



InverseCoder: Unleashing the Power of Instruction-Tuned Code LLMs with Inverse-Instruct

Yutong Wu^{1,2*} Di Huang¹ Wenxuan Shi² Wei Wang³ Lingzhe Gao³
 Shihao Liu³ Ziyuan Nan^{1,2} Kaizhao Yuan^{1,2} Rui Zhang¹ Xishan Zhang¹
 Zidong Du¹ Qi Guo¹ Yewen Pu⁴ Dawei Yin³ Xing Hu^{1,✉} Yunji Chen^{1,2,✉}

¹SKL of Processors, Institute of Computing Technology, CAS

²University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

³Baidu Inc., Beijing, China

⁴Autodesk Research

Abstract

Recent advancements in open-source code large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable coding abilities by fine-tuning on the data generated from powerful closed-source LLMs such as GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 for instruction tuning. This paper explores how to further improve an instruction-tuned code LLM by generating data from *itself* rather than querying closed-source LLMs. Our key observation is the misalignment between the translation of formal and informal languages: translating formal language (*i.e.*, code) to informal language (*i.e.*, natural language) is more straightforward than the reverse. Based on this observation, we propose INVERSE-INSTRUCT, which summarizes instructions from code snippets instead of the reverse. Specifically, given an instruction tuning corpus for code and the resulting instruction-tuned code LLM, we ask the code LLM to generate additional high-quality instructions for the original corpus through code summarization and self-evaluation. Then, we fine-tune the base LLM on the combination of the original corpus and the self-generated one, which yields a stronger instruction-tuned LLM. We present a series of code LLMs named InverseCoder, which surpasses the performance of the original code LLMs on a wide range of benchmarks, including Python text-to-code generation, multilingual coding, and data-science code generation.

1 Introduction

Code generation, which aims to generate code that satisfies the user’s intent from inputs/outputs or natural language, has been a significant challenge in computer science. Recently, closed-source LLMs like GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 [35] have enabled the generation of general-purpose code (like Python) based on natural language, making them broadly applicable in the fields of programming assistance [30], computer vision [16, 44], science [32], and embodied intelligence [24, 29, 45, 49].

To develop high-performance open-source models, researchers have leveraged these closed-source LLMs to generate datasets of instructions and code, then distilled these datasets into smaller, open-source code LLMs via instruction tuning [28, 55, 59, 63]. For example, Code Alpaca [6] was fine-tuned on 20K instruction-code pairs generated based on GPT-3.5 with SELF-INSTRUCT [51]. Luo et al. [28] used *Evol-Instruct* [57], a method that creates a diverse set of instruction data

* Work done during an internship at Baidu.

✉ Corresponding author. Contact: {wuyutong22s, huxing, cyj}@ict.ac.cn.

Table 1: Comparisons between InverseCoder and other well-known Code LLMs in annotation data sources and performances on a diverse range of benchmarks. InverseCoder surpasses all of the other Code LLMs using the same GPT-4 annotation dataset.

Model	Annotation Sources	HumanEval+	MBPP+	MultiPL-E ¹	DS-1000
<i>(unknown annotation sources)</i>					
GPT-3.5-Turbo (Nov 2023)	Unknown	70.7	69.7	64.9	-
DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct	Unknown	75.0	70.1	69.2	-
CodeQwen1.5-7B-Chat	Unknown	78.7	69.0	72.0	-
GPT-4-Turbo (April 2024)	Unknown	86.6	73.3	76.5	-
<i>(known annotation sources)</i>					
WizardCoder-CL-15B	GPT-3.5	50.6	54.2	-	29.2
MagiCoder-S-CL-7B	GPT-4 + GPT-3.5	67.7	60.1	46.1	37.5
MagiCoder-S-DS-6.7B	GPT-4 + GPT-3.5	71.3	69.0	-	-
OpenCodeInterpreter-DS-6.7B	GPT-4 + GPT-3.5	72.0	66.4	-	-
InverseCoder-DS-6.7B (ours)	GPT-4 + self-generated	76.8	69.0	62.6	44.2

from GPT-3.5 for code generation via evolution heuristics. OSS-INSTRUCT [55] first creates coding problems from the source code snippet, then queries strong LLMs for their corresponding solutions. Fine-tuned with 75K GPT-3.5 OSS-INSTRUCT data and 110K GPT-4 *Evol-Instruct* data (*i.e.* `evol-codealpaca-v1`) [48], MagiCoderS series achieve state-of-the-art (SOTA) results among open-source code models. Common to these approaches is the heavy reliance on generating data by querying closed-source LLMs (in addition to `evol-codealpaca-v1`), which incurs significant additional expenses.

This paper explores how to improve an instruction-tuned code LLM by *querying itself* (rather than querying a closed-source LLM). We make two observations: (1) While generating multiple code implementations from the same instruction can often lead to incorrect programs, generating multiple instructions from the same code often results in a diverse set of correct instructions. (2) For a fine-tuned code LLM, there is a mismatch in translation ability: translating codes into instructions (*i.e.*, in natural language) is more straightforward than translating instructions into codes. Therefore, given a fine-tuning corpus for code generation, it is possible to use the fine-tuned LLM to generate additional high-quality instructions from the same corpus, obtaining additional fine-tuning data with an increased diversity of instructions.

We develop INVERSE-INSTRUCT, a simple yet effective instruction tuning approach based on self-generating multiple instructions from code snippets (See Figure 1). INVERSE-INSTRUCT starts with an instruction-code corpus, and a code LLM fine-tuned on it. We first clean and extract code snippets from the corpus, then let the code LLM translate these code snippets into new instructions. Then, we use the code LLM to evaluate and filter consistent instruction-code pairs from the newly generated data. Finally, the filtered dataset is combined with the original instruction dataset, and the base model is fine-tuned on the combined dataset. Using INVERSE-INSTRUCT, we develop InverseCoder, a series of fine-tuned code LLMs that achieve SOTA results.

Evaluation of InverseCoder on a wide range of benchmarks, including HumanEval (+) [7, 26], MBPP (+) [1, 26], MultiPL-E [5], and DS-1000 [19]. Results show that InverseCoder series surpasses the base models by exploiting the base models’ own capability. Specifically, InverseCoder-DS-6.7B achieves 76.8% on HumanEval+, 69.0% on MBPP+, 62.6% on MultiPL-E, 44.2% on DS-1000, which are SOTA results across four benchmarks among fully open-source (both model and dataset) models with only 6.7B parameters (See Table 1 for a summary).

This paper makes the following contributions:

- We introduce INVERSE-INSTRUCT, a simple yet effective instruction tuning approach exploiting the mismatch of code-generation and instruction-generation.
- We make thorough analysis on INVERSE-INSTRUCT, including the component of generated dataset, the impact of data size, etc. We find that the self-consistency between the code generation and summarization is predictive of the effectiveness of INVERSE-INSTRUCT prior to training.

¹Some works may differ in the evaluation metric of MultiPL-E like the number of programming languages involved. We simply crawl the accuracy from the official reports. Our work follows the setting of MagiCoder.




Figure 1: **The overview of INVERSE-INSTRUCT.** INVERSE-INSTRUCT utilizes the models’ own capability in code summarization to generate an inverse instruction dataset which can further enhance the model’s performance. INVERSE-INSTRUCT consists of three steps, including code preprocessing, code summarization, and self-evaluation & data selection.

- Based on INVERSE-INSTRUCT, we present a series of code LLMs named InverseCoder, which achieves SOTA or comparative results on a wide range of benchmarks including Python code generation, multilingual code completion, and data science problems.
- We will release the parameters of InverseCoder, instruction datasets, INVERSE-INSTRUCT prompts, and training codebase to promote the development of the code generation community.

2 Related Work

2.1 Large Language Models for Code Generation

After being pre-trained on a large amount of code, large language models have demonstrated impressive code generation capabilities. Recently, AI code assistants have become one of the most important applications of large language models. Technology companies such as OpenAI and Google have developed and publicly released large language models, including Codex[7], GPT-4[35], PaLM[9], and Gemini[47], which have achieved outstanding performance on code generation benchmarks. In addition to closed-source models, there are also some available open-source models, such as CodeGen[33], PanGu-Coder series[10, 39], CodeGeeX[62], AlphaCode[23], CodeT5 series[20, 52, 53], InCoder[13], StarCoder series[21, 27], CodeLlama[37], DeepSeek-Coder[15], CodeQwen[2]. These open-source code models have shown notable advancements in code-related tasks, but there is still a gap compared to the most advanced code LLMs. Reinforcement Learning can also be applied to large language models to enhance code generation quality by using execution feedback to explore the policy model’s output space. CodeRL[20] utilizes unit test signals as rewards and employs actor-critic methods to improve the model’s code generation capabilities. PPOCoder[40] refines CodeRL by incorporating Proximal Policy Optimization, while RLTF[25] offers fine-grained rewards by identifying error locations. StepCoder[12] introduces a curriculum of code completion tasks to enhance RL-based code generation. Our approach can further improve the performance of open-source code models.

2.2 Instruction tuning methods

Instruction tuning is a method to fine-tune LLMs on instructional prompts and corresponding outputs. T5[36], FLAN[54], and FLAN-T5[11] have employed instruction tuning to augment the generalization and instruction-following capacities of large language models. For code tasks, OctoPack[31] and Shypula et al. [41] extracted high-quality instruction datasets from human-written code. Fine-tuning on these high-quality instruction datasets has significantly enhanced the program generation capabilities of the base models.

However, obtaining high-quality instruction datasets is usually laborious. Researchers have attempted to employ neural models for generating labeled datasets, including Betker et al. [4] and Gu et al. [14]. Utilizing large language models for generating synthetic instruction data has emerged as a novel

research avenue, such as Self-Instruct[51], Alpaca[46], WizardLM[57], Yin et al. [58], Sun et al. [43], Li et al. [22], Yuan et al. [60], and Chen et al. [8]. For Code LLMs, Haluptzok et al. [17] proposes a self-improvement strategy where models generate puzzle-solution pairs, which are verified and filtered by an interpreter before being utilized for language model fine-tuning. Shypula et al. [41] employs a self-play approach to generate synthetic data for code optimization tasks. CodeAlpaca[6] uses GPT-generated instructions to fine-tune LLaMA. WizardCoder[28] proposes Code Evol-Instruct, which uses different prompts to guide the instruction dataset to be more complex and diverse. Magicoder[55] introduces OSS-Instruct, which allows LLMs to generate new instructional data based on open-source code snippets. OpenCodeInterpreter[63] develops a multi-turn instruction tuning dataset by leveraging GPT-3.5/GPT-4 to emulate human feedback and incorporating feedback from execution results. WaveCoder[59] uses an LLM-based Generator-Discriminator data processing framework to generate diverse, high-quality instruction data. StarCoder2-Instruct[56] is the first self-aligned code LLM trained with self-generated instruction-response pairs. Our work utilizes the mismatch between the capacity of generating instructions from code and the capacity of generating code from instructions to enhance the performance of code LLMs without relying on more advanced language models.

3 Inverse-Instruct: Instruction Tuning with Code Summarization

In this section, we will introduce INVERSE-INSTRUCT, an instruction tuning method that can obtain more high-quality instruction data through the model’s own capabilities. The overall illustration of *Inverse-Instruct* is shown in Figure 1. Then central to INVERSE-INSTRUCT is the misalignment between formal and informal languages: (1) Converting formal language (i.e., code) into informal language (i.e., natural language) is more straightforward than the reverse process. (2) The same code can be considered as a response to different instructions, which increases the diversity of the instruction data.

The whole data generation process contains three steps: code preprocessing, code summarization, self-evaluation and data selection. In code preprocessing, we preprocess the code data by filtering clean code snippets $\{y_i^*\}$ from an off-the-shelf instruction tuning dataset (e.g., `evol-codealpaca-v1`) $\{(x_i, y_i)\}$. Subsequently, in code summarization, we prompt an instruction fine-tuned code LLM M (e.g., WizardCoder-GPT4-CL) to summarize the clean code snippets $\{y_i^*\}$ filtered before for new instructions (denote as x_{ij}^*). Note that a y_i^* may correspond to multiple summarized instructions $\{x_{ij}^*\}$. Then, in self-evaluation and data selection, we use the same code LLM M to select high-quality instruction data $\{x_{ij}^*\}$. This step merely filters out poor data through the LLM’s own capabilities and does not generate any new data. The filtered instructions are combined with the code snippets to construct a new instruction tuning dataset $\{(x_{ij}^*, y_i^*)\}$. Finally, we fine-tune the base code LLM with the instruction data $\{(x_{ij}^*, y_i^*)\} \cup \{(x_i, y_i)\}$ to obtain a stronger code LLM (i.e. InverseCoder). Details of the three steps are illustrated below.

3.1 Code Preprocessing

The first step is to preprocess the existing code data and get clean code snippets $\{y_i^*\}$. This is because the summarization capabilities of code LLMs can only be demonstrated on clean code data, whereas the response data $\{y_i\}$ in the original dataset typically contains a lot of noise, such as natural language responses.

We select data with code snippet $\{y_i^*\}$ from the original $\{y_i\}$ with the following two steps:

1. **Filtering responses.** We first collect responses that contain the marker of the code block (i.e. `````), which indicates that there are code snippets in the response. The remaining data might contain clean code without any code markers, so then we collect the responses that can pass syntax checking.
2. **Extracting code.** After filtering responses with code snippets, we remove the natural language surrounding the code snippets to make it easier for the model to summarize. If there are multiple parts of code in the original response, we only keep the first part, since the following parts are usually test cases or using examples. Detailed examples are shown in Appendix B.

At the end of code preprocessing, we obtain clean code snippets $\{y_i^*\}$ for summarization.

3.2 Code Summarization

After filtering, we employ the code LLM M to generate a certain number of corresponding instructions x_{ij}^* for each code snippet y_i^* by summarizing its functionality. During the summarization process, we randomly choose different instruction prefixes for the prompt to enhance the diversity of the instructions. The summarization prompt and the instruction prefixes are shown in Appendix B.

In this way, we have obtained new pairs of natural language and code $\{(x_{ij}^*, y_i^*)\}$.

3.3 Self-evaluation and Data Selection

We notice that code LLM M may make mistakes during the code summarization process. An example is shown in Appendix B, where M hallucinates invalid instructions. Therefore, it is necessary for us to utilize M itself to evaluate $\{(x_{ij}^*, y_i^*)\}$ and select high-quality instruction data.

Data selection is typically performed by powerful LLMs such as GPT-3.5/4 because these models possess excellent instruction-following capabilities, enabling them to understand and execute complex filtering rules [50]. However, the instruction-following capabilities of code LLMs are often weaker, making it difficult to conduct effective selection.

Inspired by Zhang et al. [61], we use the pseudo-probability of the YES token given by the code LLM M as an indicator of the instruction quality rather than a score in textual format. Specifically, we concatenate the generated instruction x_{ij}^* and the original code snippet y_i^* as a problem-answer pair. Then, we ask M to evaluate the correctness of the answer under the given problem and calculate the pseudo-probability of YES using the logits of the first token given by M . The selection prompt and the formula for calculating probability are shown in Appendix B and Equation 1.

$$\text{LM-Score}(\cdot) = \frac{\exp(\text{logit}(\text{'YES'}))}{\exp(\text{logit}(\text{'YES'})) + \exp(\text{logit}(\text{'NO'}))}. \quad (1)$$

4 Implementation Details

The original instruction tuning dataset. In this work, we mainly use `evol-codealpaca-v1` as our original instruction tuning dataset $\{(x_i, y_i)\}$, which is widely used for instruction tuning of code LLMs [55, 59, 63]. It contains 110K instruction-response pairs generated by *Evol-Instruct* using GPT-4 in various programming languages. Following Wei et al. [55], `evol-codealpaca-v1` is decontaminated by removing data that contain docstrings or solutions from HumanEval [7], MBPP [1], MultiPL-E [5], and DS-1000 [19], which are used to evaluate InverseCoder. We apply the same decontamination method to the newly generated instruction data $\{(x_{ij}^*, y_i^*)\}$.

Training for original Code LLM. We take CodeLlama-Python-7B and DeepSeek-Coder-Base-6.7B as base models. To obtain the beginning code LLM M (hereinafter called WizardCoder-GPT4), we fine-tune the base models on `evol-codealpaca-v1` for 2 epochs using 8 NVIDIA A100-40GB SMX GPUs through the Distributed Data Parallel (DDP) module from PyTorch. We set the initial learning rate at $5e - 5$ with 15 warmup steps and a linear learning rate scheduler. We use Adafactor [38] as our optimizer and choose a batch size of 512 with a sequence truncation length of 1024.

Instruction data collection. We use the vLLM inference framework [18] for code summarization and instruction selection on NVIDIA A100-40GB SMX GPUs. We generate 10 instructions $\{x_{ij}\}_{j=1}^{10}$ for each code snippet $\{y_i\}$ with `temperature = 0.8`, `repetition_penalty = 1.1` and `max_tokens = 2048` in the code summarization stage. For each instruction-response pair, the self-evaluation and data selection process is conducted by prompting the beginning code LLM M with greedy decoding. We choose the instruction with the highest pseudo-probability that the first token given by LLM is YES as the best-generated instruction for each response.

Training for InverseCoder. We first fine-tune the base models on synthetic data $\{(x_{ij}^*, y_i^*)\}$ generated through INVERSE-INSTRUCT for 1 epoch, then we continue to fine-tune the models with the original instruction tuning dataset $\{(x_i, y_i)\}$ for 2 epochs to obtain InverseCoder models. The hyperparameters and hardware configuration are the same as the training process for the beginning code LLM M . The instruction tuning prompt is the same as Magicoder, which is shown in Appendix B.

5 Experiments

In this section, we will show a series of experimental results to demonstrate the effectiveness of INVERSE-INSTRUCT: (1) Main results. We evaluate InverseCoder on four benchmarks widely used for code LLMs, including Python text-to-code generation, multilingual coding, and data-science code generation. (2) Self-consistency on generation and summarization. We attempt to quantify the mismatch between code generation and code summarization, and demonstrate how INVERSE-INSTRUCT bridges this gap. Additionally, we show that self-consistency serves as a proxy evaluation to indicate when our method is effective. (3) Ablation study on code summarization and data selection step in our method. (4) Further analysis on dataset features and the impact of data scaling (see Appendix C).

5.1 Main Results

5.1.1 HumanEval+ and MBPP+: Python Text-to-Code Generation

We use HumanEval+ and MBPP+ [26], the enhanced counterparts of two Python code generation benchmarks [1, 7], to evaluate the Python code generation capability of InverseCoder. Each benchmark offers a collection of tasks with a natural language description as the prompt for code LLM to generate function-level code, which is then validated by test cases prepared in advance.

We compare the performance of InverseCoder based on CodeLlama-Python-7B and DeepSeek-Coder-Base-6.7B with the original model (*i.e.* WizardCoder-GPT4) and other available code LLMs. For InverseCoder and WizardCoder-GPT4, we report the results whose training and evaluation process are both in our environment to fairly evaluate the improvement of our models. For other code LLMs including both closed-source models such as the GPT series [34] [35] and open-source models [28, 37, 55, 59], we report the results in EvalPlus [26] leaderboard. We use pass@1 [7] metric to compare the code generation capability among different models.

The results shown in Table 2 demonstrate that InverseCoder makes a significant improvement over WizardCoder-GPT4 on HumanEval/HumanEval+ and MBPP/MBPP+, which indicates that the Python code generation capability enhancement of the model benefit from INVERSE-INSTRUCT. Furthermore, InverseCoder-DS-6.7B has an outstanding performance in HumanEval/HumanEval+, which surpasses all open-source models with a similar scale of weights.

5.1.2 MultiPL-E: Multi-Language Programming

Besides Python, we evaluate the code generation capabilities of other six mainstream programming languages for InverseCoder on MultiPL-E benchmark [5]. We use bigcode-evaluation-harness framework [3] to generate and evaluate code of different programming languages under the inference prompt format aligned with the prompt we used in the training process.

Table 3 shows the results of InverseCoder and other models on MultiPL-E. The results reveal that the capabilities of InverseCoder to generate code in most of the mainstream programming languages are improved over WizardCoder-GPT4.

5.1.3 DS-1000: Data Science Code Generation

To show the capability of InverseCoder for complex programming problems in realistic applications, we evaluate it on DS-1000 benchmark [19], which comprises 1000 different data science workflows across seven libraries and provides unit tests to validate each problem. Following Wei et al. [55], we evaluate our model only on the completion mode.

The results in Table 4 show that the average performance of InverseCoder-DS in the generation tasks for the seven data science libraries is enhanced, which implies that INVERSE-INSTRUCT can help to improve the code generation capability of the original model in realistic tasks beyond basic programming problems.

5.2 Self-Consistency on Generation and Summarization

We attempt to quantify the mismatch between the LLM’s ability of code generation and code summarization by measuring *self-consistency*. That is, whether the model can generate equivalent

Table 2: Pass@1 (%) results of different LLMs on HumanEval (+) and MBPP (+) computed with greedy decoding. The abbreviations “CL” and “DS” refer to the base models CodeLlama-Python-7B and DeepSeek-Coder-6.7B, respectively. We set `batch_size = 4` to evaluate the models trained by ourselves. We report other results consistently from the EvalPlus [26] Leaderboard in May 2024 and Magicoder [55] paper.

Model	Size	HumanEval (+)	MBPP (+)
GPT-4-Turbo (April 2024)	-	90.2 (86.6)	85.7 (73.3)
GPT-3.5-Turbo (Nov 2023)	-	76.8 (70.7)	82.5 (69.7)
<i>(CodeLlama-Python series)</i>			
CodeLlama-Python	7B	37.8 (35.4)	59.5 (46.8)
WizardCoder-CL	7B	50.6 (45.1)	58.5 (49.5)
Magicoder-CL	7B	60.4 (55.5)	64.2 (52.6)
Magicoder-S-CL	7B	70.7 (67.7)	70.6 (60.1)
WizardCoder-GPT4-CL	7B	72.6 (68.9)	69.3 (59.3)
InverseCoder-CL (ours)	7B	76.2 (72.0)	70.6 (60.1)
<i>(DeepSeek-Coder series)</i>			
DeepSeek-Coder	6.7B	47.6 (39.6)	72.0 (58.7)
DeepSeek-Coder-Instruct	6.7B	74.4 (71.3)	74.9 (65.6)
Magicoder-DS	6.7B	66.5 (60.4)	75.4 (61.9)
Magicoder-S-DS	6.7B	76.8 (71.3)	79.4 (69.0)
WaveCoder-Ultra-DS	6.7B	75.0 (69.5)	74.9 (63.5)
OpenCodeInterpreter-DS	6.7B	77.4 (72.0)	76.5 (66.4)
WizardCoder-GPT4-DS	6.7B	77.4 (73.2)	77.8 (67.5)
InverseCoder-DS (ours)	6.7B	79.9 (76.8)	78.6 (69.0)

Table 3: Pass@1 (%) results of different LLMs on MultiPL-E [5]. The models marked with (*) are evaluated with the same prompt format as training and the following hyperparameter: `temperature = 0.2`, `top_p = 0.95`, `max_length = 4096`, `num_samples = 50` and `batch_size = 2`. We report other results consistently from Magicoder paper.

Model	Size	Java	JS	C++	PHP	Swift	Rust	Avg.
CodeLlama	7B	29.3	31.7	27.0	25.1	25.6	25.5	27.4
CodeLlama-Python	7B	29.1	35.7	30.2	29.0	27.1	27.0	29.7
Magicoder-CL	7B	36.4	45.9	36.5	39.5	33.4	30.6	37.1
Magicoder-S-CL	7B	42.9	57.5	44.4	47.6	44.1	40.3	46.1
Magicoder-S-CL*	7B	49.8	62.6	50.2	53.3	44.9	43.8	50.8
WizardCoder-GPT4-CL*	7B	50.4	60.7	50.6	51.6	45.6	48.2	51.2
InverseCoder-CL (ours)*	7B	48.7	61.9	52.6	55.2	53.0	46.1	52.9
Magicoder-S-DS*	6.7B	59.6	69.8	70.0	64.4	54.4	53.6	62.0
WizardCoder-GPT4-DS*	6.7B	61.4	66.4	68.7	61.8	52.6	56.1	61.2
InverseCoder-DS (ours)*	6.7B	60.7	70.1	70.5	63.6	53.0	57.4	62.6

Table 4: Pass@1 (%) results on DS-1000. We evaluate our models in the same prompt format as Magicoder with `temperature = 0.2`, `top_p = 0.5`, `max_length = 1024`, `num_samples = 40` and `batch_size = 4`. We report other results from Magicoder paper.

Model	Size	+155 Matplotlib	+220 Numpy	+291 Pandas	+68 Pytorch	+106 SciPy	+115 Sklearn	+45 Tensorflow	=1000 Overall
CodeLlama-Python	7B	55.3	34.5	16.4	19.9	22.3	17.6	28.5	28.0
WizardCoder-CL	7B	53.5	34.4	15.2	25.7	21.0	24.5	28.9	28.4
Magicoder-CL	7B	54.6	34.8	19.0	24.7	25.0	22.6	28.9	29.9
Magicoder-S-CL	7B	55.9	40.6	28.4	40.4	28.8	35.8	37.6	37.5
WizardCoder-GPT4-CL	7B	51.5	46.9	29.9	43.6	34.9	41.9	39.0	40.2
InverseCoder-CL (ours)	7B	54.2	48.6	27.4	38.0	34.0	41.9	40.3	39.9
Magicoder-S-DS	6.7B	54.8	48.9	30.0	49.2	27.3	44.7	41.2	41.2
WizardCoder-GPT4-DS	6.7B	53.8	53.9	28.0	49.3	30.4	45.7	44.4	42.2
InverseCoder-DS (ours)	6.7B	55.5	53.9	32.3	56.7	30.0	50.3	33.9	44.2

Table 5: Pass@1 (%) results on MBPP(+) in the self-consistency experiment. The generation and evaluation process are the same as the MBPP(+) experiments in Section 5.1 except the canonical solutions. We also report the problems removed due to errors in original answers.

Model	Self-Consistency Pass@1 on MBPP(+)	# of removed problems
CodeLlama-Python	42.7 (41.4)	64
DeepSeek-Coder	57.4 (50.6)	68
WizardCoder-GPT4-CL	69.0 (65.6)	52
InverseCoder-CL (ours)	76.0 (73.5)	53
WizardCoder-GPT4-DS	76.1 (69.7)	48
InverseCoder-DS (ours)	80.4 (75.3)	46

Table 6: Pass@1 (%) results on HumanEval+ and MBPP+ in ablation studies. ‘‘Preprocessing’’, ‘‘Summarization’’ and ‘‘Evaluation’’ correspond to the three steps in our method. ‘‘Generation’’ represents regenerate responses for each instructions.

Method	HumanEval(+)	MBPP(+)
Generation + Evaluation	70.7 (67.1)	70.9 (60.1)
Preprocessing	72.6 (68.9)	69.8 (59.8)
Preprocessing + Summarization	75.6 (71.3)	68.0 (58.2)
Preprocesssing + Summarization + Evaluation (ours)	76.2 (72.0)	70.6 (60.1)

code after summarizing the code it generates before. Self-consistency is defined as

$$\mathbb{1}(M(M^{-1}(M(x))) = M(x)), \quad (2)$$

where $M(\cdot)$ denotes the LLM’s code generation process, $M^{-1}(\cdot)$ denotes the LLM’s code summarization process, $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function, and $=$ denotes functional equivalence. Specifically, self-consistency is measured by three steps: Firstly, we prompt the code LLM M with MBPP+ problems x_i to generate code $y_i = M(x_i)$. Then, code LLM summarizes the code y_i to get new instructions $x'_i = M^{-1}(y_i)$. Next, we let the code LLM generate new code y'_i based on x'_i , *i.e.* $y'_i = M(x'_i)$. Finally, we evaluate if y'_i and y_i are functional equivalent by measuring their outputs given the same inputs taken from MBPP+ benchmark. The result is calculated as the pass@1 of new code responses y'_i taking the original code responses y_i as groundtruth solutions. Note that we remove the problems whose inputs will cause a runtime error when applied to y_i .

The results are shown in Figure 5. InverseCoder has better self-consistency than its base model, which indicates that the base model has a larger gap between generation and summarization, and the performance improvement of InverseCoder may come from bridging this gap.

Furthermore, we notice that **self-consistency can serve as a proxy evaluation** of our method before training. That is, one can predict the performance improvement of INVERSE-INSTRUCT by evaluating the model’s self-consistency without training. For example, DeepSeek-Coder-Base-6.7B has better self-consistency than CodeLlama-Python-7B, which means that INVERSE-INSTRUCT is less effective on DeepSeek-Coder-Base-6.7B than on CodeLlama-Python-7B.

5.3 Ablation Study

We conduct a series of ablation experiments to analyze the utility of code summarization and data selection steps in our method. The ablation experiments are in three aspects:

Generation + Evaluation We regenerate 10 responses $\{y_{ij}\}_{j=1}^{10}$ for each instruction $\{x_i\}$ in the original instruction tuning dataset (*i.e.* `evol-codealpaca-v1`) and apply the same self-evaluation method to select the best responses, which aims to compare code summarization with the trivial forward data generation method (*i.e.* from instruction to response).

Preprocessing We replace the new instructions dataset $\{(x_{ij}^*, y_i^*)\}$ with $\{(x_i, y_i^*)\}$ to reveal the improvement only from preprocessing, where $\{x_i\}$ is the original instructions and $\{y_i^*\}$ is the corresponding preprocessed code snippets to $\{x_i\}$.

Table 7: Pass@1 (%) results on HumanEval (+) and MBPP (+) in self-improving experiments for base model CodeLlama-Python-7B. We report performances of the model finetuned with generated data for 1 and 2 epochs. The other hyperparameters are the same as Section 5.1.

Model	HumanEval (+)	MBPP (+)
CodeLlama-Python-7B	39.6 (35.4)	51.9 (43.7)
+1 epoch self-generated data	54.3 (49.3)	52.9 (44.7)
+2 epoch self-generated data	54.9 (50.6)	54.2 (46.6)

Preprocessing + Summarization To study the role of self-evaluation and data selection, we generate only one instruction for each response in the code summarization step without any selection.

We use CodeLlama-Python-7B as the base model in ablation experiments with the same training settings as INVERSE-INSTRUCT (*i.e.* 1 epoch fine-tuning for new dataset and 2 epochs for original dataset). The HumanEval+ and MBPP+ results of the experiments are presented in Table 6. It is shown that the summarization step plays a main role in our method. Although replacing summarization with generation will bring a slight improvement in MBPP+ benchmark, its performance in HumanEval+ gets even worse than the original model, which implies the necessity of summarization.

5.4 Self-improving for Base Models

Although we still need an original instruction tuning dataset to obtain a stronger instruction following model for better code summarization and self-evaluation in INVERSE-INSTRUCT, we notice that base models already have certain summarization and self-evaluation capabilities under a well-designed prompt in completion form. Therefore, we conduct an experiment to validate that by using high-quality unlabeled source code as responses, the base model can improve itself without any human annotations.

We first use the preprocessed code responses $\{y_i^*\}$ of the original dataset $\{y_i\}$ as the high-quality unlabeled source code. Then, we apply code summarization and self-evaluation on it simply by prompting a base model to obtain an instruction-tuning dataset. Finally, we fine-tune the base model with the instruction data generated by itself.

The evaluation results of self-improving experiments for CodeLlama-Python-7B are shown in Table 7. The enhanced performance reveals that it is useful to apply INVERSE-INSTRUCT for the base model in the situation with adequate high-quality unlabeled data but insufficient human-annotated instruction data.

6 Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper presents a novel approach to enhancing the capabilities of open-source code LLMs by leveraging self-generated data for instruction tuning, rather than relying solely on data from powerful closed-source LLMs like GPT-3.5 and GPT-4. Our proposed method, named INVERSE-INSTRUCT, capitalizes on the inherent asymmetry in translating between formal and informal languages. By reversing the conventional process, INVERSE-INSTRUCT generates high-quality natural language instructions from code snippets via summarization and self-evaluation techniques. The effectiveness of this methodology is demonstrated through the development of InverseCoder, a new series of code LLMs that not only outperform their predecessors in traditional benchmarks but also show significant improvement across diverse coding tasks.

7 Limitations

Our research is subject to two primary limitations. Firstly, the performance of our approach is contingent upon the base model’s capacity to accurately summarize code. A promising avenue for future exploration is to investigate the disparities in the model’s capabilities across different modalities (e.g., code-to-code, code-to-instruction, instruction-to-code), which may enable the development of more advanced language models that surpass current performance ceilings. Secondly, the generation of synthetic data relies on access to high-quality code snippet datasets. Future work should focus on reducing the required code snippet volume to enhance efficiency and feasibility.

References

- [1] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*, 2021.
- [2] 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.
- [3] Loubna Ben Allal, Niklas Muennighoff, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Ben Lipkin, and Leandro von Werra. A framework for the evaluation of code generation models. <https://github.com/bigcode-project/bigcode-evaluation-harness>, 2022.
- [4] James Betker, Gabriel Goh, Li Jing, † TimBrooks, Jianfeng Wang, Linjie Li, † LongOuyang, † JuntangZhuang, † JoyceLee, † YufeiGuo, † WesamManassra, † PrafullaDhariwal, † CaseyChu, † YunxinJiao, and Aditya Ramesh. Improving image generation with better captions. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:264403242>.
- [5] Federico Cassano, John Gouwar, Daniel Nguyen, Sy Duy Nguyen, Luna Phipps-Costin, Donald Pinckney, Ming-Ho Yee, Yangtian Zi, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Molly Q. Feldman, Arjun Guha, Michael Greenberg, and Abhinav Jangda. Multipl-e: A scalable and polyglot approach to benchmarking neural code generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 49: 3675–3691, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258205341>.
- [6] Sahil Chaudhary. Code alpaca: An instruction-following llama model for code generation. <https://github.com/sahil280114/codealpaca>, 2023.
- [7] 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. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [8] Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, and Quanquan Gu. Self-play fine-tuning converts weak language models to strong language models, 2024.
- [9] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam M. Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Benton C. Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier García, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathleen S. Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24:240:1–240:113, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:247951931>.
- [10] Fenia Christopoulou, Gerasimos Lampouras, Milan Gritta, Guchun Zhang, Yinpeng Guo, Zhongyi Li, Qi Zhang, Meng Xiao, Bo Shen, Lin Li, Hao Yu, Liyu Yan, Pingyi Zhou, Xin Wang, Yu Ma, Ignacio Iacobacci, Yasheng Wang, Guangtai Liang, Jia Wei, Xin Jiang, Qianxiang Wang, and Qun Liu. Pangu-coder: Program synthesis with function-level language modeling. *ArXiv, abs/2207.11280*, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:251040785>.

- [11] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(70):1–53, 2024.
- [12] Shihan Dou, Yan Liu, Haoxiang Jia, Limao Xiong, Enyu Zhou, Wei Shen, Junjie Shan, Caishuang Huang, Xiao Wang, Xiaoran Fan, Zhiheng Xi, Yuhao Zhou, Tao Ji, Rui Zheng, Qi Zhang, Xuanjing Huang, and Tao Gui. StepCoder: Improve code generation with reinforcement learning from compiler feedback, 2024.
- [13] Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida I. Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Wen tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. InCoder: A generative model for code infilling and synthesis. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.05999, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:248157108>.
- [14] Yuxian Gu, Pei Ke, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Minlie Huang. Learning instructions with unlabeled data for zero-shot cross-task generalization. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:252918165>.
- [15] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Yu 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. *ArXiv*, abs/2401.14196, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:267211867>.
- [16] Tanmay Gupta and Aniruddha Kembhavi. Visual programming: Compositional visual reasoning without training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14953–14962, 2023.
- [17] Patrick M. Haluptzok, Matthew Bowers, and Adam Tauman Kalai. Language models can teach themselves to program better. *ArXiv*, abs/2207.14502, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:251197051>.
- [18] Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Haoteng Zhang, and Ion Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:261697361>.
- [19] Yuhang Lai, Chengxi Li, Yiming Wang, Tianyi Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, Wentau Yih, Daniel Fried, Sida Wang, and Tao Yu. Ds-1000: A natural and reliable benchmark for data science code generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 18319–18345. PMLR, 2023.
- [20] Hung Le, Yue Wang, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Silvio Savarese, and Steven C. H. Hoi. CoderL: Mastering code generation through pretrained models and deep reinforcement learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [21] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Terry Yue Zhuo, Thomas Wang, Olivier Dehaene, Mishig Davaadorj, Joel Lamy-Poirier, João Monteiro, Oleh Shliazhko, Nicolas Gontier, Nicholas Meade, Armel Zebaze, Ming-Ho Yee, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Jian Zhu, Benjamin Lipkin, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Zhiruo Wang, Rudra Murthy, Jason Stillerman, Siva Sankalp Patel, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Marco Zocca, Manan Dey, Zhihan Zhang, Nourhan Fahmy, Urvashi Bhattacharyya, W. Yu, Swayam Singh, Sasha Luccioni, Paulo Villegas, Maxim Kunakov, Fedor Zhdanov, Manuel Romero, Tony Lee, Nadav Timor, Jennifer Ding, Claire Schlesinger, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jana Ebert, Tri Dao, Mayank Mishra, Alexander Gu, Jennifer Robinson, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Danish Contractor, Siva Reddy, Daniel Fried, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Sean M. Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. StarCoder: may the source be with you! *ArXiv*, abs/2305.06161, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258588247>.

- [22] Xian Li, Ping Yu, Chunting Zhou, Timo Schick, Luke Zettlemoyer, Omer Levy, Jason Weston, and Mike Lewis. Self-alignment with instruction backtranslation. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.06259, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:260866107>.
- [23] Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, Thomas Hubert, Peter Choy, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Igor Babuschkin, Xinyun Chen, Po-Sen Huang, Johannes Welbl, Sven Gowal, Alexey Cherepanov, James Molloy, Daniel Jaymin Mankowitz, Esme Sutherland Robson, Pushmeet Kohli, Nando de Freitas, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Oriol Vinyals. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science*, 378:1092 – 1097, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:246527904>.
- [24] Jacky Liang, Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Peng Xu, Karol Hausman, Brian Ichter, Pete Florence, and Andy Zeng. Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 9493–9500. IEEE, 2023.
- [25] Jiatae Liu, Yiqin Zhu, Kaiwen Xiao, Qiang Fu, Xiao Han, Wei Yang, and Deheng Ye. Rlhf: Reinforcement learning from unit test feedback. *ArXiv*, abs/2307.04349, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259501019>.
- [26] Jiawei Liu, Chun Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.01210, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258437095>.
- [27] Anton Lozhkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Federico Cassano, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Nouamane Tazi, Ao Tang, Dmytro Pykhtar, Jiawei Liu, Yuxiang Wei, et al. Starcoder 2 and the stack v2: The next generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19173*, 2024.
- [28] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08568*, 2023.
- [29] Yecheng Jason Ma, William Liang, Guanzhi Wang, De-An Huang, Osbert Bastani, Dinesh Jayaraman, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Eureka: Human-level reward design via coding large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12931*, 2023.
- [30] Microsoft. Github copilot – your ai pair programmer. <https://github.com/features/copilot>, 2023.
- [31] Niklas Muennighoff, Qian Liu, Qi Liu, Armel Zebaze, Qinkai Zheng, Binyuan Hui, Terry Yue Zhuo, Swayam Singh, Xiangru Tang, Leandro von Werra, and S. Longpre. Octopack: Instruction tuning code large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.07124, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:260886874>.
- [32] Mohamed Nejjar, Luca Zacharias, Fabian Stiehle, and Ingo Weber. Llms for science: Usage for code generation and data analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16733*, 2023.
- [33] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474*, 2022.
- [34] OpenAI. Chatgpt: Optimizing language models for dialogue, 2022.
- [35] R OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv 2303.08774. *View in Article*, 2023.
- [36] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020.

- [37] Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, Artyom Kozhevnikov, I. Evtimov, Joanna Bitton, Manish P Bhatt, Cristian Cantón Ferrer, Aaron Grattafiori, Wenhan Xiong, Alexandre D’efossez, Jade Copet, Faisal Azhar, Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Nicolas Usunier, Thomas Scialom, and Gabriel Synnaeve. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.12950, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:261100919>.
- [38] Noam M. Shazeer and Mitchell Stern. Adafactor: Adaptive learning rates with sublinear memory cost. *ArXiv*, abs/1804.04235, 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:4786918>.
- [39] Bo Shen, Jiaxin Zhang, Taihong Chen, Daoguang Zan, Bing Geng, An Fu, Muhan Zeng, Ailun Yu, Jichuan Ji, Jingyang Zhao, Yuenan Guo, and Qianxiang Wang. Pangu-coder2: Boosting large language models for code with ranking feedback, 2023.
- [40] Parshin Shojaee, Aneesh Jain, Sindhu Tipirneni, and Chandan K. Reddy. Execution-based code generation using deep reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2301.13816, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:256416258>.
- [41] Alexander Shypula, Aman Madaan, Yimeng Zeng, Uri Alon, Jacob R. Gardner, Yiming Yang, Milad Hashemi, Graham Neubig, Parthasarathy Ranganathan, Osbert Bastani, and Amir Yazdanbakhsh. Learning performance-improving code edits. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ix7rLVHXyY>.
- [42] Hongjin Su, Weijia Shi, Jungo Kasai, Yizhong Wang, Yushi Hu, Mari Ostendorf, Wen tau Yih, Noah A. Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Tao Yu. One embedder, any task: Instruction-finetuned text embeddings. *ArXiv*, abs/2212.09741, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:254853816>.
- [43] Zhiqing Sun, Yikang Shen, Qinhong Zhou, Hongxin Zhang, Zhenfang Chen, David D. Cox, Yiming Yang, and Chuang Gan. Principle-driven self-alignment of language models from scratch with minimal human supervision. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.03047, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258479665>.
- [44] Dídac Surís, Sachit Menon, and Carl Vondrick. ViperGPT: Visual inference via python execution for reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11888–11898, 2023.
- [45] Hao Tang, Darren Key, and Kevin Ellis. WorldCoder, a model-based llm agent: Building world models by writing code and interacting with the environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12275*, 2024.
- [46] 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.
- [47] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- [48] theblackcat102. The evolved code alpaca dataset. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/theblackcat102/evol-codealpaca-v1>, 2023.
- [49] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
- [50] Jiahao Wang, Bolin Zhang, Qianlong Du, Jiajun Zhang, and Dianhui Chu. A survey on data selection for llm instruction tuning. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.05123, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:267547917>.

- [51] Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560*, 2022.
- [52] Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven C.H. Hoi. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. In *EMNLP*, 2021.
- [53] Yue Wang, Hung Le, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Nghi D. Q. Bui, Junnan Li, and Steven C. H. Hoi. Codet5+: Open code large language models for code understanding and generation. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258685677>.
- [54] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*, 2021.
- [55] Yuxiang Wei, Zhe Wang, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, and Lingming Zhang. Magicoder: Source code is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02120*, 2023.
- [56] Yuxiang Wei, Federico Cassano, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, Naman Jain, Harm de Vries, Leandro von Werra, Arjun Guha, and Lingming Zhang. Starcoder2-instruct: Fully transparent and permissive self-alignment for code generation, 2024. URL <https://github.com/bigcode-project/starcoder2-self-align>.
- [57] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*, 2023.
- [58] Da Yin, Xiao Liu, Fan Yin, Ming Zhong, Hritik Bansal, Jiawei Han, and Kai-Wei Chang. Dynosaur: A dynamic growth paradigm for instruction-tuning data curation. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258841263>.
- [59] Zhaojian Yu, Xin Zhang, Ning Shang, Yangyu Huang, Can Xu, Yishujie Zhao, Wenxiang Hu, and Qiufeng Yin. Wavecoder: Widespread and versatile enhanced instruction tuning with refined data generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14187*, 2023.
- [60] Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Xian Li, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. Self-rewarding language models, 2024.
- [61] Yifan Zhang, Yifan Luo, Yang Yuan, and Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. Automathtext: Autonomous data selection with language models for mathematical texts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07625*, 2024.
- [62] Qinkai Zheng, Xiao Xia, Xu Zou, Yuxiao Dong, Shanshan Wang, Yufei Xue, Zihan Wang, Lei Shen, Andi Wang, Yang Li, Teng Su, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Codegeex: A pre-trained model for code generation with multilingual evaluations on humaneval-x. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.17568, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257834177>.
- [63] Tianyu Zheng, Ge Zhang, Tianhao Shen, Xueling Liu, Bill Yuchen Lin, Jie Fu, Wenhui Chen, and Xiang Yue. Opencodeinterpreter: Integrating code generation with execution and refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14658*, 2024.

A Broader Impacts

Compared to directly distilling data from powerful LLMs, INVERSE-INSTRUCT makes the very first attempt to leverage the mismatch between the model’s code generation and summarization to self-improve. Through extensive experiments, we have demonstrated the feasibility of this approach. INVERSE-INSTRUCT offers the potential to further enhance the code generation capabilities of code LLMs.

However, similar to other code LLMs, InverseCoder may produce code that does not align with user intent and could be misused. These issues have been thoroughly discussed by Chen et al. [7], and we refer readers to the broader impacts and hazard analysis section of that work. Security concerns are not uncommon. For instance, the generated code might delete system files or the model itself. Thus, we recommend users create a virtual execution environment, such as a sandbox, to mitigate these risks before running the generated code.

B Method Details

The prompts we used in INVERSE-INSTRUCT are shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Prompt for code summarization, self-evaluation, and instruction-tuning.

Figure 3 is an example of a response with multiple code snippets.

Figure 4 is an example of a mistake in summarization.


C Further Analysis

To explore the application of INVERSE-INSTRUCT in realistic situations, we further analyze the different features and length distributions between generated instructions and original instructions and the impact of data scaling.


C.1 Dataset Analysis

Following Wei et al. [55], we use the text embeddings generated by INSTRUCTOR [42] to analyze categories of the instructions generated by INVERSE-INSTRUCT. We calculate the ratios of 10 coding-related categories of the instructions in `evol-codealpaca-v1` and the dataset generated by CodeLlama-Python-7B. The results are illustrated on Figure 5 and Figure 6. They show that the generated instructions have different distributions from its original dataset, which improves the diversity of our training data.

Furthermore, we depict the length distribution by counting the token for the instructions and responses in `evol-codealpaca-v1` and the dataset with instructions generated by CodeLlama-Python-7B.

Here is a function which takes a string and a number as arguments. The string is the one you want to split and the number is the number of equal parts you want to split the string into. 

```
```python
def split_string(string, part_count):
 str_len = len(string)
 part_len = str_len // part_count
 parts = []
 for i in range(0, str_len, part_len):
 part = string[i: i + part_len]
 parts.append(part)
 return parts
```
```

You can call this function with your test string and desired number of parts like this: 

```
```python
test_str = 'This_is_a_test'
print(split_string(test_str, 4))
```
```





Figure 3: An example response with multiple parts of code.

The distributions are shown in Figure 7 and Figure 8. We noticed that the responses in the new dataset are much shorter since it is pure code snippets extracted from the original dataset.

We also study the similarity between HumanEval of the original dataset and our generated dataset by the same approach as Wei et al. [55]. The results are shown in Figure 9.

C.2 Data Scaling

With 110K instruction tuning dataset for general programming tasks, `evol-codealpaca-v1`, the performance of InverseCoder is greatly improved by INVERSE-INSTRUCT. However, there may be a limited amount of labeled code data in some specific areas (*e.g.*, embodied intelligence). How much does the performance gain from INVERSE-INSTRUCT in different amounts of data? We conduct a series of experiments to simulate the data-limited scenarios by using 25K, 50K, 75K instruction-response pairs randomly selected from the original dataset. We fine-tune the base model with three subsets of data as three weaker original models and apply INVERSE-INSTRUCT for them respectively.

The performance enhancements on HumanEval+ of the model fine-tuned with the three subsets and the whole dataset are illustrated in Figure 10. It is shown that the performances of the original models are all improved by INVERSE-INSTRUCT at different scales of data.

D Generation Examples

Table 8 9 are some examples of the responses to programming instructions given by InverseCoder.

| Good instruction | Bad instruction |
|--|---|
| Design a ruby script to copy content of one tar file (gzip format) into another. The files can be large so they should be treated as binary streams using `binread` and `binwrite`. The paths may vary | Develop a ruby program which reads from a .tar.gz file (gzipped tar archive), decompresses it and writes the content back into a new .tar.gz file. |
| Response | |
| <pre> `ruby # read all contents = File.binread("path-to-file.tar.gz") # write all File.binwrite("test.tar.gz", contents) ` </pre> | |

Figure 4: An mistake example of summarization.




Figure 5: Instruction category constitution of evol-codealpaca-v1.




Figure 6: Instruction category constitution of the dataset generated by CodeLlama-Python-7B.




Figure 7: Token count distribution of evol-codealpaca-v1




Figure 8: Token count distribution of the dataset generated by CodeLlama-Python-7B.




Figure 9: Cosine similarities between HumanEval and different datasets.




Figure 10: **The impact of data scaling.** This figure shows pass@1 (%) results on HumanEval(+) for different scales of data. Legend “Original” and “Ours” represent the original models trained only with the corresponding amount of data and the models enhanced by INVERSE-INSTRUCT with the same sub-dataset as its original model respectively. (+) represents HumanEval+.

Table 8: Instruction and response examples of InverseCoder.

| Instruction | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>Write a Python script that lists all the files in the current directory.</p> | <p>Here is a simple Python script that lists all the files in the current directory:</p> <pre> import os # Get the current directory current_dir = os.getcwd() # List all files in the current directory files = os.listdir(current_dir) # Print the files for file in files: print(file) </pre> <p>This script uses the <code>os</code> module in Python, which provides a way of using operating system dependent functionality. The <code>os.getcwd()</code> function returns the current working directory, and <code>os.listdir(path)</code> returns a list containing the names of the entries in the directory given by path.</p> |
| <p>Please show me how to calculate the first ten primes in cpp.</p> | <p>Here is a simple C++ program that calculates the first ten prime numbers:</p> <pre> #include<iostream> using namespace std; bool isPrime(int num) { if (num <= 1) return false; for (int i = 2; i * i <= num; i++) { if (num % i == 0) return false; } return true; } int main() { int count = 0; int num = 2; while(count < 10) { if(isPrime(num)) { cout << num << " "; count++; } num++; } return 0; } </pre> <p>This program defines a function <code>isPrime</code> that checks if a number is prime. It then uses this function in a loop in the <code>main</code> function to find and print the first ten prime numbers.</p> |

Table 9: Instruction and response examples of InverseCoder.

| Instruction | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>How to do matrix multiplication in Pytorch? Show me an example.</p> | <p>Matrix multiplication in PyTorch can be done using the `mm` function from the `torch` module. Here is an example:</p> <pre> import torch # Create two matrices matrix1 = torch.tensor([[1, 2, 3], [4, 5, 6]]) matrix2 = torch.tensor([[7, 8], [9, 10], [11, 12]]) # Perform matrix multiplication result = torch.mm(matrix1, matrix2) print(result) </pre> <p>In this example, `matrix1` is a 2x3 matrix and `matrix2` is a 3x2 matrix. The `mm` function performs matrix multiplication on these two matrices and returns a new matrix. The output will be:</p> <pre> tensor([[58, 64], [139, 154]]) </pre> |
| <p>Please check if the network can connect to www.example.com using Python.</p> | <p>Sure, you can use the `requests` library in Python to check if a network can connect to `www.example.com`. Here is a simple script:</p> <pre> import requests try: response = requests.get("http://www.example.com") response.raise_for_status() print("Connection successful") except requests.exceptions.HTTPError as errh: print ("Http Error:",errh) except requests.exceptions.ConnectionError as errc: print ("Error Connecting:",errc) except requests.exceptions.Timeout as errt: print ("Timeout Error:",errt) except requests.exceptions.RequestException as err: print ("Something went wrong",err) </pre> <p>This script sends a GET request to `www.example.com` and checks for any exceptions that might occur during the request. If the request is successful, it prints "Connection successful". If there is an HTTP error, a connection error, a timeout error, or any other type of request exception, it prints the error.</p> |