
PLUM: Preference Learning Plus Test Cases Yields Better Code Language Models

Dylan Zhang

University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
shizhuo2@illinois.edu

Shizhe Diao

The Hong Kong University
of Science and Technology
shizhe.diao@gmail.com

Xueyan Zou

University of Wisconsin-Madison

xueyan@cs.wisc.edu

Hao Peng

University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
haopeng@illinois.edu

Abstract

Instruction-finetuned code language models (LMs) have shown promise in various programming tasks. They are trained, using a language modeling objective, on natural language instructions and gold code snippet pairs. Recent evidence suggests that these models, never exposed to incorrect solutions during training, often struggle to distinguish between correct and incorrect solutions. This observation raises our inquiry: Can preference learning, which trains models to prefer correct solutions over incorrect ones, help push the boundaries of code LMs even further? We propose PLUM, a novel preference learning framework augmented with test cases tailored for code LMs. PLUM aims to investigate the key success factors and potential benefits of preference learning in code LMs, which remain elusive despite its success in aligning LMs with human values. PLUM consists of three stages: (1) Generating test cases for natural language instructions, (2) sampling candidate solutions from the policy and evaluating them against the test cases to create a preference dataset, which is then used to (3) train the policy with a preference learning algorithm. Experiments demonstrate that PLUM substantially improves the performance of existing code LMs on established code generation benchmarks such as HumanEval (+) and MBPP (+), even for the state-of-the-art open-source language model CodeQwen-1.5-7B-Chat. PLUM complements the supervised fine-tuning (SFT) stage, demonstrating synergistic effects.

1 Introduction

Language models pre-trained on code corpora [29, 17, 21, 14, 3] have demonstrated strong code generation capabilities. Supervised fine-tuning (SFT) can further unlock their ability to understand natural language requirements and generate code that reflects human intentions [33, 38, 22]. However, SFT has inherent limitations, particularly in addressing semantic nuances, because SFT trains the models to maximize the likelihood of target solutions by mimicking patterns in the training data, *without* any explicit training signal to prioritize functionally correct code over incorrect ones. It fails to provide a mechanism that allows the model to discern correct solutions from incorrect ones; the intricate nature of code correctness is challenging to capture solely through SFT.

To overcome these limitations, we aim to integrate preference learning into the code LMs' training process. Preference learning aims to train models to prefer certain solutions (e.g. those that are factual, helpful, or harmless) over others. Primarily due to the lack of appropriate preference training data, the recipe for preference learning in code generation remains elusive despite its success in alignment with human values and other reasoning problems [14, 34, 31]. We propose a novel preference learning framework augmented with test cases, specifically designed for training code language models (PLUM). PLUM collects natural language instructions from established datasets,

such as OSS-Instruct [33], Evol-Instruct-Code [22] or ShareGPT [7], and constructs multiple high-quality test cases for each instruction. To create the training data for preference learning, for each instruction, PLUM samples multiple solutions from the policy model and evaluates them against the corresponding test cases. Each training instance is then a tuple consisting of the instruction, a chosen solution (passing the test cases in the generated test suite), and a rejected solution (failing at least one). This dataset is used to train the policy with established preference learning algorithms [28, 9, 2].

PLUM comes with several appealing properties. First, it does *not* require access to gold solutions for the instructions. Second, unlike existing preference learning datasets with solutions agnostic to the policy to be trained [4, 34], PLUM uses test cases to collect preferences over solutions sampled from the policy itself. This ensures that the preference data is always in-distribution for the policy, which is an important assumption made by many preference learning algorithms [28, 9, 2]. As we demonstrate in the experiments, this drops the need for the common practice of performing SFT on the same instructions before preference learning [28].

We evaluate PLUM on a diverse set of state-of-the-art code language models under different set-ups, on commonly used evaluation benchmarks: HumanEval(+) and MBPP(+) [6, 1, 20] as well as more challenging code generation dataset [15]. We show that this approach applies in a plug-and-play style to different models, requiring only natural language instructions to boost the code generation capabilities.

2 Background

Syntax and Semantics of a Computer Program Syntax refers to the formal rules governing the structure and format of statements in a programming language. These rules define how code should be written so that it can be parsed and understood by compilers or interpreters. Syntax errors, such as missing semicolons or mismatched parentheses, are typically detected at compile-time and are relatively straightforward to identify and correct.

Semantics, on the other hand, pertains to the meaning and behavior of syntactically correct programs when executed. It focuses on the logical and functional outcomes of the code. Semantic errors are more challenging to identify because they involve the correctness of the logic rather than the structure. These errors occur at runtime and can result in unexpected behavior or incorrect program results.

This distinction highlights that while syntax ensures the structural validity of code, ensuring semantic correctness is more complex and requires information from testing and/or verification.

Challenges in Achieving Semantically Correct Programs via Supervised Fine-Tuning Supervised fine-tuning has shown success in enabling models to comprehend and execute instructions, but it primarily teaches the model what the correct response is without establishing a clear distinction between correct and incorrect responses [39, 36]. Moreover, instruction-tuning data can be noisy, often relying on synthetic data generated by models like GPT-3.5-turbo, which have limitations in programming accuracy. For example, GPT-3.5-turbo achieves around 70% accuracy on basic programming benchmarks and solves only 23% of LeetCode problems across difficulty levels [14]. Models such as CodeLlama use self-generated test cases for data quality control, but issues with execution reasoning capabilities can still lead to noisy data filtering [29, 12, 19].

Preference Learning Preference learning, initially used to improve model responses for user interaction, has shown potential in enhancing reasoning capabilities [23]. Models often produce correct programs with large sampling budgets [18] but may fail to generate semantically valid answers consistently. Preference learning algorithms, such as Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) [28] and Kahneman & Tversky Optimization (KTO) [9], can help close this gap by providing signals about the semantic validity of programs. DPO optimizes the log-likelihood of preferred responses, while KTO optimizes the utility of preferred responses directly, leading to different training outcomes [34]. These algorithms can improve the generation of semantically correct programs by systematically distinguishing valid from invalid ones.




Figure 1: Overview of PLUM. It involves three steps: (1) Generating the test cases; (2) Sampling solutions from the policy and evaluating them against the test cases to collect the preference data for (3) performing preference learning.

3 Preference Learning Augmented with Test Cases for Code LMs(PLUM)

PLUM leverages test cases to produce the preference learning data to improve code language models. It first converts natural language specifications into test cases. They are then used to verify whether the solutions sampled from the policy exhibit desirable behavior in order to collect the preference data for training. PLUM complements the supervised fine-tuning (SFT) stage, and explicitly teaches code language models to prioritize functionally correct solutions over incorrect ones, thereby enhancing their overall performance. An overview of PLUM is provided in Figure 1 and Algorithm 1.

We focus on Python due to its wide use and the availability of well-established training and evaluation resources.

Generating Test Cases The test cases in PLUM are generated with a generator model over natural instructions from established code generation datasets.¹

- **Collecting instructions from established datasets:** We collect natural language instructions from established datasets including OSS-Instruct [33], Evol-Instruct-Code [22], and ShareGPT [7]. These datasets provide a diverse range of programming tasks and instructions. Although they come with gold/silver solutions in the training splits, these solutions are *never* used in PLUM. Instead, they allow us to directly compare PLUM’s performance against SFT, which relies on gold solutions, as we investigate in our experiments. Not requiring gold solutions for training broadens the applicability of PLUM to a wide variety of real-world coding tasks and user requirements.
- **Generating high-quality test cases:** Given a training instruction in natural language, we prompt a generator model to produce a reference solution, a starter code snippet specifying the function signature, and a suite of test cases using the prompt in Figure 3. The generated test cases are critical for ensuring that the solutions meet the functional requirements specified in the instructions. The correctness of the test cases is central to the success of preference learning. We adopt a consistency-based approach inspired by [5] and [29] for quality control. We check for consistency between the generated reference solution and the test cases. Pairs where the test cases do not accurately reflect the solution, or the solution does not pass the test cases, are filtered out. This process helps to minimize potential noise and enhances the quality of the test cases used in the following stages. The generated reference solutions serve only to control the quality of the test cases and are *never* used in training. Similarly, the solutions provided with the instruction data are *never* used in PLUM. On average, each instruction is paired with 3–5 test cases depending on the dataset.

¹We use GPT-4-1106 as the generator model.

Sampling Solutions from the Policy to Create the Preference Data Many preference learning algorithms assume that the preference data is in-distribution for the policy, i.e., the solutions are sampled from the policy model to be trained [28, 9, 2]. In practice, however, preference data often contains solutions sampled from different models than the policy, making the data out-of-distribution [4, 34]. A common workaround is to first perform supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on the same instructions before applying preference learning. [28, 34]. This ensures that the policy has a similar distribution to that from which the preference data is sampled.

Prompt for Test Case Generation

You are a teaching assistant helping to write reference solutions and tests for programming questions. Given a programming question, you need to first analyze the problem, then write a reference solution (code), followed by assertions that test student solutions. The test code must be runnable when concatenated at the end of student solutions to check the correctness.

Programming Question:

{Question}

Follow the format below.

[Analysis]

{{Natural Language Analysis Of The Problem.}}

[Solution]

{{Your Solution To The Problem}}

[Start Code]

{{Start code for students so that they can follow the I/O protocol. E.g. Function signatures, class names etc.}}

[Test Code]

{{Test code that is immediately runnable if concatenated with student code to check the correctness.}}

One of the research questions we aim to answer through PLUM is the standalone effect of preference learning on LMs' coding capability, with or without first performing SFT. To this end, we sample solutions from the policy to be trained and run them against the test cases to create the preference data. For each instruction, we sample K solutions from the policy and evaluate them against the generated test cases. K is set to 20 based on the findings from our preliminary experiments. With static and execution checks,² we identify and filter out solutions that contain syntactic errors and fail to execute, as our focus is on functional correctness. Moreover, as a recent work points out, training with code snippets containing syntax errors may hurt the model's performance [32]. Solutions passing all test cases are used as the chosen solutions, and those failing at least one the rejected solutions. An instruction is filtered out if it has no chosen solution after this process. This aims to ensure that the learned policy does not drift too far from the original one as drastic changes might cause the model to forget previously learned information or to perform poorly on tasks it was previously adept at [28].

Preference Learning with KTO The collected chosen and rejected solutions are potentially imbalanced. This motivates us to apply the Kahneman-Tversky Optimization (KTO) algorithm for preference learning. Unlike many other algorithms [28], KTO does *not* require pairwise preference data; instead, it operates on singleton feedback. Therefore, KTO is less affected by the potential imbalance in our dataset. As we will show in the experiments, KTO achieves better performance than DPO.

²We use mypy for the static check: <https://mypy-lang.org/>.

Algorithm 1 PLUM.

Input: Natural language instructions $\mathcal{I} = \{q_i\}$, policy model to be trained π_θ , generator model G

Output: Trained policy model $\hat{\pi}_\theta$

```
1: Initialize preference datasets  $\mathcal{D}^+$  and  $\mathcal{D}^-$ 
2: for each  $q_i \in \mathcal{I}$  do
3:   Generate  $n$  pairs of reference code and test case  $\{(r_{ij}, t_{ij})\}_{j=1}^n$  using  $G$ 
4:   for each pair  $(r_{ij}, t_{ij})$  do
5:     if  $r_{ij}$  passes  $t_{ij}$  then
6:       Add  $(q_i, t_{ij})$  to  $\mathcal{D}$ 
7:     end if
8:   end for
9:    $\mathcal{S}_{ik} \sim \pi_\theta$  for  $k = 1$  to  $K$  (sample  $K$  solutions for  $q_i$ )
10:  for each solution  $s_{ik} \in \mathcal{S}_{ik}$  do
11:    for each test case  $t_{ij}$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  do
12:      if  $s_{ik}$  passes  $t_{ij}$  then
13:        Add  $(q_i, s_{ik})$  to  $\mathcal{D}^+$ 
14:      else
15:        Add  $(q_i, s_{ik})$  to  $\mathcal{D}^-$ 
16:      end if
17:    end for
18:  end for
19: end for
20: Filter out instances with no correct solutions from  $\mathcal{D}^+$  and  $\mathcal{D}^-$ .
21: Train the policy model  $\pi_\theta$  using  $\mathcal{D}^+$  and  $\mathcal{D}^-$  with KTO and get  $\hat{\pi}_\theta$ .
22: return  $\hat{\pi}_\theta$ 
```

4 Experiments

To demonstrate the effectiveness of PLUM, we evaluate it on established benchmarks: HumanEval [6], MBPP [1], and EvalPlus (a widely-adopted augmented version [20] of them). We also use the more challenging LiveCodeBench [15].




Figure 2: Distribution of policy model correctness ratio on OSS-Instruct dataset.

Preference Data Collection We use GPT-4 [24] to generate test cases for each programming question. For the OSS-Instruct dataset and ShareGPT dataset, we query GPT-4 for 3 responses, and due to the comparatively more complex nature of the natural language instruction, we generate 6 for each of the EvoInstruct instances. We then sample 20 outputs from the policy using temperature $T = 1$ for the former two and 50 outputs for the latter. This yields around $\sim 60,000$ examples for ShareGPT and OSS-Instruct, and around $\sim 120,000$ for EvoInstruct before any filtering. We present the statistics on the pass ratio of sampled solutions over OSS-Instruct in Figure 2. We included the self-consistency pass rate of the test-generation process with GPT-4-1106 in Table 1.

| Dataset | Self-Consistency Pass Rate |
|---------------|----------------------------|
| OSS-Instruct | 63.76 |
| Evol-instruct | 42.38 |
| ShareGPT | 45.69 |

Table 1: Self-Consistency Pass Rate Using GPT-4-1106.

| Model Families | Type | Models | MBPP | MBPP+ | HE | HE+ |
|-----------------------------------|------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MagiCoder-S-CL-7B [33] | SFT | Baseline | 68.4 | 56.6 | 70.7 | 66.5 |
| | | PLUM | 71.4 | 60.8 | 73.8 | 69.5 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | 4.4 | 7.4 | 4.4 | 4.5 |
| MagiCoder-S-DS-6.7B [33] | SFT | Baseline | 75.7 | 64.4 | 76.8 | 70.7 |
| | | PLUM | 80.4 | 69.3 | 80.5 | 73.8 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | 6.2 | 7.6 | 4.8 | 4.4 |
| DeepSeek-Coder-Instruct-6.7B [14] | SFT | Baseline | 74.9 | 65.6 | 75.4 | 71.3 |
| | | PLUM | 76.9 | 67.9 | 81.7 | 76.2 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | 2.7 | 3.5 | 8.4 | 6.9 |
| MagiCoder-DS-6.7B [33] | SFT | Baseline | 75.4 | 61.9 | 66.5 | 60.4 |
| | | PLUM | 79.6 | 66.7 | 71.3 | 65.9 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | 5.6 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 9.1 |
| OpenCodeInterpreter-DS [38] | SFT | Baseline | 73.9 | 63.7 | 77.4 | 72.0 |
| | | PLUM | 78.2 | 66.4 | 80.5 | 76.2 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | 5.8 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 5.8 |
| OpenCodeInterpreter-CL [38] | SFT | Baseline | 66.4 | 55.4 | 72.6 | 65.2 |
| | | PLUM | 66.7 | 55.4 | 73.8 | 67.7 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 3.8 |
| Code-Qwen-7B-Chat [3] | SFT | Baseline | 77.7 | 67.2 | 83.5 | 78.7 |
| | | PLUM | 81.0 | 69.0 | 86.0 | 81.1 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | 4.3 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| Code-Qwen-7B-Base [3] | Base | Baseline | 72.2 | 60.2 | 51.8 | 45.7 |
| | | PLUM | 75.4 | 62.9 | 70.1 | 62.2 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | 4.4 | 4.5 | 35.3 | 36.1 |
| Deepseek-Coder-Base [14] | Base | Baseline | 70.2 | 56.6 | 47.6 | 39.6 |
| | | PLUM | 72.9 | 58.9 | 56.7 | 48.8 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | 3.9 | 4.1 | 19.1 | 23.2 |
| StarCoder2-7B-Base [21] | Base | Baseline | 54.4 | 45.6 | 35.4 | 29.9 |
| | | PLUM | 60.4 | 49.1 | 46.3 | 39.6 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | 11.0 | 7.7 | 30.8 | 32.4 |

Table 2: %Pass@1 of **PLUM-OSS-Instruct** on HumanEval (HE) and MBPP, and their enhanced versions (HE+ and MBPP+). We calculate the relative performance improvement over the baseline in row *Rel. +* for each model. Bold fonts indicate results where PLUM outperforms the baselines.

Models We consider a diverse set of strong open language models: MagiCoder [33], OpenCodeInterpreter [38], CodeQwen [3], DeepSeek Coder [14] and StarCoder2 [17]. MagiCoder and OpenCodeInterpreter contain instruction-tuned checkpoints from DeepSeek Coder and CodeLlama [29] base models. To demonstrate that PLUM is broadly applicable, we consider three different settings:

- First train with SFT followed by PLUM on the same instructions as those used in SFT.
- Train with SFT followed by PLUM on instructions *unseen* during SFT.
- Train directly with PLUM *without* SFT.

| Model Families | Type | Models | MBPP | MBPP+ | HE | HE+ |
|--|------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| PLUM-EvolInstruct | | | | | | |
| WizardCoder-CL-7B | SFT | Baseline | 48.2 | 40.9 | 56.6 | 47.1 |
| | | PLUM | 54.3 | 48.8 | 65.9 | 52.9 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | <i>16.4</i> | <i>12.3</i> | <i>12.7</i> | <i>19.3</i> |
| DeepSeek-Coder-Instruct-6.7B [14] | SFT | Baseline | 74.9 | 65.6 | 75.4 | 71.3 |
| | | PLUM | 77.7 | 67.7 | 81.7 | 76.8 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | <i>3.7</i> | <i>3.2</i> | <i>8.4</i> | <i>7.7</i> |
| PLUM-ShareGPT | | | | | | |
| DeepSeek-Coder-Instruct-6.7B [14] | SFT | Baseline | 74.9 | 65.6 | 75.4 | 71.3 |
| | | PLUM | 79.2 | 67.9 | 77.4 | 73.8 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | <i>5.7</i> | <i>3.5</i> | <i>2.8</i> | <i>3.5</i> |
| OpenCodeInterpreter-DS [38] | SFT | Baseline | 73.9 | 63.7 | 77.4 | 72.0 |
| | | PLUM | 77.7 | 64.4 | 79.9 | 75.6 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | <i>5.14</i> | <i>1.1</i> | <i>3.2</i> | <i>5.0</i> |
| Code-Qwen-7B-Chat [3] | SFT | Baseline | 77.7 | 67.2 | 83.5 | 78.7 |
| | | PLUM | 81.2 | 69.7 | 85.4 | 79.3 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | <i>4.5</i> | <i>3.7</i> | <i>2.3</i> | <i>0.8</i> |
| Code-Qwen-7B-Base [3] | Base | Baseline | 72.2 | 60.2 | 51.8 | 45.7 |
| | | PLUM | 76.4 | 64.9 | 73.2 | 67.1 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | <i>5.8</i> | <i>7.8</i> | <i>41.3</i> | <i>46.8</i> |
| Deepseek-Coder-Base [14] | Base | Baseline | 70.2 | 56.6 | 47.6 | 39.6 |
| | | PLUM | 75.4 | 60.7 | 64.0 | 53.7 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | <i>6.4</i> | <i>7.2</i> | <i>34.5</i> | <i>35.6</i> |
| StarCoder2-7B-Base [21] | Base | Baseline | 54.4 | 45.6 | 35.4 | 29.9 |
| | | PLUM | 63.9 | 51.9 | 50.0 | 42.1 |
| | | <i>Rel. +</i> | <i>17.5</i> | <i>13.8</i> | <i>41.2</i> | <i>40.8</i> |

Table 3: %Pass@1 on HumanEval (HE) and MBPP, and their enhanced versions (HE+ and MBPP+) on other open-source code-generation instruction-tuning data. We demonstrated that PLUM brings improvements when applied to different instruction distributions.

4.1 Results

HumanEval(+) and MBPP(+) The PLUM-OSS-Instruct block of Table 2 presents the results of PLUM when applied to a subset of 1K instances of the OSS-Instruct-75K dataset. MagiCoder models (-DS, -S-CL, and -S-DS) and OpenCodeInterpreter models (-CL and -DS) have already seen these instructions during supervised fine-tuning, while DeepSeekCoder-Instruct has not, as it was released earlier than the dataset. CodeQwen chat model uses proprietary data. PLUM-ShareGPT data for preference learning is generated with the same setting. Similarly, the PLUM-EvolInstruct block corresponds to the results when we apply PLUM to EvolInstruct [22] dataset. Since the instructions are comparatively less clear than the OSS-Instruct dataset, we control the number of initial samples to be the same by generating 50 samples for each problem and use about 400 instances in total.

PLUM consistently improves the performance of a wide range of code language models across all three settings, regardless of the base models’ performance. Remarkably, PLUM can even improve the state-of-the-art 7B model, CodeQwen-7B-Chat, relatively by 3% on average, using either OSS-Instruct or ShareGPT data. These results demonstrate that PLUM is broadly applicable in different datasets and settings.

LiveCodeBench We further evaluate PLUM using strong instruction-tuned models on the more challenging LiveCodeBench dataset. As shown in Table 4, the models demonstrate overall performance improvements over their respective baselines across the board. Despite the increased




Figure 3: Ablations on preference training signals reveal that using un-runnable code as negative instances does not consistently lead to performance improvements. The baseline results refer to the SFT-model without PLUM.

| Model | Item | Easy | Medium | Hard | Overall |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| MagiCoder-S-CL-7B | Baseline | 29.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 11.4 |
| | PLUM | 38.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| | <i>Rel. +</i> | 27.4 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 25.4 |
| MagiCoder-S-DS-6.7B | Baseline | 48.6 | 12.1 | 0.1 | 22.6 |
| | PLUM | 52.1 | 15.5 | 0.1 | 25.0 |
| | <i>Rel. +</i> | 7.2 | 28.1 | 0.1 | 10.6 |
| OpenCodeInterpreter-DS | Baseline | 49.6 | 9.9 | 0.4 | 21.9 |
| | PLUM | 45.8 | 13.7 | 1.2 | 22.3 |
| | <i>Rel. +</i> | -7.7 | 38.4 | 200.0 | 1.8 |
| CodeQwen-7B-Chat | Baseline | 42.7 | 18.8 | 0.9 | 23.2 |
| | PLUM | 43.0 | 23.2 | 3.0 | 25.8 |
| | <i>Rel. +</i> | 0.7 | 20.0 | 230.0 | 11.2 |

Table 4: %Pass@1 on LiveCodeBench.

difficulty and reasoning required, we show that PLUM can enhance the base models’ overall coding performance on interview-level coding problems from LiveCodeBench. PLUM proves particularly beneficial for medium-level interview questions, which are often quite challenging for models, especially those with around 7B parameters. This demonstrates that PLUM does more than simply fitting to commonly tested benchmarks; it enhances the models’ general coding capabilities in more complex and diverse coding scenarios.

4.2 PLUM-KTO vs. DPO and SFT

We also examine the performance with direct preference optimization (DPO) [28]. We use the same settings as KTO, but since DPO requires balanced preference data, we sub-sample to match the numbers of chosen and rejected solutions for each instruction. The results suggest that DPO *underperforms* KTO and could sometimes harm the performance of models that have undergone SFT, as shown in Table 6. This aligns with the findings from prior works [23, 34].

For base models that have not gone through SFT, we demonstrate that PLUM-KTO outperforms applying SFT on pairs constructed using instructions and the correct solutions (Table 5).

| Model | Type | MBPP | MBPP+ | HE | HE+ | Avg. (Base) | Avg. (+) | Avg. (All) |
|---------------|----------|------|-------|------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| SC2-7B-Base | Baseline | 54.4 | 45.6 | 35.4 | 29.9 | 44.9 | 37.8 | 41.3 |
| | SFT | 62.2 | 49.4 | 41.5 | 35.4 | 51.9 | 50.6 | 47.1 |
| | PLUM-KTO | 60.4 | 49.1 | 46.3 | 39.6 | 53.4 | 51.2 | 62.2 |
| CQ-7B-Base | Baseline | 72.2 | 60.2 | 51.8 | 45.7 | 62.0 | 53.0 | 57.5 |
| | SFT | 73.4 | 62.4 | 67.7 | 59.1 | 70.6 | 66.5 | 65.7 |
| | PLUM-KTO | 75.4 | 62.9 | 70.1 | 62.2 | 72.8 | 67.8 | 67.7 |
| DSC-6.7B-Base | Baseline | 70.2 | 56.6 | 47.6 | 39.6 | 58.9 | 57.8 | 53.5 |
| | SFT | 71.7 | 57.1 | 56.1 | 48.8 | 63.9 | 60.5 | 58.4 |
| | PLUM-KTO | 72.9 | 58.9 | 56.7 | 48.8 | 64.8 | 61.9 | 59.3 |

Table 5: PLUM vs. SFT. **Baseline**: pretrained models without SFT or preference learning; **SC2**: StarCoder2; **CQ**: CodeQwen-1.5; **DSC**: DeepSeek-Coder.

| Model | Objective | MBPP | MBPP+ | HE | HE+ | Avg. (Base) | Avg. (+) | Avg. (All) |
|---------------------|-----------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| MagiCoder-DS-6.7B | Baseline | 75.4 | 61.9 | 66.5 | 60.4 | 71.0 | 61.2 | 66.1 |
| | DPO | 75.9 | 63.4 | <u>65.2</u> | 61.0 | <u>70.6</u> | 67.0 | 66.4 |
| | KTO | 79.6 | 66.7 | 71.3 | 65.9 | 75.5 | 71.1 | 75.9 |
| MagiCoder-S-CL-7B | Baseline | 68.4 | 56.6 | 70.7 | 66.5 | 69.6 | 61.6 | 65.6 |
| | DPO | 68.9 | <u>55.9</u> | <u>67.1</u> | <u>59.1</u> | <u>68.0</u> | <u>57.5</u> | <u>62.8</u> |
| | KTO | 71.4 | 60.8 | 73.8 | 69.5 | 72.6 | 65.2 | 68.9 |
| MagiCoder-S-DS-6.7B | Baseline | 75.7 | 64.4 | 76.8 | 70.7 | 76.3 | 70.3 | 71.9 |
| | DPO | 76.2 | 64.7 | 78.7 | 73.8 | 77.5 | 71.1 | 73.4 |
| | KTO | 80.4 | 69.3 | 80.5 | 73.8 | 80.5 | 74.9 | 76.0 |

Table 6: KTO vs. DPO when used with PLUM to train SFT-ed models (**Baseline**). Red underlined numbers indicate performance that are worse than the baseline’s.

4.3 Importance of Test Case-Based Preference Learning

We experiment with including only non-executable samples as rejected solutions, while using the same set of chosen solutions. As shown in Figure 3, we observe that this is worse than PLUM in most cases. More importantly, it does not always improve the model’s performance and may even hurt. This has also been noted in previous studies [32]. Although the positive examples used are the same as our oracle-based preference learning, lower-quality negative examples do not necessarily help the model improve due to the additional noise in the preference signal.

5 Related Works

5.1 Reinforcement Learning and Preference Learning For Reasoning-Related Tasks

Preference learning algorithms like Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) [28] and Kahneman & Tversky’s Optimization [9] have gained their popularity in aligning large language models for their lower cost and better stability in training. Recently, beyond simply controlling nuances of the model when interacting with users, the community has investigated the use of these algorithms in more challenging tasks that involve reasoning. Ocrax-Math [23] adopted iterative preference learning on top of the SFT-ed language model to boost the performance of language models in solving math reasoning tasks. Eurus [34] utilized preference trees to teach models to solve complex problems via multi-step interactions with external feedback.

5.2 Code Generation with Large Language Models

Code generation has become an important real-world application of generative language models. Various code foundation models demonstrated prominent performance on program-related tasks by pre-training language models over code corpus (e.g. StarCoder [17] and StarCoder2 [21], DeepSeek-Coder [14]) or continued pre-training successful foundation models over additional code data like CodeQwen [3] and CodeLlama [29]. To further boost the capability of these models in responding to various kinds of tasks, efforts have been made to perform supervised fine-tuning for these models on pairs of instructions and responses [22, 33, 38].

5.3 Test Case Generation with Language Models

Automated test case generation [25, 11, 26], as an integral ingredient to efficiently ensuring the quality and safety of programs and software, has always been an important topic in the software engineering domain. The rise of LLMs has inspired many works to leverage transformer-based language models in generating tests for various purposes either by training models [30, 18] or prompting them [5].

Test cases can also be an effective way of clarifying user intent. These formalized specifications can improve the alignment of model-generated programs with user requirements [10, 8].

5.4 The synergy between test cases and code generation

Programming-by-examples [13] and test-driven programming [27] have long been topics of interest in the domain of programming languages. The core idea is to leverage the test cases to automatically improve the program to meet the specifications. This idea has been borrowed to improve deep learning approaches to code synthesis [16, 5, 35]. More recent approaches around language models like CodeT [5] and Parsel [35] generate test cases to reduce the search space during inference time. Similarly, ALGO [37] leverages brute-force reference solution as an oracle to produce test outputs given inputs for competitive programming.

Our approach differs from the existing works as we are leveraging the test cases in training, to improve the models' inherent capabilities to program.

6 Conclusion

We introduced PLUM, a novel preference learning framework designed to enhance the performance of code LMs. By integrating test cases into preference learning, PLUM synergizes with SFT and improves different models' performance across a variety of code generation benchmarks. By training models to prefer correct solutions over incorrect ones, PLUM mitigates the pattern-mimicking issues of SFT. This highlights the potential of preference learning in improving code language models, offering a solution for addressing the nuanced requirements of code generation tasks.

Limitations and broader impact PLUM relies on model-generated test cases to obtain preference data for training. When the coding problems are challenging, the quality of both the generated test cases could be low, potentially limiting the efficacy of PLUM.

References

- [1] J. Austin, A. Odena, M. Nye, M. Bosma, H. Michalewski, D. Dohan, E. Jiang, C. Cai, M. Terry, Q. Le, and C. Sutton. Program synthesis with large language models, 2021.
- [2] M. G. Azar, M. Rowland, B. Piot, D. Guo, D. Calandriello, M. Valko, and R. Munos. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences, 2023.
- [3] J. Bai, S. Bai, Y. Chu, Z. Cui, K. Dang, X. Deng, Y. Fan, W. Ge, Y. Han, F. Huang, B. Hui, L. Ji, M. Li, J. Lin, R. Lin, D. Liu, G. Liu, C. Lu, K. Lu, J. Ma, R. Men, X. Ren, X. Ren, C. Tan, S. Tan, J. Tu, P. Wang, S. Wang, W. Wang, S. Wu, B. Xu, J. Xu, A. Yang, H. Yang, J. Yang, S. Yang, Y. Yao, B. Yu, H. Yuan, Z. Yuan, J. Zhang, X. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Z. Zhang, C. Zhou, J. Zhou, X. Zhou, and T. Zhu. Qwen technical report, 2023.

- [4] Y. Bai, A. Jones, K. Ndousse, A. Askell, A. Chen, N. DasSarma, D. Drain, S. Fort, D. Ganguli, T. Henighan, N. Joseph, S. Kadavath, J. Kernion, T. Conerly, S. El-Showk, N. Elhage, Z. Hatfield-Dodds, D. Hernandez, T. Hume, S. Johnston, S. Kravec, L. Lovitt, N. Nanda, C. Olsson, D. Amodei, T. Brown, J. Clark, S. McCandlish, C. Olah, B. Mann, and J. Kaplan. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback, 2022.
- [5] B. Chen, F. Zhang, A. Nguyen, D. Zan, Z. Lin, J. Lou, and W. Chen. Codet: Code generation with generated tests. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023.
- [6] 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.
- [7] D. Cleston. Sharegpt. <https://github.com/domeccleston/sharegpt>, 2023.
- [8] M. Endres, S. Fakhoury, S. Chakraborty, and S. K. Lahiri. Can large language models transform natural language intent into formal method postconditions?, 2024.
- [9] K. Ethayarajh, W. Xu, N. Muennighoff, D. Jurafsky, and D. Kiela. Kto: Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization, 2024.
- [10] S. Fakhoury, A. Naik, G. Sakkas, S. Chakraborty, and S. K. Lahiri. Llm-based test-driven interactive code generation: User study and empirical evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10100*, 2024.
- [11] G. Fraser and A. Arcuri. EvoSuite: automatic test suite generation for object-oriented software. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGSOFT symposium and the 13th European conference on Foundations of software engineering*, pages 416–419, 2011.
- [12] A. Gu, B. Rozière, H. Leather, A. Solar-Lezama, G. Synnaeve, and S. I. Wang. Cruxeval: A benchmark for code reasoning, understanding and execution, 2024.
- [13] S. Gulwani. Programming by examples - and its applications in data wrangling. In *Dependable Software Systems Engineering*, 2016.
- [14] D. Guo, Q. Zhu, D. Yang, Z. Xie, K. Dong, W. Zhang, G. Chen, X. Bi, Y. Wu, Y. K. Li, F. Luo, Y. Xiong, and W. Liang. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming – the rise of code intelligence, 2024.
- [15] N. Jain, K. Han, A. Gu, W.-D. Li, F. Yan, T. Zhang, S. Wang, A. Solar-Lezama, K. Sen, and I. Stoica. Livecodebench: Holistic and contamination free evaluation of large language models for code, 2024.
- [16] S. Kulal, P. Pasupat, K. Chandra, M. Lee, O. Padon, A. Aiken, and P. S. Liang. Spoc: Search-based pseudocode to code. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [17] R. Li, L. B. allal, Y. Zi, N. Muennighoff, D. Kocetkov, C. Mou, M. Marone, C. Akiki, J. LI, J. Chim, Q. Liu, E. Zheltonozhskii, T. Y. Zhuo, T. Wang, O. Dehaene, J. Lamy-Poirier, J. Monteiro, N. Gontier, M.-H. Yee, L. K. Umapathi, J. Zhu, B. Lipkin, M. Oblokulov, Z. Wang, R. Murthy, J. T. Stillerman, S. S. Patel, D. Abulkhanov, M. Zocca, M. Dey, Z. Zhang, U. Bhattacharyya, W. Yu, S. Luccioni, P. Villegas, F. Zhdanov, T. Lee, N. Timor, J. Ding, C. S. Schlesinger, H. Schoelkopf, J. Ebert, T. Dao, M. Mishra, A. Gu, C. J. Anderson, B. Dolan-Gavitt, D. Contractor, S. Reddy, D. Fried, D. Bahdanau, Y. Jernite, C. M. Ferrandis, S. Hughes, T. Wolf, A. Guha, L. V. Werra, and H. de Vries. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. Reproducibility Certification.

- [18] Y. Li, D. Choi, J. Chung, N. Kushman, J. Schrittwieser, R. Leblond, T. Eccles, J. Keeling, F. Gimeno, A. Dal Lago, T. Hubert, P. Choy, C. de Masson d’Autume, I. Babuschkin, X. Chen, P.-S. Huang, J. Welbl, S. Gowal, A. Cherepanov, J. Molloy, D. J. Mankowitz, E. Sutherland Robson, P. Kohli, N. de Freitas, K. Kavukcuoglu, and O. Vinyals. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science*, 378(6624):1092–1097, Dec. 2022.
- [19] C. Liu, S. D. Zhang, A. R. Ibrahimzada, and R. Jabbarvand. Codemind: A framework to challenge large language models for code reasoning, 2024.
- [20] 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, 2023.
- [21] A. Lozhkov, R. Li, L. B. Allal, F. Cassano, J. Lamy-Poirier, N. Tazi, A. Tang, D. Pykhtar, J. Liu, Y. Wei, T. Liu, M. Tian, D. Kocetkov, A. Zucker, Y. Belkada, Z. Wang, Q. Liu, D. Abulkhanov, I. Paul, Z. Li, W.-D. Li, M. Risdal, J. Li, J. Zhu, T. Y. Zhuo, E. Zheltonozhskii, N. O. O. Dade, W. Yu, L. Krauß, N. Jain, Y. Su, X. He, M. Dey, E. Abati, Y. Chai, N. Muennighoff, X. Tang, M. Oblokulov, C. Akiki, M. Marone, C. Mou, M. Mishra, A. Gu, B. Hui, T. Dao, A. Zebaze, O. Dehaene, N. Patry, C. Xu, J. McAuley, H. Hu, T. Scholak, S. Paquet, J. Robinson, C. J. Anderson, N. Chapados, M. Patwary, N. Tajbakhsh, Y. Jernite, C. M. Ferrandis, L. Zhang, S. Hughes, T. Wolf, A. Guha, L. von Werra, and H. de Vries. Starcoder 2 and the stack v2: The next generation, 2024.
- [22] Z. Luo, C. Xu, P. Zhao, Q. Sun, X. Geng, W. Hu, C. Tao, J. Ma, Q. Lin, and D. Jiang. Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct, 2023.
- [23] A. Mitra, H. Khanpour, C. Rosset, and A. Awadallah. Orca-math: Unlocking the potential of slms in grade school math, 2024.
- [24] OpenAI, J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat, R. Avila, I. Babuschkin, S. Balaji, V. Balcom, P. Baltescu, H. Bao, M. Bavarian, J. Belgum, I. Bello, J. Berdine, G. Bernadett-Shapiro, C. Berner, L. Bogdonoff, O. Boiko, M. Boyd, A.-L. Brakman, G. Brockman, T. Brooks, M. Brundage, K. Button, T. Cai, R. Campbell, A. Cann, B. Carey, C. Carlson, R. Carmichael, B. Chan, C. Chang, F. Chantzis, D. Chen, S. Chen, R. Chen, J. Chen, M. Chen, B. Chess, C. Cho, C. Chu, H. W. Chung, D. Cummings, J. Currier, Y. Dai, C. Decareaux, T. Degry, N. Deutsch, D. Deville, A. Dhar, D. Dohan, S. Dowling, S. Dunning, A. Ecoffet, A. Eleti, T. Eloundou, D. Farhi, L. Fedus, N. Felix, S. P. Fishman, J. Forte, I. Fulford, L. Gao, E. Georges, C. Gibson, V. Goel, T. Gogineni, G. Goh, R. Gontijo-Lopes, J. Gordon, M. Grafstein, S. Gray, R. Greene, J. Gross, S. S. Gu, Y. Guo, C. Hallacy, J. Han, J. Harris, Y. He, M. Heaton, J. Heidecke, C. Hesse, A. Hickey, W. Hickey, P. Hoeschele, B. Houghton, K. Hsu, S. Hu, X. Hu, J. Huizinga, S. Jain, S. Jain, J. Jang, A. Jiang, R. Jiang, H. Jin, D. Jin, S. Jomoto, B. Jonn, H. Jun, T. Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, A. Kamali, I. Kanitscheider, N. S. Keskar, T. Khan, L. Kilpatrick, J. W. Kim, C. Kim, Y. Kim, J. H. Kirchner, J. Kiros, M. Knight, D. Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, A. Kondrich, A. Konstantinidis, K. Kosic, G. Krueger, V. Kuo, M. Lampe, I. Lan, T. Lee, J. Leike, J. Leung, D. Levy, C. M. Li, R. Lim, M. Lin, S. Lin, M. Litwin, T. Lopez, R. Lowe, P. Lue, A. Makanju, K. Malfacini, S. Manning, T. Markov, Y. Markovski, B. Martin, K. Mayer, A. Mayne, B. McGrew, S. M. McKinney, C. McLeavey, P. McMillan, J. McNeil, D. Medina, A. Mehta, J. Menick, L. Metz, A. Mishchenko, P. Mishkin, V. Monaco, E. Morikawa, D. Mossing, T. Mu, M. Murati, O. Murk, D. Mély, A. Nair, R. Nakano, R. Nayak, A. Neelakantan, R. Ngo, H. Noh, L. Ouyang, C. O’Keefe, J. Pachocki, A. Paino, J. Palermo, A. Pantuliano, G. Parascandolo, J. Parish, E. Parparita, A. Passos, M. Pavlov, A. Peng, A. Perelman, F. de Avila Belbute Peres, M. Petrov, H. P. de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, M. Pokrass, V. H. Pong, T. Powell, A. Power, B. Power, E. Proehl, R. Puri, A. Radford, J. Rae, A. Ramesh, C. Raymond, F. Real, K. Rimbach, C. Ross, B. Rotsted, H. Roussez, N. Ryder, M. Saltarelli, T. Sanders, S. Santurkar, G. Sastry, H. Schmidt, D. Schnurr, J. Schulman, D. Selsam, K. Sheppard, T. Sherbakov, J. Shieh, S. Shoker, P. Shyam, S. Sidor, E. Sigler, M. Simens, J. Sitkin, K. Slama, I. Sohl, B. Sokolowsky, Y. Song, N. Staudacher, F. P. Such, N. Summers, I. Sutskever, J. Tang, N. Tezak, M. B. Thompson, P. Tillet, A. Tootoonchian, E. Tseng, P. Tuggle, N. Turley, J. Tworek, J. F. C. Uribe, A. Vallone, A. Vijayvergiya, C. Voss, C. Wainwright, J. J. Wang, A. Wang, B. Wang, J. Ward, J. Wei, C. Weinmann, A. Welihinda, P. Welinder, J. Weng, L. Weng, M. Wiethoff, D. Willner, C. Winter, S. Wolrich, H. Wong, L. Workman, S. Wu, J. Wu, M. Wu, K. Xiao, T. Xu, S. Yoo, K. Yu,

- Q. Yuan, W. Zaremba, R. Zellers, C. Zhang, M. Zhang, S. Zhao, T. Zheng, J. Zhuang, W. Zhuk, and B. Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- [25] C. Pacheco, S. K. Lahiri, M. D. Ernst, and T. Ball. Feedback-directed random test generation. In *29th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE'07)*, pages 75–84. IEEE, 2007.
- [26] A. Panichella, F. M. Kifetew, and P. Tonella. Reformulating branch coverage as a many-objective optimization problem. In *2015 IEEE 8th international conference on software testing, verification and validation (ICST)*, pages 1–10. IEEE, 2015.
- [27] D. Perelman, S. Gulwani, D. Grossman, and P. Provost. Test-driven synthesis. In *PLDI '14, June 09-11, 2014, Edinburgh, United Kingdom*, June 2014.
- [28] R. Rafailov, A. Sharma, E. Mitchell, S. Ermon, C. D. Manning, and C. Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model, 2023.
- [29] B. Rozière, J. Gehring, F. Gloeckle, S. Sootla, I. Gat, X. E. Tan, Y. Adi, J. Liu, R. Sauvestre, T. Remez, J. Rapin, A. Kozhevnikov, I. Evtimov, J. Bitton, M. Bhatt, C. C. Ferrer, A. Grattafiori, W. Xiong, A. Défossez, J. Copet, F. Azhar, H. Touvron, L. Martin, N. Usunier, T. Scialom, and G. Synnaeve. Code llama: Open foundation models for code, 2024.
- [30] M. Tufano, D. Drain, A. Svyatkovskiy, S. K. Deng, and N. Sundaresan. Unit test case generation with transformers and focal context, 2021.
- [31] P. Wang, L. Li, Z. Shao, R. X. Xu, D. Dai, Y. Li, D. Chen, Y. Wu, and Z. Sui. Math-shepherd: Verify and reinforce llms step-by-step without human annotations, 2024.
- [32] X. Wang, H. Peng, R. Jabbarvand, and H. Ji. Leti: Learning to generate from textual interactions, 2024.
- [33] Y. Wei, Z. Wang, J. Liu, Y. Ding, and L. Zhang. Magicoder: Source code is all you need, 2023.
- [34] L. Yuan, G. Cui, H. Wang, N. Ding, X. Wang, J. Deng, B. Shan, H. Chen, R. Xie, Y. Lin, Z. Liu, B. Zhou, H. Peng, Z. Liu, and M. Sun. Advancing llm reasoning generalists with preference trees, 2024.
- [35] E. Zelikman, Q. Huang, G. Poesia, N. D. Goodman, and N. Haber. Parsel: Algorithmic reasoning with language models by composing decompositions, 2023.
- [36] H. Zhang, S. Diao, Y. Lin, Y. R. Fung, Q. Lian, X. Wang, Y. Chen, H. Ji, and T. Zhang. R-tuning: Teaching large language models to refuse unknown questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09677*, 2023.
- [37] K. Zhang, D. Wang, J. Xia, W. Y. Wang, and L. Li. Algo: Synthesizing algorithmic programs with llm-generated oracle verifiers, 2023.
- [38] T. Zheng, G. Zhang, T. Shen, X. Liu, B. Y. Lin, J. Fu, W. Chen, and X. Yue. Opencodeinterpreter: Integrating code generation with execution and refinement, 2024.
- [39] C. Zhou, P. Liu, P. Xu, S. Iyer, J. Sun, Y. Mao, X. Ma, A. Efrat, P. Yu, L. Yu, et al. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.