

# MHPP: Exploring the Capabilities and Limitations of Language Models Beyond Basic Code Generation

Jianbo Dai<sup>1\*</sup> Jianqiao Lu<sup>2\*</sup> Yunlong Feng<sup>3\*</sup> Rongju Ruan<sup>4</sup> Ming Cheng<sup>1</sup>  
 Haochen Tan<sup>5</sup> Zhijiang Guo<sup>6†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Edinburgh <sup>2</sup>University of Hong Kong <sup>3</sup>Harbin Institute of Technology

<sup>4</sup>South China University of Technology <sup>5</sup>City University of Hong Kong

<sup>6</sup>University of Cambridge

j6dj6d@gmail.com jqlu@cs.hku.hk ylfeng@ir.hit.edu.cn

zq283@cam.ac.uk

## Abstract

Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) have greatly improved code generation, specifically at the function level. For instance, GPT-4 has achieved an 88.4% pass rate on HumanEval. However, this draws into question the adequacy of existing benchmarks in thoroughly assessing function-level code generation capabilities. Our study analyzed two common benchmarks, HumanEval and MBPP, and found that these might not thoroughly evaluate LLMs’ code generation capacities due to limitations in quality, difficulty, and granularity. To resolve this, we introduce the Mostly Hard Python Problems (MHPP) dataset, consisting of 140 unique human-curated problems. By focusing on the combination of natural language and code reasoning, MHPP gauges LLMs’ abilities to comprehend specifications and restrictions, engage in multi-step reasoning, and apply coding knowledge effectively. Initial evaluations of 22 LLMs using MHPP showed many high-performing models on HumanEval failed to achieve similar success on MHPP. Moreover, MHPP highlighted various previously undiscovered limitations within various LLMs, leading us to believe that it could pave the way for a better understanding of LLMs’ capabilities and limitations. Dataset and code are available at <https://github.com/SparksofAGI/MHPP>.

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have recently driven striking performance improvements across various tasks (Ouyang et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023; OpenAI, 2023). Recent models such as Code Llama (Rozière et al., 2023), and GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023), have been successful in demonstrating their efficacy in code-related tasks from program repair (Haque et al., 2022; Jin et al., 2023) to automated testing (Lemieux et al., 2023; Schäfer et al., 2024). LLMs are utilized to develop innovative tools aimed at aiding programmers to write code more efficiently (Chen et al., 2021).

Code generation is a key area for evaluating LLMs’ capabilities. Code generation broadly spans converting natural language prompts into executable code, not limited to predefined templates such as function signatures and docstrings. This process can range from pure text descriptions to complete code generation, emphasizing the versatility and adaptability required for LLMs. Our focus is on Function-Level Code Generation. An example is illustrated in Figure 1. It emphasizes the translation of natural language into functional code, underlining natural language comprehension’s importance for creating accurate programming constructs. Benchmarks like HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) and MBPP (Austin et al., 2021) stand out in assessing these models, showcasing LLMs’ strengths in code generation through their understanding of natural language and generation abilities. For instance, GPT-4 impresses with an 88.4% pass rate on the first try, and the open-source WizardCoder achieves a 79.9% pass rate on the HumanEval benchmark. This suggests that current models can rival or even surpass human performance in code generation tasks.

\*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding Author.

```

1) from typing import List
2) def dice_prob(num: int) -> List[float]:
   """
   There is a regular tetrahedral dice with numbers 1, 2, 3, 4,
   and the mass distribution is uniform. If you roll n of these
   dice, please return the probabilities of all possible sums in
   ascending order using a list.
   """
3) >>> dice_prob(1)
   [0.25, 0.25, 0.25, 0.25]
4) dp = [1 / 4] * 4
   for i in range(2, num + 1):
       tmp = [0] * (3 * i + 1)
       for j in range(len(dp)):
           for k in range(4):
               tmp[j + k] += dp[j] / 4
       dp = tmp
       return dp
5) assert dice_prob(2) == [1/16, 2/6, 3/16, 4/16, 3/16, 2/16, 1/16]

```

Figure 1: A concise example from MHPP. The function is defined (1), documented with a description in its docstring (2), and is accompanied by an input example (3). A canonical answer is presented (4), and the function’s correctness is ensured through an assertion test (5).




Figure 2: Distribution of error types of GPT-3.5, GPT-4, DeepSeek-Instruct 33B and WizardCoder 33B V1.1 on HumanEval. Models tend to make mistakes on problems of the Complex type, while they are good at Basic, Distraction, and Codesense types.

However, on existing benchmarks, performance differences between models are insignificant - all achieve high pass rates. We thus raise two concerns: 1) Basic datasets lack discriminative power to distinguish model capabilities, making it difficult to assess their relative strengths and weaknesses. 2) High overall pass rates on existing tasks alone cannot determine if models have truly mastered functional programming competency and encoding skills to address diverse challenges. To answer these questions, we conducted detailed experiments with the strongest code models on the market, including closed-source models like GPT-4, GPT-3.5, and open-source models like WizardCoder and DeepSeek Coder, using the HumanEval and MBPP benchmarks. Results are displayed in Figure 2. Our error analysis revealed that different models make similar mistakes on the same problems, highlighting corresponding challenges.

Through an extensive manual analysis, we identified 7 main challenges in code generation tasks, leading to the introduction of the Mostly Hard Python Problems (MHPP) dataset. MHPP consists of 140 unique, manually created Python programming problems, each supplemented by unit tests. MHPP focuses on comprehensively evaluating LLMs’ abilities to tackle various challenges in code generation. This includes handling variance in natural language inputs, understanding newly defined contexts, demonstrating commonsense, dealing with edge cases, following complex instructions, using mathematical and algorithmic knowledge, and showing familiarity with coding principles. It is important to note that each challenge within MHPP necessitates different degrees of natural language comprehension and code reasoning abilities.

We extensively evaluated 22 LLMs on MHPP, revealing many previously undiscovered limitations and different weaknesses across models when addressing various challenges involved in code generation tasks. Notably, the models struggled the most with challenges that required advanced algorithmic reasoning. Our comprehensive experiments demonstrate that MHPP can effectively test model performance against diverse code generation challenges. We hope MHPP can serve as a stepping stone for a better understanding of LLM capabilities and limitations to advance code generation, particularly in the domain of algorithmic reasoning.

## 2 Dataset Analysis

In this section, we carry out a comprehensive manual analysis of two standard benchmarks: MBPP and HumanEval along multiple axes. Our findings indicate that these benchmarks may not fully assess LLMs’ code generation capacities due to LLMs’ rapid development.




Figure 3: The imbalance distribution of challenges and problem types in HumanEval and MBPP.

## 2.1 MBPP

The analysis of the MBPP test set revealed three main issues. Firstly, data contamination was identified as a significant problem. Through manual inspection, we found that many instances appeared on the open-access websites, such as GeeksforGeeks<sup>1</sup>. To further investigate this issue, we calculated the contamination rate using the tool (Li, 2023), 65.4% of instances in the test set were found to be contaminated. For more details refer to Appendix B. This issue may be attributed to the annotation process of MBPP, which allows crowd workers to use internet references without implementing measures to filter out questions collected directly from websites. The presence of contaminated data enables models to “cheat” by memorizing test data rather than demonstrating genuine generalization, thus distorting model comparisons and undermining the reliability of benchmarks (Jacovi et al., 2023; Sainz et al., 2023).

Additionally, upon conducting an error analysis based on the best-performing model (e.g. GPT-4), we found that 18.82% of errors identified were attributed to the quality of the test instances in MBPP. Specifically, these errors were categorized into two types: 10.59% of the errors were associated with unclear problem descriptions, while 8.23% were caused by instances lacking necessary constraints or containing incorrect test cases. A more detailed analysis, along with specific cases, can be found in Appendix H. Lastly, the problems within MBPP primarily center around basic code generation, covering tasks that entail simple arithmetic or standard library usage. The length of the natural language descriptions averages about 15.7 words per sentence, with predominantly unbalanced types, wherein 77% were related to mathematical and list as shown in Figure 3. The imbalance in problem types and difficulty levels may not thoroughly assess the capabilities of LLMs, particularly given the rapid development of LLMs.

## 2.2 HumanEval

We conduct an extensive error analysis for 4 best-reported LLMs on HumanEval, including GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023), GPT-3.5 (OpenAI, 2022), DeepSeekCoder (DeepSeekAI, 2023) and WizardCoder (Luo et al., 2023) as depicted in Figure 2. We analyze the errors made by LLMs on HumanEval and categorize the code generation challenges that led to these mistakes into 7 types:

**Distraction:** The description is lengthy and contains redundant information. To address this challenge, LLMs need to extract essential information needed for accurate code generation.

**Redefinition:** The description introduces new concepts or operational rules, presenting a counterfactual scenario with corresponding explanations. LLMs need to comprehend this newly introduced context for accurate code generation.

**Shortcut:** This challenge requires LLMs’ unconventional thinking, solving such problems often involves concise solutions derived from logical reasoning, lateral thinking, and a grasp of knowledge including mathematics and game theory.

<sup>1</sup><https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/>

	Distraction	Redefinition	Shortcut	Commonsense	Cornercase	Complex	Codesense	Total
Avg. Input Words	238.0	132.5	125.3	134.6	137.7	164.8	118.4	150.2
Avg. Code Lines	13.6	11.7	4.9	12.5	13.8	21.5	7.3	12.2
Avg. Tests	13.2	11.0	14.1	17.6	17.0	13.4	8.2	13.5
Top5 Types	Array(17%)	Array(16%)	Math(26%)	Math(17%)	Math(14%)	DP(16%)	String(17%)	Array(15%)
	Hash(10%)	Math(16%)	Array(22%)	Array(15%)	Array(14%)	Array(13%)	Array(15%)	Math(10%)
	Search(10%)	DP(10%)	Greedy(11%)	Greedy(11%)	String(11%)	Stack(10%)	Math(13%)	String(9%)
	String(8%)	Hash(8%)	Sort(9%)	String(9%)	DP(9%)	Search(9%)	Hash(8%)	DP(8%)
	Sort(8%)	Simulation(6%)	DP(7%)	Geometry(7%)	Search(9%)	Matrix(7%)	Count(8%)	Sort(7%)
Reasoning Level	Medium	Medium	Difficult	Easy	Medium	Difficult	Easy	-

Table 1: Detailed statistics of MHPP. Avg. Input Words represents the average number of words contained in the input, Avg. Code Lines means the average number of lines in code solutions and Avg. Tests represents the average number of test cases per problem. Reasoning level indicates the level of reasoning difficulties for solving the specific challenge.

**Commonsense:** Understanding the problem relies on commonsense knowledge not explicitly explained in the description. Commonsense involves universally understood facts for humans, such as temporal, spatial, and geometric knowledge. LLMs need a solid grasp of commonsense to interpret the context and then generate code.

**Cornercase:** This challenge demands thorough thinking of the problem, paying close attention to implicit boundary conditions that could affect the outcome. LLMs need to consider all the corner cases for correct code generation.

**Complexity:** The description contains multiple constraints or requires executing multiple steps to reach a solution. This complexity necessitates advanced logical reasoning or complex instruction following capabilities for code generation.

**Codesense:** This challenge requires a deep understanding of the Python language and broader programming knowledge, including familiarity with specific Python packages and the parameters needed for function calls.

In addition to seven identified challenges, we incorporated a Basic category in HumanEval that necessitates elementary programming abilities, such as string manipulation or arithmetic operations. Our analysis reveals an imbalance in HumanEval’s challenge and problem type distribution, with Basic and Codesense problems comprising 17.7% and 20.1% respectively, as depicted in Figure 3a and further illustrated in Figure 3. Codesense, demanding minimal Python proficiency, along with Basic, exhibits significantly lower error rates compared to other categories. To sum up, both MBPP and HumanEval face challenges concerning data contamination, quality, distribution, and difficulty levels, potentially affecting the reliability of benchmarking processes and the precise evaluation of LLMs’ code generation capabilities.

### 3 Benchmark Construction

To delve deeper into the capabilities and limitations of LLMs beyond the basic code generation capabilities identified by MBPP and HumanEval, we have created a unique code generation benchmark Mostly Hard Python Problems (MHPP). This benchmark comprises expert-curated problems tailored specifically for the seven challenges we identified in code generation. Note that using HumanEval as a starting point may limit the coverage of problem types and error patterns. Therefore, we actively sought to generalize the problem types and address more realistic and challenging error patterns in the creation of MHPP. We refer readers to Appendix C. Our annotation team includes 10 members, all of whom possess either a master’s or a Ph.D. degree in computer science. To ensure the quality of our dataset, three members serve as meta-annotators. Based on the seven challenges, the annotators were tasked with defining the problem statement for each challenge, creating a single, self-contained Python function to solve the given problem, and developing test cases to validate the semantic correctness of the function, as detailed in Section 3.1. Additionally, the annotators were required to provide a ground-truth solution that successfully passed all the proposed test cases.

In defining the problems, annotators were instructed to formulate descriptions clear and detailed enough to allow for the translation of these descriptions into code by a human, without further clarification. To maintain the originality and integrity of MHPP, annotators were strictly prohibited

from directly copying problems from publicly accessible websites, or employing simple modifications to existing problems, such as synonym replacements or paraphrasing, as outlined in Section 3.2.

### 3.1 Challenge-Specific Annotation

We provide guidelines catered to the diverse requirements of annotating different challenges.

**Distraction:** Annotators are required to create elaborate natural language descriptions that incorporate redundant information. These descriptions should exceed 200 words and introduce distractions.

**Redefinition:** Annotators are required to introduce new concepts or operational rules, effectively creating counterfactual scenarios. Each problem should introduce more than one new concept along with comprehensive explanations.

**Shortcut:** Annotators are required to craft problems that permit concise solutions by lateral thinking, or applying knowledge from mathematics and game theory.

**Commonsense:** Annotators are required to construct problems that are grounded in foundational commonsense concepts. These problems should not include explicit explanations of the involved commonsense principles, and more than one concept should be featured.

**Cornercase:** Annotators are required to write problems with solutions that need to consider more than 1 corner case.

**Complexity:** Annotators are required to develop problems that have more than 3 operational steps or hops of reasoning. An example would be a problem that necessitates sorting a list, extracting maximum and minimum elements, and then calculating the difference between these elements.

**Codesense:** Annotators are required to craft problems that necessitate the utilization of more than 1 specific Python package, both internal and external, such as RE and Numpy.

### 3.2 Quality Assurance

To ensure the quality of MHPP, we initiated a comprehensive two-phase quality assurance process. Our primary goal in the first phase is to eliminate any risk of data contamination that may arise from the inclusion of problems that have previously appeared on open-access websites. To achieve this, we tasked meta-reviewers with meticulously searching the Internet to ensure none of the problems selected were already publicly available. Additionally, we employed a contamination detector (Li, 2023), to confirm a 0% contamination rate, resulting in the exclusion of 6 problems identified at this stage. We then asked the annotators to annotate another 6 problems until all of the problems met the requirements. Progressing to the second phase, our focus shifted towards ensuring that each problem rigorously meets the specific criteria for the respective challenges. This entailed a detailed review of every aspect of the problem, including the natural language description, the reference solution, and the test cases, conducted by a panel of three meta-annotators. To guarantee consistency and accuracy, we adopted an iterative approach wherein annotators were tasked with addressing and rectifying any issues flagged by the meta-reviewers until unanimous approval was obtained.

### 3.3 Dataset Statistics

Detailed statistics of MHPP are outlined in Table 1. The total number of our dataset is 140 and each challenge category contains 20 questions. A significant observation is that the average problem in MHPP contains 150.2 words and the corresponding solutions span across 12.2 lines of code. This indicates a considerable increase in verbosity and code complexity when compared to benchmarks such as MBPP and HumanEval. Furthermore, MHPP surpasses these benchmarks in the number of test cases, with an average of 13.5 test cases per problem—higher than MBPP’s 3.0 and HumanEval’s 7.2. Further comparisons can be found in Appendix A. Crucially, the design of MHPP specifically addresses more nuanced challenges and diverse context formats, a distinction not observed in other datasets. For instance, challenges categorized under the Distraction and Complex categories are marked by significantly longer descriptions, posing unique challenges in context comprehension. Conversely, problems falling under the Shortcut class feature notably fewer lines of code in their solutions, highlighting challenges in achieving concise problem solutions.

Model	Distraction		Redefinition		Shortcut		Commonsense		Cornercase		Complex		Codesense		Total	
	k=1	k=5	k=1	k=5	k=1	k=5	k=1	k=5	k=1	k=5	k=1	k=5	k=1	k=5	k=1	k=5
<b>Closed-Source LLMs</b>																
GPT-4-1106-Preview	45.0	58.3	61.6	73.4	32.4	49.3	55.4	78.2	44.3	61.9	37.5	64.2	58.2	74.6	47.8	65.7
GPT-3.5-Turbo	28.2	38.8	33.7	45.8	28.6	47.2	37.6	57.9	25.3	39.2	15.9	29.1	44.5	63.5	30.6	45.9
<b>Open-Source LLMs</b>																
Phi 1-1.3B	3.0	9.5	15.7	25.7	8.8	15.5	11.2	18.2	8.3	18.1	6.9	11.3	25.7	34.8	11.4	19.0
Phi 1.5-1.3B	0.9	3.7	5.5	12.5	2.9	8.9	9.0	17.8	5.4	11.2	0.6	2.8	13.9	24.5	5.5	11.6
Phi 2-2.7B	7.1	16.3	9.7	22.3	4.6	14.5	13.9	27.0	8.2	15.5	1.3	5.5	16.2	33.2	8.7	19.2
Mistral-7B Ins	3.0	11.1	7.5	16.8	2.8	9.5	7.1	14.4	9.0	14.7	0.8	3.4	13.0	26.3	6.2	13.7
LLaMA2 Chat-7b	0.0	0.0	2.8	7.9	0.6	2.5	1.8	5.5	6.8	9.5	0.3	1.5	5.5	9.7	2.6	5.2
LLaMA2 Chat-13b	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.9	0.7	2.7	5.0	10.2	9.5	10.5	0.3	1.4	8.3	11.6	3.5	5.8
CodeLLaMA-7B	1.4	6.0	2.6	10.4	0.7	3.3	7.0	18.3	5.7	11.9	0.3	1.3	6.5	15.8	3.4	9.6
CodeLLaMA-13B	2.2	9.2	3.1	12.3	1.6	7.0	6.0	17.7	5.6	14.8	0.8	3.7	7.7	19.4	3.9	12.0
CodeLLaMA-34B	7.1	20.7	15.4	34.2	3.8	13.8	21.2	43.4	10.5	23.7	1.5	6.6	15.0	33.7	10.6	25.1
CodeLLaMA-7B Ins	8.2	20.1	9.7	17.8	8.5	15.0	13.2	23.5	14.7	19.1	2.2	7.2	14.2	25.7	10.1	18.4
CodeLLaMA-13B Ins	11.0	22.2	11.9	17.2	3.8	9.9	15.3	26.1	13.1	18.9	1.1	4.7	19.4	26.4	10.8	17.9
CodeLLaMA-34B Ins	6.0	15.5	11.7	17.3	7.2	11.3	23.0	35.8	9.3	14.4	0.8	3.5	17.0	23.7	10.7	17.4
CodeLLaMA-7B Py	1.2	5.5	3.0	11.8	0.6	2.6	6.9	18.6	5.4	11.8	0.4	2.0	4.9	12.0	3.2	9.2
CodeLLaMA-13B Py	1.9	7.4	6.4	18.5	1.2	5.2	9.9	23.5	6.3	12.9	0.6	2.9	9.8	22.1	5.2	13.2
CodeLLaMA-34B Py	8.0	24.2	13.6	32.4	2.5	10.5	19.6	43.4	9.9	20.6	2.0	9.0	14.2	32.6	10.0	24.7
DeepSeek-1.3B	11.2	22.9	12.5	24.9	7.3	18.2	21.8	36.7	11.7	19.3	0.7	3.3	15.2	33.2	11.5	22.7
DeepSeek-6.7B	17.9	33.6	29.6	43.2	15.5	30.8	36.5	60.8	22.7	37.1	8.3	25.0	36.8	60.1	23.9	41.5
DeepSeek-33B	<b>26.8</b>	<u>39.2</u>	<b>35.4</b>	<u>52.9</u>	<b>20.6</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>69.3</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>45.9</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<u>34.7</u>	<u>39.2</u>	<b>64.3</b>	<b>31.4</b>	<b>49.3</b>
WizardCoder-33B	<u>25.6</u>	<b>39.9</b>	<u>34.5</u>	<b>53.7</b>	<u>19.8</u>	<u>36.3</u>	<u>48.5</u>	<u>67.5</u>	<u>30.6</u>	<u>44.0</u>	<u>14.5</u>	<b>37.7</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<u>62.0</u>	<u>30.5</u>	<u>48.7</u>
WizardCoder-34B Py	12.6	28.3	21.4	38.2	7.1	16.9	20.2	41.1	11.9	25.6	3.3	14.0	23.8	45.1	14.4	29.9

Table 2: LLMs’ performance on MHPP in terms of pass@1 and pass@5 scores. We pinpoint top performers in open-source LLMs based on pass@1 and pass@5 scores. The best models are highlighted in **bold**, while those in second place are underscored, including ties. The performance of LLMs on MHPP using greedy-search decoding can be seen in Appendix E.

As detailed in Table 1, our analysis of the top 5 distribution of problem types underscores the unparalleled diversity in MHPP, in contrast to MBPP and HumanEval where three types predominantly emerge. This diversity extends to the varied problem types observed across different challenges; for example, while dynamic programming is a prevalent theme in the Complex category, it appears less frequently in the Redefinition and Cornercase categories, showcasing the diverse range of challenges encapsulated within MHPP.

MHPP spans a wide range of complexity levels, testing the reasoning capabilities of LLMs to varying degrees. Commonsense and Codesense challenges involve basic logical operations, such as identifying concepts and patterns, applying factual and programming knowledge, and drawing simple inferences. Distraction, Redefinition, and Cornercase challenges demand complex cognitive processes. These include analyzing the docstring, evaluating the context, and forming conclusions based on multiple conditions. Shortcut and Complex challenges necessitate even more advanced reasoning, involving abstract thinking, critical analysis, and optimization under various constraints. In essence, MHPP provides a spectrum of complexity, testing LLMs’ ability to perform natural language and algorithmic reasoning at different levels.

## 4 Experiment

### 4.1 Setup

Following prior works (Chen et al., 2021; Nijkamp et al., 2023), code generation is conducted under the setting of greedy-search and sampling decoding with a temperature of 0.7, which are evaluated with unbiased versions of pass@1 and pass@5 scores, respectively. We examined 22 LLMs on MHPP to demonstrate a comprehensive study, including the open-sourced LLMs such as CodeLLaMA (Rozière et al., 2023), DeepSeek (DeepSeekAI, 2023) and WizardCoder (Luo et al., 2023). GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023) and its predecessor are also evaluated. Each model is prompted

with “Write a Python function according to the function name and the problem description in the docstring below. *[function definition with docstring]*”, while all finetuned LLMs are equipped with the additional instruction template used during their specific finetuning. To carry out an in-depth investigation of LLMs’ capability of code generation and the effectiveness of MHPP, three research questions are naturally raised:

**RQ1** How do open-sourced coding models compare to proprietary models like GPT-3/GPT-4 in their ability to generate high-quality code? (Section 4.2)

**RQ2** What weaknesses do even the most advanced models still exhibit? (Section 4.3)

**RQ3** How well does performance on MHPP correlate with performance on the existing HumanEval benchmark for evaluating code generation capabilities? (Section 4.4)

## 4.2 Main Results

*Open-sourced LLMs are impressive, however still fall short of the performance compared with GPT-4.* Table 2 show that there is a large gap between the performance of open-sourced coding models and all the other baselines, while the open-sourced LLMs exhibit varying quality on the response of MHPP. Specifically, despite the introduction of supervised instruction tuning and the adaptation of Python coding, most CodeLLaMA models are still inadequate to generate acceptable responses, as Phi-1 and Phi-2 demonstrate comparable performance with nearly 30x smaller sizes. However, the Phi series does not deliver the benefits of scaling up the model size, as there is little correlation between the model size and the ability of code generation. In contrast, significant improvements accompany the up-scaling of the model size on the DeepSeek and WizardCoder series. Surprisingly, DeepSeek-Instruct 33B and WizardCoder-33B-v1.1 achieve 31.4 and 30.5 pass@1 scores, respectively, which is better than or on par with the GPT-3.5 (30.6), demonstrating their potential to shape the future of open-sourced coding LLMs. However, although their performance is comparable to GPT-3.5, a huge performance gap between them and GPT-4 still exists. With a 47.8 pass@1 score, GPT-4 leaves it without any competitors in the field of code generation. This suggests that the development of open-sourced coding LLMs still faces considerable challenges and requires further exploration. Furthermore, we extend our research beyond Python by translating MHPP’s problems and test cases into Java and C++. The results of GPT-4’s performance on these languages are in Appendix D. To help the community further improve performance on fine-grained code generation tasks, we have devised a set of potential strategies tailored to each category of challenges presented in MHPP, as detailed in Appendix F.

## 4.3 Results on Different Types of Challenges

*Challenges in MHPP are still hard even for top-performance LLMs.* Despite the impressive performance compared with all the other baselines, GPT models’ error rates are still unignorable. Figure 4 shows that MHPP struck GPT models on all fronts, as GPT-3.5 performed poorly on every subject of MHPP, getting 84.1% error rate in the worst category, and over 55% even in the best one. Besides, although GPT-4 outperforms its predecessor on all subjects, there is still a long way from being able to fully master problems in MHPP, especially for shortcut questions, which happened to be among the least represented in HumanEval. The experimental results indicate that MHPP provides a comprehensive overview of the LLMs’ capability to generate codes.

## 4.4 Correlation between MHPP and HumanEval

*MHPP is highly correlated with the HumanEval, but more challenging and representative.* Following the CRUXEval (Gu et al., 2024), we present the correlation between the HumanEval and MHPP in Figure 5. GPT-4 is beyond all the disputes the finest LLMs in code generation, followed by DeepSeek, GPT-3.5 and WizardCoder. It is worth noting that a bunch of model families benefit from scaling up the model size, especially the DeepSeek with an incredible performance-to-size ratio. Most of these findings are strongly correlated with the results on HumanEval. However, when comparing the CodeLLaMA-python with the CodeLLaMA-instruct, it is unexpected that the instruction-finetuned version outperforms the python-variants on MHPP, while contradicting the results on HumanEval. By inspecting all the responses generated from these two series, we attribute this phenomenon to the poor generalization capability of the python-variants, as over half of the generated responses are almost




Figure 4: Error distribution of GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 on MHPP. GPT-3.5 performed poorly on MHPP. Even the GPT-4 is still unable to fully master problems in MHPP, especially for questions belonging to Shortcut challenge, which happened to be among the least represented in HumanEval.




Figure 5: The correlation between HumanEval pass@1 scores and MHPP pass@1 scores. The font size of the model name is proportional to the model size. CL denotes CodeLLaMA, while DS and WC represent the DeepSeekCoder and WizardCoder respectively. Instruction-finetuned models are labeled with ‘I’.

the same as the instruction-finetuned CodeLLaMA, yet the variable names of each function didn’t match those in the MHPP but were the same as in the training corpus, see Figure 7 in Appendix H. Consequently, MHPP is highly correlated with the HumanEval for the most part. However, MHPP can reflect the model’s performance more truthfully in complex scenarios.

## 5 Analysis

### 5.1 Performance Sensitivity to Input Example

Our exploration of the GPT-4’s performance sensitivity revealed two significant results/: (a) model performance is insensitive to the number of examples (if it has), but the performance is significantly low when there are no examples. (b) the variability introduced by different input examples affects synthesis performance.

**Number of Examples in Docstring:** We constructed zero to four-shot settings. Without any demonstrations, only language specifications in the docstring led to the weakest performance whose pass@1 equals 46.4%, it has a huge gap between that in the one-shot scenario (pass@1 is 54.3%). Interestingly, we noted a peak in performance at two examples (pass@1 is 55.0%), indicating that a moderate number of examples might strike the best balance for guiding the model without risking overfitting (Austin et al., 2021), which can degrade performance, for example, pass@1 are 52.9% and 51.4% when given three or four examples in prompt, respectively.

**Different Input Example:** We evaluated the GPT-4 model’s performance sensitivity to the nature of the single input examples used. As evident from our analysis, the specific input examples significantly influence the model’s problem-solving success rate, averaging around 50.7% with a variability of  $\pm 3.6\%$ . The substantial fluctuation in performance based on the input example choice suggests that the model’s reasoning ability can be highly context-dependent.

### 5.2 Case Review

In this section, we reviewed the GPT-4’s failures to see if, for a particular problem, the model indeed failed to solve it due to the specific challenge we set for the problem. Two examples are shown in Figure 6, we refer the reader to Appendix J for more whole examples. From these examples, the rationality of the challenge classification can also be confirmed.






Figure 6: Two case studies showing that challenges we particularly set for certain problems can indeed cause the model to make mistakes. The highlighted text in the docstring represents where the model can be misunderstood. The pink-colored part in the code means the mistakes and the pale blue-colored part in the code means that the model knows the correct implementation.

Figure 6a shows one problem with “Commonsense” as its challenge and model’s solution. More specifically, this problem concerns the model’s understanding of space or orientation. Only people who are walking toward each other will meet, yet the model mistakenly believes it also needs to calculate for people moving in opposite directions. This indicates that the model lacks real-world spatial concepts.

The problem in Figure 6b addresses the challenge of multiple constraints - “Complex”. At the position marked pale blue, the model knows it should use index 3 to retrieve the fourth number from a Python array. However, for those parts marked by the color pink, even though the model claims in the comments that it will operate on the fourth number, it still uses 4 as the index. Therefore, as the number of constraints increases, the model commits errors that would not occur under fewer constraints.

## 6 Related Work

### 6.1 LLMs for Code

The burgeoning interest in LLMs for code has coincided with the profusion of openly available code repositories and the pressing need to enhance the productivity of software developers. Initial models predominantly focused on code generation tasks have included CodeT5 (Wang et al., 2021), AlphaCode (Li et al., 2022), CodeGen (Nijkamp et al., 2023), InCoder (Fried et al., 2023), StarCoder (Li et al., 2023a), SantaCoder (Allal et al., 2023) and DeepSeek Coder (DeepSeekAI, 2023), all of which were trained on code. Contrastingly, models such as Codex (Chen et al., 2021) and CodeLLaMA (Rozière et al., 2023) represent a subsequent stride, having been fine-tuned from foundation models (Brown et al., 2020; Touvron et al., 2023). The evolution continued as LLMs leveraged instruction-like datasets derived from GPT (OpenAI, 2022; 2023) for fine-tuning. Among these, WizardCoder (Luo et al., 2023), Phi-1 (Gunasekar et al., 2023), and Phi-1.5 (Li et al., 2023b) are notable examples. Across various coding applications, these code LLMs have set new standards of excellence, showcasing their prowess in domains including program repair (Haque et al., 2022; Jiang et al., 2023), automated testing (Lemieux et al., 2023; Deng et al., 2023), code translation (Rozière et al., 2020; Ahmad et al., 2023), type prediction (Mir et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2023), and code summarization (Hasan et al., 2021; Ahmed & Devanbu, 2022).

## 6.2 Code Generation Benchmarks

Code generation (Chen et al., 2021; Austin et al., 2021) has emerged as a vital domain for evaluating LLMs, where models generate code snippets based on natural language descriptions, often given in the form of docstrings. Creating datasets for this task is challenging, leading most efforts to source natural language and code pairs from the Internet (Hendrycks et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022; Chandel et al., 2022; Jain et al., 2022; Shinn et al., 2023) or use distant supervision (Agashe et al., 2019). For instance, APPS (Hendrycks et al., 2021) compiles questions from open-access coding portals like Codeforces and Kattis, covering a wide difficulty range. Similarly, CodeContests (Li et al., 2022) and LeetCodeHard (Shinn et al., 2023) draw problems from specific platforms, enriching the diversity and challenge of datasets. However, the training of LLMs on vast repositories, including GitHub, poses a risk of including solutions to these problems, thereby emphasizing the importance of hand-written sets like HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) and MBPP (Austin et al., 2021) for accurate benchmarks. These datasets, based entirely on human-written questions, are pivotal despite their focus on simpler functions, highlighting a need for advancing benchmarks to match the growing capabilities of LLMs. More code generation benchmarks are discussed in Appendix A

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we construct the MHPP benchmark comprising 140 unique, manually created Python problems. The prime focus of MHPP is the semantic grounding of code generation, effectively measuring LLMs’ competence in comprehending detailed specifications and restrictions in natural language descriptions, undertaking complex reasoning, and employing code knowledge to facilitate the desired functionality. Upon applying MHPP, we observe that the most powerful LLM still struggles on this challenging benchmark. We hope MHPP can shed light on understanding the capabilities and limitations of LLMs for code generation and form a foundation for further improvements. Though MHPP offers valuable insights into code generation, it’s important to acknowledge its limitations in terms of data size and potential bias, which are provided in Appendix G

## References

- Rajas Agashe, Srinivasan Iyer, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Juice: A large scale distantly supervised dataset for open domain context-based code generation. In Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-7, 2019*, pp. 5435–5445. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019. doi: 10.18653/V1/D19-1546. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1546>.
- Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Md Golam Rahman Tushar, Saikat Chakraborty, and Kai-Wei Chang. AVATAR: A parallel corpus for java-python program translation. In Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pp. 2268–2281. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.FINDINGS-ACL.143. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.143>.
- Toufique Ahmed and Premkumar T. Devanbu. Few-shot training llms for project-specific code-summarization. In *37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2022, Rochester, MI, USA, October 10-14, 2022*, pp. 177:1–177:5. ACM, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3551349.3559555. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3551349.3559555>.
- Loubna Ben Allal, Raymond Li, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Christopher Akiki, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Niklas Muennighoff, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Manan Dey, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Yangtian Zi, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Hailey Schoelkopf, Sergey Troshin, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Manuel Romero, Michael Lappert, Francesco De Toni, Bernardo García del Río, Qian Liu, Shamik Bose, Urvashi Bhattacharyya, Terry Yue Zhuo, Ian Yu, Paulo Villegas, Marco Zocca, Sourab Mangrulkar, David Lansky, Huu Nguyen, Danish Contractor, Luis Villa, Jia Li, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Sean Hughes, Daniel Fried, Arjun Guha, Harm de Vries, and Leandro von Werra. Santacoder: don’t reach for the stars! *CoRR*, abs/2301.03988, 2023.

doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2301.03988. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.03988>.

Ben Athiwaratkun, Sanjay Krishna Gouda, Zijian Wang, Xiaopeng Li, Yuchen Tian, Ming Tan, Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Shiqi Wang, Qing Sun, Mingyue Shang, Sujan Kumar Gonugondla, Hantian Ding, Varun Kumar, Nathan Fulton, Arash Farahani, Siddhartha Jain, Robert Giaquinto, Haifeng Qian, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, and Ramesh Nallapati. Multi-lingual evaluation of code generation models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=Bo7eeXm6An8>.

Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell I. Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie J. Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc V. Le, and Charles Sutton. Program synthesis with large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2108.07732, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07732>.

Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Abstract.html>.

Federico Cassano, John Gouwar, Daniel Nguyen, Sydney Nguyen, Luna Phipps-Costin, Donald Pinckney, Ming-Ho Yee, Yangtian Zi, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Molly Q. Feldman, Arjun Guha, Michael Greenberg, and Abhinav Jangda. Multipl-e: A scalable and polyglot approach to benchmarking neural code generation. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 49(7):3675–3691, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TSE.2023.3267446. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2023.3267446>.

Shubham Chandel, Colin B. Clement, Guillermo Serrato, and Neel Sundaresan. Training and evaluating a jupyter notebook data science assistant. *CoRR*, abs/2201.12901, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.12901>.

Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Pondé de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harrison Edwards, Yuri 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, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Joshua Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *CoRR*, abs/2107.03374, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374>.

DeepSeekAI. Deepseek coder: Let the code write itself, 2023. URL <https://deepseekcoder.github.io/>.

Yinlin Deng, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Chenyuan Yang, Shizhuo Dylan Zhang, Shujing Yang, and Lingming Zhang. Large language models are edge-case fuzzers: Testing deep learning libraries via fuzzgpt. *CoRR*, abs/2304.02014, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2304.02014. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.02014>.

Yanguibo Ding, Zijian Wang, Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, Ramesh Nallapati, Parminder Bhatia, Dan Roth, and Bing Xiang. Cocomic: Code completion by jointly modeling

- in-file and cross-file context. *CoRR*, abs/2212.10007, 2022. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2212.10007. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2212.10007>.
- Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Scott Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. Incoder: A generative model for code infilling and synthesis. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=hQwb-lbM6EL>.
- Alex Gu, Baptiste Rozière, Hugh Leather, Armando Solar-Lezama, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Sida I. Wang. Cruxeval: A benchmark for code reasoning, understanding and execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03065*, 2024.
- Suriya Gunasekar, Yi Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Allie Del Giorno, Sivakanth Gopi, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, Adil Salim, Shital Shah, Harkirat Singh Behl, Xin Wang, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Adam Tauman Kalai, Yin Tat Lee, and Yuanzhi Li. Textbooks are all you need. *CoRR*, abs/2306.11644, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2306.11644. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.11644>.
- Md. Mahim Anjum Haque, Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Ismini Lourentzou, and Chris Brown. Fixeval: Execution-based evaluation of program fixes for competitive programming problems. *CoRR*, abs/2206.07796, 2022. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2206.07796. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.07796>.
- Masum Hasan, Tanveer Muttaqueen, Abdullah Al Ishtiaq, Kazi Sajeed Mehrab, Md. Mahim Anjum Haque, Tahmid Hasan, Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Anindya Iqbal, and Rifat Shahriyar. Codesc: A large code-description parallel dataset. In Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL/IJCNLP 2021, Online Event, August 1-6, 2021*, volume ACL/IJCNLP 2021 of *Findings of ACL*, pp. 210–218. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. doi: 10.18653/V1/2021.FINDINGS-ACL.18. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.findings-acl.18>.
- Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Saurav Kadavath, Mantas Mazeika, Akul Arora, Ethan Guo, Collin Burns, Samir Puranik, Horace He, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring coding challenge competence with APPS. In Joaquin Vanschoren and Sai-Kit Yeung (eds.), *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks 1, NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks 2021, December 2021, virtual*, 2021. URL <https://datasets-benchmarks-proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2021/hash/c24cd76e1ce41366a4bbe8a49b02a028-Abstract-round2.html>.
- Alon Jacovi, Avi Caciularu, Omer Goldman, and Yoav Goldberg. Stop uploading test data in plain text: Practical strategies for mitigating data contamination by evaluation benchmarks. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pp. 5075–5084. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.308>.
- Naman Jain, Skanda Vaidyanath, Arun Shankar Iyer, Nagarajan Natarajan, Suresh Parthasarathy, Sriram K. Rajamani, and Rahul Sharma. Jigsaw: Large language models meet program synthesis. In *44th IEEE/ACM 44th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 25-27, 2022*, pp. 1219–1231. ACM, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3510003.3510203. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510203>.
- Nan Jiang, Kevin Liu, Thibaud Lutellier, and Lin Tan. Impact of code language models on automated program repair. In *45th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2023, Melbourne, Australia, May 14-20, 2023*, pp. 1430–1442. IEEE, 2023. doi: 10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00125. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00125>.
- Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. Swe-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? *CoRR*, abs/2310.06770, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2310.06770. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.06770>.

- Matthew Jin, Syed Shahriar, Michele Tufano, Xin Shi, Shuai Lu, Neel Sundaresan, and Alexey Svyatkovskiy. Inferfix: End-to-end program repair with llms. In Satish Chandra, Kelly Blincoe, and Paolo Tonella (eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2023, San Francisco, CA, USA, December 3-9, 2023*, pp. 1646–1656. ACM, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3611643.3613892. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611643.3613892>.
- Yuhang Lai, Chengxi Li, Yiming Wang, Tianyi Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, Wen-Tau Yih, Daniel Fried, Sida I. Wang, and Tao Yu. DS-1000: A natural and reliable benchmark for data science code generation. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett (eds.), *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 18319–18345. PMLR, 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/lai23b.html>.
- Caroline Lemieux, Jeevana Priya Inala, Shuvendu K. Lahiri, and Siddhartha Sen. Codamosa: Escaping coverage plateaus in test generation with pre-trained large language models. In *45th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2023, Melbourne, Australia, May 14-20, 2023*, pp. 919–931. IEEE, 2023. doi: 10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00085. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00085>.
- Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Terry Yue Zhuo, Thomas Wang, Olivier Dehaene, Mishig Davaadorj, Joel Lamy-Poirier, João Monteiro, Oleh Shliazhko, Nicolas Gontier, Nicholas Meade, Armel Zebaze, Ming-Ho Yee, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Jian Zhu, Benjamin Lipkin, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Zhiruo Wang, Rudra Murthy V, Jason Stillerman, Siva Sankalp Patel, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Marco Zocca, Manan Dey, Zhihan Zhang, Nour Moustafa-Fahmy, Urvashi Bhattacharyya, Wenhao Yu, Swayam Singh, Sasha Luccioni, Paulo Villegas, Maxim Kunakov, Fedor Zhdanov, Manuel Romero, Tony Lee, Nadav Timor, Jennifer Ding, Claire Schlesinger, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jan Ebert, Tri Dao, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Jennifer Robinson, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Danish Contractor, Siva Reddy, Daniel Fried, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *CoRR*, abs/2305.06161, 2023a. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.06161. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.06161>.
- Yuanzhi Li, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Allie Del Giorno, Suriya Gunasekar, and Yin Tat Lee. Textbooks are all you need II: phi-1.5 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2309.05463, 2023b. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2309.05463. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.05463>.
- Yucheng Li. An open source data contamination report for llama series models. *CoRR*, abs/2310.17589, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2310.17589. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.17589>.
- 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 J. Mankowitz, Esme Sutherland Robson, Pushmeet Kohli, Nando de Freitas, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Oriol Vinyals. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *CoRR*, abs/2203.07814, 2022. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2203.07814. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.07814>.
- Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and Lingming Zhang. Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. *CoRR*, abs/2305.01210, 2023a. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.01210. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.01210>.
- Tianyang Liu, Canwen Xu, and Julian J. McAuley. Repobench: Benchmarking repository-level code auto-completion systems. *CoRR*, abs/2306.03091, 2023b. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2306.03091. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.03091>.

Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xiubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct. *CoRR*, abs/2306.08568, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2306.08568. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.08568>.

Amir M. Mir, Evaldas Latoskinas, Sebastian Proksch, and Georgios Gousios. Type4py: Practical deep similarity learning-based type inference for python. In *44th IEEE/ACM 44th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 25-27, 2022*, pp. 2241–2252. ACM, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3510003.3510124. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3510003.3510124>.

Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023. URL [https://openreview.net/pdf?id=iaYcJKpY2B\\_](https://openreview.net/pdf?id=iaYcJKpY2B_).

OpenAI. ChatGPT, 2022. URL <https://chat.openai.com>.

OpenAI. GPT-4 Technical Report. *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774>.

Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F. Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, 2022. URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2022/hash/blfede53be364a73914f58805a001731-Abstract-Conference.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/blfede53be364a73914f58805a001731-Abstract-Conference.html).

Shishir G. Patil, Tianjun Zhang, Xin Wang, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. Gorilla: Large language model connected with massive apis. *CoRR*, abs/2305.15334, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.15334. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.15334>.

Baptiste Rozière, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Lowik Chausson, and Guillaume Lample. Unsupervised translation of programming languages. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/ed23fbf18c2cd35f8c7f8de44f85c08d-Abstract.html>.

Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Ivan Evtimov, Joanna Bitton, Manish Bhatt, Cristian Canton-Ferrer, Aaron Grattafiori, Wenhan Xiong, Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Faisal Azhar, Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Nicolas Usunier, Thomas Scialom, and Gabriel Synnaeve. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *CoRR*, abs/2308.12950, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2308.12950. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.12950>.

Oscar Sainz, Jon Ander Campos, Iker García-Ferrero, Julen Etxaniz, Oier Lopez de Lacalle, and Eneko Agirre. NLP evaluation in trouble: On the need to measure LLM data contamination for each benchmark. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pp. 10776–10787. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.722>.

Max Schäfer, Sarah Nadi, Aryaz Eghbali, and Frank Tip. An empirical evaluation of using large language models for automated unit test generation. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 50(1):85–105, 2024. doi: 10.1109/TSE.2023.3334955. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2023.3334955>.

- Noah Shinn, Beck Labash, and Ashwin Gopinath. Reflexion: an autonomous agent with dynamic memory and self-reflection. *CoRR*, abs/2303.11366, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2303.11366. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.11366>.
- Disha Shrivastava, Hugo Larochelle, and Daniel Tarlow. Repository-level prompt generation for large language models of code. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett (eds.), *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 31693–31715. PMLR, 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/shrivastava23a.html>.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton-Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurélien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2307.09288. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.09288>.
- Shiqi Wang, Zheng Li, Haifeng Qian, Chenghao Yang, Zijian Wang, Mingyue Shang, Varun Kumar, Samson Tan, Baishakhi Ray, Parminder Bhatia, Ramesh Nallapati, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, Dan Roth, and Bing Xiang. Recode: Robustness evaluation of code generation models. In Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pp. 13818–13843. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023a. doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.ACL-LONG.773. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.773>.
- Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq R. Joty, and Steven C. H. Hoi. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7-11 November, 2021*, pp. 8696–8708. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. doi: 10.18653/V1/2021.EMNLP-MAIN.685. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.685>.
- Zhiruo Wang, Shuyan Zhou, Daniel Fried, and Graham Neubig. Execution-based evaluation for open-domain code generation. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pp. 1271–1290. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023b. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.89>.
- Jiayi Wei, Greg Durrett, and Isil Dillig. Typet5: Seq2seq type inference using static analysis. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=4TyNEhI2GdN>.
- Pengcheng Yin, Wen-Ding Li, Kefan Xiao, Abhishek Rao, Yeming Wen, Kensen Shi, Joshua Howland, Paige Bailey, Michele Catasta, Henryk Michalewski, Oleksandr Polozov, and Charles Sutton. Natural language to code generation in interactive data science notebooks. In Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pp. 126–173. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.ACL-LONG.9. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.9>.

- Daoguang Zan, Bei Chen, Dejian Yang, Zeqi Lin, Minsu Kim, Bei Guan, Yongji Wang, Weizhu Chen, and Jian-Guang Lou. CERT: continual pre-training on sketches for library-oriented code generation. In Luc De Raedt (ed.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2022, Vienna, Austria, 23-29 July 2022*, pp. 2369–2375. ijcai.org, 2022. doi: 10.24963/IJCAI.2022/329. URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2022/329>.
- Fengji Zhang, Bei Chen, Yue Zhang, Jacky Keung, Jin Liu, Daoguang Zan, Yi Mao, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. Repocoder: Repository-level code completion through iterative retrieval and generation. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pp. 2471–2484. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.151>.
- Qinkai Zheng, Xiao Xia, Xu Zou, Yuxiao Dong, Shan Wang, Yufei Xue, Zihan Wang, Lei Shen, Andi Wang, Yang Li, Teng Su, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Codegeex: A pre-trained model for code generation with multilingual evaluations on humaneval-x. *CoRR*, abs/2303.17568, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2303.17568. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.17568>.



Dataset	Written	Perturb	Source	Problems	Evaluation	#Cases	#Words	#Codes
MBPP (Austin et al., 2021)	✓	N/A	N/A	974	Test Cases	3.0	15.7	6.7
HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021)	✓	N/A	N/A	164	Test Cases	7.2	23.0	6.3
APPS (Hendrycks et al., 2021)	✗	✗	Websites	5000	Test Cases	13.2	293.2	18.0
CodeContests (Li et al., 2022)	✗	✗	Codeforces	165	Test Cases	204.6	401.3	52
LeetCodeHard (Shinn et al., 2023)	✗	✗	LeetCode	40	Test Cases	N/A	275.8	N/A
DSP (Chandel et al., 2022)	✗	✗	Github	1137	Test Cases	2.1	71.9	4.5
PandasEval (Jain et al., 2022)	✗	✗	Github	725	Accuracy	N/A	12.5	1.8
DS-1000 (Lai et al., 2023)	✗	✓	StackOverflow	1000	Test Cases	1.6	140.0	3.6
ARCADE (Yin et al., 2023)	✓	N/A	N/A	661	Fuzzy Match	N/A	18.4	3.1
MHPP	✓	N/A	N/A	140	Test Cases	13.5	150.2	12.2

Table 3: Comparison of MHPP to other benchmarks. #Cases denotes the average number of test cases. #Words denotes the average of problem words. #Codes denotes the average of lines of code for reference solution. Notice that we only include the statistics of the test set. The two three benchmarks target general Python usage, the middle three benchmarks aim at harder problems, and the last four involve data science code generation.

## A Related Works for Other Code Generation Taks

Recent works try to improve HumanEval and MBPP from different perspectives. For example, HumanEval+ (Liu et al., 2023a) enhances the HumanEval with improved test cases, remedying the issue of mistakenly accepted faulty solutions. Meanwhile, ReCode (Wang et al., 2023a) takes a different approach by altering function names and docstrings within the HumanEval structure. Expanding the scope beyond Python, HumanEval-X (Zheng et al., 2023), MultiPLE (Cassano et al., 2023), and MBXP (Athiwaratkun et al., 2023) extend the HumanEval and MBPP benchmarks to incorporate a variety of programming languages. The universe of code generation benchmarks widens further when we consider the specialized needs of data science. DS-1000 (Lai et al., 2023), ARCADE (Yin et al., 2023), NumpyEval (Zan et al., 2022), and PandasEval (Jain et al., 2022) focus on the generation of code within this context. Beyond mere code creation, there are benchmarks like APIBench (Patil et al., 2023), MTPB (Nijkamp et al., 2023), RepoBench (Liu et al., 2023b), ODEX (Wang et al., 2023b), SWE-Bench (Jimenez et al., 2023), GoogleCodeRepo (Shrivastava et al., 2023), RepoEval (Zhang et al., 2023), and Cocomic-Data (Ding et al., 2022), which ratchet up the complexity by evaluating a model’s prowess in utilizing APIs or completing broader software engineering tasks. Table 3 shows comparisons among MHPP and several representative benchmarks.

## B Data Contamination

Following the official guideline of the contamination detector <sup>2</sup>, we extract only the question stems from MBPP and use Bing Search to find related content online. When matches are discovered, they are evaluated based on token-level similarity. This evaluation helps determine how similar the test sample is to online content, assisting in identifying potential contamination. We set a threshold of 0.7, meaning a match is considered contaminated if the similarity exceeds 0.7.

## C Generalization Beyond Challenge of HumanEval

Using HumanEval as a starting point may limit the coverage of problem types and error patterns. Therefore, we actively sought to generalize the problem types and address more realistic and challenging error patterns in the creation of MHPP. We provide how we generalize from different challenges as follows:

**Distraction:** there is only one problem in which there are some short sentences that are irrelevant to solving the problem, but we design more subtypes of this challenge, for example, we add a lot of background information to the problem to evaluate the model’s ability to accurately filter out redundant information and focus on core functionalities, some problems have more than 500 words (indeed, the context is not as long as those in SWE-bench (Jimenez et al., 2023) or other repo-level

<sup>2</sup>[https://github.com/liyucheng09/Contamination\\_Detector/tree/master](https://github.com/liyucheng09/Contamination_Detector/tree/master)

benchmarks, but we do find that many strong models have extremely low performances on these benchmarks, such as Claude2 (4.8%) and GPT4 (1.74%) on SWE-bench, currently there are still many models have small context window like 4096 tokens, we think it’s still necessary to have a in-between benchmark to distinguish models’ ability). We also inserted tables or misleading/ambiguous descriptions into the problem. These are all points beyond which using HumanEval can be evaluated.

**Redefinition:** in HumanEval there are always equations defined in problems or some redefinition of concepts in the real world, we generalize subtypes by adding more counterfactual concepts, to challenge the model’s ability to focus on current context but not the common sense it learned in the pre-training.

**Shortcut:** compared to those in HumanEval which can only be classified as arithmetic or brainstorming tricks, we not only keep original subtypes but also make it more general and comprehensive to be math algorithms or even gaming theory problems.

**Commonsense:** there are merely problems with simple common sense like the alphabet or cars. We make this situation more general, by adding problems relevant to temporal or spatial concepts, and academic knowledge like chemistry problems, optical problems, physics problems, etc.

**Cornercase:** there are only several problems in HumanEval contain the requirement of branches to handle simple corner cases (like dealing with the case when the input is 0), we further generalize the subtypes to be more practical cases as well as those that have hidden requirements (for example, a model must know requirements of forming a triangle before judging a triangle whether is isosceles), there are more real-world scenarios like this which are important in real-world programming tasks.

**Complexity:** there are also different subtypes from that in HumanEval, such as combining multiple simple logic units, focusing on numbers of control flow statements, dynamic programming relevant problems that are more abstract in complexity, and problems requiring models to have planning ability.

**Codesense:** we can barely say that the questions in HumanEval assess function calls, as the required function calls are either too few or too basic. We further extend it to more libraries that can be used in real-world programming tasks, for example, like the scientific computing library Numpy, or the calendar library that could be used in actual development. Additionally, the number of calls in one problem is more than that in HumanEval.

## D JAVA and C++ Results on MHPP

	Distraction	Redefinition	Shortcut	Commonsense	Cornercase	Complexity	Codesense	Total
Python	35.0	65.0	40.0	70.0	55.0	55.0	55.0	53.6
Java	20.0	35.0	20.0	45.0	20.0	20.0	15.0	25.0
C++	45.0	30.0	10.0	40.0	25.0	25.0	20.0	27.9

Table 4: GPT-4’s pass@1 performance on MHPP across different languages.

We have translated the MHPP’s problems and test cases into Java and C++ and tested the GPT-4 model’s performance in these languages. The results, as depicted in the newly introduced Table 4, reveal that the model’s performance in Python significantly surpasses that of Java and C++, with pass@1 rates of 25.00% and 27.86% respectively. This disparity suggests that the model has been more comprehensively trained in Python. Interestingly, we noticed a more pronounced performance drop from Python to other languages in our dataset compared to other function-level code generation datasets, such as from HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) to HumanEval-X (Zheng et al., 2023). We hypothesize that this could be attributed to the increased difficulty level of the problems, making it more challenging for LLMs to solve them in languages other than Python. Upon closer examination of the data across different categories, we found that the model exhibits a stronger performance in “Commonsense” problems, but struggles with “Shortcut” problems. This indicates that the model has a better understanding of common sense concepts compared to abstract mathematical algorithms.

Model	Distraction	Redefinition	Shortcut	Commonsense	Cornercase	Complex	Codesense	Total
<b>Closed-Source LLMs</b>								
GPT-4-1106-Preview	35.0	65.0	40.0	70.0	55.0	55.0	55.0	53.6
GPT-3.5-Turbo	25.0	40.0	25.0	30.0	15.0	15.0	45.0	27.9
<b>Open-Source LLMs</b>								
Phi 1-1.3B	10.0	15.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	30	12.9
Phi 1.5-1.3B	0.0	10.0	5.0	15.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	8.6
Phi 2-2.7B	10.0	15.0	<u>15.0</u>	25.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	13.6
Mistral-7B Ins	15.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	<u>15.0</u>	0.0	7.9
LLaMA2 Chat-7b	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	2.9
LLaMA2 Chat-13b	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	2.1
CodeLLaMA-7B	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	3.6
CodeLLaMA-13B	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
CodeLLaMA-34B	10.0	15.0	5.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	30.0	14.3
CodeLLaMA-7B Ins	5.0	5.0	5.0	15.0	15.0	0.0	15.0	8.6
CodeLLaMA-13B Ins	<u>20.0</u>	15.0	10.0	15.0	15.0	10.0	20.0	15.0
CodeLLaMA-34B Ins	<u>20.0</u>	25.0	10.0	25.0	5.0	5.0	25.0	16.4
CodeLLaMA-7B Py	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	3.6
CodeLLaMA-13B Py	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
CodeLLaMA-34B Py	10.0	10.0	0.0	25.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	9.3
DeepSeek-1.3B	5.0	10.0	5.0	30.0	20.0	0.0	10.0	11.4
DeepSeek-6.7B	15.0	<u>35.0</u>	10.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	<u>40.0</u>	22.9
DeepSeek-33B	<b>30.0</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<u>60.0</u>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>38.6</b>
WizardCoder-1B	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	15.0	5.0
WizardCoder-7B	5.0	25.0	5.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	25.0	14.3
WizardCoder-33B	<u>20.0</u>	30.0	<u>15.0</u>	<b>65.0</b>	<u>35.0</u>	<u>15.0</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>31.4</u>
WizardCoder-34B Py	15.0	<u>35.0</u>	10.0	40.0	15.0	10.0	35.0	22.9

Table 5: The performance of LLMs on MHPP using greedy decoding. We identify the top-performing models among open-source LLMs. Models achieving the highest performance are emphasized in **bold**, while those in second place, including tied results, are underscored.

## E LLMs’ Performance on MHPP Using Greedy Search Decoding

## F Potential Strategies for Improving LLMs on MHPP

Based on the experimental results of various LLMs on MHPP. We propose potential strategies for overcoming the challenges of MHPP. We have devised a set of strategies tailored to each category of challenges as follows:

**Distraction:** To tackle this challenge, we propose incorporating controlled noise into the training data and designing tasks that require the model to identify the genuine development intent and generate corresponding code.

**Redefinition:** We recommend enhancing the model’s exposure to knowledge-based data. This will improve its ability to comprehend concepts within questions. For new or contradictory definitions, we suggest refining the model’s in-context learning to prioritize the given context over general world knowledge. Techniques like symbol tuning could be beneficial for this purpose.

**Shortcut:** To address this, we propose augmenting the training data with more mathematical and logical reasoning tasks to help the model recognize patterns.

**Commonsense:** We recommend incorporating more relevant knowledge data. However, it’s crucial to avoid overfitting. Models can benefit from interacting with real-world data, such as world models and multimodal data, including images, to enhance their understanding of spatial concepts.

**Cornercase:** We suggest training models with more real-world code data, especially data rich in corner cases, to strengthen this capability. Using non-code data with many corner cases and extremes can also enhance the model’s robustness and accuracy during training.

**Complexity:** It’s beneficial to construct longer training data with more logical units, teaching the model to handle intricate logic. Strategies like curriculum learning can help models gradually master complex reasoning.

**Codesense:** We recommend providing rich programming language materials, such as official documentation and open-source libraries.

Furthermore, we suggest leveraging interpreters’ execution feedback to enhance the language model for the latter categories. For instance, rich test cases with execution feedback can make it easier to identify missing logic and correct generated code in Cornercase challenges. For Complexity challenges, feedback can help break down problems into smaller, more manageable tasks for improved accuracy. For Codesense challenges, error messages from code libraries can guide the model in understanding how to correctly use a library or function, leading to accurate solutions.

We believe that a well-designed dataset like MHPP can provide insights to guide strategies for improving model capabilities. By categorizing problems based on specific coding abilities, MHPP not only benchmarks models but also highlights areas for improvement. For example, if a model performs poorly on “code reasoning” problems, it suggests that incorporating more coding knowledge into the training data could help boost its capabilities in that area.

## G Limitations of MHPP

**Data Size:** The MHPP dataset indeed has a smaller scale compared to automatically generated datasets. This characteristic is intrinsic to hand-written datasets like HumanEval, to which MHPP is similar in terms of scale. While the dataset’s size enables a detailed analysis, we acknowledge that it could potentially restrict the diversity and representativeness of the data, thereby limiting the model’s ability to generalize to larger, more diverse codebases.

**Potential Bias:** The focus of MHPP on function-level code generation might introduce certain biases due to the annotation process primarily targeting challenges encountered during the writing of functions. This emphasis may result in a bias towards specific types of errors or difficulties, which might not comprehensively represent the wide array of challenges encountered in real-world coding practices. We recognize the importance of acknowledging these potential biases in the dataset collection procedure.

These limitations highlight the need for further research to develop strategies for effectively scaling up hand-written datasets while maintaining annotation quality. Extending the scope of the dataset beyond the function level to capture the broader context of code generation tasks is also important. By addressing these limitations, future code generation datasets can provide a more comprehensive picture of real-world software development challenges, ultimately leading to the development of more robust and versatile code generation models.

## H Error Analysis on MBPP

Upon analyzing GPT-4 errors in the MBPP benchmark, several critical issues have been identified. Text highlighted in red indicates the specific areas where the model makes mistakes or the error patterns appear. These issues encompass a range of deficiencies, including the absence of explicit return format specifications, the presence of ambiguous requirements, and inconsistencies between the parameters specified in function definitions and those utilized in test codes.

---

```
# Q1: Write a function to find sequences of lowercase letters  
→ joined with an underscore.
```

```
# Canonical ans  
def _text_lowercase_underscore(text):
```

```
import re
patterns = '^[a-z]+_[a-z]+$'
if re.search(patterns, text):
    return 'Found a match!'
else:
    return ('Not matched!')
```

*# GPT4's ans*

```
def text_lowercase_underscore(text):
    import re
    pattern = '[a-z]+_[a-z]+'
    result = re.findall(pattern, text)
    return result
```

```
assert text_lowercase_underscore("aab_cbbbc") == ('Found a match!')
assert text_lowercase_underscore("aab_Abbbc") == ('Not matched!')
assert text_lowercase_underscore("Aaab_abbbc") == ('Not matched!')
assert text_lowercase_underscore("aab-cbbbc") == ('Not matched!')
```

---

Example 1: No specification for the return format: The question does not declare that a specific string like 'Found a match!' or 'Not matched!' should be returned when indicating a match or not. The generated code will not address this issue at all.

---

*# Q2: Write a python function to find the product of non-repeated  
→ elements in a given array.*

*# Canonical ans*

```
def _find_Product(arr,n):
    arr.sort()
    prod = 1
    for i in range(0,n,1):
        if (arr[i - 1] != arr[i]):
            prod = prod * arr[i]
    return prod
```

*# GPT4's ans*

```
def find_Product(arr,n):
    product = 1
    for i in range(n):
        if arr.count(arr[i]) == 1:
            product *= arr[i]
    return product
```

```
assert find_Product([1,1,2,3],4) == 6
assert find_Product([1,2,3,1,1],5) == 6
assert find_Product([1,1,4,5,6],5) == 120
assert find_Product([1,1,4,5,6,5,7,1,1,3,4],11) == 2520
```

---

Example 2: The question is ambiguous, for example, it is unclear whether the term 'non-repeated' should retain or not retain duplicate elements, but the question does not provide any example to clarify this.

---

*# Q3: Write a python function to find the missing number in a  
→ sorted array.*

*# Canonical ans*

```
def _find_missing(ar,N):
```

```
l = 0
r = N - 1
while (l <= r):
    mid = (l + r) / 2
    mid = int(mid)
    if (ar[mid] != mid + 1 and ar[mid - 1] == mid):
        return (mid + 1)
    elif (ar[mid] != mid + 1):
        r = mid - 1
    else:
        l = mid + 1
return (-1)

# GPT4's ans
def find_missing(ar, N):
    total = (N+1)*(N+2)/2
    sum_of_ar = sum(ar)
    return total - sum_of_ar

assert find_missing([1,2,3,5],4) == 4
assert find_missing([1,3,4,5],4) == 2
assert find_missing([1,2,3,5,6,7],5) == 4
```

---

Example 3: Missing conditions regarding parameters: it is unclear and does not explain what N represents as a parameter.

---

*# Q4: Write a function to check if the letters of a given string  
→ can be rearranged so that two characters that are adjacent to  
→ each other are different.*

```
# Canonical ans
import heapq
from collections import Counter
def _rearrange_string(S):
    ctr = Counter(S)
    heap = [(-value, key) for key, value in ctr.items()]
    heapq.heapify(heap)
    if (-heap[0][0]) * 2 > len(S) + 1:
        return ""
    ans = []
    while len(heap) >= 2:
        nct1, char1 = heapq.heappop(heap)
        nct2, char2 = heapq.heappop(heap)
        ans.extend([char1, char2])
        if nct1 + 1: heapq.heappush(heap, (nct1 + 1, char1))
        if nct2 + 1: heapq.heappush(heap, (nct2 + 1, char2))
    return "".join(ans) + (heap[0][1] if heap else "")

# GPT4's ans
import heapq
from collections import Counter

def rearrange_string(S):
    counter = Counter(S)
    max_heap = []
    for k, v in counter.items():
        heapq.heappush(max_heap, (-v, k))
    prev_char, prev_freq = '', 0
```

```

result = []
while max_heap:
    freq, char = heapq.heappop(max_heap)
    if prev_char and prev_freq:
        heapq.heappush(max_heap, (prev_freq, prev_char))
    if not result or char != result[-1]:
        result.append(char)
        if -freq > 1:
            prev_char, prev_freq = char, freq + 1
        else:
            prev_char, prev_freq = '', 0
    else:
        return ''
return ''.join(result) if len(result) == len(S) else ''

assert rearrange_string("aab") == ('aba')
assert rearrange_string("aabb") == ('abab')
assert rearrange_string("abccdd") == ('cdabcd')

```

Example 4: Incorrect function name in the test code (missing “r” in “arrange”): a normal language model should generate the correct function name and should not have this error in the test code.

```

# Q5: Write a function to find the list with minimum length using
→ lambda function.

# Canonical ans
def _min_length_list(input_list):
    min_length = min(len(x) for x in input_list )
    min_list = min(input_list, key = lambda i: len(i))
    return (min_length, min_list)

# GPT4's ans
def min_length_list(input_list):
    return min(input_list, key=lambda x: len(x))

assert min_length_list([[0], [1, 3], [5, 7], [9, 11], [13, 15,
→ 17]]) == (1, [0])
assert min_length_list([[1,2,3,4,5], [1,2,3,4], [1,2,3], [1,2], [1]])
→ == (1, [1])
assert min_length_list([[3,4,5], [6,7,8,9], [10,11,12], [1,2]]) == (2,
→ [1,2])

```

Example 5: The question does not specify the return format: it is unclear that two elements need to be returned.

```

# Q6: Write a function to find the maximum length of the
→ subsequence with difference between adjacent elements for the
→ given array.

# Canonical ans
def _max_len_sub( arr, n):
    mls=[]
    max = 0
    for i in range(n):
        mls.append(1)
    for i in range(n):
        for j in range(i):

```

```
        if (abs(arr[i] - arr[j]) <= 1 and mls[i] < mls[j] + 1):
            mls[i] = mls[j] + 1
    for i in range(n):
        if (max < mls[i]):
            max = mls[i]
    return max

# GPT4's ans
def max_len_sub(arr, n):
    # Initialize the dp array
    dp = [[1 for i in range(n)] for j in range(n)]
    # Fill the dp array
    for i in range(n):
        for j in range(i+1, n):
            if abs(arr[j] - arr[i]) == 1:
                dp[i][j] = max(dp[i][j], dp[i][j-1] + 1)
            else:
                dp[i][j] = max(dp[i][j], dp[i][j-1])
    # Find the maximum length
    max_len = 0
    for i in range(n):
        max_len = max(max_len, max(dp[i]))
    return max_len

assert max_len_sub([2, 5, 6, 3, 7, 6, 5, 8], 8) == 5
assert max_len_sub([-2, -1, 5, -1, 4, 0, 3], 7) == 4
assert max_len_sub([9, 11, 13, 15, 18], 5) == 1
```

---

Example 6: Copying the question missed a requirement: “Given an array of n integers. The problem is to find the maximum length of the sub-sequence with the difference between adjacent elements as either 0 or 1.”

```
# Q7: Write a python function to find the perimeter of a cylinder.

# Canonical ans
def _perimeter(diameter,height) :
    return 2*(diameter+height)

# GPT4's ans
import math

def perimeter(diameter, height):
    radius = diameter / 2
    return 2 * math.pi * radius + 2 * height

assert perimeter(2,4) == 12
assert perimeter(1,2) == 6
assert perimeter(3,1) == 8
```

---

Example 7: Missing original question formula images, etc.

```
# Q8: Write a function to find the triplet with sum of the given
↪ array

# Canonical ans
def _check_triplet(A, n, sum, count):
    if count == 3 and sum == 0:
```



```
    return True
if count == 3 or n == 0 or sum < 0:
    return False
return check_triplet(A, n - 1, sum - A[n - 1], count + 1) or
    → check_triplet(A, n - 1, sum, count)

# GPT4's ans
def check_triplet(A, n, sum):
    # Sort the array
    A.sort()

    # Iterate over the array
    for i in range(0, n-2):

        # Initialize two pointers
        left = i + 1
        right = n - 1

        # Traverse the array from both ends
        while left < right:

            # If sum of triplet is equal to sum
            if (A[i] + A[left] + A[right] == sum):
                return True

            # If sum of triplet is less than sum
            elif (A[i] + A[left] + A[right] < sum):
                left += 1

            # If sum of triplet is greater than sum
            else:
                right -= 1

        # If no triplet with given sum found in array
        return False

assert check_triplet([2, 7, 4, 0, 9, 5, 1, 3], 8, 6, 0) == True
assert check_triplet([1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 5, 9], 8, 6, 0) == False
assert check_triplet([10, 4, 2, 3, 5], 5, 15, 0) == True
```

---

Example 8: The number of parameters in the function does not match those in the test code.

---

```
# Q9: Write a function to find n'th smart number.
```

```
# Canonical ans
MAX = 3000
def _smartNumber(n):
    primes = [0] * MAX
    result = []
    for i in range(2, MAX):
        if (primes[i] == 0):
            primes[i] = 1
            j = i * 2
            while (j < MAX):
                primes[j] -= 1
                if ( (primes[j] + 3) == 0):
                    result.append(j)
                j = j + i
```

```
result.sort()
return result[n - 1]

# GPT4's ans
def smartNumber(n):
    # The n'th smart number is the square of n
    return n * n

assert smartNumber(1) == 30
assert smartNumber(50) == 273
assert smartNumber(1000) == 2664
```

---

Example 9: The definition from the question is missing.

## I Error Analysis on HumanEval

---

```
def compare(game, guess):
    """I think we all remember that feeling when the result of
    → some long-awaited
    event is finally known. The feelings and thoughts you have at
    → that moment are
    definitely worth noting down and comparing.
    Your task is to determine if a person correctly guessed the
    → results of a number of matches.
    You are given two arrays of scores and guesses of equal
    → length, where each index shows a match.
    Return an array of the same length denoting how far off each
    → guess was. If they have guessed correctly,
    the value is 0, and if not, the value is the absolute
    → difference between the guess and the score.

    example:

    compare([1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 1], [1, 2, 3, 4, 2, -2]) -> [0, 0, 0, 0, 3, 3]
    compare([0, 5, 0, 0, 0, 4], [4, 1, 1, 0, 0, -2]) -> [4, 4, 1, 0, 0, 6]
    """
```

---

Example 1 - Distraction: The first paragraph of the problem talks a lot about background information that is not very relevant to solving the problem.

---

```
def tri(n):
    """Everyone knows Fibonacci sequence, it was studied deeply
    → by mathematicians in
    the last couple centuries. However, what people don't know is
    → Tribonacci sequence.
    Tribonacci sequence is defined by the recurrence:
    tri(1) = 3
    tri(n) = 1 + n / 2, if n is even.
    tri(n) = tri(n - 1) + tri(n - 2) + tri(n + 1), if n is odd.
    For example:
    tri(2) = 1 + (2 / 2) = 2
    tri(4) = 3
    tri(3) = tri(2) + tri(1) + tri(4)
           = 2 + 3 + 3 = 8
```

*You are given a non-negative integer number n, you have to a  
→ return a list of the  
first n + 1 numbers of the Tribonacci sequence.  
Examples:  
tri(3) = [1, 3, 2, 8]  
"""*

---

Example 2 - Redefinition: This problem typically defines or redefines a new concept called Tribonacci sequence.

---

```
def starts_one_ends(n):  
    """  
    Given a positive integer n, return the count of the numbers  
    → of n-digit  
    positive integers that start or end with 1.  
    """
```

---

Example 3 - Shortcut: A shortcut to this problem does exist (number of 1s equals to  $18 * (10^{n-2})$  when n is larger or equals to 2), by using a formula, this problem can be more easily solved.

---

```
def car_race_collision(n: int):  
    """  
    Imagine a road that's a perfectly straight infinitely long  
    → line.  
    n cars are driving left to right; simultaneously, a  
    → different set of n cars  
    are driving right to left. The two sets of cars start out  
    → being very far from  
    each other. All cars move in the same speed. Two cars are  
    → said to collide  
    when a car that's moving left to right hits a car that's  
    → moving right to left.  
    However, the cars are infinitely sturdy and strong; as a  
    → result, they continue moving  
    in their trajectory as if they did not collide.  
  
    This function outputs the number of such collisions.  
    """
```

---

Example 4 - Commonsense: The problem requires the model to understand the concept of collisions and spatial concepts.

---

```
from typing import List  
  
def intersperse(numbers: List[int], delimiter: int) -> List[int]:  
    """ Insert a number 'delimiter' between every two consecutive  
    → elements of input list `numbers`  
>>> intersperse([], 4)  
    []  
>>> intersperse([1, 2, 3], 4)  
    [1, 4, 2, 4, 3]  
    """
```

---

Example 5 - Cornercase: The problem has a corner case which is that the numbers are an empty list, the solution is expected to have a single control branch to handle this case.

---

```
def unique_digits(x):
    """Given a list of positive integers x. return a sorted list
    ↪ of all
    elements that hasn't any even digit.

    Note: Returned list should be sorted in increasing order.

    For example:
    >>> unique_digits([15, 33, 1422, 1])
    [1, 15, 33]
    >>> unique_digits([152, 323, 1422, 10])
    []
    """
```

---

Example 6 - Complex: There are many constraints in this problem.

---

```
def solve(N):
    """Given a positive integer N, return the total sum of its
    ↪ digits in binary.

    Example
    For N = 1000, the sum of digits will be 1 the output
    ↪ should be "1".
    For N = 150, the sum of digits will be 6 the output
    ↪ should be "110".
    For N = 147, the sum of digits will be 12 the output
    ↪ should be "1100".

    Variables:
    @N integer
    Constraints: 0 <= N <= 10000.

    Output:
    a string of binary number
    """
```

---

Example 7 - Codesense: The model needs to know the knowledge of binary operators.

## J Error Analysis on MHPP

### # PROMPT:

Write a Python function according to the function name and the  
 ↪ problem description in the docstring below.

```
def least_goods_number(n: int) -> int:
    """Given a list of products where the first column represents the product name and the second column
    represents the product price. You have n dollars, please calculate and return the minimum number of
    ↪ products
    required to spend the total amount exactly. If no combination of products can add up to the total amount,
    return -1. You can assume that the quantity of each product is unlimited.

    +-----+
    | Milk   | 2   |
    +-----+
    | Soap   | 3   |
    +-----+
    | Batteries | 5 |
    +-----+
    | Eggs   | 1   |
    +-----+

    >>> least_goods_number(11)
    3
```

```
>>> least_goods_number(5)
1
"""
```

## # RESPONSE:

```
return None
```

```
def is_valid_parentheses(p: str) -> bool:
    """Given a string p consisting only of '(' and ')', return true if every opening parenthesis is closed in
    ↳ the
    right order. Otherwise, return false.
```

```
+-----+
| Example 1 | Example 2 |
+-----+
| '()'      | '()'      |
+-----+
```

```
>>> is_valid_parentheses('()')
True
>>> is_valid_parentheses('()')
False
"""
return None
```

```
def is_perfect(num: int) -> bool:
    """Given an integer, return True if the integer is a perfect number or False otherwise.
    A perfect number is a positive integer that is equal to the sum of its positive divisors excluding the
    ↳ number
    itself.
```

```
+-----+
| Numbers | Perfect Numbers |
+-----+
| 6        | 6                |
+-----+
| 28       | 496              |
+-----+
| 496      | 8128             |
+-----+
```

```
>>> is_perfect(6)
True
>>> is_perfect(28)
True
>>> is_perfect(496)
True
"""
return False
```

```
def is_pangram(sentence: str) -> bool:
    """Given a sentence, return True if the sentence is a pangram or False otherwise.
    A pangram is a sentence that contains all the alphabetic characters from the alphabet.
```

```
+-----+
| Sentence | Pangram | Not Pangram | Pangram |
+-----+
| "The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog" | False | True | True |
+-----+
| "The quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog" | False | True | True |
+-----+
```

```
>>> is_pangram('The quick brown fox jumps over the lazy dog')
True
>>> is_pangram('The quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog')
True
"""
return False
```

```
def grid_search(matrix: list, pattern: list) -> list:
    """Given a matrix of size m x n, where each cell has a character, and a pattern, find all occurrences of
    ↳ the
    pattern in the matrix by moving left to right, top to bottom. Return a list of all occurrences of the
    ↳ pattern
    in the form of [row, column] (0-based indexing).
```

```
+-----+
| Matrix | Pattern | Occurrences |
+-----+
| [      |         |             |
| 'A', 'B', 'C', 'E', 'E', 'F', 'G', 'G', 'H', 'I', 'I', 'J', 'K', 'L', 'M', 'O', 'O', |
| 'P', 'Q', 'R', 'S', 'T', 'U', 'V', 'W', 'X', 'Y', 'Z' |
| ]      |         |             |
+-----+
| 'C', 'G', 'G', 'G', 'C', 'C', 'C' |
+-----+
| [2, 6], [2, 7], [2, 8] |
+-----+
```

```
>>> grid_search(['ABCD', 'EFGH', 'IJKL', 'MNOP'], ['CD', 'EF', 'IJK', 'OP'])
[[3, 1], [3, 2]]
"""
return None
```

Example 1 - Distraction: By introducing a table in the question to distract the model's focus, the strategy was indeed effective, leading the model to produce a series of table-based problems, completely deviating from solving the original question properly.

---

**# PROMPT:**

Write a Python function according to the function name and the  
→ problem description in the docstring below.

```
from typing import List

def max_balance_factor(weights: List[int]) -> int:
    """Write a function to find the maximum balance factor of
    → object weights.
    The maximum balance factor refers to the size of the sum that
    → results
    from extracting some or all elements from weights, dividing
    → them into two
    parts, and ensuring that the sums of these two parts are
    → equal.
    If such a maximum balance factor does not exist. return 0
    >>> max_balance_factor([4, 2, 3, 9])
    9
    >>> max_balance_factor([7, 1, 9])
    0
    """
```

**# RESPONSE:**

To solve this problem, we can use dynamic programming. We will  
→ first calculate the total sum of the weights and then try to  
→ find if there is a subset of weights that sums up to half of  
→ the total sum. The maximum balance factor would be half of  
→ the total sum if such a subset exists.

Here's the function:

```
```python

from typing import List

def max_balance_factor(weights: List[int]) -> int:
    """Return the maximum balance factor of a list of weights."""
    total_weight = sum(weights)
    # The balance factor can only exist if the total weight is
    → even.
    if total_weight % 2 != 0:
        return 0

    half_weight = total_weight // 2
    # Dynamic programming array to track the possible sums with
    → subsets.
    possible_sums = [False] * (half_weight + 1)
    possible_sums[0] = True # zero is always possible

    for weight in weights:
```

```
# Update the possible sums in reverse order to avoid
→ using the same weight multiple times.
for j in range(half_weight, weight - 1, -1):
    if possible_sums[j - weight]:
        possible_sums[j] = True

# Check if half_weight is possible as a sum of a subset of
→ weights.
if possible_sums[half_weight]:
    return half_weight
else:
    return 0

# Examples
print(max_balance_factor([4, 2, 3, 9])) # Output: 9
print(max_balance_factor([7, 1, 9]))   # Output: 0
...

```

The function first checks if the total sum is even, because if  
→ it's not, there is no way to divide it into two parts with  
→ equal sums. Then, it initializes a list of boolean values  
→ (`possible_sums`) that will help to track which sums are  
→ possible with the given subset of weights. Each weight is  
→ processed to update the `possible_sums`, and after processing  
→ all weights, the function checks whether `half_weight` is a  
→ possible sum, which would be the maximum balance factor if it  
→ exists. If `half_weight` is indeed possible, it returns  
→ `half_weight`; otherwise, it returns 0.

---

Example 2 - Redefinition: The model did not grasp the concept of redefinition; it misunderstood that the balance factor is only applicable if the total weight is even.

---

#### # PROMPT:

Write a Python function according to the function name and the  
→ problem description in the docstring below.

```
def counting_game(n: int) -> int:
    """In a playful counting game, children start counting from 1
    → but they skip any number that contains the digit 9,
    considering it to be unlucky. This results in a sequence that
    → avoids the number 9 entirely,
    such as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, and so forth.

    Given an integer n, return the nth number in this new integer
    → sequence where the indexing begins at 1.
    >>> counting_game(4)
    4
    >>> counting_game(10)
    11
    """

```

#### # RESPONSE:

Below is the Python function that implements the counting game  
→ logic described in the docstring:

Here's the function:

```
```python
def counting_game(n: int) -> int:
    """
    In a playful counting game, children start counting from 1
    → but they skip any number that contains
    the digit 9, considering it to be unlucky. This results in a
    → sequence that avoids the number 9 entirely,
    such as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, and so forth.

    Given an integer n, return the nth number in this new integer
    → sequence where the indexing begins at 1.
    """
    count = 0 # Initialize the count for the number of valid
    → numbers found
    current_number = 1 # Start counting from 1

    while True:
        if '9' in str(current_number):
            # Skip the number if it contains the digit 9
            current_number += 1
            continue
        else:
            # Increment the count since this number doesn't
            → contain the digit 9
            count += 1
            if count == n:
                # If the count matches the desired position,
                → return the current number
                return current_number
            # Move to the next number to check
            current_number += 1

    # Example usage:
    print(counting_game(4)) # Output: 4
    print(counting_game(10)) # Output: 11
    ...
```

This function iterates through the natural numbers starting from  
→ 1 and increases a counter each time it finds a number that  
→ does not contain the digit 9. When the counter matches the  
→ input ``n``, the function returns the current number.

---

Example 3 - Shortcut: It resulted in a timeout due to not knowing the shortcut.

---

**# PROMPT:**

Write a Python function according to the function name and the  
→ problem description in the docstring below.

```
def morning_commute(a: int, b: int, c: int, d: int):
    """There are two companies located at both ends of a straight
    → road, with two towns in the middle.
    Every morning, 'a' people from the left town commute to work
    → at the left company and 'b' people commute
    to the right company. From the right town, 'c' people commute
    → to the left company and 'd' people commute
```



```

to the right company. Everyone walks at the same pace. Please
→ calculate how many encounters occur in total on their
→ commute to work each morning.
>>> morning_commute(7, 3, 4, 6)
12
>>> morning_commute(17, 31, 13, 40)
403
"""

```

#### # RESPONSE:

Here's the Python function implementation for the problem  
→ described in the docstring:

```
```python
```

```

def morning_commute(a: int, b: int, c: int, d: int) -> int:
    """
    The number of encounters is determined by the pairings of
    → commuters going in opposite directions.
    For each person commuting to the left company from the left
    → town (group a),
    they will encounter all people commuting to the right company
    → from the right town (group d).
    Similarly, for each person commuting to the right company
    → from the left town (group b),
    they will encounter all people commuting to the left company
    → from the right town (group c).
    Therefore, the total encounters can be calculated as the
    → product of a and d plus the product of b and c.
    """
    return a * d + b * c

```

```
# Example usage:
```

```

print(morning_commute(7, 3, 4, 6)) # Expected output: 12
print(morning_commute(17, 31, 13, 40)) # Expected output: 403

```

```
...
```

Let's go through the function `morning_commute` step by step:

1. The function takes four arguments ``a``, ``b``, ``c``, and ``d``,  
→ representing the number of people commuting.
2. The encounters are calculated based on the fact that a person  
→ from group ``a`` (left town to left company) will encounter all  
→ ``d`` people (right town to right company), and similarly, a  
→ person from group ``b`` (left town to right company) will  
→ encounter all ``c`` people (right town to left company).
3. The total number of encounters is the sum of the products  
→ ``a*d`` and ``b*c``.
4. The function returns the total number of encounters.

---

Example 4 - Commonsense: There is a complete lack of understanding of spatial awareness for LLMs; those moving left from the right side won't meet those moving right from the left side.

---

#### # PROMPT:

Write a Python function according to the function name and the  
→ problem description in the docstring below.

```
def is_isosceles_triangle(x1, y1, x2, y2, x3, y3):  
    """Given the coordinates of three points in a two-dimensional  
    → plane, tell whether the figure formed  
    by connecting these three points is an isosceles triangle  
    → (which is a triangle that has at least two  
    sides of equal length).  
    >>> is_isosceles_triangle(0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)  
    True  
    >>> is_isosceles_triangle(0, 0, 2, 0, 2, 1)  
    False  
    """
```

#### # RESPONSE:

Here is a Python function that implements the logic described in  
→ the docstring. It calculates the distances between each pair  
→ of points and checks if at least two distances are equal,  
→ indicating an isosceles triangle.  
```python

```
import math
```

```
def is_isosceles_triangle(x1, y1, x2, y2, x3, y3):  
    """Given the coordinates of three points in a two-dimensional  
    → plane, tell whether the figure formed  
    by connecting these three points is an isosceles triangle  
    → (which is a triangle that has at least two  
    sides of equal length).  
  
    >>> is_isosceles_triangle(0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)  
    True  
    >>> is_isosceles_triangle(0, 0, 2, 0, 2, 1)  
    False  
    """  
  
    def distance(px1, py1, px2, py2):  
        """Calculate the distance between two points."""  
        return math.sqrt((px1 - px2) ** 2 + (py1 - py2) ** 2)  
  
        # Calculate the distances between all three points  
        d1 = distance(x1, y1, x2, y2)  
        d2 = distance(x2, y2, x3, y3)  
        d3 = distance(x3, y3, x1, y1)  
  
        # Check if at least two sides are equal  
        return d1 == d2 or d2 == d3 or d3 == d1  
  
    # Example usage:  
    print(is_isosceles_triangle(0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)) # Should return  
    → True  
    print(is_isosceles_triangle(0, 0, 2, 0, 2, 1)) # Should return  
    → False  
    ...
```

This function uses a nested helper function `distance()` to  
→ calculate the Euclidean distance between two points. It then  
→ checks if any two of the three side lengths are equal, which  
→ would mean the triangle is isosceles.

---

Example 5 - Cornercase: LLMs truly did not check for the boundary condition of being a triangle.

---

**# PROMPT:**

Write a Python function according to the function name and the  
→ problem description in the docstring below.

```
from typing import List

def is_new_year(numbers: List[int]):
    """
    Given a list containing four numbers. First, calculate the
    → square of the first number.
    For the second number, check if it is divisible by 3. If it
    → is, add it to the result, otherwise subtract it.
    Multiply the resulting value by the third number three times.
    → For the fourth number, calculate the sum of its digits
    and compare it with the first number. If the sum is greater,
    → add the fourth number to the result,
    otherwise keep the result unchanged. If the final result
    → equals 2024, return the string "Happy New Year",
    otherwise return "Whoops".
    >>> is_new_year([2, 0, 2, 4])
    "Whoops"
    >>> is_new_year([3, 5, 6, 1160])
    "Happy New Year"
    """
```

**# RESPONSE:**

Here is the Python function that follows the description provided  
→ in the docstring:

```
```python

from typing import List

def is_new_year(numbers: List[int]) -> str:
    """
    Given a list containing four numbers. First, calculate the
    → square of the first number.
    For the second number, check if it is divisible by 3. If it
    → is, add it to the result, otherwise subtract it.
    Multiply the resulting value by the third number three times.
    → For the fourth number, calculate the sum of its digits
    and compare it with the first number. If the sum is greater,
    → add the fourth number to the result,
    otherwise keep the result unchanged. If the final result
    → equals 2024, return the string "Happy New Year",
    otherwise return "Whoops".
    """
    # Calculate the square of the first number
    result = numbers[0] ** 2

    # Check if the second number is divisible by 3 and
    → add/subtract accordingly
    if numbers[1] % 3 == 0:
        result += numbers[1]
    else:
```

```

    result -= numbers[1]

    # Multiply the resulting value by the third number three times
    result *= numbers[2] ** 3

    # Calculate the sum of the digits of the fourth number
    sum_of_digits = sum(int(digit) for digit in str(numbers[3]))

    # Compare the sum of the digits with the first number and add
    → the fourth number if the sum is greater
    if sum_of_digits > numbers[0]:
        result += numbers[4]

    # Return "Happy New Year" if the final result equals 2024,
    → otherwise "Whoops"
    return "Happy New Year" if result == 2024 else "Whoops"

# Example calls to the function
print(is_new_year([2, 0, 2, 4])) # Output should be "Whoops"
print(is_new_year([3, 5, 6, 1160])) # Output should be "Happy
→ New Year"
...

```

This Python function follows the steps described in the problem  
 → statement and uses conditional logic to manipulate the result  
 → according to the given instructions.

Example 6 - Complex: The model knows that it should use index 3 to retrieve the fourth number from a Python array in early lines. However, even though the model claims in the comments that it will operate on the fourth number, it still uses 4 as the index. As the number of constraints increases, the model commits errors that would not occur under fewer constraints.

---

#### # PROMPT:

Write a Python function according to the function name and the  
 → problem description in the docstring below.

```

def custom_sort(dictionary):
    """Given a dictionary with non-negative integers as keys,
    → sort the key-value pairs in the
    dictionary where the values are strings. Arrange these
    → key-value pairs in descending order
    based on the count of ones in the ternary representation of
    → the keys. In case of equal
    counts of ones, arrange them in ascending order based on the
    → alphabetical order of the values.
    Return the sorted list.
    >>> custom_sort({1: 'apple', 2: 123, 3: 'banana', 4:
    → 'orange', 5: 456, 6: 'cherry'})
    [(4, 'orange'), (1, 'apple'), (3, 'banana'), (6, 'cherry')]
    """

```

#### # RESPONSE:

To implement the `custom\_sort` function, we need to follow these  
 → steps:

1. Convert the keys to their ternary representation.

2. Count the number of ones in the ternary representation of each  
→ key.
3. Sort the key-value pairs first by the count of ones in  
→ descending order, and then by the value in ascending  
→ alphabetical order if there's a tie in the count of ones.
4. Return the sorted list of key-value pairs.

Here's the implementation of the function:

```
```python
def count_ones_in_ternary(n):
    """Helper function to count the number of ones in the ternary
    → representation of an integer."""
    return bin(n).count('1')

def custom_sort(dictionary):
    """Given a dictionary with non-negative integers as keys,
    → sort the key-value pairs in the
    dictionary where the values are strings. Arrange these
    → key-value pairs in descending order
    based on the count of ones in the ternary representation of
    → the keys. In case of equal
    counts of ones, arrange them in ascending order based on the
    → alphabetical order of the values.
    Return the sorted list.
    """
    # Filter out non-string values
    filtered_dict = {k: v for k, v in dictionary.items() if
    → isinstance(v, str)}

    # Sort the dictionary by the count of ones in the ternary
    → representation of the keys
    # and then by the values in case of a tie
    sorted_items = sorted(filtered_dict.items(), key=lambda item:
    → (-count_ones_in_ternary(item[0]), item[1]))

    return sorted_items

# Example usage:
print(custom_sort({1: 'apple', 2: '123', 3: 'banana', 4:
→ 'orange', 5: '456', 6: 'cherry'}))
...

```

Please note that the example provided in the docstring contains  
→ non-string values (123 and 456), which are not considered in  
→ the sorting process as per the problem description. The  
→ function filters out these non-string values before sorting.

Also, the helper function `count_ones_in_ternary` is incorrectly  
→ named since it counts the number of ones in the binary  
→ representation, not ternary. However, the example provided  
→ does not require ternary representation, so the function  
→ works for the given example. If ternary representation is  
→ needed, the helper function should be modified accordingly.

...

When you run the `custom_sort` function with the example provided  
→ in the docstring, it should return the sorted list as follows:

```
....  
[(4, 'orange'), (1, 'apple'), (3, 'banana'), (6, 'cherry')]  
....
```

Please note that Python uses zero-based indexing, so the keys in  
→ the example (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) are not directly related to  
→ the ternary representation but rather arbitrary non-negative  
→ integer keys as stated in the problem description.

---

Example 7 - Codesense: Despite understanding ternary, the model mistakenly used a binary function, indicating a weakness in utilizing external functions.

Write a Python function according to the function name and the problem description in the docstring below.

```

from typing import List

def get_highest_occurrence_count(number_list: List[int]) -> int:
    """
    I was recently talking with my friend John who works as a data analyst.
    He was telling me about some of the common tasks he has to do with the data sets he works with.
    John mentioned he often needs to write little functions to calculate these frequencies. Last week,
    he was working with a data set of numbers and needed to find the total frequency of the number(s) that
    appear most often.
    He asked if I could help him turn this task into a simple function. Here is a concise description
    of what it needs to do:

    Given an array `nums` of positive integers, return the total frequency of the most frequent
    element(s) in the array `nums`.
    The frequency of an element is the number of times it appears in the array.
    >>>get_highest_occurrence_count([2,2,3,3])
    4
    >>>get_highest_occurrence_count([4,3,2,1])
    4
    """

```

CodeLlama-34B-Python Output:

```

from typing import List

def get_highest_occurrence_count(nums: List[int]) -> int:
    """
    Given an array `nums` of positive integers, return the total frequency of the most frequent
    element(s) in the array `nums`.
    The frequency of an element is the number of times it appears in the array.
    """
    from collections import Counter
    count = Counter(nums)
    return max(count.values())

# Test cases
print(get_highest_occurrence_count([2,2,3,3])) # Output: 2
print(get_highest_occurrence_count([4,3,2,1])) # Output: 1

```

Figure 7: The variable name in the generated function didn't match that in the MHPP but was the same as in the training corpus.