

Natural Language to Code Generation in Interactive Data Science Notebooks

Pengcheng Yin*, Wen-Ding Li, Kefan Xiao, Abhishek Rao, Yeming Wen, Kensen Shi, Joshua Howland, Paige Bailey, Michele Catasta, Henryk Michalewski, Alex Polozov, Charles Sutton

Google Inc.

Abstract

Computational notebooks, such as Jupyter notebooks, are interactive computing environments that are ubiquitous among data scientists to perform data wrangling and analytic tasks. To measure the performance of AI pair programmers that automatically synthesize programs for those tasks given natural language (NL) intents from users, we build ARCADE, a benchmark of 1,082 code generation problems using the pandas data analysis framework in data science notebooks. ARCADE features multiple rounds of NL-to-code problems from the same notebook. It requires a model to understand rich multi-modal contexts, such as existing notebook cells and their execution states as well as previous turns of interaction. To establish a strong baseline on this challenging task, we develop PACHINCO, a 62B code language model (LM) for Python computational notebooks, which significantly outperforms public code LMs. Finally, we explore few-shot prompting strategies to elicit better code with step-by-step decomposition and NL explanation, showing the potential to improve the diversity and explainability of model predictions.¹

1 Introduction

Data science is the process of extracting insights from data (Wang et al., 2021a), and has become an integral part of decision making and knowledge discovery (Donoho, 2017). Data scientists and machine learning (ML) practitioners often use *computational notebooks*, which are interactive environments such as Jupyter notebooks (Kluyver et al., 2016) and Google Colab,² in their work. As illustrated in Fig. 1, data scientists spend significant amount of time on data wrangling and exploratory data analysis (EDA) (Agashe et al., 2019; Wang

```
[1] import pandas as pd
c1 df = pd.read_csv('dataset/Gamepass_Games_v1.csv')

[2] u1 Extract min and max hours as two columns
def get_avg(x):
    try: return float(x[0]), float(x[1])
    except: return 0, 0
df['min'], df['max'] = zip(*df['TIME'].str.replace('hours', '').str.split("-").apply(get_avg))
c2

[3] df['ADDED'] = pd.to_datetime(df['ADDED'], format="%d %b %y", errors='coerce')
c3

[4] u2 In which year was the most played game added?
df['GAMERS'] = df['GAMERS'].str.replace(' ', '').astype(int)
added_year = df[df['GAMERS'].idxmax()]['ADDED'].year
c4

[5] u3 For each month in that year, how many games that has a rating of more than four?
df[(df['ADDED'].dt.year == added_date.year) & (df['RATING'] > 4)].groupby(df["ADDED"].dt.month)['GAME'].count()
c5

[6] u4 What is the average maximum completion time for all fallout games added in 2021?
fallout = df[df['GAME'].str.contains('Fallout')]
fallout.groupby(fallout['ADDED'].dt.year).get_group(2021)['max'].mean()
c6

[7] u5 What is the amount of games added in each year for each month? (show a table with index as years, columns as months and fill null values with 0)
pd.pivot_table(df, index=df['ADDED'].dt.year, ..., aggfunc=np.count_nonzero, fill_value=0).rename_axis(index='Year', columns='Month')
c7
```

Figure 1: An example of a computational notebook adapted from our dataset, with examples of reading and preprocessing data (cell c_1), data wrangling (cell c_2, c_3), and data analysis (cells $c_3 - c_7$). Annotated NL intents are shown in green.

et al., 2022a). This has motivated research on automating and accelerating the data science workflow in general (Aggarwal et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2021a,b), with particular interest in data wrangling and EDA tasks (Bavishi et al., 2019; Jain et al., 2021; Karmaker et al., 2020; Nazabal et al., 2020; Kandel et al., 2011).

On the other hand, large language models (LLMs) trained on code can assist developers by translating natural language (NL) intents into exe-

*Correspondence to pcyin@google.com

¹Dataset will be released shortly.

²<https://colab.research.google.com/>

cutable programs (Chen et al., 2021a; Austin et al., 2021; Chowdhery et al., 2022; Nijkamp et al., 2022; Fried et al., 2022, *inter alia*), with promising applications in synthesizing code for data wrangling and EDA tasks (Jain et al., 2021; Rajkumar et al., 2022; Cheng et al., 2022). Computational notebooks also present unique challenges to LLMs, because notebooks freely mix NL, code, graphics, and execution results (Perkel, 2021), and because of their interactivity, notebooks feature multiple turns of related NL-to-code problems (Heyman et al., 2021). As illustrated in Fig. 1, those problems often have interesting dependency structures. They may share common execution context (*e.g.* DataFrame `df`), form semantically coherent turns (*e.g.* c_4, c_5), or exhibit non-trivial long range data dependency (*e.g.* from c_6 to c_2 , or c_7 to c_3). This dependency structure is more complex than existing multi-turn text to code tasks with sequentially dependent problems (Nijkamp et al., 2022).

Several benchmarks have been proposed to evaluate program synthesis of data science programs from NL intents, but these datasets have several limitations. First, some datasets derive from data science tutorial notebooks (Agashe et al., 2019; Chandel et al., 2022), but this data tends to contain NL text (*e.g.* exercise questions) which is more verbose and elaborate than the concise, ephemeral style that developers write when interacting with code LMs (Barke et al., 2022, more in §3). Other datasets assume that the developer provides extra information, such as unit tests or input/output examples (Chandel et al., 2022; Jain et al., 2022), but such systems pose an extra burden to users who might not normally write such tests or examples during their workflow (Pimentel et al., 2019). Finally, existing datasets usually contain independent tasks with isolated contexts (Lai et al., 2022), or limited number of contextually dependent problems (Huang et al., 2022), rather than having multiple, related tasks with complex dependencies such as in Fig. 1. Therefore, there is a need for a benchmark that provides *realistic NL intents, rich notebook context, and multiple interrelated problems*, so as to better reflect real-world usage by data scientists.

To fill this gap, we present ARCADE,³ a new benchmark for code generation for data wrangling and EDA tasks in computational notebooks (§3).

³Answer Repository for Computational Analysis and Data Engineering

ARCADE consists of 1,082 problems spanning across 136 notebooks for 106 ML datasets. ARCADE features a series of NL utterances written by professional data scientists with the intention of interacting with an AI pair programmer when working in a notebook (*e.g.*, green texts in Fig. 1), with high-quality code solutions using the pandas library. To mitigate the risk of data leakage when evaluating LLMs, 65% of the problems and their notebooks are created from scratch, based on recent ML datasets on Kaggle.⁴ ARCADE also challenges LLMs with grounded language understanding, where a model needs to ground relevant semantic concepts in intents (*e.g.* “*min and max*” in u_1) to variable states (*e.g.* the column `df['TIME']`) to understand the intent. Besides featuring concise NL intents and contextually rich problems, more than 67% of problems in ARCADE also require complex solutions using 5 or more pandas API calls, making it more challenging than most existing benchmarks.

To demonstrate how ARCADE can motivate new research, we evaluate public code LMs, finding that they struggle on this task, especially newly created problems from scratch. To build an LM tailored for data science, we develop PACHINCO, a 62B code language model for Python computational notebooks, trained on a mixture of general-domain NL, source code, and Jupyter notebooks (§4). PACHINCO significantly outperforms public code LMs on ARCADE. Further, we explore few-shot prompting strategies to alter the style of model predictions, such as decomposing code into step-by-step solutions and adding inline NL explanations (§5.2). Not only is code in this style potentially more understandable to novice data scientists (§7), we also demonstrate that this improves the accuracy of self-consistency reranking (Wang et al., 2022b), because prompting the model to explain its solutions improves the diversity of the model’s predictions.

2 Problem: Code Generation in Computational Notebooks

Problem Definition A computational notebook is an interactive computing environment that allows mixing code, text, and graphics. The notebook itself consists of a sequence of markdown or source code cells. Formally, given a partial notebook context with k cells $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^k$ and a user-

⁴<https://www.kaggle.com/>

specified intent u for the next cell c_{k+1} (e.g., u_1 in Fig. 1 for $k = 1$), we aim to generate code for c_{k+1} that fulfills the user’s intent (Agashe et al., 2019). This process could proceed sequentially with multiple rounds between the user and a system (Heyman et al., 2021). To answer subsequent intents (e.g., u_4), a system will leverage the updated notebook context (e.g., $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^5$) which includes previous problems (e.g., $\langle u_1 \sim u_3 \rangle$).

Tasks and Programming Library We focus on synthesizing programs for data wrangling and exploratory data analysis tasks. Specifically, **data wrangling** refers to the process of cleaning and transforming data to allow for downstream analysis and machine learning, while **exploratory data analysis** involves querying the data for insights to support later statistical analysis and decision making. We focus on generating code using pandas, a popular Python library for performing wrangling and EDA tasks in computational notebooks, with built-in objects such as DataFrames and Series to model tabular data types (tables and columns, respectively).

3 ARCADE: A Benchmark of pandas Data Science Code Generation

3.1 Constructing ARCADE

ARCADE consists of 1,082 NL-to-code problems from both existing data science notebooks on GitHub (§3.1.1) and new ones curated from scratch (§3.1.2). In this section we elaborate on details to create annotated examples from both sources.

3.1.1 Mining Examples from Existing Notebooks

We identify candidate code cells performing data wrangling and EDA tasks from existing high-quality data science notebooks, and then manually annotate these cells with NL intents.

Collecting Notebooks for Annotation To form a pool of candidate notebooks, we use JuIce (Agashe et al., 2019), a collection of Jupyter notebooks from GitHub, together with additional notebooks from BIGQUERY, yielding over 1.5M notebooks in total.⁵ These notebooks are first filtered and near-deduplicated, similar to PACHINCO’s training data preprocessing step in §4. We then identify candidate code cells from the remaining notebooks for annotation. Specifically,

⁵<https://cloud.google.com/bigquery/public-data/>

we select code cells that are either (1) contain pandas programs with at least 3 pandas API calls, or (2) preceded by a markdown cell with a short question as its content (e.g., *What are the top 10 producers?*). The first heuristic is useful to identify complex wrangling tasks, while the second one is particularly effective in finding interesting dataset-specific EDA tasks, and the existing markdown texts also provide reference for labeling intents later. Next, we group the notebooks with at least one candidate cell based on their underlying ML datasets (e.g. imported using `pd.read_csv()`), and then select the top 5 notebooks with the most number of candidate cells from a curated set of 36 dataset groups for annotation.⁶ We favor notebooks with more candidate cells so that we could extract multiple NL-to-code problems within the same notebook.

Annotating Cells with NL Intents We hired a group of data scientists to annotate the notebooks selected above.⁷ Annotation primarily consists of judging the quality of candidate code cells, fixing any errors, and creating NL intents summarizing the code. Specifically, the annotators are instructed to frame their intents the way they prefer when interacting with an AI system to help them implement the existing code solution, while keeping the intents natural, concise without redundant elaboration, such as line-by-line explanation. In addition, to make the intents more challenging, we encourage annotators to refer to entities and variables in intents using semantic rewrites without introducing ambiguity (e.g., use “*convert all binary columns to bool*” instead of listing columns verbatim), reminiscent of synonym substitution for labeling utterances in text-to-SQL (Gan et al., 2021).

Mitigate Ambiguity in NL Intents Creating succinct NL intents without ambiguity could be non-trivial in this open-domain code generation setting, especially when there could be multiple plausible interpretations of an intent. For example, without the underlined part of u_5 (Fig. 1), a programmer or a system may propose alternative solutions using different table schema. Therefore, for such open-ended problems where there could be multiple alternative ways to present the answer, we ask annotators to provide extra specification in

⁶This set contains ML datasets from a variety of domains and schema.

⁷Eight freelancers reported skill in pandas are hired from Upwork, with an average of 3 years of experience.

their intents about the desired output (*e.g.* schema of output DataFrame, such as the *underlined part* in u_5). Even with these additional semantic constraints, empirically we observe around 45% intents are still under-specified, making ARCADE a challenging benchmark for handling realistic NL intents with uncertainty. We present more analysis in §3.2, while introducing a robust evaluation metric that mitigates this issue in §3.3.

Other Considerations Indeed, re-purposing notebooks in the wild for our benchmark is not an easy task. As an example, many notebooks in JulCe are data science tutorials, which often contains documentation that includes background knowledge, reference materials, and even solution hints. Those extra information makes the code generation task easier, and may not reflect the style of ordinary notebooks authored by data scientists in their day-to-day work. We therefore ask the annotators to clean the notebook and remove such extra information whenever possible. We compile a 35-page annotation guideline to cover corner cases like this. Refer to Appendix A for more details about the guideline.

3.1.2 Creating Notebooks with Examples from Scratch

The problems derived from high-quality GitHub notebooks in §3.1.1 capture realistic tasks and notebook contexts, but may result in artificially high evaluation accuracies due to potential leakage of evaluation notebooks to the training data of LLMs, which is a common issue in LLM evaluation (Brown et al., 2020).⁸ To defend against this data contamination, we additionally annotated 660 problems by creating notebooks from scratch.

Sourcing Novel ML Datasets To ensure that those newly-created examples can be used to evaluate the generalization ability of code LMs on unseen ML datasets, we create notebooks targeting data wrangling and EDA tasks for 70 tabular ML datasets that have been recently uploaded to the Kaggle data science platform since February 2022. Those short-listed datasets are manually selected from a pool of 600 datasets with reasonably complex schema (*e.g.*, having columns with diverse data type), and are verified by our annotators that no older-versioned datasets with similar schema appeared before.

⁸Since JulCe and BigQuery primarily contain source files before or in 2019, this issue could be more problematic.

Creating Notebooks from Scratch For each ML dataset, the annotators were asked to create one notebook with a series of wrangling and EDA tasks annotated with NL intents.⁹ Specifically, we ask annotators to come up with tasks that they would like to perform in order to gain insights into these recently appeared ML datasets in order to build models for them. We follow the same standard to create intents as in §3.1.1. To make the problems more challenging, annotators are encouraged to create harder tasks whose code solutions require at least 5 pandas API calls. For quality assurance, each notebook is peer reviewed by another annotator, before a final round of review by the first author. Since the annotators have already worked on the prior task of creating examples from existing notebooks, they are fairly familiar with the requirement, and are able to create each problem in 13 minutes on average.

3.2 Dataset Analysis

ARCADE consists of 1,082 NL-to-code problems from 133 notebooks based on 106 unique ML datasets. We first present some analysis on our dataset, before comparing the statistics of ARCADE with existing datasets in Tab. 1.

NL Intents are often Under-specified Since ARCADE aims to evaluate code LMs in the real-world scenario where data scientists provide succinct NL intents without extra specification (*e.g.* I/O examples), the intents we collected are often under-specified and may not contain sufficient information to generate a solution that executes to the exact reference output. To understand the patterns of semantic ambiguity in user-issued intents, we conduct a case study, in which we manually examine a small group of random samples. Among those samples, around 55% of them are unambiguous, *i.e.*, they are precise and sufficient to infer the target outputs. Those intents are often numerical queries with limited variety in output type (*e.g.*, *How many customers receive an income of more than 95 percentile?*), or contain sufficient descriptions of output specification (§3.1.1, *e.g.*, *List the 3 largest towns, return the name and area*). The remaining 45% of intents are under-specified. Of these, 30% lack a description of target columns in output DataFrames (*e.g.*, c_4 , Fig. 1). An additional 25% of intents

⁹We only invite the top-3 performers for this task since it is harder than labeling existing notebooks.

Dataset	Source	Execu- table?	Evaluation Method	No. Notebooks	No. Problems	Problems per N.B.	Intents Type	Intent Length	AST Size* All / pandas	No. API [△]
Existing Datasets										
JuICE (Eval)	GH	✗	EM+BLEU	1,457	3,946	2.7	Markdown	60.2	21.2 / 24.3 [‡]	2.5
MS DSP	GH	✓	Unit Tests	305	1,096	3.6	Markdown+Unit Tests	54.3	28.7 / 34.8 [‡]	3.1
ExeDS	GH	✓	Output Match	277	534	1.9 [†]	Annotated NL	20.0	9.0 / 10.7	2.4
NLGP	GH	✗	BLEU+Manual Eval	150	201	1.3	Annotated NL	7.7	13.5 / 15.1	2.1
DS-1000 [◊]	SO	✓	Constraints+Unit Tests	N/A	1,000	N/A	Annotated NL	166.5	27.3 / 41.6 [‡]	5.0
This Work: ARCADE										
[⊥] Existing Tasks	GH	✓	Fuzzy	63	422	7.7	Annotated NL	14.1	19.8	4.2
[⊥] New Tasks	New	✓	Output Match	70	660	9.4		18.4	27.2	5.8

Table 1: Summary statistics of ARCADE compared with existing work. Source: GitHub (GH) or StackOverflow (SO). [△]Number of pandas API calls calculated on the subset of examples using the library. *Metrics are averaged over all and (/) the subset of examples using pandas. [‡]AST sizes for existing datasets are for reference only because some code snippets also contain extra boilerplate code (e.g. function/class sketches) which is not part of solution. [†]Most problems in ExeDS actually do not use preceding examples in the same notebook as contexts for evaluation. [◊]DS-1000 derived StackOverflow problems without multi-cell notebook context, and is not directly comparable with other work.

imply that the desired DataFrames should have a complex schema, such as a nested row index or table header (e.g., *Show the time of the day and the fare price for each airline*), which is difficult to predict without additional information. Another 25% of ambiguous intents have lists of entities as their answers, and do not specified the desired container type (e.g. List or pandas.Series). Finally, the remaining 20% cases require outputs with more complex structures (e.g., multiple variables), or imply additional post-processing steps such as data imputation.

Notebook Context help Disambiguate Intents

Interestingly, while nearly half of the intents are under-specified, we observe that $\sim 30\%$ of those cases can be disambiguated by referring to intents or code snippets from prior rounds of problems with similar query patterns in the notebook context. A common scenario is follow-up EDA queries (e.g. *How many of them are . . .*) that refine the previous query step (e.g. *Show me all . . .*) by narrowing the down search condition, while the output DataFrame structure is the same as previous turns, reminiscent of similar thematic relation patterns in contextual semantic parsing (Iyyer et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2019b).

Comparing Existing and New Tasks Looking closer into the problems in the *Existing Tasks* (§3.1.1) and *New Tasks* (§3.1.2) splits, the *New Tasks* split has more challenging problems than *Existing Tasks*, as measured by the number of pandas API invocations and the AST size in reference code solutions (Tab. 1, Bottom). Fig. 2 plots the histogram of pandas API usage, which shows 67% problems in *New Tasks* require at least 5 API calls to solve them. As we show in §5, with more complex held-out problems targeting for recent ML datasets, the *New Tasks* split serves both as a more

robust and challenging benchmark for state-of-the-art code LLMs.

Comparing with Existing Datasets

Tab. 1 compares ARCADE with existing datasets for data science code generation in computational notebooks. Specifically, **JuICE** (Agashe et al., 2019) contains exercise problems in assignment notebooks from data science tutorials or courses, where the NL intents are usually elaborative assignment problem definitions. Notebooks in JuICE are not executable so evaluation is performed by surface-level matching (exact match or BLEU) between reference and predicted programs. **DSP** (Chandel et al., 2022) contains problems from a filtered set of JuICE notebooks that are executable and also associated with unit tests for auto-grading. Hence the intents in DSP follow similar patterns as those in JuICE. To ensure that the free-form model-predicted code is compatible with unit tests, DSP uses the unit test code itself as extra model input besides NL intents to constrain the model to generate code that could be directly consumed by the tests. Next, **ExeDS** (Huang et al., 2022), a concurrent work to this paper, is another set of filtered problems from JuICE. Similar to this work, ExeDS uses hand-annotated intents, and compares the execution output between reference and predicted code for evaluation instead of relying on unit tests (§3.3). Moreover, **NLGP** (Heyman et al., 2021) is another collection of the NL-to-code problems in Jupyter notebooks with short annotated intents for simple data manipulation tasks, where most notebooks have one associated problem. Finally, for the sake of completeness, we also list another concurrent work **DS-1000** (Lai et al., 2022), a collection of data science problems derived from StackOverflow questions. It primarily features problems using synthetic contexts with minimal working examples,

and therefore does *not* concerns with code generation in notebooks with interrelated problems on general ML datasets.

We remark that ARCADE is the only benchmark that satisfies *all* the following criteria: *First*, our dataset consists of manually annotated, concise NL intents (“Intents Type” column in Tab. 1). Those utterances are significantly shorter (“Intent Length” column) than verbose markdown texts often found in tutorial notebooks (*c.f.* JuICe, DSP), and do not require a model to rely on extra specification such as unit tests (*c.f.* DSP). Those succinct intents are also under-specified, requiring a more robust evaluation metric to consider alternative answers (later in §3.3). This may also motivate future research on generating more diverse predictions to cover possible interpretations of a problem — which we will explore in §5 — or even models to explicitly capture such uncertainty in NL intents (Lin et al., 2022). *Second*, ARCADE contains more interrelated problems in a single notebook (“Problems per N.B.”) with complex dependencies (Fig. 1), capturing the essence of interactive computing. This makes our dataset useful in testing an LLM’s skill at understanding rich contexts, including existing user-written code and markdown cells, as well as preceding problems and their solutions (§2). *Third*, ARCADE challenges LLMs with grounded language understanding, where the model needs to link relevant concepts (*e.g.* “*max and min*” in u_1) in an intent to the corresponding variable execution states in the context (*e.g.* content of the TIME column in `df`). Such necessity of understanding semi-structured tabular data contents (Pasupat and Liang, 2015) and performing data transformations using an open domain programming language (Python) potentially makes NL grounding in ARCADE more challenging than other applications like database semantic parsing (Yu et al., 2019b). *Fourth*, ARCADE has problems with complex data transformations and richer usage of real-world data science APIs. As evidence for this, note that the number of pandas APIs used in each problem (“No. API” in Tab. 1)¹⁰ is on par with DS-1000 and significantly higher than ExeDS, DSP and NLGP. *Finally*, nearly 70% of problems and their notebooks (*New Tasks*) are curated from scratch targeting for recent

¹⁰Calculated by counting function names in a predefined list of pandas functions, including advanced array indexing operations. Functions with similar names from other libraries (*e.g.* `numpy`) may also be included.




Figure 2: Histogram of the number of pandas API calls in ARCADE.

ML datasets, which mitigates the risk of training data contamination of LLMs, and also makes ARCADE a more reliable benchmark to test the generalization ability of LMs in understanding held-out tabular datasets (Lee et al., 2021).

To summarize, ARCADE features *more realistic NL intents* and *multiple related problems in the same notebook context* to better reflect the real-world scenario where data scientists prompt LLMs using ephemeral NL comments for assistance with complex data wrangling or EDA tasks (Barke et al., 2022), therefore making it ideal to evaluate LLMs in this realistic setting. Nevertheless, we remark that existing datasets in Tab. 1 usually contain broader types of problems other than the wrangling and EDA tasks (*e.g.* fitting ML models) considered in this paper. We leave expanding the task spectrum as important future work.

3.3 Evaluation by Fuzzy Output Matching

Recent code generation datasets have shifted from surface form evaluation metrics like BLEU (Yin and Neubig, 2017) to functional correctness, where the execution results of predicted programs on some input examples are matched with the reference output verbatim (Hendrycks et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021a; Austin et al., 2021), or approximately (for complex output like plots, see Chandel et al., 2022) using unit tests. Such evaluation methods assume a model generates code that strictly follows the signature of unit tests, which is impractical in data science notebooks with free-form code.

In this paper we aim to evaluate accuracy of code LLMs in synthesizing code for data science notebooks in the wild, *i.e.*, the model is only conditioned on preceding notebook context besides a short user-issued intent (§2). As discussed in §3.2, those intents are often under-specified and have multiple alternative solutions. We therefore use a set of heuristics to approximately match the execu-

tion output¹¹ of a predicted program with the annotated reference to determine if they are functionally equivalent. These heuristics primarily cover two scenarios. First, if the output variable is a container type,¹² we canonicalize variables to the same type. Second, we allow for partial matching between complex DataFrame variables. Formally, consider a reference DataFrame v with a set of columns $\{v_i\}$, where each v_i is a vector of cell values for the i -th column. We define that v is equivalent with the output DataFrame of a predicted program \hat{v} , iff for any $v_i \in v$, we have $v_i \in \hat{v}$. Intuitively, we consider a predicted program as correct if its output DataFrame contains all the columns (and cell entries) in the reference frame. Intuitively, a predicted program is already useful as long as it covers all the necessary information in the reference. In cases of DataFrames, a user could easily create a more compact view of the frame by selecting a subset of target columns.

Empirically, we find our evaluation metric is reliable in identifying solutions with alternative output structures, with a relatively low false-negative rate (under 10%). We present an error analysis in §6.

4 PACHINCO: Adapting Code LMs to Computational Notebooks

In this section we elaborate on PACHINCO, our code LM for Python notebooks.

Base LM PACHINCO is based on PALM, a family of Transformer-based LMs developed for few-shot learning for general natural language tasks (Chowdhery et al., 2022). Specifically, we use the 62B PALM model trained on 1.3T tokens with a mixture of conversational, webpages and code data (Section F, Chowdhery et al. (2022)). Starting with 62B PALM as the base model, we perform two stages of fine-tuning, first on Python source code data, followed by another fine-tuning run on a collection of Jupyter notebooks.

Fine-tuning on Python Code We first fine-tune PALM 62B on a large corpus of Python source code with 64B tokens. This corpus consists of deduplicated Python source files with permissive license collected from GitHub. We finetune PALM for 1 epoch with a batch size of 256 while keeping the other hyper parameters consistent with Chowd-

hery et al. (2022). As we show in §5 and also in Appendix C, this Python-finetuned PALM 62B model is already a strong code LM, registering significant improvements on ARCADE over the base model, while even outperforming the larger code LM PALM-Coder 540B on existing benchmarks.

Continued Fine-tuning on Notebooks After fine-tuning on Python code, we perform a second stage of fine-tuning on a large collection of Jupyter notebooks. Our Jupyter notebook dataset is created similarly as the Python code corpus from GitHub, with additional domain-specific preprocessing steps, such as filtering out notebooks with fewer than 4 cells. In addition, to mitigate the risk of having notebooks similar to the evaluation notebooks from GitHub in the *Existing Tasks* split leaked into the training data, we perform near deduplication against notebooks in *Existing Tasks* at the cell level. Specifically, we cluster the cells of notebooks in both the evaluation and training sets based on a fuzzy-matching similarity metric, and remove any training notebooks that has one cell that falls into the same cluster as a cell from one of the evaluation notebooks. This process eliminates ~350K notebooks from the fine-tuning data. Our final training set consist of ~3.8M notebooks and ~9.6B tokens in total. We use nbconverter to linearize Jupyter notebooks to Python code, where cells in a notebook are concatenated using the special delimiter ‘# In [] :’, with markdown texts converted to comments. Refer to Appendix B for details about fine-tuning, and Appendix M for a data card.

5 Experiments

5.1 Models and Setup

To demonstrate the challenges of ARCADE, we compare the performance of PACHINCO with existing large code language models.

CODEGEN (Nijkamp et al., 2022) is a family of code LMs (350M, 2.7B, 6.1B and 16.1B parameters) trained using a combination of NL and code data scraped from GitHub (THEPILE, Gao et al., 2020). We evaluated on both the **multilingual** version trained on BIGQUERY and the **monolingual** version trained on 71B Python tokens.

INCODER (Fried et al., 2022) is a code LM (1.3B and 6.7B parameters) for both left-to-right generation and infilling tasks. The LM is trained on a mixture of StackOverflow (SO) posts and 159GB of multilingual code data. In particular, the corpus

¹¹For code that in-place modifies a variable (e.g. `df in c2`), we treat the modified variable as the output.

¹²List, Tuple, Set, `numpy.ndarray`, `pandas.Series` and single-column `pandas.DataFrame`.

```
[1] import pandas as pd
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt

[2] # Exercise 1
df = pd.read_csv('scores.csv')

[3] # Schema of Dataframes:
# Columns in df with example values:
# Stu_Name (Mike), Engineering (90), English (89), Math (92)

[4] # Problem: Get the students with an averaged score
above 90 for science subjects.
(format of the answer determines the prompting method)
```

Figure 3: An example problem. Cells 1-3 encode the notebook context. Cell 4 contains the NL intent as problem statement.

```
[4a] # Solution:
df['Science_Avg'] = (df['Engineering'] + df['Math']) / 2
df[df['Science_Avg'] > 90]['Stu_Name', 'Science_Avg']

[4b] # Solution:
df['Science_Avg'] = (df['Engineering'] + df['Math']) / 2
df_score_above_90 = df[df['Science_Avg'] > 90]
result = df_score_above_90[['Stu_Name', 'Science_Avg']]

[4c] # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
df['Science_Avg'] = (df['Engineering'] + df['Math']) / 2
df_score_above_90 = df[df['Science_Avg'] > 90]
result = df_score_above_90[['Stu_Name', 'Science_Avg']]

[4d] # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
# Step 1: Create a new column with the average score of
engineering and math
df['Science_Avg'] = (df['Engineering'] + df['Math']) / 2
# Step 2: Get the rows whose average score is above 90
df_score_above_90 = df[df['Science_Avg'] > 90]
# Step 3: Return the student name and average scores
result = df_score_above_90[['Stu_Name', 'Science_Avg']]
```

Figure 4: Example completions of Cell 4 from Fig. 3 which illustrate the desired coding style for different few-shot prompting strategies.

contains a dedicated portion of Jupyter notebooks (~ 5 GB), making it appealing to evaluate on ARCADE.

PALM Besides PACHINCO, we also evaluate the base PALM 62B LM, as well as the Python code LM obtained from the first-stage of code fine-tuning (§4).

Inference For each problem, we convert the problem into a prompt (§5.2) and draw random samples from the LMs using nucleus sampling with a top probability of 0.95 and a temperature 0.8. Refer to Appendix D for details.

Metrics Following prior work (Chen et al., 2021a; Austin et al., 2021), we measure model performance using the $pass@k$ metric, defined as the fraction of problems with at least one correct sample given a sample size k . To reduce variance, we estimate $pass@k$ ($k \leq 30$) by drawing 50 samples for each problem (Chen et al., 2021a).

5.2 LM Prompting Strategies

For a given problem, we conducted two types prompting experiments: prompting using only the

notebook context of the problem (§5.3), and few-shot prompting with extra exemplars as prompt prefix before notebook context (§5.4), in order to impose more control to the style of predicted code.

5.2.1 Prompting using Notebook Context

In our default setting (§5.3), for a given problem we turn its notebook context to a prompt to query LLMs. Fig. 3 gives an example. The context consists of preceding cells before the problem, which may include previous rounds of interactions (§2), and is followed by the current NL intent. To help LLMs understand intents using variable state information (§3.2), we also add NL descriptions of the schema of the dataset imported to the notebook (**schema description**, e.g. cell 3, Fig. 3), which consist of columns and example values in the DataFrame. Representing structured schema information in NL is a common strategy when prompting LLMs to solve tasks requiring understanding structured data (Xie et al., 2022). Next, for the following problems after cell 4, we include reference solutions to previous problems in their prompts, following the multi-turn task-oriented dialogue setting in Andreas et al. (2020). See Appendix N for a complete example.

5.2.2 Few-shot Prompting

Besides the basic setting using the notebook context of a problem, we also explored prompting using additional NL-to-code exemplars as prompt prefix before the notebook context. The motivation is to nudge the LM to generate code solutions following different coding and commenting styles, such as documenting the “reasoning path” used by the code. We develop four prompting strategies:

1. **Vanilla code strategy** as in Fig. 4, completion 4a. The predicted code follows the common practice of chaining multiple API calls in a single line.
2. **Step-by-step (SbS) code strategy** as in Fig. 4, completion 4b, which leads to code with fine-grained decomposition structure.
3. **SbS code with preamble**, as in Fig. 4, completion 4c, which could further elicit decomposition in predictions.
4. **SbS code with preamble and explanation**, as in Fig. 4, completion 4d, with inline NL explanations per step.

<i>pass@k</i>	<i>Existing Tasks</i>				<i>New Tasks</i>			
	5	10	20	30	5	10	20	30
INCODER 1B	30.1	36.4	42.6	46.0	3.8	5.8	8.4	10.0
INCODER 6B	41.3	48.0	54.0	57.2	7.0	10.0	13.5	15.8
CODEGEN _{multi} 350M	13.3	16.0	18.8	20.4	1.0	1.6	2.5	3.1
CODEGEN _{multi} 2B	25.0	29.9	34.8	37.7	2.7	4.0	5.5	6.5
CODEGEN _{multi} 6B	28.0	34.0	39.9	43.3	3.0	4.6	6.7	8.0
CODEGEN _{multi} 16B	31.2	37.6	43.8	47.2	4.6	6.8	9.5	11.3
CODEGEN _{mono} 350M	18.9	24.3	30.1	33.4	1.9	2.8	4.0	4.9
CODEGEN _{mono} 2B	35.8	43.3	50.7	54.9	6.5	9.8	13.8	16.3
CODEGEN _{mono} 6B	42.1	49.4	56.3	59.7	8.9	13.1	18.3	21.6
CODEGEN _{mono} 16B	46.7	54.5	60.9	64.0	12.0	17.1	22.7	26.3
PALM 62B (1.3T Tokens)	49.7	57.5	64.4	67.8	12.5	17.4	22.8	26.0
+ Python Code	58.8 ^{+9.1}	65.7 ^{+8.2}	71.7 ^{+7.3}	74.7 ^{+6.9}	21.4 ^{+8.9}	28.4 ^{+11.0}	35.6 ^{+12.8}	39.8 ^{+13.8}
+ Notebooks (PACHINCo)	64.6 ^{+7.8}	71.0 ^{+5.3}	76.0 ^{+4.3}	78.3 ^{+3.6}	30.6 ^{+9.2}	38.0 ^{+9.6}	45.0 ^{+9.4}	48.6 ^{+8.8}
- Schema Description	60.5 ^{-4.1}	67.1 ^{-3.9}	72.8 ^{-3.2}	75.5 ^{-2.8}	22.7 ^{-7.9}	28.5 ^{-9.5}	34.1 ^{-10.9}	37.2 ^{-11.4}

Table 2: *pass@k* evaluation on ARCADE using notebook context as prompts. Grey figures indicate difference to previous line.

Each strategy has four exemplars in its prompt prefix, as listed in Appendix N. Those extra exemplars before notebook context could help the model better understand the task (Brown et al., 2020). More importantly, we could also use additional exemplars to impose more control on the inference process of LMs, with each strategy imposing a slightly different level of granularity of the expected completion. Specifically, we focus on prompting LMs to generate code that follows a multi-line, step-by-step decomposition structure (SbS), with NL explanations of the underlying data transformation for each step. Prompting LMs to explain its own solution in such a step-by-step fashion has been found effective in improving accuracy of natural language reasoning (Wei et al., 2022; Gao et al., 2022) and program induction (Nye et al., 2021) tasks. In §5.4, we show it effectively improves diversity of predicted code solutions, which is beneficial for self-consistency reranking.

5.3 Results

In our first set of experiments, we evaluate the performance of state-of-the-art code LMs on ARCADE. Results are listed in Tab. 2. As in §5.2, inputs to those models are only the notebook context (no few-shot prompting). We truncate the prompt up to 900 tokens using the tokenizer of PALM.

Comparing PALM Models Our PACHINCo model registers the best performance on both the *Existing Tasks* split based on high-quality GitHub notebooks as well as on the *New Tasks* split with held-out ones, thanks to its larger size and domain-specific fine-tuning on notebooks.¹³ It is worth noting that the base NL-focused PALM 62B model already outperforms most public code LMs and is

¹³See Appendix E for *pass@1* results.

on par with CODEGEN_{mono} 16B. As the LM is fine-tuned on Python (+ Python Code) and notebooks (+ Notebooks) data, the domain gap is closing, and *pass@k* continues improving. Indeed, the Python fine-tuned PALM is already a strong model for Python code generation, achieving state-of-the-art results on benchmarks such as HUMANEVAL and MBPP (Appendix C). Meanwhile, the absolute gain after fine-tuning on Python code is higher than continued training on notebooks, which is not surprising since the semantic gap between NL data and Python code is larger than that between code in Python and notebooks.

Comparing Public Code LMs Next, we discuss results on public code LMs.¹⁴ First, among models at similar size and trained with roughly similar amount of Python code data, namely INCODER 6B and CODEGEN_{multi} 6B, INCODER 6B performs better. This is likely due to that INCODER contains dedicated portion of Jupyter notebooks (8GB) in its training data, which makes the model more suitable for ARCADE. With 4× more Python data, CODEGEN_{mono} 6B takes over, which is in line with the performance pattern of these two model families on existing code generation datasets (Fried et al., 2022). Moreover, comparing CODEGEN models at different size, we observe that *pass@k* scales linearly with model size. As we discuss more in Appendix F, the scaling curve for ARCADE (*New Tasks*) is also more flatten than that for other code generation datasets, which might suggest that it is more challenging for CODEGEN.

Comparing Existing Tasks and New Tasks It is interesting to compare results between the *Existing Tasks* and *New Tasks* splits, where we observe two patterns. First, results on *Existing Tasks* are signifi-

¹⁴We also evaluate CODEX. Results are in Appendix G.




Figure 5: $pass@k$ of PACHINCO w.r.t problem complexity

cantly higher across all models. Second, comparing the improvements after Python and notebook-specific fine-tuning of PALM 62B, the gain on *New Tasks* is higher. These results are likely due to two factors. First, an obvious reason is that problems in *Existing Tasks* are overall simpler than *New Tasks* (§3.2). Second, it is likely that some code data similar to our evaluation notebooks in *Existing Tasks* split is leaked into the training data of those LMs. Specifically for PALM, its training mixture contains general Web documents and sampled Python source files. Despite the fact that we went through significant amount of effort to deduplicate the training data against ARCADE during the second-stage notebook fine-tuning (§4), given that some of the notebooks used to create *Existing Tasks* are popular data science tutorials on GitHub, it is still possible PALM has already seen similar code data from the Web or notebook-converted Python source files. This suggests the importance of evaluating code LMs on held-out data, which is the purpose of *New Tasks*. We leave investigating training data contamination as important future work.

Impact of Schema Descriptions Our prompts contain NL descriptions of schema for DataFrames imported to a notebook (§5.2.2). As in §3.2, variable state information like DataFrame schema is crucial for understanding NL intents. The last row in Tab. 2 (–Schema Description) reports an ablation where we remove such NL schema descriptions from prompts, which leads up to significantly worse results, especially on the *New Tasks* split. Encoding the states for more intermediate variables could potentially further improve performance, which we leave as interesting future work.

Accuracy with Problem Complexity To better understand PACHINCO’s performance on problems at different levels of complexity, we plot $pass@30$ with respect to the number of pandas function calls in the annotated reference solutions,




Figure 6: $pass@30$ as w.r.t the number of context cells from the notebook.

as shown in Fig. 5. For problems with similar complexity, PACHINCO generally achieves higher pass rate on *Existing Tasks*, again suggesting that the *New Tasks* split is still more challenging even after controlling problem complexity. Refer to Appendix H for a similar plot w.r.t AST size.

How Much Notebook Context is Useful? ARCADE requires a model to leverage rich programmatic and NL context in test notebooks to generate code solutions for the current cell. To study PACHINCO’s performance with varying amount of available notebook context, we control the number d of context cells $\{c_i\}_{i=k-d}^{k-1}$ (§2) when generating code for each problem (at cell c_k) in our dataset. Fig. 6 depicts $pass@30$ as a function of the context size d . Since we use the first preceding cell c_{k-1} to store the NL intent u_k for c_k (Appendix N), having only one context cell is equivalent to the “cold-start” setting of only using u_k (besides schema description) to predict c_k . PACHINCO achieves a pass rate of 44% (existing tasks) and 17% (new tasks) in this challenging setting ($d = 1$), with errors mostly due to failure in referring to variables that the solution relies on, whose information is not present in the short context. Indeed, including additional context cells is crucial for good performance. In particular, having 3 context cells could already lift the $pass@30$ to 72% and 36% on the two splits — 1.6 \sim 2 \times higher than $d = 1$. The results also start to plateau after including 5 \sim 7 context cells, with diminishing returns after including more cells, which is in line with findings in Agashe et al. (2019).¹⁵ Empirically, we observe that using more context helps to reduce schema understanding errors (e.g. using undefined columns in DataFrames). Refer to Appendix I for more details.

¹⁵Prior work suggests that the plateau point is around three neighboring cells, while in our case, the number is approximately doubled since we need extra cells to include intents in previous turns (Appendix N).




Figure 7: *pass@30* for few-shot prompting on *New Tasks*. Results averaged over three runs with different prompt prefixes.




Figure 8: Few-shot prompting code style metrics




Figure 9: Pass rate on examples grouped by context size. We also report the number of examples in each group.

Does Problem Location Impact Performance?

Another interesting angle to study the effect of context is through the lens of model accuracy when solving problems c_k at different locations. Intuitively, problems located later in a notebook (k is larger) would have more context available, therefore they could be easier to answer (Wang and Cho, 2016). Fig. 9 shows *pass@30* on problems grouped by their preceding context size, which shows increased task success rate when solving problems with more context, confirming the prior intuition.¹⁶

¹⁶We remark that our setup is different from multi-turn semantic parsing where later turns are conditioned on the *predictions* of prior turns, while we use reference solutions (§5.2). See §8 for discussion.

5.4 Few-shot Prompting Beyond Test Notebook Contexts

Our previous set of experiments demonstrate diminishing returns after including more notebook context cells. As motivated in §5.2, besides test notebook context, we use few-shot prompting with additional exemplars to teach the model to perform this challenging task, while generating code in different styles. Here, we report both functional correctness (Fig. 7) as well as metrics evaluating the style of model-predicted code (Fig. 8) for problems in *New Tasks*. We only evaluate PACHINCO due to that the prompt length (maximal 2, 100 sub-tokens) exceeds the limit of public code LMs.

With **Step-by-Step Prompting (SbS)**, we observe an improvement on *pass@30* over the baseline using only notebook contexts (Tab. 2). This is consistent with the general results on other tasks when comparing few- vs zero-shot learning with LLMs (Brown et al., 2020), while we remark that in our case, the “zero”-shot prompting setting (Tab. 2) still contains notebook cells as rich contexts. Nevertheless, as Fig. 7 suggests, SbS prompting is quite helpful for improving pass rate. Empirically, we observe SbS prompting is especially helpful for problems (at code cells c_k) without adequate preceding notebook context (k is small). For instance, SbS prompting results in 6% absolute improvement for the first two rounds of problems. Interestingly, even if we include more test notebook context in the non-exemplar baseline such that the prompt length match with SbS prompting using extra exemplars




Figure 10: Cumulative distributions of the number of unique API sequences (top) and output clusters (bottom) extracted from PACHINCO’s 50 predictions on the *New Tasks* split. Curves that appear more to the right represent prompting methods with greater diversity in the samples. Step-by-step prompting leads to much greater diversity than the baselines.

(**Baseline + More Context**), SbS prompting is still better, which again suggests the value of extra exemplars to compliment the information in notebook context.

In line with our intuition, SbS prompting yields code predictions that are better decomposed into more lines of code (LoC_{\uparrow}), with each line being simpler ($Tokens/API\ per\ Line_{\downarrow}$). It also appears to generate slightly more complex solutions, as indicated by the increased pandas API usage. Our finding demonstrates the effectiveness of SbS prompting in improving accuracy and also code style. In contrast, we also report results from prompting the model using exemplars with “vanilla”-styled code following the common practice of chaining multiple pandas API calls in a single line (**Vanilla Code**), which only leads to marginal improvements on $pass@k$ over the non-exemplar baseline, while the code style remains consistent.

Next, on top of SbS prompting, using a preamble at the beginning of a target cell to further encourage the model to solve the problem in a step-by-step fashion (**SbS + Preamble**) improves $pass@k$, as well as the level of decomposition in predicted code (LoC_{\uparrow} , $Tokens/API\ per\ Line_{\downarrow}$). This




Figure 11: Self-consistency decoding accuracy (using 1 reranked sample) on *New Tasks*

finding is inline with [Kojima et al. \(2022\)](#) where using preambles to nudge the model to generate reasoning steps can still be useful together with few-shot step-by-step demonstrations. More surprisingly, with additional inline NL explanations for each step (**+Preamble + Explanation**), PACHINCO produces even more decomposed code while maintaining similar accuracy. Those predictions also come with rich NL comments as explanations, with the number of comment lines nearly equal to the number of code lines. Intuitively, step-wise NL explanations could be potentially helpful for developers to better understand predictions from code LMs, as we demonstrate later in §7.

We also report breakdown results of pass rate on problems with varying level of complexity. SbS prompting and its variants are helpful across the board, especially for harder tasks with more than 7 pandas function calls. This might suggest the value of step-by-step decomposition when synthesizing complex programs. Next, we provide more insight into the effectiveness of SbS prompting.

Step-by-Step Prompting Produces More Diverse Solutions

Given the effectiveness of SbS prompting in improving accuracy, code style, and explainability (§7), next we explore why it is helpful by analyzing patterns in model-predicted solutions. One interesting question is whether SbS prompting could produce more diverse solution approaches to solve a problem. Intuitively, greater diversity in the output space could improve the odds of finding a solution at higher sample size k . Determining whether two solutions are “different” is difficult and subjective, but we approximate this from two angles. First, we use the sequence of pandas API calls as a signature of the high-level solution pattern. Second, since different solutions




Figure 12: Frequency of execution errors on *New Tasks*.

might have the same functionality (*i.e.*, they execute to the same output), we also measure the diversity in *functionality* by clustering predictions based on their outputs.¹⁷ Fig. 10 plots the cumulative distributions of the number of unique solution patterns and output clusters on the *New Tasks* split. Step-by-step prompting results in greater diversity on both metrics compared to the baselines. Interestingly, prompting with NL explanations yields even more solution patterns. Having diverse predictions could be potentially useful to handle under-specified intents (§3.2), as those predictions could correspond to different interpretations of the ambiguous intents. Empirically, we find diverse predictions are particularly effective for post-hoc reranking such as self-consistency decoding, where we show the user one prediction from the largest output cluster instead of showing all k predictions. As shown in Fig. 11, SbS prompting significantly improves over baselines when using self-consistency decoding (Wang et al., 2022b). Notably, the 1-sample accuracy of SbS with NL explanations is on par with PACHINCO’s $pass@5$ accuracy (last row, Tab. 2). We present further analysis of solution diversity from PACHINCO in Appendix K.

6 Error Analysis

To understand the types of errors that LLMs make on ARCADE, especially on challenging problems, we conduct an error analysis on PALM’s predictions on the *New Tasks* split (Tab. 2). Overall, we notice a significant drop in execution errors after two-stage code fine-tuning (PALM_f→PACHINCO, §4). Out of all the incorrect predictions from PACHINCO under the fuzzy output matching evaluation metric (§3.3), roughly 35% of the samples result in execution errors, while the remaining

¹⁷Here, each cluster corresponds to programs that executes to the same exact results (*i.e.* no fuzzy matching as in §3.3).

65% predictions have executable programs but are functionally incorrect. First, for un-executable samples, we present an analysis of the distribution of different execution error types, as illustrated in Fig. 12. The primary source of execution error is `KeyError` and `AttributeError` due to reference to non-existing index or columns in `DataFrames`. While in the prompts we provide NL descriptions of schema for `DataFrames` loaded to notebooks (§5.2), such descriptions for intermediate `DataFrames` that are later derived in the context are still missing due to limited prompt length, and the model may not be able infer their schema information solely from the source code. This could be especially problematic for APIs that create compound intermediate `DataFrames` with complex schema, such as `pd.groupby`, which accounts for that more than 50% of those `KeyErrors` and `AttributeErrors`. Similarly, other execution errors such as `ValueError` and `TypeError` are often caused by the insufficient knowledge about the `DataFrame` contents. For example, `ValueError` occurs when a model tries to calculate the mean of a column which has `NaN` values. This finding suggests the importance of developing LLMs that could handle longer context (Transformers et al., 2022) in order to include more `DataFrame` information in prompts. We gave a detailed case study on these types of execution errors in Appendix L.

Next, we conduct a manual analysis on 50 randomly sampled incorrect predictions (with a focus on executable but incorrect predictions). The cause of these errors can be grouped into the following categories: 1. Complex problems requiring non-trivial reasoning or data transformation steps (43%); 2. Errors in interpreting NL intents, such as missing a requirement specified in the intent (*e.g.* `round to two decimal places`) in the code solution (26%); 3. Errors caused by under-specified intents (§3.2, 19%); 4. False-negatives due to limited coverage of the fuzzy-matching evaluation metric (§3.3, 6%); 5. Annotation errors (6%).

The primary source of errors is due to complex problems, which reiterates the motivation of ARCADE — evaluating code LLMs on challenging data wrangling and EDA tasks. The second majority type of errors (misunderstanding intents) suggests room to improve PACHINCO’s skill in instruction following. Next, a non-trivial amount of errors are caused by under-specified intents, which are common in the setting of prompting LLMs

using short instructions (§3.2), calling for future research to specifically address this issue. Finally, our evaluation metric based on fuzzy output matching seems effective in identifying plausible alternative solutions. Still, there are non-trivial cases where there are multiple ways of presenting the outputs (*e.g.* DataFrames with nested columns or different orientations, Fig. 32). We present more detailed examples of these errors in Appendix I.

7 Case Study: How Useful is Predicted Code with Step-wise Explanations?

In §5 we show how prompting PACHINCO to generate code with step-wise explanations is helpful in improving solution diversity (Fig. 10) and also accuracy of self-consistency reranking (Fig. 11). In this section we conduct a qualitative analysis on model-generated code snippets with explanations to explore how they could be useful for novice data scientists.

First, we observe that NL explanations could help users follow the flow of complex data transformations for programs involving a chain of pandas operations. By decomposing and explaining how data is manipulated after individual transformation steps, it is easier for users to understand the solution and track its dataflow behind the scene, especially when some steps involve complex computation (Fig. 19), or the underlying schema is less intelligible (*e.g.*, column names with abbreviations, Fig. 20). Additionally, some inline explanations also describe the output of intermediate steps, which is particularly helpful when these steps involve advanced pandas functions whose output may not be obvious, such as `pd.unstack` (Fig. 21)

Meanwhile, step-wise NL explanations serve as high-level procedural descriptions of code, which enables users to easily browse through and understand different solution approaches without being distracted by nuances in the actual code implementation (Fig. 22). Moreover, explanations also help users verify the code solutions by identifying potentially incorrect steps and make necessary corrections (Fig. 23). The observations presented here offer insight into potential future avenues to improve the utility of code LMs for developers through the use of step-by-step explanations, which we leave as important future work.

8 Related Works

LLMs for Code In recent years there has been a burgeoning of LMs trained on code (Chen et al., 2021a; Austin et al., 2021; Nijkamp et al., 2022; Fried et al., 2022; Li et al., 2022; Tunstall et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2022). Many generalist LMs also have source code as part of their training data mixture (Thoppilan et al., 2022; Chowdhery et al., 2022; Wang and Komatsuzaki, 2021; Black et al., 2021). Those LLMs have registered impressive performance on a variety of benchmarks for code, such as code translation (Lachaux et al., 2020a), program repair (Gupta et al., 2017), and natural language to code generation (Chen et al., 2021a; Hendrycks et al., 2021; Austin et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022).

Automating Data Science Given the sheer amount of tasks involved in the lifecycle of data science and the expertise required, it calls for development of systems to automate this lifecycle (Aggarwal et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2021a,b). As an example, automating the process of feature engineering and finding the best-performing models has been the central theme of AutoML research (He et al., 2021; Karmaker et al., 2020), with well-established systems (Feurer et al., 2015) and evaluation protocols (Zöller and Huber, 2021). In this paper we focus on automating data wrangling and EDA tasks, which account for nearly the same amount of code and documentations in notebooks as that for feature engineering and building ML models (Agashe et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2022a). Along this line of research, AUTOPANDAS (Bavishi et al., 2019) synthesizes pandas programs for data transformation given examples of input/output DataFrames. Other approaches aim to generate pandas programs using LLMs using both NL intents and I/O samples (Jain et al., 2021) or unit tests (Chandel et al., 2022). In this paper we consider code generation in notebook environments with multiple rounds of problems and interdependent contexts (refer to §3.2 for detailed discussions of recent work). Related to this line, another thread of research focuses on synthesizing problems for visualization plots (Amar et al., 2005; Narechania et al., 2020; Fu et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021b; Wu et al., 2022). ARCADE also includes 57 plotting examples which are not used in this paper. We leave collection and systematic evaluation of plotting tasks as important future work.

Context-driven Code Generation Our work is another application of context-driven code generation, which concerns with mapping a series of contextually dependent utterances to executable programs, such as domain-specific logical forms (Zettlemoyer and Collins, 2009; Long et al., 2016; Iyyer et al., 2017), SQL queries over databases (Suhr et al., 2018; Yu et al., 2019a,b), or general-purpose languages (PLs) like Python (Nijkamp et al., 2022). Some of those existing works also feature EDA problems, mainly for querying structured databases, while the problems in ARCADE exhibit more complex query patterns (e.g. string manipulation over semi-structured data, as u_1 in Fig. 1), in addition to extra data wrangling tasks, thanks to the expressiveness of pandas API and the general-purpose PL (Python) compared to domain-specific formalisms. As the first step forward, in this paper we perform evaluation using ground-truth solutions for previous turns (§5.2), similar to multi-turn program synthesis for task-oriented dialogue in Andreas et al. (2020). We leave conditioning on model-predicted solutions as context for evaluation (Nijkamp et al., 2022) as an important future avenue.

9 Conclusion

In this paper we present ARCADE, a code generation benchmark for data wrangling and EDA tasks in computational notebooks. ARCADE features problems with realistic NL intents and rich notebook contexts. We also develop PACHINCO, a 62B LM tailed for data science, and show that PACHINCO outperforms public code LMs on ARCADE, while being effective in few-shot learning to improve code style and solution diversity.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Meg Risdal and Goeff Thomas from Kaggle for help with dataset collection, and Miltos Allamanis for research discussion. We thank Jo Chick from the research partnership team, and Rebecca Watson, Ashley Dawe and Kimberly Herrera from Upwork to help with managing the annotation project. We thank Aroma Mahendru for writing the data card section. We also thank Cheriskumar Patel, Preet Patel, and Jayendra Parmar for general assistance with the project.

References

- Rajas Agashe, Srinivasan Iyer, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. [JuICe: A large scale distantly supervised dataset for open domain context-based code generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 5436–5446, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Charu Aggarwal, Djallel Bouneffouf, Horst Samulowitz, Beat Buesser, Thanh Hoang, Udayan Khurana, Sijia Liu, Tejaswini Pedapati, Parikshit Ram, Ambrish Rawat, et al. 2019. How can AI automate end-to-end data science? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.14436*.
- Robert A. Amar, James R. Eagan, and John T. Stasko. 2005. Low-level components of analytic activity in information visualization. *IEEE Symposium on Information Visualization, 2005. INFOVIS 2005.*, pages 111–117.
- Jacob Andreas, Johannes Bufe, David Burkett, Charles C. Chen, Joshua Clausman, Jean Crawford, Kate Crim, Jordan DeLoach, Leah Dorner, Jason Eisner, Hao Fang, Alan Guo, David Leo Wright Hall, Kristin Delia Hayes, Kellie Hill, Diana Ho, Wendy Iwaszuk, Smriti Jha, Dan Klein, Jayant Krishnamurthy, Theo Lanman, Percy Liang, C. H. Lin, Ilya Lintsbakh, Andy McGovern, Aleksandr Nisnevich, Adam Pauls, Dmitriy Petters, Brent Read, Dan Roth, Subhro Roy, Jesse Rusak, Beth Ann Short, Div Slomin, B Snyder, Stephon Striplin, Yu Su, Zachary Tellman, Sam Thomson, A. A. Vorobev, Izabela Witoszko, Jason Wolfe, A. G. Wray, Yuchen Zhang, and Alexander Zotov. 2020. Task-oriented dialogue as dataflow synthesis. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:556–571.
- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*.
- Shraddha Barke, Michael B James, and Nadia Polikarpova. 2022. Grounded copilot: How programmers interact with code-generating models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.15000*.
- Rohan Bavishi, Caroline Lemieux, Roy Fox, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. 2019. Autopandas: neural-backed generators for program synthesis. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 3:1–27.
- Sid Black, Leo Gao, Phil Wang, Connor Leahy, and Stella Biderman. 2021. [GPT-Neo: Large Scale Autoregressive Language Modeling with Mesh-Tensorflow](#).
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind

- Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Shubham Chandel, Colin B Clement, Guillermo Serrato, and Neel Sundaresan. 2022. Training and evaluating a Jupyter notebook data science assistant. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.12901*.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde, Jared Kaplan, Harrison Edwards, Yura Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, David W. Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William H. Guss, Alex Nichol, Igor Babuschkin, S. Arun Balaji, Shantanu Jain, Andrew Carr, Jan Leike, Joshua Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew M. Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021a. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.03374.
- Xinyun Chen, Linyuan Gong, Alvin Cheung, and Dawn Xiaodong Song. 2021b. Plotcoder: Hierarchical decoding for synthesizing visualization code in programmatic context. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Zhoujun Cheng, Tianbao Xie, Peng Shi, Chengzu Li, Rahul Nadkarni, Yushi Hu, Caiming Xiong, Dragomir Radev, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, et al. 2022. Binding language models in symbolic languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02875*.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2022. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*.
- David Donoho. 2017. 50 years of data science. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 26(4):745–766.
- Matthias Feurer, Aaron Klein, Katharina Eggenberger, Jost Springenberg, Manuel Blum, and Frank Hutter. 2015. Efficient and robust automated machine learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28.
- Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Wen-tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2022. InCoder: A generative model for code infilling and synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05999*.
- Siwei Fu, Kai Xiong, Xiaodong Ge, Yingcai Wu, Siliang Tang, and Wei Chen. 2020. Quda: Natural language queries for visual data analytics. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.03257.
- Yujian Gan, Xinyun Chen, Qiuping Huang, Matthew Purver, John R. Woodward, Jinxia Xie, and Pengsheng Huang. 2021. Towards robustness of text-to-SQL models against synonym substitution. pages 2505–2515, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, Shawn Presser, and Connor Leahy. 2020. The Pile: An 800GB dataset of diverse text for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027*.
- Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2022. PAL: Program-aided language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2211.10435.
- Rahul Gupta, Soham Pal, Aditya Kanade, and Shirish K. Shevade. 2017. DeepFix: fixing common C language errors by deep learning. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Xin He, Kaiyong Zhao, and Xiaowen Chu. 2021. AutoML: a survey of the state-of-the-art. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 212:106622.
- Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Saurav Kadavath, Mantas Mazeika, Akul Arora, Ethan Guo, Collin Burns, Samir Puranik, Horace He, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring coding challenge competence with apps. *NeurIPS*.
- Geert Heyman, Rafael Huyssegems, Pascal Justen, and Tom Van Cutsem. 2021. Natural language-guided programming. *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on New Ideas, New Paradigms, and Reflections on Programming and Software*.
- Junjie Huang, Chenglong Wang, Jipeng Zhang, Cong Yan, Haotian Cui, Jeevana Priya Inala, Colin Clement, Nan Duan, and Jianfeng Gao. 2022. Execution-based evaluation for data science code generation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09374*.
- Mohit Iyyer, Wen tau Yih, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2017. Search-based neural structured learning for sequential question answering. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Naman Jain, Skanda Vaidyanath, Arun Iyer, Nagarajan Natarajan, Suresh Parthasarathy, Sriram Rajamani, and Rahul Sharma. 2022. Jigsaw: Large language models meet program synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 1219–1231.

- Naman Jain, Skanda Vaidyanath, Arun Shankar Iyer, Nagarajan Natarajan, Suresh Parthasarathy, Sri-ram K. Rajamani, and Rahul Sharma. 2021. Jigsaw: Large language models meet program synthesis. *2022 IEEE/ACM 44th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 1219–1231.
- Sean Kandel, Andreas Paepcke, Joseph Hellerstein, and Jeffrey Heer. 2011. Wrangler: interactive visual specification of data transformation scripts. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '11*, pages 3363–3372, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Shubhra (Santu) Karmaker, Md. Mahadi Hassan, Micah J. Smith, Lei Xu, ChengXiang Zhai, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. 2020. Automl to date and beyond: Challenges and opportunities. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 54:1–36.
- Thomas Kluyver, Benjamin Ragan-Kelley, Fernando Pérez, Brian Granger, Matthias Bussonnier, Jonathan Frederic, Kyle Kelley, Jessica Hamrick, Jason Grout, Sylvain Corlay, Paul Ivanov, Damián Avila, Safia Abdalla, Carol Willing, and Jupyter development team. 2016. *Jupyter notebooks - a publishing format for reproducible computational workflows*. In *Positioning and Power in Academic Publishing: Players, Agents and Agendas*, pages 87–90, Netherlands. IOS Press.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *ArXiv*, abs/2205.11916.
- Marie-Anne Lachaux, Baptiste Rozière, Lowik Chanussot, and Guillaume Lample. 2020a. Un-supervised translation of programming languages. *ArXiv*, abs/2006.03511.
- Marie-Anne Lachaux, Baptiste Rozière, Lowik Chanussot, and Guillaume Lample. 2020b. Un-supervised translation of programming languages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03511*.
- Yuhang Lai, Chengxi Li, Yiming Wang, Tianyi Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, Scott Wen tau Yih, Daniel Fried, Sida Wang, and Tao Yu. 2022. Ds-1000: A natural and reliable benchmark for data science code generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2211.11501.
- Chia-Hsuan Lee, Oleksandr Polozov, and Matthew Richardson. 2021. Kaggledbqa: Realistic evaluation of text-to-sql parsers. In *ACL*.
- Yujia Li, David H. 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. 2022. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *ArXiv*, abs/2203.07814.
- Zi Lin, Jeremiah Liu, and Jingbo Shang. 2022. Neural-symbolic inference for robust autoregressive graph parsing via compositional uncertainty quantification. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*.
- Reginald Long, Panupong Pasupat, and Percy Liang. 2016. Simpler context-dependent logical forms via model projections. *ArXiv*, abs/1606.05378.
- Arpit Narechania, Arjun Srinivasan, and John T. Stasko. 2020. Nl4dv: A toolkit for generating analytic specifications for data visualization from natural language queries. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 27:369–379.
- Alfredo Nazabal, Christopher K I Williams, Giovanni Colavizza, Camila Rangel Smith, and Angus Williams. 2020. *Data engineering for data analytics: A classification of the issues, and case studies*. *arXiv*.
- Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. 2022. A conversational paradigm for program synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474*.
- Maxwell Nye, Anders Andreassen, Guy Gur-Ari, Henryk Michalewski, Jacob Austin, David Bieber, David Dohan, Aitor Lewkowycz, Maarten Bosma, David Luan, Charles Sutton, and Augustus Odena. 2021. Show your work: Scratchpads for intermediate computation with language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2112.00114.
- Panupong Pasupat and Percy Liang. 2015. Compositional semantic parsing on semi-structured tables. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Jeffrey Perkel. 2021. Reactive, reproducible, collaborative: computational notebooks evolve. *Nature*, 593.
- João Felipe Pimentel, Leonardo Gresta Paulino Murta, Vanessa Braganholo, and Juliana Freire. 2019. A large-scale study about quality and reproducibility of Jupyter notebooks. *2019 IEEE/ACM 16th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, pages 507–517.
- Nitarshan Rajkumar, Raymond Li, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. 2022. Evaluating the text-to-sql capabilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00498*.
- Jianlin Su, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Bo Wen, and Yunfeng Liu. 2021. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding. *ArXiv*, abs/2104.09864.
- Alane Suhr, Srini Iyer, and Yoav Artzi. 2018. Learning to map context-dependent sentences to executable formal queries. *ArXiv*, abs/1804.06868.

- Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam M. Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, Yuguang Li, Hongrae Lee, Huaixiu Zheng, Amin Ghafouri, Marcelo Menegali, Yanping Huang, Maxim Krikun, Dmitry Lepikhin, James Qin, Dehao Chen, Yuanzhong Xu, Zhifeng Chen, Adam Roberts, Maarten Bosma, Yanqi Zhou, Chung-Ching Chang, I. A. Krivokon, Willard James Rusch, Marc Pickett, Kathleen S. Meier-Hellstern, Meredith Ringel Morris, Tulsee Doshi, Renelito Delos Santos, Toju Duke, Johnny Hartz Søraker, Ben Zevenbergen, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Mark Díaz, Ben Hutchinson, Kristen Olson, Alejandra Molina, Erin Hoffman-John, Josh Lee, Lora Aroyo, Ravindran Rajakumar, Alena Butryna, Matthew Lamm, V. O. Kuzmina, Joseph Fenton, Aaron Cohen, Rachel Bernstein, Ray Kurzweil, Blaise Agüera-Arcas, Claire Cui, Marian Croak, Ed Chi, and Quoc Le. 2022. Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. *ArXiv*, abs/2201.08239.
- Memorizing Transformers, Yuhuai Wu, Markus N. Rabe, DeLesley S. Hutchins, and Christian Szegedy. 2022. Memorizing transformers.
- Lewis Tunstall, Leandro von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. 2022. *Natural language processing with transformers*. "O'Reilly Media, Inc."
- April Yi Wang, Dakuo Wang, Jaimie Drozdal, Michael Muller, Soya Park, Justin D Weisz, Xuye Liu, Lingfei Wu, and Casey Dugan. 2022a. Documentation matters: Human-centered ai system to assist data science code documentation in computational notebooks. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 29(2):1–33.
- Ben Wang and Aran Komatsuzaki. 2021. GPT-J-6B: A 6 Billion Parameter Autoregressive Language Model. <https://github.com/kingoflolz/mesh-transformer-jax>.
- Dakuo Wang, Josh Andres, Justin D Weisz, Erick Oduor, and Casey Dugan. 2021a. Autods: Towards human-centered automation of data science. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–12.
- Dakuo Wang, Q Vera Liao, Yunfeng Zhang, Udayan Khurana, Horst Samulowitz, Soya Park, Michael Muller, and Lisa Amini. 2021b. How much automation does a data scientist want? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.03970*.
- Tian Wang and Kyunghyun Cho. 2016. [Larger-context language modelling with recurrent neural network](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1319–1329, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, and Denny Zhou. 2022b. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2201.11903.
- Zhengkai Wu, Vu Le, Ashish Tiwari, Sumit Gulwani, Arjun Radhakrishna, Ivan Radicek, Gustavo Soares, Xinyu Wang, Zhenwen Li, and Tao Xie. 2022. NL2Viz: Natural language to visualization via constrained syntax-guided synthesis. *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*.
- Tianbao Xie, Chen Henry Wu, Peng Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Torsten Scholak, Michihiro Yasunaga, Chien-Sheng Wu, Ming Zhong, Pengcheng Yin, Sida I. Wang, Victor Zhong, Bailin Wang, Chengzu Li, Connor Boyle, Ansong Ni, Ziyu Yao, Dragomir R. Radev, Caiming Xiong, Lingpeng Kong, Rui Zhang, Noah A. Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Tao Yu. 2022. Unifiedskg: Unifying and multi-tasking structured knowledge grounding with text-to-text language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2201.05966.
- Frank F. Xu, Uri Alon, Graham Neubig, and Vincent J. Hellendoorn. 2022. A systematic evaluation of large language models of code. *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming*.
- Pengcheng Yin and Graham Neubig. 2017. [A syntactic neural model for general-purpose code generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 440–450, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, He Yang Er, Suyi Li, Eric Xue, Bo Pang, Xi Victoria Lin, Yi Chern Tan, Tianze Shi, Zihan Li, Youxuan Jiang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Sungrok Shim, Tao Chen, Alexander R. Fabbri, Zifan Li, Luyao Chen, Yuwen Zhang, Shreya Dixit, Vincent Zhang, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, Walter S. Lasecki, and Dragomir R. Radev. 2019a. Cosql: A conversational text-to-sql challenge towards cross-domain natural language interfaces to databases. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yi Chern Tan, Xi Victoria Lin, Suyi Li, He Yang Er, Irene Z Li, Bo Pang, Tao Chen, Emily Ji, Shreya Dixit, David Proctor, Sungrok Shim, Jonathan Kraft, Vincent Zhang, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir R. Radev. 2019b. Sparc: Cross-domain semantic parsing in context. *ArXiv*, abs/1906.02285.
- Luke Zettlemoyer and Michael Collins. 2009. Learning context-dependent mappings from sentences to logical form. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Marc-André Zöller and Marco F Huber. 2021. Benchmark and survey of automated machine learning

frameworks. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 70:409–472.

Supplementary Materials

A Outline of ARCADE Annotation Guideline

In this section we provide a brief summary of the outline in our annotation guideline.

Existing Tasks The annotators are given a list of Jupyter notebooks. Each notebook uses pandas to perform certain data analysis tasks. For each notebook, an annotator is asked to:

1. Identify code cells that contain instructive code snippets that perform data wrangling or exploratory data analysis tasks.
2. Fix the notebook and make them clean and executable.
3. For each code snippet identified in Step 1, create natural language descriptions of the task. Also verify the code solution and fix them as appropriate. Finally, remove any redundant text in the notebook (*e.g.* solution outline or hints for tutorial notebooks) that could give away to the reference solution.

Instruction on Creating Natural Intents Specifically, for step 3, in order to collect realistic NL intents, the annotators are given the following high-level description, followed by detailed instructions and examples.

Below we share some suggestions to write good intents.

Keep it natural without redundant explanations. Imagine an AI programmer can help you accomplish simple data wrangling and EDA tasks, what kind of intents will you send to the system? Our goal is to collect real inputs to such a system from data scientists like you.

One idea to write good intents is to keep it concise such that another programmer could quickly understand and implement a solution that executes to the same outputs. You are encouraged to create simple, short intents while describing the desired outputs without much ambiguity.

New Tasks For each ML dataset we provided, an annotator creates a Colab notebook with code snippets for some interesting data wrangling and exploratory data analysis tasks using this dataset. Each code snippet is paired with its natural language intent, similar to the process of annotating *Existing Tasks*. We ask annotators to feel free to work on any tasks that they may find interesting for the given dataset, as long as the code solution for the task should consist of multiple lines and use different pandas API functions. Different from annotating *Existing Tasks*, we ask them to first create a natural language intent for their task, and then write a code solution in the next cell.

Below is an excerpt from the annotation guideline describing the types of data wrangling and EDA tasks to create.

What Tasks to Create

In general, you may create whatever exploratory data analysis tasks that you find interesting for the given datasets. To come up with interesting tasks, you can think in this way: before training your ML models for the dataset, what kind of data wrangling or EDA tasks would you like to perform on the dataset? Below are some more concrete descriptions of such wrangling or EDA tasks:

Data Preprocessing/Wrangling Tasks which involves modifying existing dataframes or creating new ones. Such as normalizing column names, adding new columns, modifying existing columns (e.g., converting string values to date times), generating new dataframes using ops like `group_by`, and so on. Some datasets we shared are just raw data without any preprocessing or cleaning. Feel free to . Please also refer to Section: Identify Code Snippets to Annotate in our previous annotation guideline for more examples.

Exploratory Data Analysis Tasks that Require Some Wrangling and Preprocessing Answering interesting EDA questions using the given dataset, but some data wrangling steps are required in order to derive the answer. For example, given a dataframe `df` of user shopping history and credit card expiration dates in the format of `df.loc[0]['cc_exp'] = '08/26'`. To answer the EDA question “How many users have a credit card expiring in 2024?”, we need to first convert the expiration year from the string-formatted `cc_exp` column.

To encourage the annotators to create more complex tasks, we also provide the following high-level instruction:

Complexity of Tasks

You should create relatively complex tasks that require multiple steps and also a combination of different pandas APIs to solve them. Avoid problems that can be solved using one-liner code such as `df.groupby(...).sort_values(...)`. An ideal task should be reasonably complex and needs to be broken down into multiple smaller steps to solve, and each step may require using one or multiple pandas functions.

As a general rule of thumb, you should aim at creating tasks that either have at least 50 tokens or use at least 4 pandas APIs (dataframe/series indexing, like `df[df['continent'] == 'NA']` is also counted as one API usage). You can find more concrete example tasks at the end of this doc.

Full Guideline Our annotation guideline is 35-pages long in total, which we provide on a per request basis. Please contact pcyin@google.com to request access.

B Details of Fine-tuning PACHINCO

We take the fully trained PALM 62B model that has been trained on 1,325B tokens (Chowdhery et al., 2022) as the base model. To achieve the best performance on , we finetune the base model in two stages: a python only and a ARCADE only finetuning. For the two-stage code fine-tuning (§4), we use the similar training recipe of the base PALM 62B model. More specifically, we apply the learning rate decay scheduling of $0.2/\sqrt{t}$ where t is the number of steps. We train the model for 124K steps (1 epoch) with a batch size of 256 on 512 TPU v4 chips. Afterwards, we reload the optimizer state and continue training on the Jupyter notebooks data (10B tokens) using the same hyper parameter for 3 epochs ($\sim 572K$ steps).

Linearize Notebooks to Python Source Code We convert computational notebooks for finetuning (§4) and evaluation (§5.2) to Python source code using `nbconverter`. Specifically, markdown and code cells in a notebook are concatenated using the special delimiter `# In[]:`, and text in markdown cells is commented out using the `#` prefix. See Listing 7 for an example of the linearized notebook for

Fig. 1 (up to c_3). Jupyter notebooks that are converted to Python files in such format are common in GitHub repositories, which mitigates the domain transfer gap between general Python code and notebook-specific data, and also allows us to prompt public code LLMs, which might have seen similar data during pre-training.

C Performance of Python-finetuned PALM 62B on Code Benchmarks

We evaluate the PALM 62B model after the first-stage fine-tuning on Python data (§4) on other code generation benchmarks, namely HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021a), MBPP (Austin et al., 2021) and Transcoder (Lachaux et al., 2020b), following the evaluation setup of PALM-CODER in Chowdhery et al. (2022). Tab. 3 lists the results. With $7\times$ more Python code tokens, our Python fine-tuned PALM 62B model outperforms the $8\times$ larger PALM-CODER 540B model on all the benchmarks, including the multilingual code translation task.

Dataset	Human Eval	MBPP	Transcoder
Metric	<i>pass@100</i>	<i>pass@80</i>	<i>pass@25</i>
PALM-CODER 540B (Chowdhery et al., 2022)	88.4%	80.8%	82.5%
PALM 62B Python (§4)	91.5%	86.0%	86.4%

Table 3: Python fine-tuned PaLM 62B model evaluation results on public code benchmarks.

D Inference Setup

For CODEGEN, we use the inference script from the official GitHub repository. For INCODER, we follow the official inference example script and use the release on Huggingface model hub. We convert each example in our dataset to Python source code to a prompt, as outlined in §5.2. Notebooks are linearized using nbconverter similar as generating fine-tuning data (Appendix B). One exception is INCODER, for which we follow Fried et al. (2022) and use the Jupyter notebook linearization template used in its pre-training.

At inference time, we left-truncate notebook context up to 900 tokens (measured by PALM’s vocabulary), which fit in the context window size of all LLMs we evaluated. We also make sure to always include NL schema descriptions in prompts given their importance in understanding NL intents. In addition, for few-shot experiments in §5.4, we use additional 1,200 tokens to accommodate the prompt prefix, making the total maximal prompt length to be 2,100. Due to its excessive length, we only perform few-shot prompting experiments on PACHINCO since its rotatory positional embedding (Su et al., 2021) could generalize to encode longer contexts at inference time. During sampling, we set the maximum target length to be 512 tokens.

E *pass@1* for PACHINCO

<i>Existing Tasks</i>	<i>New Tasks</i>
48.8	17.5

Table 4: *pass@1* for PACHINCO (temperature=0.2)

For reference, we also report *pass@1* of PACHINCO on ARCADE. Samples are generated using the same hyper parameters as in §5.3, except for the temperature, which is 0.2.

F Scaling Curve of CODEGEN on ARCADE

Fig. 13 depicts the scaling curve of ARCADE with respect to the number of parameters for CODEGEN_{mono} models. The pass rate scales nearly linearly as a function of model size, and the performance has not saturated, especially on the *New Tasks* split. This shows ARCADE is a reliable dataset to study the




Figure 13: Scaling curve of CODEGEN on ARCADE and existing code generation benchmarks. Results on HumanEval are selected from the best temperature $t \in \{0.2, 0.6, 0.8\}$ (Nijkamp et al., 2022).

scaling behavior of code LLMs. The slope of the curve on *New Tasks* is also smaller than on other datasets, suggesting that this problem set is more challenging for CODEGEN models.

G Comparing with CODEX on ARCADE

$pass@k$	<i>Existing Tasks</i>				<i>New Tasks</i>			
	5	10	20	30	5	10	20	30
PACHINCo (62B)	64.6	71.0	76.0	78.3	30.6	38.0	45.0	48.6
CODEX-cushman-001 (12B)	51.0	59.0	65.9	69.4	14.2	20.1	27.0	31.3
CODEX-davinci-002	66.1	72.6	78.3	81.2	36.0	43.8	50.8	54.8

Table 5: $Pass@k$ evaluation on ARCADE using CODEX API.

For reference, we also report the results on ARCADE using the public CODEX API, following the same evaluation setting as in Tab. 2. PACHINCO significantly outperforms the smaller CODEX-cushman-001 API, on par with CODEX-davinci-002 on *Existing Tasks*, while CODEX-davinci-002 is stronger on *New Tasks*. While we cannot gain much insight from the results due to limited knowledge about CODEX-davinci-002, through error analysis, we find that CODEX-davinci-002 is better at instruction following, especially in understanding NL descriptions of complex DataFrame schema (§5.2). We leave improving the instruction following skills of PACHINCO as interesting future work.

H Performance on Problems with Different Complexity

Fig. 14 plots $pass@30$ with respect to the AST size of reference programs. Similar to Fig. 5, results on *New Tasks* are generally lower. Meanwhile, it seems that AST size correlates better with $pass@k$ compared to the number of API usage, while the latter metric offers more intuitive information about the data transformation steps involved.

I Distribution of Execution Error Types w.r.t Context Size

In Fig. 9 we observe that $pass@k$ improves when more notebook context is available. Fig. 15 illustrates the distribution of execution error types on failed predictions. Notably, using more notebook context cells significantly reduces the chance of NameErrors caused by using undefined variables in context. The number of KeyErrors is also reduced, indicating that the model makes fewer schema understanding errors when referring to columns in DataFrames.




Figure 14: $pass@k$ of PACHINCO w.r.t AST size of reference programs.




Figure 15: Frequency of runtime errors from PACHINCO’s predictions aggregated over the two splits with varying amount of notebook context cells.

J Few-shot Prompting Results on *Existing Tasks* Split

We report results of prompting PACHINCO using few-shot exemplars on the *Existing Tasks* split in Fig. 17. Compared to the results obtained on *New Tasks* (Fig. 7), while few-shot prompting, especially step-by-step prompting, is still effective compared to the baseline, the gap is not as profound as the results on *New Tasks*. The difference between different prompting methods is also less significant, and using natural language explanations (SbS + Explanations) seems to hurt performance on simpler tasks, while still beneficial for complex problems with more than 7 pandas API calls. This is likely due to that the model relies on memorization to solve problems in *Existing Tasks*, rendering using extra exemplars to control generation less effective. Nevertheless, these results reiterate the value of *New Tasks* as a more reliable benchmark to better differentiate different prompting strategies.

K Further Analysis of Solution Diversity

Here we provide further analysis of the diversity in solution patterns, measured by the number of distinct pandas API call sequences used in the samples. Fig. 18 shows a cumulative distribution of the number of solution patterns for different subsets of the predictions: all predictions, only those that execute successfully, and only the correct predictions. In each case, we see that step-by-step prompting leads to increased diversity compared to the baselines, and prompting with NL explanations further increases




Figure 16: $pass@30$ for few-shot prompting on *Existing Tasks*




Figure 17: Code style metrics for few-shot prompting on *Existing Tasks*

the diversity. While increased diversity is helpful in finding a correct solution at higher sample size k , it is also helpful when considering only correct solutions because a user might want to see a variety of solution approaches, whether for educational purposes or to choose the one they like best (which is partially subjective). Refer to §7 for such examples.

L Error Analysis Examples

In this section, we provided a preliminary study on selected example model errors. We analyzed two types of errors: execution error and semantic error (executable but incorrect). Execution error has error message from the notebook environment. We can classify these errors into more fine-grained categories in Fig. 12. As the result shows, `KeyError` is the top error mode in the execution errors. Over 50% of the `KeyError` are associated with the `pd.groupby` API call. `pd.groupby` API call changes the dataframe schema as the model generates the code. For example, `pd.groupby(*).mean()` will remove non-numeric columns in the dataframe. This requires the model to have a profound understanding of the dataframe schema. We gave an example in Fig. 24. The column `shipping_fee` is string value which will be removed after `df.groupby(ship_state).sum()`. The secondary source of execution error is `AttributeError`, which shares a similar cause to the `KeyError`. This is because `AttributeError` is often triggered by calling a non-existing column as an attribute of a `pd.dataframe`. An example is given in Fig. 25, where the model tries to call the non-existing column `signupdate` as an attribute of `df_users`, leading to the `AttributeError`. These two error modes suggest that building a better schema aware language model is a promising future research direction. We also present Fig. 26 and Fig. 27 as the example for `TypeError` and `ValueError` respectively. These two error modes are often caused by insufficient knowledge of the column values. For example, the model tried to compare a string-value column to an integer in Fig. 26, which causes `TypeError`. Fig. 27 showcased that the model tries to apply numeric operation `pd.DataFrame.mean()` on a column with `NaN` values, leading to `ValueError`.

Semantic errors account for more than 65% of the incorrect predictions. We cannot get any error messages from these executable but incorrect programs. Therefore, we conducted a manual analysis on 50% randomly sampled incorrect predictions. We classified the semantic errors into 5 categories: 1. Complex task requiring non-trivial computation (43%); 2. NL misunderstanding (26%); 3. Under-specified intents (19%); 4. False-negatives of the fuzzy-matching evaluation metric (6%); 5. Annotation Errors (6%). To complement the discussion in §6, we showcase examples of these types of errors. The primary source of semantic error is **complex reasoning**. Examples are given in Fig. 28 and Fig. 29. In Fig. 28, the model need to infer that last 10 year can be computed by `dt.datetime.today().year -`




Figure 18: Cumulative distributions of the number of unique API sequences extracted from PACHINCO’s 50 predictions on the *New Tasks* split, for all predictions (top left), only executable predictions (top right), or only correct predictions (bottom). Curves that appear more to the right represent prompting methods with greater diversity in the samples.

10 then apply string operation `str.contains('accident')` to select the required contents. Fig. 29 is another example of complex data wrangling steps. To generate the correct program, the model need to compare the current rank to the past rank, ensure the 2021 rank column exists and then aggregate the information. **NL misunderstanding** is the secondary source of semantic errors. In Fig. 30, the generated output does not reflect the institute constraint in the intent. Another source of semantic errors is **under-specified intent**, which happens occasionally in natural language instructions. In Fig. 31, the intent does not specify the output format. The program generated by the model calculates the sum of front and left facing trees while the reference calculates them respectively. The evaluation fails but the model output is not necessarily incorrect in this case. Fig. 32 illustrates another type of semantic error: **evaluation coverage**. In this example, the model gives an acceptable answer which only differs from the reference in the column order. It does not pass the evaluation due to its limited coverage.

u: What are the five most common genres for shows released during the year having the highest percent increase in votes?

```
# Step 1: Get the year that has the highest percent increase in votes.
max_year_pct_change = pct_change_votes.idxmax()
# Step 2: Get the genres for each shows in that year.
genres = drama[drama['Year of Release']==max_year_pct_change]['Genre']
# Step 3: Count each genre
genre_counts = {}
for genre in genres:
    for genre in genre.split(','):
        if genre not in genre_counts:
            genre_counts[genre] = 0
        genre_counts[genre] += 1
# Step 4: Return the most common genres
most_common_genres = pd.Series(genre_counts).sort_values(ascending=False)
most_common_genres[:5]
```

Figure 19: An example prediction from PACHINCO with a complex single step.

u: Convert crash dates to datetime and show the total number of vehicles involved in crashes over the years.

```
# Step 1: Convert crash date to datetime
df['CRASH DATE'] = pd.to_datetime(df['CRASH DATE'])
# Step 2: Create a new column with the year of the crash date
df['CRASH YEAR'] = df['CRASH DATE'].dt.year
# Step 3: Return the total number of vehicles involved in crashes in each year
result = df.groupby('CRASH YEAR')['TOT VEH'].sum()
```

Figure 20: An example prediction from PACHINCO that explains the semantics of a column.

u: What is the distribution of student adaptivity level across each age group? Return a DataFrame with age groups as an index and adaptivity levels as columns.

```
# Step 1: Get the unique values of age
age_groups = students['Age'].unique()
# Step 2: Group students by their age groups and adaptivity level and
# get the number of students in each group
distribution = students.groupby(['Age', 'Adaptivity Level']).size()
# Step 3: Return the age groups as an index and adaptivity levels as columns
result = distribution.unstack(level=1, fill_value 0)
```

Figure 21: An example prediction from PACHINCO that explains the return value from a complex API.

u: Drop columns with more than 70 percent null values

```
Solution 1:
# Step 1: Get the column names and total number of null values in each column.
column_names = df.columns
total_rows = len(df)
column_null_count = df.isnull().sum()
# Step 2: Filter columns with less than 70 percent null values
# Get the names of columns whose null values are less than 70%
column_names_filtered = column_names[column_null_count / total_rows < 0.7]
# Step 3: Return the filtered columns
result = df[column_names_filtered]

Solution 2:
# Step 1: Calculate the number of rows
num_rows = len(df)
# Step 2: Count the number of null values in each column
num_missings = df.isna().sum()
# Step 3: Divide the number of null values in each column by the total number
of rows
pct_missings = num_missings / num_rows
# Step 4: Get the columns with more than 70% of values missing
drop_cols = pct_missings[pct_missings > 0.7]
# Step 5: Drop the columns
result = df.drop(drop_cols.index, axis='columns')
```

Figure 22: Two predictions from PACHINCO with different solution approaches.

u: In which year, within the last ten years, did Israel receive the highest amount of financial aid, in constant amount? Show the year and amount received.

```

Correct Solution:
# Step 1: Get all the rows with Israel in country_name column
israel_aid_df = aid[aid['country_name'] == 'Israel']
# Step 2: Get all the rows for last 10 years
israel_aid_df = israel_aid_df[israel_aid_df['fiscal_year'] >=
israel_aid_df['fiscal_year'].max()-10]
# Step 3: Group by the years and get the sum of aid received in each year.
israel_aid_df.groupby('fiscal_year').constant_amount.sum().agg(['max', 'idxmax'])

Incorrect Solution:
# Step 1: Get the Israel data
isr = aid[aid.country_name=='Israel']
# Step 2: Group the data by fiscal year
isr_by_year_df = isr.groupby('fiscal_year')
# Step 3: Find the index of the row that has the highest constant amount
idx = isr_by_year_df['constant_amount'].idxmax()
# Step 4: Get the row with the highest constant amount
max_aid = isr.loc[idx]
# Step 5: Return the fiscal year and constant amount
result = max_aid[['fiscal_year', 'constant_amount']]

```

Figure 23: Two predictions from PACHINCO. NL explanations help users identify incorrect steps.

u: What are the average shipping fees for each state, starting from highest to lowest? (rounded to 2 decimal places)?

```

Reference Solution:
df['shipping_fee']=df['shipping_fee'].apply(total_float)
df.groupby('ship_state').mean()['shipping_fee'].sort_values(ascending=False).round(2)

Incorrect Model Output:
df.groupby('ship_state').sum()['shipping_fee'].sort_values(ascending=False).apply(
lambda x: round(x,2))
# Error Text:
RuntimeError: KeyError: 'shipping_fee'

```

Figure 24: An example of `KeyError`: the model calls a column which is removed after the `pd.groupby().mean()` API call.

u: Show how many new users signed up for every year since 2000

```

Reference Solution:
df_users[df_users['Customer Since']>datetime.fromisoformat('2000-01-01']]['Customer
Since'].apply(lambda x: x.year)\
.value_counts().sort_index()

Incorrect Model Output:
df_users['signup_year'] = df_users.signupdate.dt.year
df_users[df_users.signupdate.dt.year >= 2000].signup_year.value_counts()
# Error Text:
RuntimeError: AttributeError: 'DataFrame' object has no attribute 'signupdate'

```

Figure 25: An example of `AttributeError`: the model tries to call a non-existing column.

u: What are the top five models with most number of bikes having mileage less than 5000 kilometers?

```

Reference Solution:
df_bikes=bikes[bikes['Ridden for']<5000]
df_bikes['Model Name'].value_counts().head()

Incorrect Model Output:
model=bikes.groupby('Model Name')['Comfort'].mean().loc[bikes_models.index].idxmax()
# Error Text:
RuntimeError: TypeError: '<' not supported between instances of 'str' and 'int'

```

Figure 26: An example of `TypeError`: the model is intent to compare a string-value column to an integer.

u: What is the average number of filed charges for drug related cases?

```

Reference Solution:
int(district[district.crime_type.str.contains('narcotic',case=False,
na=False)].num_charges.mean())

Incorrect Model Output:
district[district.crime_type.str.contains('Drugs')].num_charges.mean()
# Error Text:
RuntimeError: ValueError: Cannot mask with non-boolean array containing NA / NaN values

```

Figure 27: An example program of `ValueError`: the model tries to calculate the mean of a column containing NaN values.

u: What is the number of deaths by accident as a percentage of total deaths in the last ten years?

```
Reference Solution:  
import datetime as dt  
last_ten_years = age[(age['Death year']>=dt.datetime.today().year-10)]  
total_deaths = last_ten_years.groupby('Death year').size()  
deaths_by_accident = last_ten_years[last_ten_years['Manner of  
death'].str.contains('accident')].groupby('Death year').size()  
deaths_by_accident / total_deaths * 100  
  
Incorrect Model Output:  
(age[(age['Manner of death']=='accident') & (age['Death year'].between(2007,2017,  
inclusive='left'))].shape[0] / age[age['Death year'].between(2007,2017,  
inclusive='left')].shape[0])*100
```

Figure 28: An example of complex reasoning: the model has to infer the API call `(dt.datetime.today().year - 10)` from the last-ten-years constraint in the intent.

u: Which hotels had a worse ranking this year than in 2021? Show the hotel name, location and the difference in ranking from last year.

```
Reference Solution:  
drop_rankings = hotels[(hotels.Rank > hotels.Past_rank) & (hotels['2021']==1)]  
drop_rankings['rank_drop'] = drop_rankings.Rank - drop_rankings.Past_rank  
drop_rankings[['Hotel', 'Location', 'rank_drop']]  
  
Incorrect Model Output:  
hotels['Ranking_diff'] = hotels.Past_rank - hotels.Rank  
hotels.loc[hotels['Ranking_diff'] > 0, ['Hotel', 'Location', 'Ranking_diff']]
```

Figure 29: An example of complex reasoning: the model needs to compare the current rank and the past rank while making sure the rank in 2021 exists.

u: What was the mean opening rank across all IIT institutes for each program over the years? Show the mean opening rank for each year in columns with program as index and consider only general students.

```
Reference Solution:  
df_iit = df_general[df_general.institute_type == 'IIT']  
df_iit[['year', 'opening_rank', 'program_name']].groupby(['year', 'program_name']).mean().unstack(0)  
  
Incorrect Model Output:  
df_general[['program_name', 'opening_rank', 'year']].groupby(['program_name',  
'year']).mean().unstack(0)
```

Figure 30: An example of NL misunderstanding: the model does not filter the institute type according to the intent.

u: How many front and left facing trees were planted in that park?

```
Reference Solution:  
trees[(trees.Parks==park) &  
(trees.SideOfParcel.str.contains('front|left', case=False))].groupby('SideOfParcel').size()  
  
Incorrect Model Output:  
trees[trees.Parks == park][trees.SideOfParcel == 'Left'].shape[0] + trees[trees.Parks ==  
park][trees.SideOfParcel == 'Front'].shape[0]
```

Figure 31: An example of under-specified intent. It does not specify the output should not sum the number of front facing and left facing trees.

w: Return a matrix with the average ticket prices to and from all the cities for each ticket class.

```

Reference Solution:
flights.groupby(['class', 'source_city', 'destination_city']).price.mean().unstack(level=2)

Incorrect Model Output:
prices = flights.groupby(['class', 'source_city', 'destination_city']).price.mean()
prices.unstack(level=[0,2]).round()

```

(a) Intent, reference program and generated program

	destination_city	Bangalore	Chennai	Delhi	Hyderabad	Kolkata	Mumbai
class	source_city						
Business	Bangalore	NaN	52436.915395	48144.337108	50395.796948	58854.693091	58024.618208
	Chennai	53113.008692	NaN	52443.367242	51559.874283	57078.895872	56223.838086
	Delhi	48576.027921	52031.778099	NaN	44457.376775	56239.853659	44364.442811
	Hyderabad	50358.290706	51132.155288	44250.700281	NaN	53729.157762	52184.424666
	Kolkata	58681.104437	56502.775035	55047.492193	54732.447908	NaN	57422.551724
	Mumbai	57970.544389	55703.326197	43846.329273	51593.643678	57106.526385	NaN
Economy	Bangalore	NaN	7105.953850	6124.897982	6360.141698	7375.638594	6381.093332
	Chennai	7175.020192	NaN	6075.961190	5960.788831	7547.295815	6529.119453
	Delhi	6175.622535	6102.317245	NaN	6031.164261	7045.621678	6059.826087
	Hyderabad	6234.882649	6049.884930	6072.296659	NaN	6881.680392	5969.259906
	Kolkata	7471.621990	8011.745229	7161.400077	7489.144374	NaN	7405.787239
	Mumbai	6432.511946	6420.917984	5889.281400	5774.891130	7227.971735	NaN

(b) Reference output

class	Business						Economy						
	destination_city	Chennai	Delhi	Hyderabad	Kolkata	Mumbai	Bangalore	Chennai	Delhi	Hyderabad	Kolkata	Mumbai	Bangalore
	source_city												
	Bangalore	52437.0	48144.0	50396.0	58855.0	58025.0	NaN	7106.0	6125.0	6360.0	7376.0	6381.0	NaN
	Chennai	NaN	52443.0	51560.0	57079.0	56224.0	53113.0	NaN	6076.0	5961.0	7547.0	6529.0	7175.0
	Delhi	52032.0	NaN	44457.0	56240.0	44364.0	48576.0	6102.0	NaN	6031.0	7046.0	6060.0	6176.0
	Hyderabad	51132.0	44251.0	NaN	53729.0	52184.0	50358.0	6050.0	6072.0	NaN	6882.0	5969.0	6235.0
	Kolkata	56503.0	55047.0	54732.0	NaN	57423.0	58681.0	8012.0	7161.0	7489.0	NaN	7406.0	7472.0
	Mumbai	55703.0	43846.0	51594.0	57107.0	NaN	57971.0	6421.0	5889.0	5775.0	7228.0	NaN	6433.0

(c) Model output

Figure 32: An example of plausible alternative prediction that is labeled as incorrect due to limited coverage of the evaluation metric.

M Data Card for the Training Data of PACHINCO

We provide a data card for the training data of PACHINCO as outlined in §4, following the structure presented in Chowdhery et al. (2022). We also report training data composition in Tab. 7.

Motivation	
For what purpose was the dataset created? Who created the dataset? Who funded the creation of the dataset?	The dataset was created for training code and language models by a team of researchers at Google.

Composition	
What do the instances that comprise the dataset represent (e.g., documents, photos, people, countries)?	Dataset comprises of Python source code files and Jupyter notebooks from GitHub, filtered by license so as to exclude code with restrictive licenses.
How many instances are there in total (of each type, if appropriate)?	The data makeup is given in Table 7.
Does the dataset contain all possible instances or is it a sample (not necessarily random) of instances from a larger set?	The dataset is a small (random) subset of a larger set.
What data does each instance consist of?	Each instance is encoded content of a source code file.
Is there a label or target associated with each instance?	No, there are no labels associated with each instance.
Is any information missing from individual instances?	No.
Are relationships between individual instances made explicit?	No.
Are there recommended data splits?	We use random splits for the training, validation, and test.
Are there any errors, sources of noise, or redundancies in the dataset?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Python files were near deduplicated at the file level using a custom implementation of minhash algorithm, so lower level redundancies (lines, code blocks) may still exist.• Some files were misclassified in the license tagging and filtration process given that license classification algorithm can have false positives and negatives.
Is the dataset self-contained, or does it link to or otherwise rely on external resources?	The dataset is self-contained.

Does the dataset contain data that might be considered confidential? No.

Does the dataset contain data that, if viewed directly, might be offensive, insulting, threatening, or might otherwise cause anxiety? Given the dataset contains source code, it is not likely there is any offensive text in it, however no explicit measures are in place to eliminate such data if it were present.

Collection Process

How was the data associated with each instance acquired? The data was collected from publicly available sources.

What mechanisms or procedures were used to collect the data? The data was collected using a variety of software programs to extract and clean source code files.

If the dataset is a sample from a larger set, what was the sampling strategy? The dataset is small subset of publicly available code from Github, sampled randomly.

Who was involved in the data collection process? A team of researchers at Google.

Over what timeframe was the data collected? April - July 2022

Were any ethical review processes conducted? No.

Preprocessing, cleaning, and labeling

Was any preprocessing, cleaning, or labeling of the data done (e.g., discretization or bucketing, tokenization, part-of-speech tagging, SIFT feature extraction, removal of instances, processing of missing values)? License filtration, quality filtration and deduplication were applied to the source code files.

- License classification was done using [Google License Classifier](#) library. Source code files with restricted licenses were filtered out.
- Python files were deduplicated at the file level using a custom variant of minhash algorithm. Locality sensitive hashes of file content were used to create partitions of potentially duplicate files based on collisions in the hash buckets. For each pair in the partitions, Jaccard Similarity and Edit Distance scores were calculated to create an "edge" for a pair whenever the scores are higher than the specified threshold. This was followed by application of connected components algorithm to return the sets of duplicates.
- Jupyter notebooks were first deduplicated following the same procedure as deduplicating Python files, and then deduplicated at individual cell level against the evaluation dataset (§4).

Is the software used to preprocess, clean, or label the instances available? No.

Uses

Has the dataset been used for any tasks already? Yes, we use the dataset for pre-training other code and language models.

Is there a repository that links to any or all papers or systems that use the dataset? No.

What (other) tasks could the dataset be used for? The dataset can be used for training of other code and language models.

Is there anything about the composition of the dataset or the way it was collected and pre-processed/cleaned/labeled that might impact future uses? The dataset is static in nature and thus will become progressively more “stale”. It will not include any new source code repositories that were created/updated later on Github.

Are there tasks for which the dataset should not be used? This should not be used for any unacceptable code or language modeling use cases e.g. generating code or language with toxic/biased connotations.

Distribution

Will the dataset be distributed to third parties outside of the entity (e.g., company, institution, organization) on behalf of which the dataset was created? No.

Language	Tokens	Source Files
Python	63,786,481,126	60,397,107
Jupyter Notebooks	9,613,648,619	3,796,713

Table 7: Data Composition of the fine-tuning data for PACHINCo.

N Detailed Prompting Examples

In this section we provide detailed examples of prompts used in our experiments. As in §5.2, there are two categories of experiments in §5, namely prompting using notebook context (§5.3) and few-shot prompting with extra exemplars pre-pended to notebook context (§5.4). Here, we list the prompts for u_2 in Fig. 1 in these two types of prompting experiments.

Prompting using Notebook Context In the basic setup without extra few-shot exemplars, the prompt basically consist of all the prior notebook context, including NL descriptions of schema information and previous rounds of problems. Listing 7 shows the complete prompt for u_2 in Fig. 1 in this setup.¹⁸ At inference time, a code LM will complete the last code cell after the cell delimiter ‘# In[]:’. Note that for INCODER we follow Fried et al. (2022) and use a special template to linearize notebooks (Appendix D).

Prompting using Additional Few-shot Exemplars We have four prompting styles for few-shot experiments. Here, we show the prompt prefix (§5.2) for Vanilla Code and Step-by-Step+Explanations prompting, as the remaining two styles are just simplified version of the latter by removing inline explanations (SbS + Preamble) and preambles (Step-by-Step).

A prompt in this setup is the concatenation of a prompt prefix (with few-shot exemplars) and the notebook context (with prior rounds of problems and NL schema descriptions). The part of a prompt that corresponds to notebook context as the same as the previous setting (e.g. Listing 7), except that we insert the preamble # Solution: Let’s solve this problem step-by-step. as appropriate after the last cell delimiter. For prompt prefix, Listing 1 gives an example prompt prefix for Step-by-Step prompting, while Listing 4 shows the same set of few-shot exemplars for Vanilla Code prompting.

As mentioned in §5.2, we created three prompt prefixes for each of the four different styles, and report results averaged over these three restarts. Listings 1 to 3 show the three groups of prompt prefixes for Step-by-Step, and Listings 4 to 6 show those for Vanilla Code prompting. Each prompt prefix has four exemplars, and some exemplars are shared across different prefixes. Note that some prompt prefixes in Step-by-Step also contain one simple problem that does not require decomposition and explanation (e.g. Exercise 3, Listing 1). We find this to be useful to not bias a model from generate overly complex code solutions for simpler problems. We did not put much effort in prompting engineering. Actually, those prompt prefixes were created before we collected 70% of the dataset,

Listing 1: Step-by-Step Prompt Prefix (Group 1)

```
1 # In[ ]:
2
3
4 import pandas as pd
5 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
6
7
8 # In[ ]:
9
10
11 # You are a professional data scientist. Answer the following questions using pandas and matplotlib.
12
13
14 # In[ ]:
15
16
17 # # Exercise 1
18
19
20 # In[ ]:
21
22
23 df = pd.read_csv('employee.csv')
24
25
26 # In[ ]:
27
28
29 # Schema of Dataframes:
30 # Columns in df with example values:
31 # name (Peter), gender (m), DOB (1992/01/17)
32
```

¹⁸This prompt is not exactly the same as the one in our dataset. It is adapted to align with the illustrative example in Fig. 1

```

33
34 # In[ ]:
35
36
37 # Problem: How many male and female employees are born in 1992?
38
39
40 # In[ ]:
41
42
43 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
44 # Step 1: convert date of birth in to datetime
45 df['DOB'] = pd.to_datetime(df['DOB'])
46 # Step 2: get the number of male born in 1992
47 num_male_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'm')])
48 # Step 3: get the number of female born in that year
49 num_female_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'f')])
50
51
52 # In[ ]:
53
54
55 # # Exercise 2
56
57
58 # In[ ]:
59
60
61 df = pd.read_csv('scores.csv')
62
63
64 # In[ ]:
65
66
67 # Schema of Dataframes:
68 # Columns in df with example values:
69 # Stu_Name (Mike), Engineering (90), English (89), Math (92)
70
71
72 # In[ ]:
73
74
75 # Problem: Get the students with an averaged score above 90 for science subjects.
76
77
78 # In[ ]:
79
80
81 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
82 # Step 1: Create a new column with the average score of engineering and math
83 df['Science_Avg'] = (df['Engineering'] + df['Math']) / 2
84 # Step 2: Get the rows whose average score is above 90
85 df_score_above_90 = df[df['Science_Avg'] > 90]
86 # Step 3: Return the student name and average scores
87 result = df_score_above_90[['Stu_Name', 'Science_Avg']]
88
89
90 # In[ ]:
91
92
93 # # Exercise 3
94
95
96 # In[ ]:
97
98
99 df = pd.read_csv('geo.csv')
100
101
102 # In[ ]:
103
104
105 # Schema of Dataframes:
106 # Columns in df with example values:
107 # state (WA), capital (Seattle), population (1.4 million)
108
109
110 # In[ ]:
111
112
113 # Problem: What is the population of California?
114
115
116 # In[ ]:
117
118
119 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.

```

```

120 result = df[df['state'] == 'CA']['population']
121
122
123 # In[ ]:
124
125
126 # # Exercise 4
127
128
129 # In[ ]:
130
131
132 df = pd.read_csv('phones.csv')
133
134
135 # In[ ]:
136
137
138 # Schema of Dataframes:
139 # Columns in df with example values:
140 # model (Pixel 6), brand (Google), price (387), release (2022)
141
142
143 # In[ ]:
144
145
146 # Problem: What is the most expensive phone in each brand.
147
148
149 # In[ ]:
150
151
152 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
153 # Step 1: Group models by their brands.
154 model_by_brand_df = df.groupby('brand')
155 # Step 2: Find the index of rows that have the highest price in each group
156 idx = model_by_brand_df['price'].idxmax()
157 # Step 3: Get the rows using the index
158 expensive_models_df = df.loc[idx]
159 # Step 4: Return the brand name, model and price.
160 result = expensive_models_df[['brand', 'model', 'price']]
161
162
163 # In[ ]:
164
165
166 # # Exercise 5

```

Listing 2: Step-by-Step Prompt Prefix (Group 2)

```

167 # In[ ]:
168
169
170 import pandas as pd
171 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
172
173
174 # In[ ]:
175
176
177 # You are a professional data scientist. Answer the following questions using pandas and matplotlib.
178
179
180 # In[ ]:
181
182
183 # # Exercise 1
184
185
186 # In[ ]:
187
188
189 df = pd.read_csv('employee.csv')
190
191
192 # In[ ]:
193
194
195 # Schema of Dataframes:
196 # Columns in df with example values:
197 # name (Peter), gender (m), DOB (1992/01/17)
198
199
200 # In[ ]:
201

```

```

202
203 # Problem: How many male and female employees are born in 1992?
204
205
206 # In[ ]:
207
208
209 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
210 # Step 1: convert date of birth in to datetime
211 df['DOB'] = pd.to_datetime(df['DOB'])
212 # Step 2: get the number of male born in 1992
213 num_male_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'm')])
214 # Step 3: get the number of female born in that year
215 num_female_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'f')])
216
217
218 # In[ ]:
219
220
221 # # Exercise 2
222
223
224 # In[ ]:
225
226
227 df = pd.read_csv('scores.csv')
228
229
230 # In[ ]:
231
232
233 # Schema of Dataframes:
234 # Columns in df with example values:
235 # Stu_Name (Mike), Engineering (90), English (89), Math (92)
236
237
238 # In[ ]:
239
240
241 # Problem: Get the students with an averaged score above 90 for science subjects.
242
243
244 # In[ ]:
245
246
247 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
248 # Step 1: Create a new column with the average score of engineering and math
249 df['Science_Avg'] = (df['Engineering'] + df['Math']) / 2
250 # Step 2: Get the rows whose average score is above 90
251 df_score_above_90 = df[df['Science_Avg'] > 90]
252 # Step 3: Return the student name and average scores
253 result = df_score_above_90[['Stu_Name', 'Science_Avg']]
254
255
256 # In[ ]:
257
258
259 # # Exercise 3
260
261
262 # In[ ]:
263
264
265 df = pd.read_csv('geo.csv')
266
267
268 # In[ ]:
269
270
271 # Schema of Dataframes:
272 # Columns in df with example values:
273 # state (WA), capital (Seattle), population (1.4 million)
274
275
276 # In[ ]:
277
278
279 # Problem: What is the population of California?
280
281
282 # In[ ]:
283
284
285 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
286 result = df[df['state'] == 'CA']['population']
287
288

```

```

289 # In[ ]:
290
291 # # Exercise 4
292
293
294 # In[ ]:
295
296
297
298 df = pd.read_csv('phones.csv')
299
300
301 # In[ ]:
302
303
304 # Schema of Dataframes:
305 # Columns in df with example values:
306 # model (Pixel 6), brand (Google), price (387), release (2022)
307
308
309 # In[ ]:
310
311
312 # Problem: What is the most expensive phone in each brand.
313
314
315 # In[ ]:
316
317
318 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
319 # Step 1: Group models by their brands.
320 model_by_brand_df = df.groupby('brand')
321 # Step 2: Find the index of rows that have the highest price in each group
322 idx = model_by_brand_df['price'].idxmax()
323 # Step 3: Get the rows using the index
324 expensive_models_df = df.loc[idx]
325 # Step 4: Return the brand name, model and price.
326 result = expensive_models_df[['brand', 'model', 'price']]
327
328
329 # In[ ]:
330
331
332 # # Exercise 5

```

Listing 3: Step-by-Step Prompt Prefix (Group 3)

```

333 # In[ ]:
334
335
336 import pandas as pd
337 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
338
339
340 # In[ ]:
341
342
343 # You are a professional data scientist. Answer the following questions using pandas and matplotlib.
344
345
346 # In[ ]:
347
348
349 # # Exercise 1
350
351
352 # In[ ]:
353
354
355 df = pd.read_csv('olympics.csv')
356
357
358 # In[ ]:
359
360
361 # Schema of Dataframes:
362 # Columns in df with example values:
363 # Year (1896), City (Athens), Country (Greece), Nations (14)
364
365
366 # In[ ]:
367
368
369 # Problem: Which countries host at least two olympic games?
370

```

```

371
372 # In[ ]:
373
374
375 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
376 # Step 1: Count the number of times each country hosted olympics
377 count_df = df['Country'].value_counts()
378 # Step 2: Find entries with more than 2 counts
379 filtered_df = count_df[count_df >= 2]
380 # Step 3: Get the country names as a list
381 filtered_df.index.tolist()
382
383
384 # In[ ]:
385
386 # # Exercise 2
387
388
389 # In[ ]:
390
391
392 df = pd.read_csv('employee.csv')
393
394
395 # In[ ]:
396
397
398 # Schema of Dataframes:
399 # Columns in df with example values:
400 # name (Peter), gender (m), DOB (1992/01/17)
401
402
403 # In[ ]:
404
405
406 # Problem: How many male and female employees are born in 1992?
407
408
409 # In[ ]:
410
411
412 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
413 # Step 1: convert date of birth in to datetime
414 df['DOB'] = pd.to_datetime(df['DOB'])
415 # Step 2: get the number of male born in 1992
416 num_male_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'm')])
417 # Step 3: get the number of female born in that year
418 num_female_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'f')])
419
420
421 # In[ ]:
422
423
424 # # Exercise 3
425
426
427 # In[ ]:
428
429
430 df = pd.read_csv('score.csv')
431
432
433 # In[ ]:
434
435
436 # Schema of Dataframes:
437 # Columns in df with example values:
438 # name (John), score (97)
439
440
441 # In[ ]:
442
443
444 # Problem: Make a new column "grade" for letter grades (A: 90+, B: 70-90, C: <70) and plot the number of
445 ↪ students in each grade.
446
447
448 # In[ ]:
449
450
451 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
452 # Step 1: Define a function to convert scores to letter grades.
453 def get_grade(score):
454     if score >= 90:
455         return 'A'
456     elif 70 <= score < 90:

```

```

457     return 'B'
458 else:
459     return 'C'
460 # Step 2: Convert scores to letter grades.
461 df['grade'] = df.score.apply(get_grade)
462 # Step 3: Count the number of students by grade.
463 count_df = df['grade'].value_counts()
464 # Step 4: Visualize in a bar chart.
465 count_df.plot(kind='bar')
466
467
468 # In[ ]:
469
470
471 # # Exercise 4
472
473
474 # In[ ]:
475
476
477 df = pd.read_csv('phones.csv')
478
479
480 # In[ ]:
481
482
483 # Schema of Dataframes:
484 # Columns in df with example values:
485 # model (Pixel 6), brand (Google), price (387), release (2022)
486
487
488 # In[ ]:
489
490
491 # Problem: What is the most expensive phone in each brand.
492
493
494 # In[ ]:
495
496
497 # Solution: Let's solve this problem step-by-step.
498 # Step 1: Group models by their brands.
499 model_by_brand_df = df.groupby('brand')
500 # Step 2: Find the index of rows that have the highest price in each group
501 idx = model_by_brand_df['price'].idxmax()
502 # Step 3: Get the rows using the index
503 expensive_models_df = df.loc[idx]
504 # Step 4: Return the brand name, model and price.
505 result = expensive_models_df[['brand', 'model', 'price']]
506
507
508 # In[ ]:
509
510
511 # # Exercise 5

```

Listing 4: Vanilla Code Prompt Prefix (Setup 1)

```

512 # In[ ]:
513
514
515 import pandas as pd
516 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
517
518
519 # In[ ]:
520
521
522 # You are a professional data scientist. Answer the following questions using pandas and matplotlib.
523
524
525 # In[ ]:
526
527
528 # # Exercise 1
529
530
531 # In[ ]:
532
533
534 df = pd.read_csv('employee.csv')
535
536
537 # In[ ]:
538

```



```

539
540 # Schema of Dataframes:
541 # Columns in df with example values:
542 # name (Peter), gender (m), DOB (1992/01/17)
543
544
545 # In[ ]:
546
547
548 # Problem: How many male and female employees are born in 1992?
549
550
551 # In[ ]:
552
553
554 # Solution:
555 df['DOB'] = pd.to_datetime(df['DOB'])
556 num_male_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'm')])
557 num_female_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'f')])
558
559
560 # In[ ]:
561
562
563 # # Exercise 2
564
565
566 # In[ ]:
567
568
569 df = pd.read_csv('scores.csv')
570
571
572 # In[ ]:
573
574
575 # Schema of Dataframes:
576 # Columns in df with example values:
577 # Stu_Name (Mike), Engineering (90), English (89), Math (92)
578
579
580 # In[ ]:
581
582
583 # Problem: Get the students with an averaged score above 90 for science subjects.
584
585
586 # In[ ]:
587
588
589 # Solution:
590 df['Science_Avg'] = (df['Engineering'] + df['Math']) / 2
591 df[df['Science_Avg'] > 90][['Stu_Name', 'Science_Avg']]
592
593
594 # In[ ]:
595
596
597 # # Exercise 3
598
599
600 # In[ ]:
601
602
603 df = pd.read_csv('geo.csv')
604
605
606 # In[ ]:
607
608
609 # Schema of Dataframes:
610 # Columns in df with example values:
611 # state (WA), capital (Seattle), population (1.4 million)
612
613
614 # In[ ]:
615
616
617 # Problem: What is the population of California?
618
619
620 # In[ ]:
621
622
623 # Solution:
624 result = df[df['state'] == 'CA']['population']
625

```

```

626
627 # In[ ]:
628
629 # # Exercise 4
630
631
632
633 # In[ ]:
634
635
636 df = pd.read_csv('phones.csv')
637
638
639 # In[ ]:
640
641
642 # Schema of Dataframes:
643 # Columns in df with example values:
644 # model (Pixel 6), brand (Google), price (387), release (2022)
645
646
647 # In[ ]:
648
649
650 # Problem: What is the most expensive phone in each brand.
651
652
653 # In[ ]:
654
655
656 # Solution:
657 df.loc[df.groupby('brand')['price'].idxmax()][['brand', 'model', 'price']]
658
659
660 # In[ ]:
661
662
663 # # Exercise 5

```

Listing 5: Vanilla Code Prompt Prefix (Setup 2)

```

664 # In[ ]:
665
666
667 import pandas as pd
668 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
669
670
671 # In[ ]:
672
673
674 # You are a professional data scientist. Answer the following questions using pandas and matplotlib.
675
676
677 # In[ ]:
678
679
680 # # Exercise 1
681
682
683 # In[ ]:
684
685
686 df = pd.read_csv('employee.csv')
687
688
689 # In[ ]:
690
691
692 # Schema of Dataframes:
693 # Columns in df with example values:
694 # name (Peter), gender (m), DOB (1992/01/17)
695
696
697 # In[ ]:
698
699
700 # Problem: How many male and female employees are born in 1992?
701
702
703 # In[ ]:
704
705
706 # Solution:
707 df['DOB'] = pd.to_datetime(df['DOB'])

```

```

708 num_male_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'm')])
709 num_female_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'f')])
710
711 # In[ ]:
712
713
714 # # Exercise 2
715
716
717 # In[ ]:
718
719
720
721 df = pd.read_csv('scores.csv')
722
723
724 # In[ ]:
725
726
727 # Schema of Dataframes:
728 # Columns in df with example values:
729 # Stu_Name (Mike), Engineering (90), English (89), Math (92)
730
731
732 # In[ ]:
733
734
735 # Problem: Get the students with an averaged score above 90 for science subjects.
736
737
738 # In[ ]:
739
740
741 # Solution:
742 df['Science_Avg'] = (df['Engineering'] + df['Math']) / 2
743 df[df['Science_Avg'] > 90][['Stu_Name', 'Science_Avg']]
744
745
746 # In[ ]:
747
748
749 # # Exercise 3
750
751
752 # In[ ]:
753
754
755 df = pd.read_csv('geo.csv')
756
757
758 # In[ ]:
759
760
761 # Schema of Dataframes:
762 # Columns in df with example values:
763 # state (WA), capital (Seattle), population (1.4 million)
764
765
766 # In[ ]:
767
768
769 # Problem: What is the population of California?
770
771
772 # In[ ]:
773
774
775 # Solution:
776 result = df[df['state'] == 'CA']['population']
777
778
779 # In[ ]:
780
781
782 # # Exercise 4
783
784
785 # In[ ]:
786
787
788 df = pd.read_csv('phones.csv')
789
790
791 # In[ ]:
792
793
794 # Schema of Dataframes:

```

```

795 # Columns in df with example values:
796 # model (Pixel 6), brand (Google), price (387), release (2022)
797
798
799 # In[ ]:
800
801
802 # Problem: What is the most expensive phone in each brand.
803
804
805 # In[ ]:
806
807
808 # Solution:
809 df.loc[df.groupby('brand')['price'].idxmax()][['brand', 'model', 'price']]
810
811
812 # In[ ]:
813
814
815 # # Exercise 5

```

Listing 6: Vanilla Code Prompt Prefix (Setup 3)

```

816 # In[ ]:
817
818
819 import pandas as pd
820 import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
821
822
823 # In[ ]:
824
825
826 # You are a professional data scientist. Answer the following questions using pandas and matplotlib.
827
828
829 # In[ ]:
830
831
832 # # Exercise 1
833
834
835 # In[ ]:
836
837
838 df = pd.read_csv('olympics.csv')
839
840
841 # In[ ]:
842
843
844 # Schema of Dataframes:
845 # Columns in df with example values:
846 # Year (1896), City (Athens), Country (Greece), Nations (14)
847
848
849 # In[ ]:
850
851
852 # Problem: Which countries host at least two olympic games?
853
854
855 # In[ ]:
856
857
858 # Solution:
859 count_df = df['Country'].value_counts()
860 count_df[count_df >= 2].index.tolist()
861
862
863 # In[ ]:
864
865
866 # # Exercise 2
867
868
869 # In[ ]:
870
871
872 df = pd.read_csv('employee.csv')
873
874
875 # In[ ]:
876

```

```

877
878 # Schema of Dataframes:
879 # Columns in df with example values:
880 # name (Peter), gender (m), DOB (1992/01/17)
881
882
883 # In[ ]:
884
885
886 # Problem: How many male and female employees are born in 1992?
887
888
889 # In[ ]:
890
891
892 # Solution:
893 df['DOB'] = pd.to_datetime(df['DOB'])
894 num_male_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'm')])
895 num_female_students = len(df[(df['DOB'].dt.year == 1992) & (df['gender'] == 'f')])
896
897
898 # In[ ]:
899
900
901 # # Exercise 3
902
903
904 # In[ ]:
905
906
907 df = pd.read_csv('score.csv')
908
909
910 # In[ ]:
911
912
913 # Schema of Dataframes:
914 # Columns in df with example values:
915 # name (John), score (97)
916
917
918 # In[ ]:
919
920
921 # Problem: Make a new column "grade" for letter grades (A: 90+, B: 70-90, C: <70) and plot the number of
922 ↪ students in each grade.
923
924 # In[ ]:
925
926
927 # Solution:
928 df['grade'] = df.score.apply(lambda x: 'A' if x >= 90 else ('B' if 70 <= x < 90 else 'C'))
929 df.grade.value_counts().plot(kind='bar')
930
931
932 # In[ ]:
933
934
935 # # Exercise 4
936
937
938 # In[ ]:
939
940
941 df = pd.read_csv('phones.csv')
942
943
944 # In[ ]:
945
946
947 # Schema of Dataframes:
948 # Columns in df with example values:
949 # model (Pixel 6), brand (Google), price (387), release (2022)
950
951
952 # In[ ]:
953
954
955 # Problem: What is the most expensive phone in each brand.
956
957
958 # In[ ]:
959
960
961 # Solution:
962 df.loc[df.groupby('brand')['price'].idxmax()][['brand', 'model', 'price']]

```

```
963
964
965 # In[ ]:
966
967
968 # # Exercise 5
```

Listing 7: The notebook context part of the prompt for u_2 in Fig. 1

```
969 # In[ ]:
970
971
972 import pandas as pd
973
974 df=pd.read_csv('dataset/Gamepass_Games_v1.csv')
975
976
977 # In[ ]:
978
979
980 # Schema of Dataframes:
981 # Columns in df with example values:
982 # GAME (Mass Effect Legendary Edition), RATIO (1.87), GAMERS (84,143), COMP % (4.1), TIME (100-120 hours),
983 ↪ RATING (4.8), ADDED (06 Jan 22), True_Achievement (5442), Game_Score (2915)
984
985 # In[ ]:
986
987
988 # Extract min and max (if applicable) hours as two columns
989
990
991 # In[ ]:
992
993
994 def get_avg(x):
995     try:
996         return float(x[0]) , float(x[1])
997     except:
998         return 0,0
999 df['min'],df['max']=zip(*df['TIME'].str.replace(" hours",'').str.strip('+').str.split("-").apply(get_avg))
1000
1001
1002 # In[ ]:
1003
1004
1005 df['ADDED']=pd.to_datetime(df['ADDED'],format="%d %b %y",errors='coerce')
1006
1007
1008 # In[ ]:
1009
1010
1011 # In which year was the most played game added?
1012
1013
1014 # In[ ]:
1015 > Model starts prediction
```