

# Multi-Objective Fine-Tuning for Enhanced Program Repair with LLMs

Boyang Yang<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Haoye Tian<sup>3,4\*</sup>, Jiadong Ren<sup>1</sup>, Hongyu Zhang<sup>5</sup>, Jacques Klein<sup>4</sup>, Tegawendé F. Bissyandé<sup>4</sup>,  
Claire Le Goues<sup>3</sup>, Shunfu Jin<sup>1†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Information Science and Engineering, Yanshan University,*

<sup>2</sup>*Jisuan Institute of Technology, Beijing JidaoYouda Network Technology Co. Ltd.,*

<sup>3</sup>*School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University,*

<sup>4</sup>*SnT, University of Luxembourg,*

<sup>5</sup>*School of Big Data and Software Engineering, Chongqing University*

yangboyang@jisuanke.com, tianhaoyemail@gmail.com, jdren@ysu.edu.cn, hongyujohn@gmail.com,

jacques.klein@uni.lu, tegawende.bissyande@uni.lu, clegoues@cs.cmu.edu, jsf@ysu.edu.cn

**Abstract**—Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities on a broad spectrum of downstream tasks. Within the realm of software engineering, specialized tasks on code, such as program repair, present unique challenges, necessitating fine-tuning to unlock state-of-the-art performance. Fine-tuning approaches proposed in the literature for LLMs on program repair tasks are however generally overlooking the need to reason about the logic behind code changes, beyond syntactic patterns in the data. High-performing fine-tuning experiments also usually come at very high computational costs. With MOREPAIR, we propose a novel perspective on the learning focus of LLM fine-tuning for program repair: we not only adapt the LLM parameters to the syntactic nuances of the task of code transformation (objective ①), but we also specifically fine-tune the LLM with respect to the logical reason behind the code change in the training data (objective ②). Such a multi-objective fine-tuning will instruct LLMs to generate *high-quality* patches.

We apply MOREPAIR to fine-tune four open-source LLMs with different sizes and architectures. Experimental results on C++ and Java repair benchmarks show that the implemented fine-tuning effectively boosts LLM repair performance by 7.6% to 10% in Top-10 repair suggestions. We further show that our fine-tuning strategy yields superior performance compared to the incumbent state-of-the-art in fine-tuned models for program repair, Fine-tune-CoT and RepairLLaMA.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Large language models have achieved promising performance on a variety of tasks in different domains. In software engineering, among many code-related tasks, automated program repair (APR) has greatly benefited from the general knowledge encoded in prominent models such as GPT-4 [1]. Recent studies [2], [3], [4] have indeed shown that LLMs can even outperform traditional APR tools. Researchers have realized these achievements through two main strategies: prompt engineering and fine-tuning. Indeed, to steer LLMs towards adapting to the specific format of repair, few-shot learning techniques have been employed [5], [6], [7], [8], [9] where a small set of example patches are provided in

the prompt along with the buggy code to repair. While few-shot-based approaches have shown better performance than initial zero-shot-based attempts [10], [11], [12], prompting is inherently limited by the pre-trained model capabilities. Prompting further often fails to produce high-quality patches within the constraints of developers’ attempt limits [13]. In contrast, fine-tuning-based approaches [4], [14], [15], [16], [17] strive to refine the fundamental capabilities of LLMs and have therefore demonstrated substantially greater potential in achieving reliable program repair. In practice, fine-tuning consists in adapting a pre-trained LLM on a very specific dataset, such as patches, or task, such as program repair, enabling the model to refine its knowledge and improve performance in targeted areas [18]. Unfortunately, the existing literature proposes approaches that still face two major limitations:

- ① **Need for Reasoning on Repair Logic:** The program repair task is complex: it demands some deep comprehension of control and data flow, of the developer intentions in the design of the buggy code, and finally of the intrinsic repair logic. Yet, most of the standard fine-tuning approaches for LLM-based program repair focus on optimizing the training dataset [4], [15], [19]. Thus, while with such approaches the LLMs can be refined to notice some repair patterns, the actual logic reasoning behind the repair operation (“the why”) is not explicitly learned.
- ② **High Cost:** Fine-tuning for program repair generally requires large datasets to achieve state of the art performance. In recent works, Lajkó *et al.* [15] used 16k samples to fine-tune GPT-2, while RepairLLaMA [17] was fine-tuned with about 30-50k code pairs. Such large datasets further suggest the expenditure of significant computational resource. Creating and expanding these datasets takes substantial effort and time, emphasizing the resource-intensive nature of fine-tuning in program repair. With limited public datasets available, manual construction of training data further increases labor costs.

\*Co-first authors who contributed equally to this work.

†Corresponding author.

**This paper.** In this work, we propose a new fine-tuning objective using natural language explanations of code changes to capture the logic underlying a given repair operation. This objective, which seeks conversational guidance, is considered in addition to the classical objective of learning code transformations. MOREPAIR is thus designed as a novel, effective multi-objective fine-tuning framework for LLM-based program repair.

By focusing on conversational guidance, i.e., natural language, MOREPAIR ensures that the learning is programming language-independent, making it suitable for multilingual repair scenarios. Furthermore, by conducting multi-objective learning, we indirectly scale up the learning dataset: more pattern combinations can be explored in a small dataset. We also observe that conversational guidance presents the benefit of providing various potential fix strategies that extend beyond the confines of a specific buggy code. As such, our approach does not depend on large-scale datasets for fine-tuning that are required by prior works. Experimentally, we show that with an order of magnitude smaller dataset, we achieve higher fine-tuning performance than prior works. Finally, to account for insufficient/missing patch descriptions, we rely on LLMs to generate high-quality patch guidance. The successful application of such automatically generated guidance is essential as it relieves APR from this expensive human input.

We apply MOREPAIR to fine-tune four open-source LLMs, namely CodeLlama-13B-instruct [20], CodeLlama-7B-instruct [20], StarChat-alpha [21], and Mistral-Instruct-7B-v0.1 [22], which are chosen to represent a variety of model sizes and architectures. These are assessed against two new repair benchmarks, EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java, which we produced based on HumanEval [23] by including augmented test cases to avoid patch over-fitting [24]. The experiments demonstrate that the proposed fine-tuning technique effectively improves the LLM performance on the program repair task: CodeLlama-13B-instruct performance is improved by 11% and 8% on the EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java benchmarks, respectively. Similar performance improvements have been observed across all LLMs. We also show that MOREPAIR is indeed superior to the fine-tuning approaches used for state of the art models such as Fine-tune-CoT [25] and RepairLLaMA [17]. Finally, we show that MOREPAIR has the ability to narrow the performance gap between small open-source models and larger closed-source models.

The main contributions of our work are as follows:

- **Approach.** We propose MOREPAIR, a novel multi-objective fine-tuning framework designed specifically for LLM-based program repair. MOREPAIR steers LLMs towards a precise understanding the reasoning logic behind the repair process, thereby enabling them to generate high-quality patches.
- **Benchmarks.** We provide two new repair benchmarks, EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java, consisting of 164 and 163 patches (pairs of code samples), respectively. EvalRepair-C++ was created by manually introducing bugs into the ground truth C++ code from HumanEval-X [26], while EvalRepair-Java is derived from HumanEval-Java [4].

```

1 --- 0_58980_RE_SEGV.cpp
2 +++ 0_58980_AC.cpp
3 @@ -35,8 +35,8 @@
4         num.push(cal(tmp1,tmp2,opr));
5     }
6     op.pop();
7 }else if (s[i] == '+' || s[i] == '-') {
8 -     while (!op.empty()) {
9 +     while (!op.empty() && op.top() != '(') {
10         int tmp1 = num.top();
11         num.pop();
12         int tmp2 = num.top();

```

**Fig. 1:** An example patch from TUTORLLMCODE.

To mitigate patch overfitting impact on the reported performance metrics, we augment the original test suites of both benchmarks: we indeed observe a decline of up to ~9% in terms of top-10 repair predictions from CodeLlama-13B-instruct when we apply it to the new EvalRepair-C++ benchmark.

- **Experiments.** We conduct a comprehensive evaluation of MOREPAIR’s effectiveness for improving the performance of open source LLMs, as well as its generalizability across various LLMs and different programming languages. The assessment also considers baseline models and baseline fine-tuning approaches.
- **Insights.** Through an ablation study, we assess the impact of LLM-generated guidance within the MOREPAIR framework. Additionally, we compare the repair performance of MOREPAIR with state-of-the-art fine-tuning methods, including Fine-tune-CoT and RepairLLaMA. This study highlights the value of LLM-generated guidance in MOREPAIR and underscores MOREPAIR’s superior effectiveness over current fine-tuning approaches in program repair tasks.

## II. MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

Figure 1 provides an example patch for repairing a C++ program in the TUTORLLMCODE dataset. The bug is related to the handling of precedence in the operator of arithmetic expressions. When operation expressions are mixed or rather interleaved, the buggy program could yield inaccurate evaluation of the arithmetic expressions. In TUTORLLMCODE, this repair case is an example of a patch that was necessary to fix the solution provided by a student to an *Expression Evaluation* problem. The solution to this engineering problem is to introduce parentheses in basic arithmetic operations (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division). Writing this code without taking into account the presence of parentheses may lead to bugs.

---

Line 39, also ensure that the top element of the stack is not a left parenthesis.

---

**Listing 1:** Human-generated guidance for yielding the patch in Figure 1

The human-generated guidance in Listing 1 accurately points to the buggy location, and also conceptually describes the necessary code checks that are missing. We postulate that

such information is precious as it informs about the logical reasoning behind the requested repair and abstracts away from the particular syntax of the associated program, enabling a fine-tuning process with this information to potentially generalize to a broader set of programs.

Listing 2 depicts the LLM-generated guidance for this repair case. The LLM was prompted with the buggy along the fixed code and instructed to provide step-by-step descriptions of the repair logic. Interestingly, it goes into more depth and offers a more comprehensive and contextual analysis of the buggy code. The LLM identifies the primary issue: the correct handling of '+' and '-' operators when not preceded by a '(', and highlights four potential problems. Concretely, the LLM-guidance outlines in details some corrections by refining the logic for operator precedence, by ensuring accurate parenthesis handling, by mentioning parameter order adjustments in the *cal* function for subtraction and division, and by introducing error handling for enhanced robustness.

- 
- 1 Certainly! Let's go through the code step by step and identify the issues that need to be fixed:
  - 2 1. **\*\*Operator Precedence\*\***: In the original code, when encountering a '+' or '-', it immediately evaluates all operations in the stack without considering operator precedence. This is incorrect because '\*' and '/' should have higher precedence and should be evaluated first.
  - 3 **\*\*Fix\*\***: When encountering a '+' or '-', only evaluate the top of the stack if it is not a '(' and if the operator at the top of the stack is '+' or '-'. Do not evaluate '\*' or '/' immediately; they should be evaluated when the next '+' or '-' is encountered or at the end of the expression.
  - 4 2. **\*\*Parentheses Handling\*\***: The original code correctly handles the opening parenthesis '(', but when it encounters a closing parenthesis ')', it evaluates all operations until it finds the corresponding '('. This is correct, but it does not consider operator precedence within the parentheses.
  - 5 **\*\*Fix\*\***: When encountering a ')', evaluate the operations in the stack until you reach the corresponding '('. Make sure to evaluate '\*' and '/' before '+' and '-'.
  - 6 3. **\*\*End of Expression\*\***: At the end of the expression, the original code evaluates all remaining operations in the stack. This is correct, but again, it does not consider operator precedence.
  - 7 **\*\*Fix\*\***: When reaching the end of the expression, evaluate the remaining operations in the stack while considering operator precedence. Evaluate '\*' and '/' before '+' and '-'.
  - 8 4. **\*\*Function 'cal'\*\***: The 'cal' function has the parameters in the wrong order for subtraction and division. This will lead to incorrect results when these operations are performed.
  - 9 **\*\*Fix\*\***: Swap the order of the parameters 'x' and 'y' in the subtraction and division cases within the 'cal' function to ensure the correct order of operands.
  - 10 5. **\*\*Error Handling\*\***: The original code does not handle errors or invalid input. While the problem statement guarantees valid input, it's good practice to include error handling.
  - 11 **\*\*Fix\*\***: Add error handling to check for invalid characters, mismatched parentheses, or other potential input errors. This is not explicitly required by the problem statement but is a good practice.
  - 12 By addressing these issues, the code should correctly evaluate expressions with proper operator precedence and parentheses handling. Remember to test the code with various expressions to ensure that all edge cases are handled correctly.
- 

**Listing 2:** LLM-generated guidance for the patch in Figure 1

Our main intuition in this work is that the conversational guidance generated from repair examples will greatly benefit a model fine-tuning procedure for program repair.

### III. APPROACH

In this section, we provide an overview of our proposed approach, followed by a detailed description of the methodology, which is divided into specific steps across several subsections.

**[Overview]**: we introduce MOREPAIR, a novel multi-objective fine-tuning framework that empowers open-source LLMs to grasp repair logic and produce high-quality patches effectively. Figure 2 illustrates our approach, which unfolds in three phases: training preparation, multi-objective fine-tuning, and repair inference.


During the **Training Preparation phase**, we construct a dataset TUTORLLMCODE, consisting of 1,600 pairs of buggy and repaired code. This preparation includes LLM-generated guidance generated by GPT-4 to elucidate the nature of code bugs and their fixes (as detailed in Section III-A). The **Multi-objective Fine-tuning phase** applies the principles of multi-objective learning, targeting two specific learning objectives: (1) generating repaired code and (2) producing repaired code with guidance that explains the repair logic. Leveraging QLoRA allows for the fine-tuning of a low-rank adapter while freezing the original LLM parameters, cutting down the trainable parameters to only 1.84% and thus minimizing computational costs. In the **Repair Inference phase**, the ensemble of the pre-trained LLM and the fine-tuned repair adapter generates candidate patches for the provided buggy code, whose correctness is validated through the test cases from benchmarks.

#### A. Training Preparation

The initial step in our approach involves preparing the training dataset for fine-tuning. We utilize a dataset TUTORLLMCODE, provided by a company, which includes 1,600 pairs of buggy codes and repaired codes across 45 distinct programming tasks, each accompanied by descriptions of the respective programming tasks. Recognizing the effectiveness of few-shot learning [27] for straightforward tasks, researchers explored the innovative use of rationale as intermediate steps, known as chain-of-thought (CoT) [28], to enhance LLMs' reasoning abilities. By employing GPT-4-1106-preview, we generate guidance that clarifies the nature of the bug and the logic behind the patch in natural language. The prompts used for generating this guidance with GPT-4 are depicted in Figure 3. Aimed at benefiting the wider community while mitigating future data leakage risks, TUTORLLMCODE will be publicly available through authorized API. Listing 2 illustrates an example of guidance generated by GPT-4.

- 
- 1 This is a programming task description along with a buggy code:
  - 2 {{description}}
  - 3 {{buggy code}}
  - 4 This is a repaired code:
  - 5 {{repaired code}}
  - 6 Please think step by step and tell me how to fix the buggy code.
- 

**Fig. 3:** The prompt to generate guidance utilizing GPT-4.



**Fig. 2:** Overview of MOREPAIR: The process unfolds in three phases—preparation, fine-tuning, and inference for code repair.

### B. Multi-objective Fine-tuning

The second step of our approach involves fine-tuning LLMs through multi-objective learning. Multi-objective learning, a paradigm in machine learning, aims to leverage relevant information across multiple tasks simultaneously to enhance the performance of each task [29]. In this context, we propose our framework **MOREPAIR**, which applies multi-objective learning to teach open-source LLMs the intricacies of the program repair process during fine-tuning. This approach enables the LLMs to generate high-quality patches for buggy code. Specifically, the LLMs are fine-tuned with two objectives: (1) generating repaired code and (2) producing repaired code accompanied by guidance that clarifies the nature of the bugs and their logic. To optimize for these objectives, we calculate separate losses for each, denoted as  $Loss_1$  for generating the repaired code, and  $Loss_2$  for producing both the repaired code and its explanatory guidance. These losses are then combined using the following equation:

$$Loss = Loss_1 + \lambda Loss_2 \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\lambda$  is a weighting coefficient that balances the importance of each objective during the training process. The computation of  $Loss_1$  uses a cross-entropy loss function to evaluate the discrepancy between the LLM’s predicted probability distribution  $P(y_i|\mathbf{x}, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})$  for each token in the sequence and the actual distribution  $Q(y_i|\mathbf{x}, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})$ , defined as:

$$Loss_1 = - \sum_i Q(y_i|\mathbf{x}, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}) \times \log P(y_i|\mathbf{x}, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}) \quad (2)$$

For  $Loss_2$ , which assesses the LLM’s capability to generate relevant explanatory guidance alongside repaired code, the loss calculation extends to the entire sequence of both code and guidance tokens, using a similar cross-entropy function:

$$Loss_2 = - \sum_i Q'(y_i|\mathbf{x}, y_1, \dots, y_{i+n}) \times \log P(y_i|\mathbf{x}, y_1, \dots, y_{i+n}) \quad (3)$$

Here,  $n$  represents the number of guidance tokens added to the sequence, aiming to enhance the LLM’s ability to provide comprehensive expected outputs. To optimize the fine-tuning process efficiently, we incorporate the QLoRA (Quantized Low-Rank Adaptation) technique, which is an efficient fine-tuning approach that builds upon LoRA [30] by incorporating several innovative strategies, as detailed by Dettmers *et al.* [31]. It employs 4-bit NormalFloat (NF4) quantization for pre-trained model weights, applies double quantization to the quantization constants, and utilizes paged optimizers to reduce memory usage. These enhancements allow QLoRA to drastically reduce the memory requirement for fine-tuning LLMs. Integrating QLoRA into our fine-tuning process involves precise adjustments to the attention and feed-forward parameters  $\Delta W$  aiming to refine the loss functions

$Loss_1$  and  $Loss_2$ . The effectiveness of these adjustments is encapsulated in the following formulation:

$$P(y_i|\mathbf{x}, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})' = \sigma((X + \Delta X)(W + \Delta W)) \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\sigma$  denotes the softmax function, which normalizes the outputs to probability distributions,  $X$  represents the input embeddings,  $W$  is the original weight matrix, and  $\Delta W$  signifies the adjustments made via QLoRA. These adjustments are strategically implemented to minimize the specified loss functions, directly linking QLoRA’s parameter optimization to the overarching objective of enhancing the LLM’s performance in generating both code and explanatory guidance. By leveraging QLoRA, we fine-tune a mere **1.84%** of pre-trained parameters in CodeLlama-13B-instruct.

Additionally, we incorporate NEFTune [32] to further enhance fine-tuned LLMs’ generalization. Noisy Embedding Fine-Tuning (NEFTune), presents a novel and effective augmentation technique that aims to prevent over-fitting during fine-tuning LLMs. NEFTune introduces random noise to the embedding vectors of training data during the forward pass of fine-tuning. Formally, for an embedding matrix  $X_{emb} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times L \times d}$ , where  $B$  is the batch size,  $L$  is the sequence length, and  $d$  is the embedding dimension, NEFTune modifies the embeddings as follows:

$$X'_{emb} = X_{emb} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{Ld}}\right)\epsilon \quad (5)$$

In this equation,  $\epsilon \sim \text{Uniform}(-1, 1)$  and  $\alpha$  is a tunable hyper-parameter that scales the noise.

### C. Repair Inference

In the final step of our approach, we combine quantized LLM with QLoRA adapters to generate repaired codes during inference. The buggy code, represented by instruction  $x$ , is first transformed into a vector representation  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , where each  $x_i$  corresponds to the embedding vector of the  $i$ -th token. This vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is fed into fine-tuned LLMs equipped with quantization and QLoRA adapters to facilitate efficient and precise program repair generation. The computation within each linear layer of the quantized LLM is performed as follows:

$$Y = X \cdot \text{doubleDequant}(c_1, c_2, W) + X \cdot L_1 \cdot L_2 \quad (6)$$

Here,  $\text{doubleDequant}(\cdot)$  functionally restores the quantized weight matrix  $W$  to its full precision, and  $L_1, L_2$  are the QLoRA adapter matrices.

Through dequantization, we ensure that computations achieve the necessary precision for high-quality output, with each layer’s output feeding into the subsequent layer until a final probability distribution over the vocabulary is achieved. This distribution,  $p(y_i|\mathbf{x}, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})$ , guides the generation of the next tokens  $y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}$ , based on both the input  $\mathbf{x}$  and the previously generated tokens  $y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}$ . To generate diverse and coherent program repairs, we employ a blend of sampling techniques and hyper-parameters, setting the temperature and  $top_p$  (nucleus sampling) both to 1.0 and enabling sampling within the generation process with `do_sample=True`. The resulting sequence  $\hat{s} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$  encompasses the LLM’s

response, from which we extract the first code segment as the candidate repaired code  $\hat{s}$ . This step is crucial because the LLM’s output may encompass candidate repaired code and supplementary natural language descriptions.

## IV. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

First, we outline the LLMs utilized in this study. Next, we detail the benchmark used for evaluation in our experiments. Following this, we explain the metrics employed to evaluate the repair capabilities of the fine-tuned LLMs. Lastly, we list the research questions we aim to address through this study.

### A. Model Selection

To evaluate the generalizability of our approach, it is crucial to experiment with LLMs of varying architectures and sizes. Given the significant computational resources required for training and deploying large-scale LLMs, as highlighted by Chen [33], we focused on code-targeted LLMs with parameters range of 7B to 16B. Table I presents our selected models, chosen based on their popularity (as indicated by downloads from HuggingFace) and the diversity of their underlying architectures. These LLMs include CodeLlama-13B-instruct [20], CodeLlama-7B-instruct [20], StarChat-alpha [21], and Mistral-Instruct-7B [22], allowing us to comprehensively assess our approach’s efficacy.

**TABLE I:** Selected Models

Model	Base Model	# Params	Downloads*
CodeLlama-13B-instruct	CodeLlama	13B	46.4k
CodeLlama-7B-instruct	CodeLlama	7B	59.5k
StarChat-alpha	StarCoderBase	16B	24.9k
Mistral-Instruct-7B-v0.1	Mistral-7B-v0.1	7B	773.6k

\* “Downloads” count reflects the number of times LLMs were downloaded from HuggingFace before Feb. 2024.

The selected models showcase a range of innovative features tailored to programming tasks. CodeLlama-13B-instruct and CodeLlama-7B-instruct, building on the Llama2 architecture [34], offer infilling capabilities and optimized large-batch inference, demonstrating the adaptability of the CodeLlama [20] foundation. StarChat-alpha, based on StarCoder [35], introduces advanced pre-training techniques and benefits from expansive code datasets such as The Stack [36], illustrating a novel approach to leveraging data diversity for performance gains. Meanwhile, Mistral-Instruct-7B-v0.1, based on Mistral [22], emphasizes advancements in attention mechanisms, highlighting the potential for auto-regressive models in processing long sequences efficiently. In the following paragraphs, we denote CodeLlama-13B-instruct as CodeLlama-13B, CodeLlama-7B-instruct as CodeLlama-7B, and Mistral-Instruct-7B-v0.1 as Mistral-7B.

### B. Evaluation Benchmark

To rigorously assess our code generation and translation framework, we leveraged HumanEval-X [26], a multilingual extension of the HumanEval benchmark specifically designed for programming languages such as C++, Java, JavaScript, Go, and Python. Each of the original 164 Python problems in HumanEval [23] is expanded in HumanEval-X to include

equivalent problems in the other four languages, culminating in 820 distinct problem-solution pairs. This setup enables comprehensive evaluation across code generation and translation tasks in five popular programming languages.

To establish a robust C++ program repair benchmark, we adapted the methodology from Jiang *et al.* [4] used for HumanEval-Java, injecting various types of bugs into the C++ section of HumanEval-X to form the EvalRepair-C++ benchmark. This benchmark encompasses 115 single-line bugs, 143 single-hunk bugs, 21 multi-hunk bugs, and 2 multi-function bugs, offering a broad spectrum of defect scenarios for evaluation. Recognizing the potential for overfitting due to a limited number of test cases, we enriched EvalRepair-C++ with additional test cases from the EvalPlus [37]. This expansion revealed that some original solutions in HumanEval-X’s C++ component failed to pass the new, more rigorous test cases. We corrected these issues, ensuring the augmented benchmark’s correctness. Consequently, the average number of test cases per problem in EvalRepair-C++ surged to 590, a significant increase to provide a more accurate assessment of model performance.

HumanEval-Java serves as a critical benchmark for Java program repair, distinct in its exclusion from the pre-training datasets of existing LLMs to avoid data leakage [4]. By introducing EvalRepair-Java, which expands HumanEval-Java with additional EvalPlus [37] test cases, the average number of test cases per problem has been increased to 583. This significant augmentation of test cases actively mitigates patch overfitting issues.

TABLE II: Mitigation of Patch Overfitting

	EvalRepair-C++	EvalRepair-Java
① # Original Test Cases	7	7
② # Augmented Test Cases	590	583
CodeLlama-13B TOP-10 with ①	67.7	73.6
CodeLlama-13B TOP-10 with ②	58.5	69.9

As illustrated in Table II, augmenting the test cases leads to a noticeable decline in the TOP-10 of LLMs such as CodeLlama-13B, which experienced a reduction of 9.2% in EvalRepair-C++ and 3.7% in EvalRepair-Java. The introduction of a more comprehensive set of test cases not only highlights the importance of rigorous evaluation in the development of LLMs but also sets a new standard for assessing their performance in program repair tasks. These benchmarks, EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java, will be made publicly accessible via an API, ensuring that the research community can benefit from these resources for future explorations and improvements in the field without data leakage problem.

### C. Evaluation Metrics

To accurately evaluate the effectiveness of LLMs in program repair, this study employs two primary metrics: TOP-5 and TOP-10. The “TOP-k” metric is the scenario where, among the top k candidate patches produced by the LLMs, the code is considered successfully repaired if any candidates pass all test cases in the benchmark. This metrics selection is grounded in the observation by Kochhar *et al.* [38] that most

developers tend to abandon automated debugging tools if they fail to identify the actual bugs within the first five attempts. Furthermore, Noller *et al.* [13] found that developers are unlikely to consider more than the top-10 ranked patches when seeking solutions. Reflecting on these insights and aligning with the findings from prior program repair studies [39], [12], [13], [40], our selection of the TOP-5 and TOP-10 metrics is not only justified but also crucial for ensuring our evaluation mirrors real-world developers scenarios and expectations.

### D. Research Questions

**RQ-1: How effective is fine-tuning with two objectives for program repair?** We investigate the performance of MOREPAIR’s multi-objective fine-tuning in contrast to standard, single-objective fine-tuning on the CodeLlama-13B. This comparative analysis is conducted using the EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java benchmarks to assess not only the effectiveness of MOREPAIR in improving program repair but also its ability to generalize across different programming languages.

**RQ-2: How does model size or type impact repair performance of MOREPAIR?** We examine MOREPAIR’s performance on LLMs with distinct sizes and architectures, including CodeLlama-13B, CodeLlama-7B, StarChat-alpha-16B, and Mistral-7B, on EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java benchmarks. This study aims to validate MOREPAIR’s generalization capability by comparing its fine-tuning effects against standard approaches and baseline performance across varying LLMs.

**RQ-3: How does MOREPAIR compare against MOREPAIR with human guidance and state-of-the-art fine-tuning methods?** Through an ablation study, we explore the influence of the source of guidance (LLM-generated vs. human-generated) on MOREPAIR’s effectiveness. Additionally, we compare MOREPAIR’s performance to two advanced fine-tuning methodologies, Fine-tune-CoT [25] and RepairL-LaMA [17], across various LLMs.

## V. EXPERIMENTS & RESULTS

### A. Effectiveness of Multi-objective Fine-tuning for Program Repair

**[Objective:]** This study assesses MOREPAIR’s impact on fine-tuning LLMs for program repair, comparing its multi-objective approach against standard single-objective fine-tuning and baseline LLMs without fine-tuning. Our investigation centers around two sub-questions:

- **RQ-1.1** How does fine-tuning LLMs with MOREPAIR compare to both standard fine-tuning and the baseline LLM in terms of repair performance?
- **RQ-1.2** Does MOREPAIR exhibit cross-language generalization in program repair tasks compared to standard fine-tuning and baseline LLM?

**[Experimental Design for RQ-1.1]:** We fine-tune CodeLlama-13B using both MOREPAIR and the standard fine-tuning approach. Here, the baseline represents CodeLlama-13B without any fine-tuning, serving as our control for

evaluating the impact of fine-tuning. Standard fine-tuning refers to fine-tuning CodeLlama-13B to generate repaired code without other information, denoted as STDFT. In contrast, MOREPAIR involves multi-objective fine-tuning, aiming to enhance LLM’s repair capabilities through additional natural language guidance. The comparative analysis is based on TOP-5 and TOP-10 metrics on the benchmark EvalRepair-C++, detailed in Section IV-B.

**[Experimental Results for RQ-1.1]:** Table III shows MOREPAIR’s significant repair performance enhancement on EvalRepair-C++ over both the baseline, and STDFT. Against the baseline, MOREPAIR elevates TOP-5 by 20.7%, and TOP-10 by 11.0%. Compared to STDFT, MOREPAIR maintains its superiority with increments of 12.2% in TOP-5, and 5.5% in TOP-10. These substantial improvements, particularly in TOP-5 and TOP-10, more than double the gains of STDFT, showcasing MOREPAIR’s profound impact. The success of the MOREPAIR approach underscores the advantage of multi-objective fine-tuning in fostering a more nuanced understanding and application of repair logic than what is achieved through standard fine-tuning.

**[Experimental Design for RQ-1.2]:** To probe MOREPAIR’s and STDFT’s capacity for cross-language generalization in program repair, we fine-tuned CodeLlama-13B with each method using the TUTORLLM CODE. Their performances were then evaluated on the Java repair benchmark EvalRepair-Java across TOP-5 and TOP-10 metrics, offering insights into how these approaches adapt to a language different from the training dataset.

**[Experimental Results for RQ-1.2]:** The repair performance presented in Table IV for the EvalRepair-Java benchmark detail how both STDFT and MOREPAIR extend their capabilities into a cross-language scenario. STDFT enhances the TOP-10 by 6.8% over the baseline (CodeLlama-13B), while MOREPAIR further improves upon this, exhibiting an additional 1.2% increase in TOP-10 over STDFT. These enhancements validate the cross-language generalization capability of both fine-tuning approaches, with MOREPAIR showcasing superior performance in adapting to Java, which is a shift from the training dataset’s programming language. Notably, MOREPAIR achieves a 77.9% TOP-10, marking an 8.0% increase over the baseline. This significant improvement underscores MOREPAIR’s effectiveness in cross-language repair scenarios.

**TABLE III:** Fine-tune CodeLlama-13B with STDFT and MOREPAIR vs GPT-4 on EvalRepair-C++.

Model	TOP-5	TOP-10
GPT-4	97.6	98.2
CodeLlama-13B	40.9	58.5
CodeLlama-13B-STDFT	49.4 (+ 8.5)	64.0 (+ 5.5)
CodeLlama-13B-MOREPAIR	<b>61.6 (+20.7)</b>	<b>69.5 (+11.0)</b>

**TABLE IV:** Fine-tune CodeLlama-13B with STDFT and MOREPAIR vs GPT-4 on EvalRepair-Java.

Model	TOP-5	TOP-10
GPT-4	85.9	89.0
CodeLlama-13B	54.0	69.9
CodeLlama-13B-STDFT	62.0 (+ 8.0)	76.7 (+ 6.8)
CodeLlama-13B-MOREPAIR	<b>69.3 (+15.3)</b>	<b>77.9 (+ 8.0)</b>

Reflecting on the examples illustrated in Section II, the evaluation results of buggy codes “separate\_paren\_groups.cpp” in EvalRepair-C++ and “SEPARATE\_PAREN\_GROUPS.java” in EvalRepair-Java demonstrates the distinct effectiveness of MOREPAIR and STDFT. MOREPAIR successfully repairs these buggy codes within Top-10 attempts, while STDFT fails to accomplish these repairs. This result supports that cross-language generalization enhancement of MOREPAIR is attributed to natural language guidance from GPT-4, enabling MOREPAIR to learn language-independent repair logic.

Furthermore, we include GPT-4, state-of-the-art closed-source LLM, as a benchmark for upper limits of repair performance, as illustrated in Tables III and IV. The result shows that MOREPAIR narrows the performance gap between CodeLlama-13B and GPT-4.

**[RQ-1] Findings:** (1) Fine-tuning with MOREPAIR outperforms CodeLlama-13B baseline significantly in repair performance. The improvements in TOP-10 for EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java are 11.0% and 8.0%, respectively, showcasing superior repair capabilities. (2) Against STDFT, MOREPAIR shows repair performance gains with increases in TOP-5 of 12.2% for EvalRepair-C++ and 7.3% for EvalRepair-Java, indicating generalization across programming languages. **Insights:** Our approach MOREPAIR highlights multi-objective learning’s impact on automated program repair, proving its ability to enhance repair tasks.

### B. Impact of Size or Type for Fine-tuning LLMs on Code Repair Performance

**[Objective]:** To investigate RQ-2, we assess the impact of fine-tuning with MOREPAIR on LLMs of varying sizes and architectures in terms of their code repair capabilities.

**[Experimental Design]:** To examine the generalization of the MOREPAIR approach across LLMs with different sizes and architectures, we selected CodeLlama-7B, StarChat-alpha (which has 16B parameters), and Mistral-7B as our base LLMs. These LLMs represent a diverse range of architectures, and CodeLlama-7B differs in size from the CodeLlama-13B assessed in RQ-1. We fine-tune these LLMs using either standard fine-tuning (STDFT) or MOREPAIR, then evaluate their performance on two benchmarks: EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java.

**TABLE V:** Impact of model sizes or architectures in the effectiveness of fine-tuning on EvalRepair-C++.

Model	TOP-5	TOP-10
CodeLlama-13B	40.9	58.5
CodeLlama-13B-STDFT	49.4 (+ 8.5)	64.0 (+ 5.5)
CodeLlama-13B-MOREPAIR	<b>61.6 (+20.7)</b>	<b>69.5 (+11.0)</b>
CodeLlama-7B	46.3	59.1
CodeLlama-7B-STDFT	50.0 (+ 3.7)	61.6 (+ 2.5)
CodeLlama-7B-MOREPAIR	<b>56.7 (+10.4)</b>	<b>62.8 (+ 3.7)</b>
StarChat-alpha	50.0	62.2
StarChat-STDFT	43.3 (- 6.7)	58.5 (- 3.7)
StarChat-MOREPAIR	<b>52.4 (+ 2.4)</b>	<b>65.9 (+ 3.7)</b>
Mistral-7B	32.3	47.0
Mistral-7B-STDFT	39.0 (+ 6.7)	46.3 (- 0.7)
Mistral-7B-MOREPAIR	<b>40.2 (+ 7.9)</b>	<b>50.0 (+ 3.0)</b>

<sup>†</sup> Values in parentheses indicate the change relative to the corresponding baseline.

**[Experimental Results]:** Table V outlines the TOP-5 and TOP-10 repair performance metrics for baseline, STDFT, and MOREPAIR across four LLMs on EvalRepair-C++. Notably, STDFT doesn’t consistently improve repair metrics, failing to surpass the repair performance of baseline on several base LLMs, such as StarChat-alpha. Conversely, MOREPAIR consistently enhances performance across all metrics and LLMs, with a maximum 11.0% TOP-10 improvement over baseline and a maximum 7.4% TOP-10 over STDFT evaluated on EvalRepair-C++. This suggests superior generalizability of multi-objective learning across different LLMs for code repair.

**TABLE VI:** Impact of model sizes or architectures on the effectiveness of fine-tuning on EvalRepair-Java.

Model	TOP-5	TOP-10
CodeLlama-13B	54.0	69.9
CodeLlama-13B-STDFT	62.0 (+ 8.0)	76.7 (+ 6.8)
CodeLlama-13B-MOREPAIR	<b>69.3 (+15.3)</b>	<b>77.9 (+ 8.0)</b>
CodeLlama-7B	49.7	62.0
CodeLlama-7B-STDFT	49.1 (- 0.6)	60.7 (- 1.3)
CodeLlama-7B-MOREPAIR	<b>59.5 (+ 9.8)</b>	<b>67.5 (+ 5.5)</b>
StarChat-alpha	43.6	60.7
StarChat-STDFT	47.9 (+ 4.3)	56.4 (- 4.3)
StarChat-MOREPAIR	<b>56.4 (+12.8)</b>	<b>66.3 (+ 5.6)</b>
Mistral-7B	33.7	52.1
Mistral-7B-STDFT	42.3 (+ 8.6)	54.6 (+ 2.5)
Mistral-7B-MOREPAIR	<b>45.4 (+11.7)</b>	<b>58.3 (+ 6.2)</b>

<sup>†</sup> Values in parentheses indicate the change relative to the corresponding baseline.

Table VI presents the TOP-5 and TOP-10 metrics for baseline, STDFT, and MOREPAIR on the EvalRepair-Java benchmark across four LLMs. Unlike the results from EvalRepair-C++ in Table V, CodeLlama-7B-STDFT underperforms on EvalRepair-Java, revealing STDFT’s inconsistent cross-language generalization. Similarly, StarChat-STDFT’s decline mirrors its performance on EvalRepair-C++, indicating STDFT’s limited adaptability across LLMs of different architectures. Conversely, MOREPAIR demonstrates robust improvements over baseline and STDFT, with an increment of 5.5%-8.0% TOP-10 over baseline and 1.2%-9.9% TOP-10 over STDFT evaluated on EvalRepair-Java. Despite STDFT

showcasing a decrease in repair performance compared to the baseline of four LLMs, MOREPAIR consistently improves over baseline in cross-language scenarios. This underscores the effectiveness of MOREPAIR leveraging multi-objective learning and LLM-generated natural language guidance in enhancing repair capabilities.

**[RQ-2] Findings:** MOREPAIR consistently elevates repair performance across LLMs with varied sizes and architectures. Notably, it achieves a maximum 11.0% improvement in TOP-10 scores over the baseline and a maximum 7.4% improvement over STDFT on EvalRepair-C++. On EvalRepair-Java, MOREPAIR showcases 8.0% TOP-10 improvement over the baseline and 9.9% TOP-10 enhancement over STDFT, further highlighting its superior generalization. **Insights:** These findings underscore the versatility of LLMs in understanding and applying language-independent programming logic through strategies such as LLM-generated guidance and multi-objective learning, paving the way for advancements in program repair.

### C. Evaluating the Impact of Guidance Sources and Comparing MOREPAIR against State-of-the-Art Fine-tuning Methods

**[Objective]:** This section is dedicated to examining the influence of source of guidance on MOREPAIR’s repair capabilities and assessing MOREPAIR’s comparative performance against advanced fine-tuning techniques. Specifically, we address the following sub-questions:

RQ-3.1: How does the code repair performance of MOREPAIR differ when fine-tuned with LLM-generated guidance compared to human-generated guidance?

RQ-3.2: How does the performance improvement of fine-tuning with MOREPAIR against that achieved with existing methodologies, such as Fine-tune-CoT and RepairLLaMA?

**[Experimental Design for RQ-3.1]:** To evaluate the impact of the source of guidance on MOREPAIR’s code repair capabilities, we expanded our training dataset TUTORLLMCODE with human-generated instructions for each pair of buggy and corrected code, as illustrated in Listing 1. Human-generated guidance provides explicit repair strategies, contrasting with the LLM-generated advice, and serves as a new training dataset for MOREPAIR. We then evaluate their code repair performance employing the EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java benchmarks. Finally, we compare the LLMs fine-tuned with human-generated guidance against those fine-tuned with LLM-generated guidance. This comparison aims to identify which source of guidance (human-generated versus LLM-generated) more effectively enhances the fine-tuning process and results in superior code repair performance.



**TABLE VII:** Impact of different source of guidance in the effectiveness of MOREPAIR on EvalRepair-C++.

Model	Guidance	TOP-5	TOP-10
CodeLlama-13B	Human	52.4 (+11.5)	66.5 (+ 8.0)
	LLM	<b>61.6 (+20.7)</b>	<b>69.5 (+11.0)</b>
CodeLlama-7B	Human	40.9 (- 5.4)	54.9 (- 4.2)
	LLM	<b>56.7 (+10.4)</b>	<b>62.8 (+ 3.7)</b>
StarChat-alpha	Human	48.2 (- 1.8)	59.8 (- 2.4)
	LLM	<b>52.4 (+ 2.4)</b>	<b>65.9 (+ 3.7)</b>
Mistral-7B	Human	35.4 (+ 3.1)	45.7 (- 1.3)
	LLM	<b>40.2 (+ 7.9)</b>	<b>50.0 (+ 3.0)</b>

† Values in parentheses indicate the change relative to the corresponding baseline.

**TABLE VIII:** Impact of different source of guidance in the effectiveness of MOREPAIR on EvalRepair-Java.

Model	Guidance	TOP-5	TOP-10
CodeLlama-13B	Human	63.2 (+ 9.2)	76.1 (+ 6.2)
	LLM	<b>69.3 (+15.3)</b>	<b>77.9 (+ 8.0)</b>
CodeLlama-7B	Human	51.5 (+ 1.8)	62.0 (+ 0.0)
	LLM	<b>59.5 (+ 9.8)</b>	<b>67.5 (+ 5.5)</b>
StarChat-alpha	Human	51.5 (+ 7.9)	63.2 (+ 2.5)
	LLM	<b>56.4 (+12.8)</b>	<b>66.3 (+ 5.6)</b>
Mistral-7B	Human	44.2 (+10.5)	53.4 (+ 1.3)
	LLM	<b>45.4 (+11.7)</b>	<b>58.3 (+ 6.2)</b>

† Values in parentheses indicate the change relative to the corresponding baseline.

**[Experimental Results for RQ-3.1]:** The impact of different sources of guidance on the code repair capabilities of MOREPAIR is quantitatively analyzed in this experiment, and results are presented in Tables VII for EvalRepair-C++, and VIII for EvalRepair-Java. These tables illustrate that LLM-generated guidance significantly surpasses human-generated guidance in enhancing code repair performance. Employing LLM-generated guidance resulted in TOP-10 improvements over their human-generated counterparts of 3.0% to 7.9% for EvalRepair-C++ and 1.2% to 5.5% for EvalRepair-Java. Furthermore, Listing 2 and 1 provide illustrative examples of the guidance produced by LLMs and humans, respectively. These examples demonstrate how LLM-generated guidance tends to be more structured and insightful, which likely contributes to the observed improvements in code repair tasks over human-generated guidance.

A detailed analysis highlights significant variance in the effectiveness of human-generated guidance across different model sizes. For example, by leveraging human-generated guidance, CodeLlama-13B achieves an 8.0% and 6.2% TOP-10 increment compared to the baseline on EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java, respectively. In contrast, CodeLlama with another size 7B exhibits a 4.2% decrease of TOP-10 on EvalRepair-C++. This variation emphasizes the superior text comprehension and reasoning capabilities of larger LLMs, such as Llama2-13B, over smaller models like Llama2-7B[34], underscoring the significance of model size in effectively utilizing human-generated guidance.

**[Experimental Design for RQ-3.2]:** To evaluate the effectiveness of MOREPAIR, we compare it with two advanced fine-tuning approaches for code repair tasks: RepairLLaMA [17] and Fine-tune-CoT [25]. RepairLLaMA fine-tunes LLMs using code representation and fault localization information to repair buggy codes. This approach requires manually annotated perfect fault location information before repairing the buggy code, contrasting with our MOREPAIR, which directly repairs buggy code without additional manual costs. Since Silva *et al.* only released the code and the checkpoint of fine-tuned CodeLlama-7B, and they have not released the training dataset, thus we can only reproduce their results based on CodeLlama-7B. To provide the necessary input information for the inference of RepairLLaMA, we manually annotated the fault localization information of EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java. Fine-tune-CoT is a method that utilizes the chain-of-thought data generated by large language models to fine-tune small models, thereby transferring complex reasoning capabilities from teacher models to student models. We implement the Fine-tune-CoT by concatenating the repaired code with guidance information to serve as the target objective for fine-tuning. We fine-tune all four selected LLMs with Fine-tune-CoT, evaluating their repair performance on EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java, compared to MOREPAIR.

**[Experimental Results for RQ-3.2]:** The results, as detailed in Tables IX and X, clearly demonstrate that MOREPAIR surpasses both Fine-tune-CoT and RepairLLaMA across TOP-5 and TOP-10 metrics on EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java benchmarks. This establishes the robustness of MOREPAIR in enhancing code repair tasks. It is noteworthy that, when evaluating the repair performance of RepairLLaMA, benchmarks comprising manually annotated bug localization information, represent more information than what MOREPAIR received. Despite this, MOREPAIR demonstrates a more substantial improvement in repair performance than RepairLLaMA, which failed to achieve a TOP-10 enhancement in both benchmarks. This indicates that LLM-based program repair can achieve better repair performance without first conducting bug localization and then proceeding to patch generation.

Meanwhile, Fine-tune-CoT demonstrates mixed results. It increased TOP-10 by 9.8% on EvalRepair-C++ for CodeLlama-13B, outperforming the STDFT by 3.0% of TOP-10. However, Fine-tune-CoT gains only a 1.3% improvement in TOP-10 evaluated on EvalRepair-Java and did not enhance TOP-10 over the other baselines, indicating the lack of cross-language generalization. These findings underscore the effectiveness of MOREPAIR in code repair compared to state-of-the-art fine-tuning approaches like RepairLLaMA and Fine-tune-CoT.

**[RQ-3] Findings:** (1) LLM-generated guidance is more effective in enhancing the reasoning capabilities during fine-tuning LLMs than human-generated guidance, highlighting its key role in MOREPAIR. (2) MOREPAIR outperforms Fine-tune-CoT and RepairLLaMA on EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java, even when RepairLLaMA is provided with perfect fault location information. **Insights:** (1) LLM-generated guidance signifies that the previously manual task of annotating datasets with rationale can now be automatically generated by LLMs, leading to liberation from labor constraints. (2) The outperforming results of the end-to-end fine-tuning approach MOREPAIR confirm that LLM-based program repair can perform well without the need to identify fault location before generating patches.

**TABLE IX:** Performance of LLMs fine-tuned with Fine-tune-CoT, RepairLLaMA, and MOREPAIR on EvalRepair-C++.

Model	Approach	TOP-5	TOP-10
CodeLlama-13B	Fine-tune-CoT	56.7 (+15.8)	68.3 (+ 9.8)
	MOREPAIR	<b>61.6 (+20.7)</b>	<b>69.5 (+11.0)</b>
CodeLlama-7B	Fine-tune-CoT	42.7 (- 3.6)	55.5 (- 3.6)
	RepairLLaMA*	52.4 (+ 6.0)	55.5 (- 3.6)
	MOREPAIR	<b>56.7 (+10.4)</b>	<b>62.8 (+ 3.7)</b>
StarChat-alpha	Fine-tune-CoT	37.8 (-12.2)	43.9 (-18.3)
	MOREPAIR	<b>52.4 (+ 2.4)</b>	<b>65.9 (+ 3.9)</b>
Mistral-7B	Fine-tune-CoT	33.5 (+ 1.2)	37.8 (-14.3)
	MOREPAIR	<b>40.2 (+ 7.9)</b>	<b>50.0 (+ 3.0)</b>

\* RepairLLaMA only has the version of CodeLlama-7B.

† Values in parentheses indicate the change relative to the corresponding baseline.

**TABLE X:** Performance of LLMs fine-tuned with Fine-tune-CoT, RepairLLaMA, and MOREPAIR on EvalRepair-Java.

Model	Approach	TOP-5	TOP-10
CodeLlama-13B	Fine-tune-CoT	59.5 (+ 5.5)	71.2 (+ 1.3)
	MOREPAIR	<b>69.3 (+15.3)</b>	<b>77.9 (+ 8.0)</b>
CodeLlama-7B	Fine-tune-CoT	45.4 (- 4.3)	57.7 (- 4.3)
	RepairLLaMA*	52.1 (+ 2.4)	60.1 (- 1.9)
	MOREPAIR	<b>59.5 (+ 9.8)</b>	<b>67.5 (+ 5.5)</b>
StarChat-alpha	Fine-tune-CoT	41.7 (- 1.9)	54.6 (- 6.1)
	MOREPAIR	<b>56.4 (+12.8)</b>	<b>66.3 (+ 5.6)</b>
Mistral-7B	Fine-tune-CoT	36.8 (+ 3.1)	46.0 (- 6.1)
	MOREPAIR	<b>45.4 (+11.7)</b>	<b>58.3 (+ 6.2)</b>

\* RepairLLaMA only has the version of CodeLlama-7B.

† Values in parentheses indicate the change relative to the corresponding baseline.

## VI. THREATS TO VALIDITY

**Threats to Internal Validity.** The choice of base LLMs may impact the experimental conclusions. To minimize potential bias, we have conducted experiments using four LLMs varying different sizes and architectures, including CodeLlama-13B-instruct, CodeLlama-7B-instruct, StarChat-alpha, and Mistral-Instruct-7B. By diversifying the LLMs selection, we aim to ensure that our findings are not limited to a specific LLM type or scale.

**Threats to External Validity.** Insufficient test cases in the evaluation benchmarks may lead to patch over-fitting problems, where LLMs successfully pass the limited test cases without genuinely understanding or correcting the underlying logical errors. To address this issue, we have integrated test cases from EvalPlus [37] to enhance the diversity of the test cases in our benchmark EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java, detailed in Section IV-B. This helps us to assess the LLMs’ repair performance in a more realistic setting and improves the external validity of our conclusions.

**Threats to Construct Validity.** The inherent randomness in generating outputs by LLMs could undermine the validity of experimental conclusions. To address this issue, we utilize LLMs to produce outputs ten times, subsequently calculating the TOP-5 and TOP-10 metrics. By considering multiple rounds of generated outputs, we aim to minimize the impact of randomness on our findings and ensure that the conclusions are based on a more stable and representative set of results.

## VII. RELATED WORK

In recent years, code LLMs [41], [42], [35], [22], [20] have made significant strides in advancing the field of code-related tasks, especially in program repair. Among the various methodologies employed, fine-tuning has become a crucial technique for adapting LLMs to specific domain applications, demonstrating significant improvements in program repair tasks [15], [16], [4], [18], [43], [14]. TFix, proposed by Berabi *et al.* [14], leveraging T5 [19] fine-tuned with GitHub commits to surpass existing learning-based repair approaches for JavaScript programs. Lajkó *et al.* [15] fine-tuned GPT-2 [44] with 16k samples of JavaScript codes, evaluated both the pre-trained (baseline) and the fine-tuned GPT-2 model on a dataset of 18,736 created from GitHub commits, with 16,863 samples used for fine-tuning and 1,559 samples for testing, achieving a 15.5% improvement in TOP-10 accuracy on a JavaScript benchmark. The results showed that while the pre-trained model could generate syntactically and semantically correct source code, fine-tuning increased the number of correctly repaired programs from 27 to 269, significantly boosting its performance. Jiang *et al.* [4] studied the impact of LLMs on automated program repair (APR) and evaluated fine-tuning LLMs on four APR benchmarks, including a new benchmark HumanEval-Java to avoid the data leakage issue. Experiments showed that the best LLMs fixed 72% more bugs in total on the four benchmarks than the best deep learning-based APR technique, and fine-tuning further improved LLMs’ fixing capabilities, enabling them to fix 46% to 164% more bugs than the best deep learning APR technique. Huang *et al.* [16] found that UniXcoder [45], an LLM smaller than CodeT5 [46], could achieve superior repair performance through fine-tuning, challenging the notion that larger models always perform better. RepairLLaMA [17] presented a novel fine-tuning approach to automated program repair by combining specialized code representations with efficient fine-tuning techniques. This approach allowed RepairLLaMA to effectively adapt LLMs for

the program repair task, significantly surpassing CodeLlama-13B [20] baseline on multiple Java benchmarks.

Diverging from prior fine-tuning practices that utilize LLMs for program repair, which predominantly concentrated on enriching the training datasets with standard single-objective fine-tuning approaches [15], [4], [16], [14], our approach MOREPAIR leverage multi-objective learning and LLM-generated guidance during fine-tuning, consistently achieving superior repair performance compared to standard single-objective fine-tuning approach, and state-of-the-art fine-tuning approaches RepairLLaMA and Fine-tune-CoT.

### VIII. CONCLUSION

This paper introduces a novel multi-objective fine-tuning framework MOREPAIR that empowers open-source LLMs to effectively learn repair logic and generate high-quality patches for program repair tasks. Our approach employs a multi-objective learning strategy, simultaneously optimizing for generating repaired code and producing corresponding explanatory guidance during fine-tuning. By employing multi-objective learning and explanatory guidance on four LLMs with different architectures and sizes, MOREPAIR outperforms STDFT and baseline models, achieving up to 11.0% and 8.0% improvements over baseline in TOP-10 on EvalRepair-C++ and EvalRepair-Java benchmarks, respectively. These findings highlight MOREPAIR’s robustness and adaptability across different programming languages and various LLM architectures and sizes. Furthermore, MOREPAIR surpasses existing state-of-the-art fine-tuning methods such as Fine-tune-CoT and RepairLLaMA across four LLMs in both benchmarks. Our ablation study emphasizes the significant impact of multi-objective learning and the distinct advantages of LLM-generated guidance over human-generated guidance in enhancing program repair performance. Our work highlights the significance of employing a multi-objective learning strategy and LLM-generated natural language guidance in advancing code repair tasks, paving the way for more intelligent and efficient automated program repair paradigms in the future.

### REFERENCES

- [1] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat *et al.*, “Gpt-4 technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] C. S. Xia and L. Zhang, “Keep the conversation going: Fixing 162 out of 337 bugs for \$0.42 each using chatgpt,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.00385*, 2023.
- [3] Z. Fan, X. Gao, A. Roychoudhury, and S. H. Tan, “Improving automatically generated code from codex via automated program repair,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10583*, 2022.
- [4] N. Jiang, K. Liu, T. Lutellier, and L. Tan, “Impact of code language models on automated program repair,” in *Proceedings of the 45th International Conference on Software Engineering*, ser. ICSE ’23. IEEE Press, 2023, p. 1430–1442. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00125>
- [5] J. Cao, M. Li, M. Wen, and S.-c. Cheung, “A study on prompt design, advantages and limitations of chatgpt for deep learning program repair,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08191*, 2023.
- [6] T. Phung, J. Cambronero, S. Gulwani, T. Kohn, R. Majumdar, A. Singla, and G. Soares, “Generating high-precision feedback for programming syntax errors using large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04662*, 2023.

- [7] Y. Peng, S. Gao, C. Gao, Y. Huo, and M. Lyu, “Domain knowledge matters: Improving prompts with fix templates for repairing python type errors,” in *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2024, pp. 1–13.
- [8] H. Joshi, J. C. Sanchez, S. Gulwani, V. Le, G. Verbruggen, and I. Radiček, “Repair is nearly generation: Multilingual program repair with llms,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 4, 2023, pp. 5131–5140.
- [9] S. Feng and C. Chen, “Prompting is all you need: Automated android bug replay with large language models,” in *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2024, pp. 1–13.
- [10] Z. Fan, X. Gao, M. Mirchev, A. Roychoudhury, and S. H. Tan, “Automated repair of programs from large language models,” in *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1469–1481.
- [11] J. A. Prenner, H. Babii, and R. Robbes, “Can openai’s codex fix bugs? an evaluation on quixbugs,” in *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Automated Program Repair*, 2022, pp. 69–75.
- [12] M. Fu, C. Tantithamthavorn, T. Le, V. Nguyen, and D. Phung, “Vulrepair: a t5-based automated software vulnerability repair,” in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2022, pp. 935–947.
- [13] Y. Noller, R. Shariffdeen, X. Gao, and A. Roychoudhury, “Trust enhancement issues in program repair,” in *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*, 2022, pp. 2228–2240.
- [14] B. Berabi, J. He, V. Raychev, and M. Vechev, “Tfix: Learning to fix coding errors with a text-to-text transformer,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 780–791.
- [15] M. Lajkó, D. Horváth, V. Csuvik, and L. Vidács, “Fine-tuning gpt-2 to patch programs, is it worth it?” in *International Conference on Computational Science and Its Applications*. Springer, 2022, pp. 79–91.
- [16] K. Huang, X. Meng, J. Zhang, Y. Liu, W. Wang, S. Li, and Y. Zhang, “An empirical study on fine-tuning large language models of code for automated program repair,” in *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1162–1174.
- [17] A. Silva, S. Fang, and M. Monperrus, “Repairllama: Efficient representations and fine-tuned adapters for program repair,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15698*, 2023.
- [18] N. Jiang, T. Lutellier, and L. Tan, “Cure: Code-aware neural machine translation for automatic program repair,” in *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1161–1173.
- [19] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, and P. J. Liu, “Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 21, no. 140, pp. 1–67, 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html>
- [20] B. Roziere, J. Gehring, F. Gloeckle, S. Sootla, I. Gat, X. E. Tan, Y. Adi, J. Liu, T. Remez, J. Rapin *et al.*, “Code llama: Open foundation models for code,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023.
- [21] L. Tunstall, N. Lambert, N. Rajani, E. Beeching, T. Le Scao, L. von Werra, S. Han, P. Schmid, and A. Rush, “Creating a coding assistant with starcoder,” *Hugging Face Blog*, 2023, <https://huggingface.co/blog/starchat>.
- [22] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Mensch, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. de las Casas, F. Bressand, G. Lengyel, G. Lample, L. Saulnier, L. R. Lavaud, M.-A. Lachaux, P. Stock, T. L. Scao, T. Lavril, T. Wang, T. Lacroix, and W. E. Sayed, “Mistral 7b,” 2023.
- [23] M. Chen, J. Tworek, H. Jun, Q. Yuan, H. P. de Oliveira Pinto, J. Kaplan, H. Edwards, Y. Burda, N. Joseph, G. Brockman, A. Ray, R. Puri, G. Krueger, M. Petrov, H. Khlaaf, G. Sastry, P. Mishkin, B. Chan, S. Gray, N. Ryder, M. Pavlov, A. Power, L. Kaiser, M. Bavarian, C. Winter, P. Tillet, F. P. Such, D. Cummings, M. Plappert, F. Chantzis, E. Barnes, A. Herbert-Voss, W. H. Guss, A. Nichol, A. Paino, N. Tezak, J. Tang, I. Babuschkin, S. Balaji, S. Jain, W. Saunders, C. Hesse, A. N. Carr, J. Leike, J. Achiam, V. Misra, E. Morikawa, A. Radford, M. Knight, M. Brundage, M. Murati, K. Mayer, P. Welinder, B. McGrew, D. Amodei, S. McCandlish, I. Sutskever, and W. Zaremba, “Evaluating large language models trained on code,” 2021.

- [24] J. Yang, A. Zhikhartsev, Y. Liu, and L. Tan, “Better test cases for better automated program repair,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 11th joint meeting on foundations of software engineering*, 2017, pp. 831–841.
- [25] N. Ho, L. Schmid, and S.-Y. Yun, “Large language models are reasoning teachers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10071*, 2022.
- [26] Q. Zheng, X. Xia, X. Zou, Y. Dong, S. Wang, Y. Xue, Z. Wang, L. Shen, A. Wang, Y. Li, T. Su, Z. Yang, and J. Tang, “Codegeex: A pre-trained model for code generation with multilingual evaluations on humaneval-x,” 2023.
- [27] Z. Shen, Z. Liu, J. Qin, M. Savvides, and K.-T. Cheng, “Partial is better than all: Revisiting fine-tuning strategy for few-shot learning,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 11, 2021, pp. 9594–9602.
- [28] J. Wei, X. Wang, D. Schuurmans, M. Bosma, F. Xia, E. Chi, Q. V. Le, D. Zhou *et al.*, “Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 24 824–24 837, 2022.
- [29] Y. Zhang and Q. Yang, “An overview of multi-task learning,” *National Science Review*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 30–43, 2018.
- [30] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, “Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [31] T. Dettmers, A. Pagnoni, A. Holtzman, and L. Zettlemoyer, “Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [32] N. Jain, P.-y. Chiang, Y. Wen, J. Kirchenbauer, H.-M. Chu, G. Somepalli, B. R. Bartoldson, B. Kaikhura, A. Schwarzschild, A. Saha *et al.*, “Neptune: Noisy embeddings improve instruction finetuning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05914*, 2023.
- [33] Y. Chen, D. Hazarika, M. Namazifar, Y. Liu, D. Jin, and D. Hakkani-Tur, “Empowering parameter-efficient transfer learning by recognizing the kernel structure in self-attention,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.03720*, 2022.
- [34] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale *et al.*, “Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [35] R. Li, L. B. Allal, Y. Zi, N. Muennighoff, D. Kocetkov, C. Mou, M. Marone, C. Akiki, J. Li, J. Chim *et al.*, “StarCoder: may the source be with you!” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06161*, 2023.
- [36] H. Khlaaf, P. Mishkin, J. Achiam, G. Krueger, and M. Brundage, “A hazard analysis framework for code synthesis large language models,” 2022.
- [37] J. Liu, C. S. Xia, Y. Wang, and L. Zhang, “Is your code generated by chatgpt really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.01210*, 2023.
- [38] P. S. Kochhar, X. Xia, D. Lo, and S. Li, “Practitioners’ expectations on automated fault localization,” in *Proceedings of the 25th international symposium on software testing and analysis*, 2016, pp. 165–176.
- [39] F. Huq, M. Hasan, M. M. A. Haque, S. Mahbub, A. Iqbal, and T. Ahmed, “Review4repair: Code review aided automatic program repairing,” *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 143, p. 106765, 2022.
- [40] C.-P. Wong, P. Santiesteban, C. Kästner, and C. Le Goues, “Varfix: balancing edit expressiveness and search effectiveness in automated program repair,” in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM joint meeting on European software engineering conference and symposium on the foundations of software engineering*, 2021, pp. 354–366.
- [41] E. Nijkamp, B. Pang, H. Hayashi, L. Tu, H. Wang, Y. Zhou, S. Savarese, and C. Xiong, “Codegen: An open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474*, 2022.
- [42] D. Fried, A. Aghajanyan, J. Lin, S. Wang, E. Wallace, F. Shi, R. Zhong, W.-t. Yih, L. Zettlemoyer, and M. Lewis, “InCoder: A generative model for code infilling and synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05999*, 2022.
- [43] M. Jin, S. Shahriar, M. Tufano, X. Shi, S. Lu, N. Sundaresan, and A. Svyatkovskiy, “Inferfix: End-to-end program repair with llms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07263*, 2023.
- [44] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever *et al.*, “Language models are unsupervised multitask learners,” *OpenAI blog*, vol. 1, no. 8, p. 9, 2019.
- [45] D. Guo, S. Lu, N. Duan, Y. Wang, M. Zhou, and J. Yin, “Unixcoder: Unified cross-modal pre-training for code representation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03850*, 2022.
- [46] Y. Wang, W. Wang, S. Joty, and S. C. Hoi, “Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00859*, 2021.