiqiang Yuan, Junwei Liu, Qiancheng Zi, Mingwei Liu, Xin Peng, and Yiling Lou. Evaluating instruction-tuned large language models on code comprehension and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01240*, 2023.
- Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xiubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct, 2023b.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Huai hsin Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2201.11903, 2022b.
- Sharegpt. Sharegpt, 2023. URL sharegpt.com.
- AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card. 2024. URL https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023.
- Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, et al. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*, 2024.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, Albert Webson, Shixiang Shane Gu, Zhuyun Dai, Mirac Suzgun, Xinyun Chen, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Alex Castro-Ros, Marie Pellat, Kevin Robinson, Dasha Valter, Sharan Narang, Gaurav Mishra, Adams Yu, Vincent Zhao, Yanping Huang, Andrew Dai, Hongkun Yu, Slav Petrov, Ed H. Chi, Jeff Dean, Jacob Devlin, Adam Roberts, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, and Jason Wei. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models, 2022.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H. Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Taewoon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Fevry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Tali Bers, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M. Rush. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization, 2022.
- Xinlu Zhang, Chenxin Tian, Xianjun Yang, Lichang Chen, Zekun Li, and Linda Ruth Petzold. Alpaca:instruction-tuned large language models for medical application, 2024.
- Lichang Chen, Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Kalpa Gunaratna, Vikas Yadav, Zheng Tang, Vijay Srinivasan, Tianyi Zhou, Heng Huang, and Hongxia Jin. Alpapasus: Training a better alpaca with fewer data, 2023.

- Xingyao Wang, Sha Li, and Heng Ji. Code4struct: Code generation for few-shot event structure prediction, 2023.
- Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Yiming Yang, and Graham Neubig. Language models of code are few-shot commonsense learners, 2022.
- Peter Cathcart Wason and Philip Nicholas Johnson-Laird. *Psychology of reasoning: Structure and content*, volume 86. Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Peter C Wason. Reasoning about a rule. *Quarterly journal of experimental psychology*, 20(3): 273–281, 1968.
- Conor McHugh and Jonathan Way. What is reasoning? *Mind*, 127(505):167–196, 2018.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. Emergent abilities of large language models, 2022c.
- Shiyang Li, Jianshu Chen, Yelong Shen, Zhiyu Chen, Xinlu Zhang, Zekun Li, Hong Wang, Jing Qian, Baolin Peng, Yi Mao, Wenhu Chen, and Xifeng Yan. Explanations from large language models make small reasoners better, 2022.
- Xinlu Zhang, Shiyang Li, Xianjun Yang, Chenxin Tian, Yao Qin, and Linda Ruth Petzold. Enhancing small medical learners with privacy-preserving contextual prompting, 2023.
- Linlu Qiu, Liwei Jiang, Ximing Lu, Melanie Sclar, Valentina Pyatkin, Chandra Bhagavatula, Bailin Wang, Yoon Kim, Yejin Choi, Nouha Dziri, et al. Phenomenal yet puzzling: Testing inductive reasoning capabilities of language models with hypothesis refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08559*, 2023.
- Koustuv Sinha, Shagun Sodhani, Jin Dong, Joelle Pineau, and William L. Hamilton. CLUTRR: A diagnostic benchmark for inductive reasoning from text. *CoRR*, abs/1908.06177, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.06177>.
- Joshua Stewart Rule. *The child as hacker: building more human-like models of learning*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2020.
- Jason Weston, Antoine Bordes, Sumit Chopra, Alexander M Rush, Bart Van Merriënboer, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. Towards ai-complete question answering: A set of prerequisite toy tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.05698*, 2015.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- Arkil Patel, Satwik Bhattamishra, and Navin Goyal. Are nlp models really able to solve simple math word problems? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.07191*, 2021.
- Shen-yun Miao, Chao-Chun Liang, and Keh-Yih Su. A diverse corpus for evaluating and developing English math word problem solvers. In Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault, editors, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 975–984, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.92. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.92>.
- Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Subhro Roy, Aida Amini, Nate Kushman, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. MAWPS: A math word problem repository. In Kevin Knight, Ani Nenkova, and Owen Rambow, editors, *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1152–1157, San Diego, California, June 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N16-1136. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N16-1136>.
- Armando Fortes. Simple dataset generation. <https://github.com/atfortes/simple-dataset-generation>, 2023.

Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srini Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, Susan Zhang, Gargi Ghosh, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Omer Levy. Lima: Less is more for alignment, 2023.

Alon Albalak, Yanai Elazar, Sang Michael Xie, Shayne Longpre, Nathan Lambert, Xinyi Wang, Niklas Muennighoff, Bairu Hou, Liangming Pan, Haewon Jeong, Colin Raffel, Shiyu Chang, Tatsunori Hashimoto, and William Yang Wang. A survey on data selection for language models, 2024.

Abulhair Saparov, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Vishakh Padmakumar, Nitish Joshi, Mehran Kazemi, Najoung Kim, and He He. Testing the general deductive reasoning capacity of large language models using ood examples. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

A Appendix

A.1 Prompt detail.

Table 5: Prompt for data classification

system prompt:
You are an annotation expert tasked with categorizing conversations between humans and AI. Review each conversation and assign it to one of these categories: "Math", "Coding", or "Others".
Use the following guidelines:
Math: Assign this category if the conversation focuses on mathematical problems or concepts.
Coding: Choose this category for conversations that involve actual coding.
Others: Use this category for conversations that do not clearly fit into "Math" or "Coding," or are only slightly related to these topics.

For generating output:
1. If necessary, include your reasoning within 150 words for the category selection BEFORE the final answer.
2. Your response MUST contain the chosen category, formatted as: `[[Category]]`.

For example, if a conversation is about solving a calculus problem, your response would be:
"Since the conversation is centered around solving a mathematical problem, it falls under the Math category. `[[Math]]`"

conversation prompt:
Human:
{human_value}

AI:
{ai_value}

Table 6: Prompt for coding data diversity analysis.

system prompt:
You are an annotation expert tasked with categorizing conversations between humans and AI. Review each conversation related to coding and assign it to the appropriate code category, such as Python, JavaScript, Java, C++, C#, Ruby, Swift, Go, Kotlin, R, SQL, PHP, etc.

For generating output:
1. If necessary, include your reasoning within 50 words for the category selection BEFORE the final answer.
2. Your response MUST contain the chosen category, formatted as: `[[Category]]`. For example, if a conversation is about C++, your response would be: "Since the conversation involves C++ code, it falls under the C++ category. `[[C++]]`"
3. If you cannot categorize a conversation into a specific class, output `[[Others]]`.
4. You MUST try your best to label the conversation into a specific class instead of directly using `[[Others]]`.

conversation prompt:
Human:
{human_value}

AI:
{ai_value}

Table 7: Prompt for answer extraction.

system prompt:
 You are a helpful AI assistant to extract the final prediction of a candidate’s answer to a given question.

Here are several requirements:

(1) You MUST extract the final prediction in the candidate answer, e.g. a numeric value, true or false, yes or no, or other types, etc., within <prediction> XML tag.
 (2) If you cannot find the final prediction in the candidate answer, you need to cast it as "none" and output it in an XML tag.

question-answer pair prompt:
 Here is <Question, Candidate answer> pair:

Question:
 {question}

Candidate answer:
 {response}

Please extract the final prediction in the candidate answer within <prediction> XML tag.

Table 8: Prompt for coding data detection in response.

system prompt:
 You are a helpful AI assistant tasked with classifying whether the given input contains code or only general natural text. If code exists, output ‘1’; otherwise, output ‘0’. Ensure to only output ‘1’ or ‘0’ without any thinking path.

content prompt:
 Input: {model generated response}
 Output:

A.2 Coding data diversity analysis.




Figure 7: The distribution of the top 20 code categories diversity in the Code dataset.

As shown in Figure 7, Python is the most common programming language, appearing in more than 30% of instances in the Human-AI conversations from the ShareGPT source. JavaScript is the second most common, present in around 15% of conversations. This phenomenon suggests that these two

programming languages may have the most significant impact on the model’s performance during our IFT stage, while other languages might have a much lesser influence due to their limited proportions. Future work could investigate the effects of different coding language types by considering specific structures, syntax complexities, and idiomatic usage patterns among various languages. Understanding these nuances may help clarify how these specialized characteristics in coding data can affect the model’s general reasoning capacities.

A.3 More about task description

Discussion on reasoning task selection. In our work, we conduct experiments across three reasoning domains: *symbolic*, *logical*, and *arithmetic*. We choose these domains because they primarily evaluate reasoning capacities without relying on intensive knowledge in areas such as medicine, law, or finance. This allows us to focus on how coding data affects pure logical reasoning, rather than on how it elicits specific knowledge from pretrained LLMs. Additionally, we carefully select these domains to comprehensively evaluate the reasoning capacities of LLMs from various angles. Specifically, symbolic manipulation involves tasks that are straightforward for humans but can challenge models in fundamental reasoning [Wei et al., 2022b]. Logical reasoning, central to human intelligence, combines inductive and deductive processes. It requires deep contextual understanding and abstract thinking to extrapolate principles from limited observations and generalize across diverse situations [Saparov et al., 2024, Qiu et al., 2023]. Lastly, arithmetic reasoning is essential for evaluating LLMs’ ability to execute complex multi-hop and quantitative reasoning tasks, which are crucial for real-world applications [Yue et al., 2023, Liang et al., 2023].

Details about synthetic data generation. We generate symbolic datasets following the method described in Fortes [2023]. Specifically:

- **Coin Flip:** We gather data for three conditions where the number of flips equals 2, 3, and 4. Each condition contains 500 instances, resulting in a total of 1500 instances for testing.
- **First and Last Letters Concatenation:** Three conditions are considered, where we concatenate the corresponding first or last letters with a string containing 2, 3, or 4 words. Each condition contains 500 instances, leading to 1500 instances used for testing in both the first and last letters concatenation tasks.
- **Reverse Sequence:** Five conditions are tested by reversing a sequence containing 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 phrases in a string. Each condition has 200 test cases, resulting in a total of 1000 instances in this test set.

A.4 hyperparameter setup.

We show the hyperparameter settings for each backbone model used for fine-tuning. We follow Alpaca [Taori et al., 2023] to set up the hyperparameters for Llama-1 [Touvron et al., 2023a], Llama-2 [Touvron et al., 2023b], Llama-3 [AI@Meta, 2024], Qwen-1.5 [Bai et al., 2023], Gemma [Team et al., 2024], and Mammoth [Yue et al., 2023] for Mistral-v0.1 [Jiang et al., 2023]. The details are shown in Table 9.

Table 9: **Hyperparameter setup.**

Model Family	Model Size	GPUs	Epoch	LR	Batch Size
Llama-1	7B	4 40G A100	3	2e-5	128
	13B	4 80G A100	5	1e-5	128
Llama-2	7B	4 40G A100	3	2e-5	128
	13B	4 80G A100	5	1e-5	128
Llama-3	8B	4 40G A100	3	2e-5	128
Mistral-v0.1	7B	4 40G A100	2	5e-6	128
Qwen-1.5	7B	4 40G A100	3	2e-5	128
Gemma	7B	4 40G A100	3	2e-5	128