

Unlock the Correlation between Supervised Fine-Tuning and Reinforcement Learning in Training Code Large Language Models

Jie Chen

Seed Foundation, ByteDance
chenjie@seedai.com

Xintian Han

Seed Foundation, ByteDance
hanxintian@bytedance.com

Yu Ma

Seed Foundation, ByteDance
mayu.1231@bytedance.com

Xun Zhou

Seed Foundation, ByteDance
zhouxun@bytedance.com

Liang Xiang

Seed Foundation, ByteDance
xiangliang@bytedance.com

Abstract

Automatic code generation has been a long-standing research topic. With the advancement of general-purpose large language models (LLMs), the ability to code stands out as one important measure to the model’s reasoning performance. Usually, a two-stage training paradigm is implemented to obtain a Code LLM, namely the pretraining and the fine-tuning. Within the fine-tuning, supervised fine-tuning (SFT), and reinforcement learning (RL) are often used to improve the model’s zero-shot ability. A large number of work has been conducted to improve the model’s performance on code-related benchmarks with either modifications to the algorithm or refinement of the dataset. However, we still lack a deep insight into the correlation between SFT and RL. For instance, what kind of dataset should be used to ensure generalization, or what if we abandon the SFT phase in fine-tuning. In this work, we make an attempt to understand the correlation between SFT and RL. To facilitate our research, we manually craft 100 basis python functions, called atomic functions, and then a synthesizing pipeline is deployed to create a large number of synthetic functions on top of the atomic ones. In this manner, we try to avoid issues like data contamination. Through comprehensive ablation study, we find: (1) Both atomic and synthetic functions are indispensable for SFT’s generalization, and only a handful of synthetic functions are adequate; (2) Through RL, the SFT’s generalization to target domain can be greatly enhanced, even with the same training prompts; (3) Training RL from scratch can alleviate the over-fitting issue introduced in the SFT phase.

1 Introduction

Code generation or program synthesis based on natural language descriptions is a longstanding challenge (Summers, 1977; Liang et al., 2010; Yin and Neubig, 2017), which is greatly powered by

the recent development of Large Language Models (LLMs). Following rather early works such as Codex (Chen et al., 2021), which is fine-tuned from the GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) model family with publicly available code data from GitHub, a series of powerful Code LLMs have emerged in both open-source and proprietary domains (Achiam et al., 2023; Team et al., 2023; Lozhkov et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2024; Roziere et al., 2023; Pinnaparaju et al., 2024). By deliberately designing data collection pipelines and training LLMs with vast code-related corpus, Code LLMs have shown superior performance in code generation tasks (Guo et al., 2024; Lozhkov et al., 2024; Roziere et al., 2023). However, as pointed in Ouyang et al. (2022), making language models bigger does not inherently make them better at following a user’s intent, which raises the importance of instruction-tuning or alignment (Askeff et al., 2021; Bai et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2024). This has been repeatedly indicated by the performance gap between the base version and instruction-following version of various model series (Guo et al., 2024; Roziere et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023).

Mostly, we can consider instruction-tuning through two approaches, supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and reinforcement learning (RL). For instance, both DeepSeekCoder and Code Llama utilized SFT to enhance their models’ instruction-following and safety properties following their corresponding pretrained version. SFT relies on appropriate prompt-response pairs to make models follow user’s intent and generate helpful, trustworthy and harmless responses, it is direct to implement but with easy tendencies to overfit. Therefore, RL is usually introduced after SFT and benefits more from exploration and being able to interacting with the environment dynamically with diverse preferential reward signals. In the context of code generation, one of the most significant reward signals that should be taken into account is the feedback

from unit tests of the generated program. For example, [Le et al. \(2022\)](#) used an offline actor-critic RL approach with unit test signals to further optimize a fine-tuned CodeT5 model ([Wang et al., 2021](#)). [Liu et al. \(2023a\)](#) proposes an online RL framework to exploit the real-time unit test feedback and further categorizes the feedback signals into more fine-grained levels and provides varying rewards based on the ratio of passed test cases. Although both SFT and RL approaches have shown their effectiveness in alignment, there is still lack of thorough discussions on the correlation between SFT and RL in training Code LLMs, in either data or model aspect.

In this paper, by constructing a rather simple but effectively designed dataset for both SFT and RL, we provide new insights into how SFT and RL are correlated. More specifically, we manually designed a set of atomic functions, which is further used to generate composite datasets for SFT and RL training. Experimenting with these synthesized data, we can avoid issues like data contamination and focus on the ablation study. More importantly, composing the synthetic data from a controlled set of atomic functions in an organized order gives us a clear sight of analyzing how SFT and RL trained with different datasets affect the model’s final generalization capability. In this paper, we would not only show the effects of different combined and augmented datasets on each stage separately, but would also show how SFT trained on different datasets would affect the following RL performance. In addition to testing on our synthesized datasets, we also evaluate our fine-tuned models on benchmarks like HumanEval ([Chen et al., 2021](#)) and MBPP ([Austin et al., 2021](#)).

To summarize, the main contributions of this paper can be described as follows: (1) We propose an efficient method to synthesize python-function-like dataset, which is able to generate a large number of complex while legal python functions at a very low cost and has the potential to be extended to production environment; (2) With the manually crafted atomic functions and the synthetic ones, we discover that both datasets are indispensable for improving SFT’s generalization ability to the target domain; (3) Specifically, we find just a handful of synthetic functions are adequate in guaranteeing the SFT’s generalization performance. This indicates that a remarkable reduction to the cost of curating SFT dataset might be achieved, as in real-world scenarios, collecting or annotating syn-

thetic functions often requires much more effort compared to their atomic counterparts; (4) Using the same training prompts for both SFT and RL, we show that the RL phase can still improve the model’s generalization ability to the target domain by a large margin when initialized from the SFT’s checkpoint. (5) We find the SFT model can easily overfit to the target domain; (6) When we run the RL process from scratch, a significant performance drop in the target domain can be observed, but the overfitting issue is well alleviated.

2 Related Work

2.1 Code LLMs

Following the rapid development of general large language models ([Achiam et al., 2023](#); [Team et al., 2023](#); [Touvron et al., 2023](#); [Jiang et al., 2023](#)), Code LLMs ([Lozhkov et al., 2024](#); [Guo et al., 2024](#); [Roziere et al., 2023](#)) have emerged as well targeting specifically code-related tasks such as code generation, code understanding, code-related QA, etc. While code generation following natural language instructions is a primary focus up to this stage, Code LLMs have exhibited the potential to enhance all phases of the software development cycle ([Lozhkov et al., 2024](#); [Hou et al., 2024](#)). Most of the Code LLMs such as AlphaCoder ([Li et al., 2022](#)), StarCoder ([Lozhkov et al., 2024](#)), DeepSeekCoder ([Guo et al., 2024](#)) are trained on code-corpus, while CodeLlama ([Roziere et al., 2023](#)) finds that initializing the model from LLaMA2 ([Touvron et al., 2023](#)) which is a foundation model pretrained on general-purpose text and code data outperforms the architecture trained on code only for a given budget. Although the intended goal of Code LLMs are far more comprehensive ([Fan et al., 2023](#); [Wang et al., 2024](#)), at this stage, the most common way to evaluate the performance of Code LLMs is through several standard code-generation benchmarks ([Chen et al., 2021](#); [Austin et al., 2021](#); [Lai et al., 2023](#); [Jain et al., 2024](#)) and evaluating the passed rates via pre-defined unit tests.

2.2 Supervised Fine-Tuning for Code LLMs

Supervised fine-tuning in the early stages was primarily used to enhance the cross-task generalization capabilities of language models by incorporating diverse NLP task instructions ([Xu et al., 2023](#); [Raffel et al., 2020](#); [Chen et al., 2020](#); [Sanh et al., 2021](#)). While fine-tuning LMs with these close-




Figure 1: Distribution of programming topics among the manually crafted atomic python functions.

domain NLP tasks has shown consistent performance improvements, in the era of LLMs, it often falls short for real user’s varying intents. Therefore, various efforts have been made lately to fine-tune both general-purpose LLMs and Code LLMs by searching for the best ways of constructing open-domain instruction data (Wei et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023b). Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023) utilized directly gathered user-shared conversations to fine-tune Llama. Wizard (Xu et al., 2023; Luo et al., 2023) instead introduced the Evol-Instruct method, which evolved existing instruction data to generate more complex and diverse datasets. CodeLlama primarily generated and selected their instruction fine-tuning data in a self-instruct way via prompting LLaMA2 for interview-style programming questions and then generating Python solutions and unit tests by prompting CodeLlama 7B base model (Roziere et al., 2023).

2.3 Reinforcement Learning for Code LLMs

Reinforcement learning essentially learns the optimal policy by obtaining reward signals from the real environment (Sutton et al., 1999). Its role in fine-tuning LLMs is becoming more significant since Ouyang et al. (2022) demonstrates its promising effects on aligning the model with human intent by exploiting human feedback. With regard to Code LLMs, there has also been emerging research on utilizing RL to further enhance model performance. As mentioned above, one of the common ways to construct reward signals is to utilize unit test signals (Shojaee et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023a). In PPOCoder (Shojaee et al., 2023), it obtains the reward signal at the end of each generation

Atomic Function
<p>---prompt---</p> <p>把一个字符串按单词反转，比如abc def ghi->ghi def abc，得到一个字符串</p> <p>---response---</p> <pre>def reverse_word(s: str) -> str: s_reversed = s[::-1] s_word = '' s_word_reversed_ooo = '' for i in range(len(s_reversed)): if s_reversed[i] == ' ': if len(s_word) > 0: s_word_reversed_ooo += s_word[::-1] s_word = '' s_word_reversed_ooo += ' ' else: s_word += s_reversed[i] if len(s_word) > 0: s_word_reversed_ooo += s_word[::-1] return s_word_reversed_ooo</pre>

Figure 2: An example of atomic functions. We first craft the prompt and then write the response. Please note that the prompts are written in Chinese.

episode based on the generated code’s syntactic and functional correctness as well as its structural alignment with executable codes. And RLTF (Liu et al., 2023a) takes a small step further by adding additional fine-grained feedback signals that points out specific reasons for errors. Meanwhile, it also takes into account the number of passed test examples by introducing an "adaptive feedback" score. To address the exploration challenge in RL, StepCoder (Dou et al., 2024) proposed breaking the long sequences code generation task into a curriculum of code completion subtasks to alleviate the complexities associated with exploration in RL. In this work, we utilizes the reward signal from executing the generated response against unit tests as well.

3 Methods

Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) and Reinforcement Learning (RL) are usually performed after the pre-training stage. The motivation of SFT is considered to improve the model’s zero-shot generalization capability (Wei et al., 2021), while RL is often implemented to optimize the model’s performance over certain objectives, e.g., the preference reward model. Usually, the RL process initializes from an SFT checkpoint and continues training on its own dataset. We can often observe that different datasets and SFT checkpoints pose a significant change to the performance of the RL process. However, we

still lack a solid understanding about the correlation between SFT and RL. For instance, can we use the same prompts for both SFT and RL? What will happen if we train the RL without initializing from an SFT checkpoint?

In order to obtain a deep insight into the correlation between SFT and RL, we manually design a set of python atomic functions, then we propose an effective and efficient data synthesizing method which randomly draws a few functions from the atomic set and organizes the functions in reasonable orders to formulate a large amount of much more complicated but legal python functions. Experimenting with the synthesized data, we can avoid issues like data contamination and focus on the ablation study. We also implement the SFT and RL algorithms, where in the RL phase we use Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017) to optimize the model. A code sandbox environment is devised to run the generated code snippet. The sandbox returns 1 if the code passes all the unit tests otherwise 0. Finally, we carefully design a number of ablation experiments to investigate the correlation between SFT and RL.

3.1 Atomic Python Functions

Ten programming topics have been designed, as displayed in fig. 1. Based on these topics, we hand-write 100 coding questions and invite a few experts to create responses for these questions using Python. We name these functions, the atomic python functions, since they form the basis of our data synthesizing process. Each atomic function has a prompt, namely the handwritten question, and a standard answer to the prompt and can be attributed to one of the ten programming topics, e.g., string operation or math.

One example of the atomic functions is shown in fig. 2. We include the types of both input and output in the definition of the functions. In this work, to simplify the problem, we limit the input to four different types only: Int, String, List[Int], and List[String].

3.2 Data Synthesizing

We create the synthetic functions by concatenating a few atomic functions sequentially. One atomic function’s output becomes another one’s input. Therefore, the input type of the proceeding function has to be the same as the output type of the current one. The generation process is as follows: (1) Sampling the first one atomic func-

Input Type	Sampling Criteria
Int	Randomly sample an integer from 0 to 999.
String	Randomly sample a string from numbers, letters, spaces and a mixture of them.
List[Int]	Randomly sample the length of the list from 16 to 64, then sample for each integer in the list from 0 to 999.
List[String]	Randomly sample the length of the list from 16 to 64, then sample for each item in the list from numbers, letters, spaces and a mixture of them.

Table 1: Sampling criteria in mocking inputs for the synthetic functions.

tion randomly; (2) Randomly selecting one from those atomic functions whose input type matches the previous function’s output type; (3) Repeatedly running step 2 until the total number of functions reaches the desired count (in this work, the desired count is set to be 2, 3, or 4).

With the sampled atomic functions, we need to reconstruct their prompts and responses to build the synthetic function. For the prompts, we simply change some wording according to Chinese grammar. As for responses, we make sure the proceeding function’s input variable’s name matches the current function’s output. One example of the synthetic functions can be found in fig. 12.

Check Validity of synthetic functions. Now we already have a pool of synthetic functions. However, not all the synthetic functions can be executed successfully, besides some of them may be too easy or even meaningless. Therefore, we further filter the synthetic functions by mocking the inputs and executing the code. And then we create some principles to filter out easy or meaningless functions that may be harmful for training. The mocked inputs are sampled following table 1.

For each synthetic function, we mock ten different sets of inputs according to its pre-defined input type, and then we execute the atomic functions contained in it in order. According to the execution feedback, we filter out functions which: (1) has runtime error; (2) has any atomic function outputting **None**. A None output usually means that the execution of the function is meaningless;




Figure 3: Workflow of the data synthesizing process. In step 1, we manually craft 100 atomic python functions covering a few programming topics, such as math and sorting algorithms. In the second step, we run the data synthesizing pipeline and obtain a large number of synthetic functions. Finally, all the synthetic functions will be checked via the code sandbox for validity.

(3) has an atomic function whose input and output are the same, indicating that the function does not do anything useful; (4) has same final outputs for the ten different sets of inputs, which means the function may be too easy. We depict the data synthesizing process in fig. 3. For those valid synthetic functions, we keep the mocked inputs and their corresponding outputs, and use the `assert` formula to construct unit test cases.

3.3 Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT)

Given the manually crafted atomic python functions and the data synthesizing method, we create four different datasets, namely `Atom_base`, `Composite_A`, `Composite_B`, and `Composite_C`. `Atom_base` includes all the atomic python functions. In order to generate the other three composite datasets, we firstly divide all the atomic python functions into three distinct sets, namely `set_A`, `set_B`, `set_C`, then we run the data synthesizing method on each set separately to obtain the corresponding composite dataset. In this manner, we can avoid issues like data contamination. We also perform deduplication to the composite datasets, such as exact string matching and Min-Hash (Shrivastava and Li, 2014). Finally, we get 5000 `<prompt, response>` pairs for both `Composite_A` and `Composite_B`, and 1000 for `Composite_C`, where `Atom_base` and `Composite_A` are used by our SFT process and `Composite_C` serves as the test dataset for both SFT and RL.

3.4 Code Sandbox Environment

For safety and efficiency reason, we design a code sandbox environment to run the code snippets generated by the model (Chen et al., 2021). As described in the data synthesizing method, given a prompt, apart from the code we also generate the unit test cases. The code sandbox is used in both training and evaluation stages, and only if one generated code passes all the unit tests will the sandbox determine it as correct. As only code can be executed, we extract the code block contained in the model’s response and send it to the sandbox.

3.5 Reinforcement Learning (RL)

Reinforcement learning (RL) has been proven to be effective in further improving the coding capability of LLMs after SFT. In this work, we implement the PPO algorithm which is widely used in the alignment stage. The learning objective of PPO is:

$$\max_{\theta} E [L^{\text{CLIP}}(\theta)] \quad (1)$$

where θ denotes parameters of the LLM, and $L^{\text{CLIP}}(\theta)$ is the Clipped Surrogate Objective,

$$L^{\text{CLIP}}(\theta) = E_t \left[\min \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta}(a_t|s_t)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(a_t|s_t)} \cdot A_t, \text{clip} \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta}(a_t|s_t)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(a_t|s_t)}, 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon \right) \cdot A_t \right) \right] \quad (2)$$

where $\frac{\pi_{\theta}(a_t|s_t)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(a_t|s_t)}$ is the ratio between current and last models, A_t is the advantage, and ϵ is the clip




Figure 4: SFT with different mixtures of Composite_A and Atom_base. Where ‘Composite_A(0%), Atom_base(100%)’ means only the Atom_base dataset is used for tuning, ‘Composite_A(100%), Atom_base(0%)’ indicates we tune the model with only Composite_A. While in ‘Composite_A(0.1%), Atom_base(600%)’, ‘Composite_A(10%), Atom_base(600%)’, and ‘Composite_A(1%), Atom_base(600%)’, we randomly down-sample Composite_A to 0.1% (5), 10% (500), 1% (50), respectively, and up-sample Atom_base to 600% (600).




Figure 5: SFT with a mixture of Composite_A and Atom_modify. Where ‘Composite_A(0%), Atom_base(100%)’ means only the Atom_base dataset is used for tuning, ‘Composite_A(100%), Atom_base(0%)’ indicates we tune the model with only Composite_A. In ‘Composite_A(1%), Atom_modify(600%)’, we randomly down-sample Composite_A to 1% (50) and up-sample Atom_modify to 600% (600), while in ‘Composite_A(1%), Atom_base(600%)’, we randomly down-sample Composite_A to 1% (50) and up-sample Atom_base to 600% (600).

range. The reward of PPO includes the score returned by the code sandbox r and a KL penalty term to ensure the RL policy does not deviate too much from its initialization checkpoint,

$$R = r - \beta \text{D}_{\text{KL}}[\pi_{\theta}(a_t|s_t)||\pi^{\text{Init}}(a_t|s_t)] \quad (3)$$

where β is a coefficient controlling the strength of the KL penalty, and $\pi^{\text{Init}}(a_t|s_t)$ is the initialization model. In order to stabilize training, we apply whitening to both the reward and the advantage estimation (Schulman et al., 2015).

4 Experimental Results

In this section, based on our designed atomic python functions, Atom_base, and the composite functions, Composite_A, Composite_B, and Composite_C, we make a comprehensive study on both SFT and RL. As Composite_C is totally isolated from Composite_A and Composite_B, we use it as a fair out-of-distribution test dataset in the following experiments. We use a GPT2-like model (Radford et al., 2019) with 1.5B parameters to perform the SFT and RL processes, where the hidden size is 2048, the number of attention heads is 16, and the number of hidden layers is 24.

4.1 Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT)

4.1.1 Composite_A and Atom_base

As we have 5000 <prompt, response> pairs in Composite_A, but only 100 pairs are available in Atom_base, in order to fairly compare the impact of Composite_A and Atom_base in the SFT phase, we conduct a few experiments by down-sampling Composite_A or up-sampling Atom_base.

In fig. 4, we can see that the model fine-tuned on Atom_base or Composite_A only performs poorly on Composite_C. By down-sampling Composite_A and up-sampling Atom_base, we find ‘Composite_A(1%), Atom_base(600%)’ performs the best, where only 50 <prompt, response> pairs are randomly drawn from Composite_A, and achieves a 54.7% zero-shot pass@1 on Composite_C. As Composite_A is constructed from a subset of Atom_base with similar rules as Composite_C, we attribute the contribution of Composite_A to teaching the model how to use Atom_base to solve a given synthetic problem, while Atom_base endows the model with coding abilities at an atomic level. Given the experimental results, we can draw the conclusion: just a handful of composite data is good enough for the model to master the problem-solving skills in a specific domain, while enough




Figure 6: SFT with different mixtures of Composite_A and Atom_translate. Where 'Composite_A(0%), Atom_base(100%)' means only the Atom_base dataset is used for tuning, 'Composite_A(100%), Atom_base(0%)' indicates we tune the model with only Composite_A. While in 'Composite_A(0.1%), Atom_translate(600%)', 'Composite_A(10%), Atom_translate(600%)', and 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_translate(600%)', we randomly down-sample Composite_A to 0.1% (5), 10% (500), 1% (50), respectively, and up-sample Atom_translate to 600% (600).

atomic data is necessary.

4.1.2 Composite_A and Atom_modify

As shown in fig. 4, enough atomic data is necessary for the model's generalization capability, we wonder what if we modify the code snippets and instructions a little bit in Atom_base. We get a new atomic dataset, Atom_modify, and a few examples are provided in fig. 13.

In fig. 5, we can see that 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_modify(600%)' outperforms using Composite_A or Atom_base only, and achieves a 9.7% zero-shot pass@1 on Composite_C, but lags significantly behind 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_base(600%)'. It seems that even minor changes to the atomic data can lead to a large performance drop in generalization.

4.1.3 Composite_A and Atom_translate

In fig. 5, we find Atom_modify under-performs Atom_base significantly, we suspect it may be due to we rewrite both the prompts and responses in Atom_base simultaneously. Therefore, in this section, we propose to modify only the prompts. In order to minimize the impact of our modification operation, we just translate the original Chinese prompts in Atom_base into English, and get a new




Figure 7: SFT with translated instructions. Where 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_translate(600%)' indicates we randomly down-sample Composite_A to 1% (50) and up-sample Atom_translate to 600% (500). In 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_translate(600%), en2cn', <prompt_English, prompt_Chinese> pairs are added, in 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_translate(600%), cn2en', <prompt_Chinese, prompt_English> pairs are added. While in 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_translate(600%), cn2en, en2cn', both <prompt_Chinese, prompt_English> and <prompt_English, prompt_Chinese> pairs are added to the instruction tuning dataset.

atomic dataset, Atom_translate. Examples can be found in fig. 14.

In fig. 6, by mixing Composite_A and Atom_translate, the fine-tuned model outperforms using Composite_A or Atom_base only, and achieves a 12.6% zero-shot pass@1 on Composite_C. We note that the performance of 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_translate(600%)' is on par with that of 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_modify(600%)', which means even if we just translate the instructions, the model's generalization capability degrades significantly. We propose maybe the base model lacks the ability of English to Chinese understanding, therefore, we construct a new dataset containing <prompt_Chinese, prompt_English> and <prompt_English, prompt_Chinese> pairs, where prompt_Chinese is the original instruction in Atom_base, and prompt_English denotes the translated version.

As shown in fig. 7, the translated instructions do help the tuned model to generalize. However, when only the <prompt_English, prompt_Chinese> pairs are provided, the model failed to improve compared to 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_translate(600%)'. When both <prompt_Chinese, prompt_English> and <prompt_English, prompt_Chinese> pairs are




Figure 8: Continue to train the SFT model with RL on Composite_A and Atom_base. In training, we set the temperature to 0.2 and top-p to 0.7, while we use greedy decoding strategy for the testing.




Figure 9: Continue to train the SFT model with RL on Composite_B and Atom_base. In training, we set the temperature to 0.2 and top-p to 0.7, while we use greedy decoding strategy for the testing.

available, the model benefits most from the instruction tuning phase by achieving a 23.5% zero-shot pass@1 on Composite_C, suggesting the importance of bi-directional language understanding.

4.1.4 Summary

Based on the experimental results of our SFT process, we can draw the following assumptions: (1) Both composite/synthetic and atomic data contribute to the generalization capability of tuned models; (2) A small number of composite data is adequate for the model to master problem solving skills; (3) Modification to the atomic data hurts the model's performance compared to using the original atomic data, while the model performs better with the modified atomic data than without it; (4) Bi-directional translation corpus is helpful in our setting.

4.2 Reinforcement Learning

Through SFT on Composite_A and Atom_base, the model do generalize well to Composite_C and achieves a 54.7% zero-shot pass@1. We wonder whether RL can further improve the model's generalization capability. Different from the data format used in the instruction tuning phase, namely <prompt, response>, we replace the response item with a set of unit tests, and the resulted data format is <prompt, unit_tests>. A code sandbox en-

vironment is integrated into the training system to execute the model's generated code snippet, if the code passes all the unit test cases, the reward is 1.0 otherwise 0.0.

As we use PPO to train our model, apart from the model itself, a reference policy model and a value model are added to the system. For the reference model, we initialize it from the instruction tuned checkpoint and keep its parameters frozen during training. For the value model, we choose to use a much smaller model than the policy model, where the hidden size is 1024, the number of attention heads is 16, and the number of hidden layers is 6. Please note that the value model is trained from scratch. Since we use a sandbox to calculate the reward, we avoid using a reward model and the so-called over-optimization issue.

4.2.1 RL on Composite_A and Atom_base

As shown in fig. 4, after training on 'Composite_A(1%), Atom_base(600%)', the model achieves a 54.7% zero-shot pass@1 on Composite_C. We wonder what if we initialize from the tuned model, and continue to train the model on Composite_A and Atom_base with reinforcement learning. Firstly, we continue to train the instruction tuned model on Composite_A only, we can see that (fig. 8) on the training dataset, namely




Figure 10: Train an untuned model with RL on Composite_B and Atom_base. In training, we set the temperature to 0.2 and top-p to 0.7, while we use greedy decoding strategy for the testing.




Figure 11: Comparisons between RL using different initialization models on Composite_C (left), HumanEval-Python (middle), and MBPP (right). The training dataset is Composite_B and Atom_base, and we use greedy decoding strategy for the evaluation.

Composite_A, the model achieves a 95% zero-shot pass@1, while on the test dataset, namely Composite_C, the model achieves a 72.5% zero-shot pass@1, meaning a 17.8% increase on top of the SFT phase. Then, we perform RL with both Composite_A and Atom_base, as shown in fig. 8, training on Composite_A and Atom_base achieves similar performance on the training dataset, however, it arrives at a higher pass rate on the test dataset, around 74%.

4.2.2 RL on Composite_B and Atom_base

Composite_A has been learned by the model in the SFT phase, so what if we train the reinforcement learning model with the unused dataset Composite_B. Since Composite_B has the same size as Composite_A, we reproduce the experiments in last section to ablate the influence of different reinforcement learning datasets.

In fig. 9, we use RL to optimize the SFT model on Composite_B and Atom_base. When trained on Composite_B only, the model achieves a 88% zero-shot pass@1 on the training dataset, which is a bit lower than Composite_A's experiments. We think this is reasonable as Composite_A's standard answers have been shown to the model during instruction tuning phase. However, it achieves a higher pass rate on the test dataset, around 77.5%, which is

a 2.5% absolute increase compared with the best result in Composite_A's experiments. When trained on both Composite_B and Atom_base, the model performs similarly on the training dataset, however, it performs a little bit worse on the test dataset.

4.2.3 Initialized from an Untuned Model

In the above experiments, we arrive at the following insights: (1) Even with the same training prompts, RL can improve the model's generalization by a large margin over SFT; (2) Providing RL with unseen training prompts, the model performs better than using the same data as in SFT. In this section, we would like to investigate what if we train from an untuned model with RL, where "untuned" means we skip SFT on Composite_A and Atom_base. As depicted in fig. 10, initialized from an untuned model, the RL performs better in both training and testing when using Composite_B and Atom_base than Composite_B only. This is reasonable, as Composite_B does not include the atomic functions used to construct Composite_C. Compared to the results in fig. 9, we can conclude that, even if we use the same training dataset for reinforcement learning, performing SFT prior to RL does help the model to achieve a much higher generalization score in the target domain.

In addition to Composite_C, we also include

HumanEval-python and MBPP in the test dataset. As shown in fig. 11, although the supervised fine-tuned model generalizes well to Composite_C (fig. 10), it performs poorly on HumanEval-python and MBPP, suggesting it already overfits to the composite dataset. However, when initializing reinforcement learning from the untuned model, it can sustain the model’s performance on HumanEval-python and MBPP, and meanwhile improve its generalization score over Composite_C. More training details can be found in fig. 15 and fig. 16.

4.2.4 Summary

Based on the experimental results of our reinforcement learning process, we can draw the following assumptions: (1) Initialized from the SFT model, after optimization by RL with the same dataset, the model can still obtain a significant improvement on the test dataset; (2) Continuing training with RL of the SFT model on an unseen dataset, namely Composite_B, performs better than with the same prompts used in instruction tuning; (3) Different initializations pose an significant impact to the reinforcement learning phase, and SFT prior to RL does help the model to achieve a much higher generalization score in the target domain; (4) Training RL from scratch can alleviate the over-fitting issue introduced in the SFT phase.

5 Conclusion

We investigate the correlation between supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and reinforcement learning (RL) in training a code language model. To facilitate our research, an efficient data synthesizing pipeline is designed. The pipeline can generate a large number of complex while legal python functions at a very low cost, demonstrating the potential to be extended to production environment. Comprehensive ablation study has been performed for both SFT and RL. As for SFT, we discover that the atomic and the synthetic functions are all indispensable for improving generalization performance in the target domain. Specifically, we find just a handful of synthetic functions are adequate for guaranteeing the SFT’s generalization ability. This indicates that a remarkable reduction to the cost of curating SFT dataset might be achieved, as in real-world scenarios, collecting or annotating synthetic functions often requires much more effort compared to their atomic counterparts. Through RL, the SFT’s generalization to target domain can be greatly enhanced, even with the same training prompts. Moreover,

we find training RL from scratch can alleviate the over-fitting issue introduced by the SFT phase.

In the near future, we are going to extend the insights obtained in this work by: (1) Instead of manually crafting the atomic functions, the large corpus of code pre-training data can be used to filter atomic functions; (2) Except for Python, more programming languages will be considered; (3) We are going to scale up both the model and the dataset and see whether the insights in this work still hold; (4) More code-related benchmarks will be included.

6 Acknowledgments

We appreciate Yunzhe Tao, Liyu Chen, Yufeng Zhang for the helpful discussions. Especially, Yunzhe Tao provided the initial version of both atomic and composite functions.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Andy Jones, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Nova DasSarma, et al. 2021. A general language assistant as a laboratory for alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00861*.
- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. 2022. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.

- Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Kevin Swersky, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2020. Big self-supervised models are strong semi-supervised learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:22243–22255.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. 2023. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality. See <https://vicuna.lmsys.org> (accessed 14 April 2023), 2(3):6.
- Shihan Dou, Yan Liu, Haoxiang Jia, Limao Xiong, Enyu Zhou, Junjie Shan, Caishuang Huang, Wei Shen, Xiaoran Fan, Zhiheng Xi, et al. 2024. Step-coder: Improve code generation with reinforcement learning from compiler feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01391*.
- Angela Fan, Beliz Gokkaya, Mark Harman, Mitya Lyubarskiy, Shubho Sengupta, Shin Yoo, and Jie M Zhang. 2023. Large language models for software engineering: Survey and open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03533*.
- Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y Wu, YK Li, et al. 2024. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming—the rise of code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196*.
- Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Yue Liu, Zhou Yang, Kailong Wang, Li Li, Xiapu Luo, David Lo, John Grundy, and Haoyu Wang. 2024. Large language models for software engineering: A systematic literature review. *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.10620.
- Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. 2024. Live-codebench: Holistic and contamination free evaluation of large language models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07974*.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. *Mistral 7b*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.06825.
- Yuhang Lai, Chengxi Li, Yiming Wang, Tianyi Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, Wen-tau Yih, Daniel Fried, Sida Wang, and Tao Yu. 2023. Ds-1000: A natural and reliable benchmark for data science code generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 18319–18345. PMLR.
- Hung Le, Yue Wang, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Chu Hong Hoi. 2022. Coder1: Mastering code generation through pretrained models and deep reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:21314–21328.
- Raymond Li, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Li Jia, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, et al. 2023. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, R mi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, et al. 2022. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science*, 378(6624):1092–1097.
- Percy Liang, Michael I Jordan, and Dan Klein. 2010. Learning programs: A hierarchical bayesian approach. In *ICML*, pages 639–646.
- Jiate Liu, Yiqin Zhu, Kaiwen Xiao, QIANG FU, Xiao Han, Yang Wei, and Deheng Ye. 2023a. RLtf: Reinforcement learning from unit test feedback. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Wei Liu, Weihao Zeng, Keqing He, Yong Jiang, and Junxian He. 2023b. What makes good data for alignment? a comprehensive study of automatic data selection in instruction tuning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Anton Lozhkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Federico Cassano, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Nouamane Tazi, Ao Tang, Dmytro Pykhtar, Jiawei Liu, Yuxiang Wei, Tianyang Liu, Max Tian, Denis Kocetkov, Arthur Zucker, Younes Belkada, Zijian Wang, Qian Liu, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Indraneil Paul, Zhuang Li, Wen-Ding Li, Megan Risdal, Jia Li, Jian Zhu, Terry Yue Zhuo, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Nii Osae Osae Dade, Wenhao Yu, Lucas Krau , Naman Jain, Yixuan Su, Xuanli He, Manan Dey, Edoardo Abati, Yekun Chai, Niklas Muennighoff, Xiangru Tang, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Christopher Akiki, Marc Marone, Chenghao Mou, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Binyuan Hui, Tri Dao, Armel Zebaze, Olivier Dehaene, Nicolas Patry, Canwen Xu, Julian McAuley, Han Hu, Torsten Scholak, Sebastien Paquet, Jennifer Robinson, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Nicolas Chapados, Mostofa Patwary, Nima Tajbakhsh, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Mu oz Ferrandis, Lingming Zhang, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. 2024. *Starcode 2 and the stack v2: The next generation*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.19173.
- Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08568*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Nikhil Pinnaparaju, Reshinth Adithyan, Duy Phung, Jonathan Tow, James Baicoianu, Ashish Datta,

- Maksym Zhuravynskiy, Dakota Mahan, Marco Belagente, Carlos Riquelme, et al. 2024. Stable code technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01226*.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, et al. 2021. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- John Schulman, Philipp Moritz, Sergey Levine, Michael Jordan, and Pieter Abbeel. 2015. High-dimensional continuous control using generalized advantage estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02438*.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- Parshin Shojaee, Aneesh Jain, Sindhu Tipirneni, and Chandan K Reddy. 2023. Execution-based code generation using deep reinforcement learning. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Anshumali Shrivastava and Ping Li. 2014. In defense of minhash over simhash. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 886–894. PMLR.
- Phillip D Summers. 1977. A methodology for lisp program construction from examples. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 24(1):161–175.
- Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour. 1999. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 12.
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Junjie Wang, Yuchao Huang, Chunyang Chen, Zhe Liu, Song Wang, and Qing Wang. 2024. Software testing with large language models: Survey, landscape, and vision. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*.
- Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven CH Hoi. 2021. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00859*.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yuxiang Wei, Zhe Wang, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, and Lingming Zhang. 2023. Magicoder: Source code is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02120*.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. [Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2304.12244.
- Pengcheng Yin and Graham Neubig. 2017. A syntactic neural model for general-purpose code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.01696*.
- Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srinivasan Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, et al. 2024. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

A An example of synthetic functions

Atomic Functions	Synthetic Function
<pre> ---atomic function 1--- def reverse_word(s_iii: str) -> str: """ 把一个字符串按单词反转，比如abc def ghi->ghi def abc，得到一个字符串 """ s_reversed = s_iii[::-1] s_word = '' s_word_reversed_ooo = '' for i in range(len(s_reversed)): if s_reversed[i] == ' ': if len(s_word) > 0: s_word_reversed_ooo += s_word[::-1] s_word = '' s_word_reversed_ooo += s_word[::-1] else: s_word += s_reversed[i] if len(s_word) > 0: s_word_reversed_ooo += s_word[::-1] return s_word_reversed_ooo </pre>	<pre> ---prompt--- 把一个字符串按单词反转，比如abc def ghi->ghi def abc，得到一个字符串，然后把这个字符串中每个大写字母 后面都加一个空格，得到一个字符串，接下来把这个字符 串按照空格分开，找到出现次数是3的倍数的单词，按照字 典序逆序放到一个字符串列表中，最后计算这个字符串数 组中不同元素的个数，返回一个整数 ---response--- from collections import Counter def solve(s): # 把一个字符串按单词反转，比如abc def ghi->ghi def abc，得到一个字符串 s_reversed = s[::-1] s_word = '' s_word_reversed = '' for i in range(len(s_reversed)): if s_reversed[i] == ' ': if len(s_word) > 0: s_word_reversed += s_word[::-1] s_word = '' s_word_reversed += s_word[::-1] else: s_word += s_reversed[i] if len(s_word) > 0: s_word_reversed += s_word[::-1] # 把一个字符串中每个大写字母后面都加一个空格， 得到一个字符串 s_sp_after_upper = '' for i in range(len(s_word_reversed)): s_sp_after_upper += s_word_reversed[i] if s_word_reversed[i].isupper(): s_sp_after_upper += ' ' # 把一个字符串按照空格分开，找到出现次数是3的倍 数的单词，按照字典序逆序放到一个字符串列表中 from collections import Counter arr = s_sp_after_upper.split(' ') c = Counter(arr) arr = sorted([x for x, y in c.items() if y % 3 == 0], reverse=True) # 计算一个字符串数组中不同元素的个数，得到一个 整数 count_uniq = len(set(arr)) return count_uniq </pre>
<pre> ---atomic function 2--- def add_space_after_upper(s_iii: str) -> str: """ 把一个字符串中每个大写字母后面都加一个空格，得到 一个字符串 """ s_sp_after_upper_ooo = '' for i in range(len(s_iii)): s_sp_after_upper_ooo += s_iii[i] if s_iii[i].isupper(): s_sp_after_upper_ooo += ' ' return s_sp_after_upper_ooo </pre>	
<pre> ---atomic function 3--- def word_count_3rd(s_iii: str) -> list[str]: """ 把一个字符串按照空格分开，找到出现次数是3的倍数 的单词，按照字典序逆序放到一个字符串列表中 """ from collections import Counter arr_ooo = s_iii.split(' ') c = Counter(arr_ooo) arr_ooo = sorted([x for x, y in c.items() if y % 3 == 0], reverse=True) return arr_ooo </pre>	
<pre> ---atomic function 4--- def uniq_count_str_array(arr_iii: list[str]) -> int: """ 计算一个字符串数组中不同元素的个数，得到一个整数 """ count_uniq_ooo = len(set(arr_iii)) return count_uniq_ooo </pre>	

Figure 12: An example of synthetic functions, where on the left column are the sampled four atomic functions. We concatenate the atomic functions one by one to create the synthetic function. For sake of use, we name all the synthetic functions "solve". The validity of the synthetic functions is checked by the code sandbox.

B Examples of atomic functions

Example 1	
Original Code	Rewritten Code
<p>---prompt---</p> <p>Given a list of strings, count the number of unique strings</p> <p>---response---</p> <pre>def solve(arr): count_uniq = len(set(arr)) return count_uniq</pre>	<p>---prompt---</p> <p>Given a list of float numbers, calculate the sum of unique positive numbers</p> <p>---response---</p> <pre>def solve(arr): positive_numbers = [num for num in set(arr) if num > 0] sum_positives = sum(positive_numbers) return sum_positives</pre>
Example 2	
Original Code	Rewritten Code
<p>---prompt---</p> <p>Given an integer, determine whether it is a prime number</p> <p>---response---</p> <pre>from math import sqrt def solve(n): is_prime_correct = True if n <= 1: is_prime_correct = False else: n_sqrt = int(sqrt(n)) for i in range(2, n_sqrt + 1): if n % i == 0: is_prime_correct = False break return is_prime_correct</pre>	<p>---prompt---</p> <p>Given an integer, find all of its factors (excluding 1 and itself), sort the factors in ascending order</p> <p>---response---</p> <pre>from math import sqrt def solve(n): factors = [] n_sqrt = int(sqrt(n)) for i in range(2, n_sqrt + 1): if n % i == 0: factors.append(i) if i != n // i: factors.append(n // i) factors.sort() return factors</pre>

Figure 13: Two examples of modified atomic functions, where on the left column are the original functions and the rewritten ones are placed on the right column. Please note that we translate the prompts into English here to ease understanding, while in the ablation experiment we keep using the Chinese version.

Example 1	
Original Code	Translated Code
<p>---prompt---</p> <p>输入一个字符串列表，计算其中不重复的字符串的数量</p> <p>---response---</p> <pre>def solve(arr): count_uniq = len(set(arr)) return count_uniq</pre>	<p>---prompt---</p> <p>Given a list of strings, count the number of unique strings</p> <p>---response---</p> <pre>def solve(arr): count_uniq = len(set(arr)) return count_uniq</pre>
Example 2	
Original Code	Translated Code
<p>---prompt---</p> <p>给定一个整数，判断是否是质数</p> <p>---response---</p> <pre>from math import sqrt def solve(n): is_prime_correct = True if n <= 1: is_prime_correct = False else: n_sqrt = int(sqrt(n)) for i in range(2, n_sqrt + 1): if n % i == 0: is_prime_correct = False break return is_prime_correct</pre>	<p>---prompt---</p> <p>Given an integer, determine whether it is a prime number</p> <p>---response---</p> <pre>from math import sqrt def solve(n): is_prime_correct = True if n <= 1: is_prime_correct = False else: n_sqrt = int(sqrt(n)) for i in range(2, n_sqrt + 1): if n % i == 0: is_prime_correct = False break return is_prime_correct</pre>

Figure 14: Two examples of translated atomic functions, where on the left column are the original functions prompted in Chinese. We manually translate the Chinese prompts into English.

C RL from Different Initializations




Figure 15: Training details of reinforcement learning on Composite_B with different initialized checkpoints. Initialized from the untuned model, the KL divergence, entropy loss and the value loss are higher, while the mean response length tends to be shorter.




Figure 16: Training details of reinforcement learning on Composite_B and Atom_base with different initialized checkpoints. Similar as fig. 15, the KL divergence, entropy loss and the value loss are higher, and the mean response length is shorter, when initializing the RL training phase from the untuned model.

D Case Study for RL from Different Initializations

In order to provide a detailed overview on how different initializations influences the performance of RL, we present a few representative cases in this section. Specifically, our RL is initialized from two different checkpoints, namely the SFT and the untuned ones, and is fine-tuned on the same training dataset, namely Composite_B and Atom_base. Therefore, we have two different RL models, to make it simple, we would like to refer to the two models as SFT-RL and untuned-RL in the following section.

In fig. 17 and fig. 18, cases from the Composite_C dataset are shown. It is clear that the untuned-RL performs poorly than the SFT-RL and fails to solve all of the problems. Actually, to write the correct codes for problems contained in Composite_C, the model needs to: (1) Understand the synthetic prompts and well split them into sub-prompts; (2) Generate the correct coding block for each sub-prompt; (3) Organize the corresponding coding blocks in the correct order and format. As displayed, the SFT-RL model can successfully accomplish the above three tasks. However, as for the untuned-RL model, it struggles to understand the presented synthetic prompts.

As pointed out in section 4.2.3, although the SFT-RL model performs well on Composite_C, it fails to generalize to HumanEval-Python and MBPP due to the overfitting issues. A few cases from the HumanEval-Python are presented in fig. 19 and fig. 20. The prompts in HumanEval-Python are consisted of function signatures and the docstrings. In order to generate the correct response, the model needs to copy the prompt firstly and then continue to write the code. However, the SFT-RL model tends to generate responses from the continuation point of a code-completion task more often, thus fail to produce an executable code block. The untuned-RL model performs better in HumanEval-Python, and it wraps the responses within a Python markdown block.

Cases from the MBPP test dataset are shown in fig. 21. Prompts in MBPP often contains a natural language instruction followed by a unit test case, and the model is required to generate codes matching the instructions while passing all the test cases. As seen, the untuned-RL model performs well on MBPP, similarly as in HumanEval-Python, it tends to wrap the generated responses using a

Python markdown block. Moreover, the programming style of the untuned-RL model is straight forward and neat. However, the SFT-RL model fails to solve most problems in MBPP. In some cases, it is clearly influenced by the "assert" expression in the prompt and generates hallucination by inserting wrong assertion expressions in the code.

In the cases from Composite_C, HumanEval-Python, and MBPP, we can observe that the untuned-RL model tends to generate much shorter responses compared to that of the SFT-RL model. We have included the "mean_response_length" as a metric in fig. 15 and fig. 16, which calculates the mean length of the generated responses within a batch. Clearly, the untuned-RL model generates much shorter responses during training. Besides, the KL divergence of the untuned-RL model with respect to the initialized checkpoint is much higher than that of the SFT-RL, indicating more exploration has been achieved during training. Meanwhile, the entropy loss and the value loss of the SFT-RL model are much lower and more stable than that of the untuned-RL.

Composite_C Example	
prompt	response from SFT-RL: correct
<p>问题：把一个字符串数组中的非空字符串压入栈中，如果当前字符串和栈顶字符串的首字母相同（不区分大小写），则弹出栈顶字符串，直到可以插入当前字符串为止，得到这样操作后最终栈里面的字符串组成的字符串数组，然后找到这个字符串数组中反转后按字典序最大的元素，得到一个字符串，接下来找到这个字符串中出现大于两次的字母（不区分大小写），字典序排序后，变成大写，拼成一个新字符串，最后判断这个字符串是否只包含大写字符，返回布尔值，请使用python解答本问题，同时定义一个名字为solve的函数</p> <p>答案：</p>	<pre>from collections import Counter def solve(arr): # 把一个字符串数组中的非空字符串压入栈中，如果当前字符串和栈顶字符串的首字母相同（不区分大小写），则弹出栈顶字符串，直到可以插入当前字符串为止，得到这样操作后最终栈里面的字符串组成的字符串数组 stack = [] for elem in arr: if len(elem) == 0: continue while len(stack) > 0 and elem[0].lower() == stack[-1][0].lower(): stack.pop() stack.append(elem) array_remain = stack # 找到一个字符串数组中反转后按字典序最大的元素，得到一个字符串 if len(array_remain) == 0: return None s_reverse_largest = array_remain[0][::-1] for s in array_remain[1:]: if s_reverse_largest < s[::-1]: s_reverse_largest = s[::-1] s_reverse_largest = s_reverse_largest[::-1] # 找到一个字符串中出现大于两次的字母（不区分大小写），字典序排序后，变成大写，拼成一个新字符串 c = Counter(s_reverse_largest.upper()) s = ".join(sorted([x for x, y in c.items() if y > 2])) # 判断一个字符串是否只包含大写字符，得到布尔值 s_upper_only = ".join([x for x in s if x.isupper()]) is_upper_correct = (s == s_upper_only) return is_upper_correct</pre>
response from untuned-RL: wrong	
<pre>python def solve(s): stack = [] for x in s: if x: stack.append(x) while len(stack) > 1 and stack[-1].lower() == stack[-2].lower(): stack.pop() return ".join(stack)[::-1] ...</pre>	

Composite_C Example	
prompt	response from SFT-RL: correct
<p>问题：把一个字符串中ascii码是5的倍数的字符去掉，得到一个新的字符串，然后把这个字符串按照非字母数字字符分割（结果中不要有空字符串），得到一个字符串数组，最后把这个字符串数组中不含空格的字符串用逗号拼接起来，返回一个字符串，请使用python解答本问题，同时定义一个名字为solve的函数</p> <p>答案：</p>	<pre>import re def solve(s): # 把一个字符串中ascii码是5的倍数的字符去掉，得到一个新的字符串 s_remove_ascii5 = ".join([ch for ch in s if ord(ch) % 5 > 0]) # 把一个字符串按照非字母数字字符分割（结果中不要有空字符串），得到一个字符串数组 sp = re.compile(r'[^\w-0-9]') arr_words = sp.split(s_remove_ascii5) arr_words = [x for x in arr_words if len(x) > 0] # 把一个字符串数组中不含空格的字符串用逗号拼接起来，得到一个字符串 s_concat = ".join([x for x in arr_words if x.find(' ') < 0]) return s_concat</pre>
response from untuned-RL: wrong	
<pre>python def solve(s): new_s = ".join(filter(lambda x: ord(x) % 5 == 0, s)) return '!'.join(filter(lambda x: x != "", new_s.split())) ...</pre>	

Figure 17: Cases from Composite_C generated by SFT-RL and untuned-RL

Composite_C Example	
prompt	response from SFT-RL: correct
问题: 对一个字符串数组按照每个字符串的MD5值进行排序, 得到一个新的字符串数组, 然后把这个字符串数组中的非空字符串压入栈中, 如果当前字符串和栈顶字符串的首字母相同 (不区分大小写), 则弹出栈顶字符串, 直到可以插入当前字符串为止, 得到这样操作后最终栈里面的字符串组成的字符串数组, 请使用python解答本问题, 同时定义一个名字为 solve 的函数 答案:	<pre>import hashlib def solve(arr): # 对一个字符串数组按照每个字符串的MD5值进行排序, 得到一个新的字符串数组 arr_sorted = sorted(arr, key=lambda x: hashlib.md5(x.encode('utf-8')).hexdigest()) # 把一个字符串数组中的非空字符串压入栈中, 如果当前字符串和栈顶字符串的首字母相同 (不区分大小写), 则弹出栈顶字符串, 直到可以插入当前字符串为止, 得到这样操作后最终栈里面的字符串组成的字符串数组 stack = [] for elem in arr_sorted: if len(elem) == 0: continue while len(stack) > 0 and elem[0].lower() == stack[-1][0].lower(): stack.pop() stack.append(elem) array_remain = stack return array_remain</pre>
response from untuned-RL: wrong	
<pre>python def solve(s): stack = [] for x in s: stack.append(x) while len(stack) > 1 and stack[-1].lower() == stack[-2].lower(): stack.pop() return ".join(stack) ... </pre>	

Composite_C Example	
prompt	response from SFT-RL: correct
问题: 把一个字符串数组中的非空字符串压入栈中, 如果当前字符串和栈顶字符串的首字母相同 (不区分大小写), 则弹出栈顶字符串, 直到可以插入当前字符串为止, 得到这样操作后最终栈里面的字符串组成的字符串数组, 然后把把这个字符串数组中不含空格的字符串用逗号拼接起来, 得到一个字符串, 接下来把这个字符串中ascii码是5的倍数的字符去掉, 得到一个新的字符串, 最后找到这个字符串中所有元音字母的位置, 返回一个整数列表, 请使用python解答本问题, 同时定义一个名字为 solve 的函数 答案:	<pre>def solve(arr): # 把一个字符串数组中的非空字符串压入栈中, 如果当前字符串和栈顶字符串的首字母相同 (不区分大小写), 则弹出栈顶字符串, 直到可以插入当前字符串为止, 得到这样操作后最终栈里面的字符串组成的字符串数组 stack = [] for elem in arr: if len(elem) == 0: continue while len(stack) > 0 and elem[0].lower() == stack[-1][0].lower(): stack.pop() stack.append(elem) array_remain = stack # 把一个字符串数组中不含空格的字符串用逗号拼接起来, 得到一个字符串 s_concat = ''.join([s for s in array_remain if s.find(' ') < 0]) # 把一个字符串中ascii码是5的倍数的字符去掉, 得到一个新的字符串 s_remove_ascii5 = "".join([ch for ch in s_concat if ord(ch) % 5 > 0]) # 找到一个字符串中所有元音字母的位置, 得到一个整数列表 vowel = 'AEIOUaeiou' arr_vowel_pos = [] for i in range(len(s_remove_ascii5)): if s_remove_ascii5[i] in vowel: arr_vowel_pos.append(i) return arr_vowel_pos</pre>
response from untuned-RL: wrong	
<pre>python def solve(s): stack = [] for c in s: if c: stack.append(c) elif stack and stack[-1] == c.lower(): stack.pop() return ".join(stack) ... </pre>	

Figure 18: Cases from Composite_C generated by SFT-RL and untuned-RL

HumanEval-Python Example	
prompt	response from SFT-RL: wrong
<pre>def string_to_md5(text): """ Given a string 'text', return its md5 hash equivalent string. If 'text' is an empty string, return None. >>> string_to_md5('Hello world') == '3e25960a79dbc69b674cd4ec67a72c62' """</pre>	<pre>import hashlib if len(text) == 0: return None text_md5 = hashlib.md5(text.encode('utf-8')).hexdigest() return text_md5</pre>
response from untuned-RL: correct	
<pre>```python from hashlib import md5 def string_to_md5(text): """ Given a string 'text', return its md5 hash equivalent string. If 'text' is an empty string, return None. >>> string_to_md5('Hello world') == '3e25960a79dbc69b674cd4ec67a72c62' """ if not text: return None return md5(text.encode('utf-8')).hexdigest() ```</pre>	

HumanEval-Python Example	
prompt	response from SFT-RL: wrong
<pre>def cycpattern_check(a, b): """You are given 2 words. You need to return True if the second word or any of its rotations is a substring in the first word cycpattern_check("abcd","abd") => False cycpattern_check("hello","ell") => True cycpattern_check("whassup","psus") => False cycpattern_check("abab","baa") => True cycpattern_check("efef","eef") => False cycpattern_check("himenss","simen") => True """</pre>	<pre>is_correct = False for i in range(len(b)): is_correct = (b == a[i:]) if is_correct: break return is_correct</pre>
response from untuned-RL: correct	
<pre>```python def cycpattern_check(a, b): """You are given 2 words. You need to return True if the second word or any of its rotations is a substring in the first word cycpattern_check("abcd","abd") => False cycpattern_check("hello","ell") => True cycpattern_check("whassup","psus") => False cycpattern_check("abab","baa") => True cycpattern_check("efef","eef") => False cycpattern_check("himenss","simen") => True """ for i in range(len(b)): if b in a: return True b = b[1:] + b[0] return False ```</pre>	

Figure 19: Cases from HumanEval generated by SFT-RL and untuned-RL

HumanEval-Python Example	
prompt	response from SFT-RL: wrong
<pre>def sort_array(arr): """ In this Kata, you have to sort an array of non-negative integers according to number of ones in their binary representation in ascending order. For similar number of ones, sort based on decimal value. It must be implemented like this: >>> sort_array([1, 5, 2, 3, 4]) == [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] >>> sort_array([-2, -3, -4, -5, -6]) == [-6, -5, -4, -3, -2] >>> sort_array([1, 0, 2, 3, 4]) [0, 1, 2, 3, 4] """</pre>	<pre>def sort_array(arr): """ In this Kata, you have to sort an array of non-negative integers according to number of ones in their binary representation in ascending order. For similar number of ones, sort based on decimal value. It must be implemented like this: >>> sort_array([1, 5, 2, 3, 4]) == [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] >>> sort_array([-2, -3, -4, -5, -6]) == [-6, -5, -4, -3, -2] >>> sort_array([1, 0, 2, 3, 4]) [0, 1, 2, 3, 4] """</pre>
<p>response from untuned-RL: correct</p> <pre>```python def sort_array(arr): return sorted(arr, key=lambda x: (bin(x).count('1'), x)) ```</pre>	<pre>def count_ones(n): c_ones = 0 n = abs(n) while n > 0: c_ones += (n % 2) n //= 2 return c_ones arr_sorted = sorted(arr, key=count_ones) return arr_sorted</pre>

HumanEval-Python Example	
prompt	response from SFT-RL: wrong
<pre>def triangle_area(a, b, c): """ Given the lengths of the three sides of a triangle. Return the area of the triangle rounded to 2 decimal points if the three sides form a valid triangle. Otherwise return -1 Three sides make a valid triangle when the sum of any two sides is greater than the third side. Example: triangle_area(3, 4, 5) == 6.00 triangle_area(1, 2, 10) == -1 """</pre>	<pre>from math import sqrt def triangle_area(a, b, c): """ Given the lengths of the three sides of a triangle. Return the area of the triangle rounded to 2 decimal points if the three sides form a valid triangle. Otherwise return -1 Three sides make a valid triangle when the sum of any two sides is greater than the third side. Example: triangle_area(3, 4, 5) == 6.00 triangle_area(1, 2, 10) == -1 """</pre>
<p>response from untuned-RL: correct</p> <pre>```python def triangle_area(a, b, c): if a + b > c and a + c > b and b + c > a: p = (a + b + c) / 2 return round((p * (p - a) * (p - b) * (p - c)) ** 0.5, 2) else: return -1 ```</pre>	<pre>if a + b > c: s = (a + b + c) / 2 area = sqrt(s * (s - a) * (s - b) * (s - c)) else: area = -1 return round(area, 2)</pre>

Figure 20: Cases from HumanEval generated by SFT-RL and untuned-RL

MBPP Example	
prompt	response from SFT-RL: wrong
Write a function to find the perimeter of a square. Your code should satisfy these tests: assert square_perimeter(10)==40	def square_perimeter(l): # Write a function to find the perimeter of a square. Your code should satisfy these tests: assert square_perimeter(10) == 40 return 4 * l
response from untuned-RL: correct	
```python def square_perimeter(length): return length * 4 ```	

MBPP Example	
<b>prompt</b>	<b>response from SFT-RL: wrong</b>
Write a python function to check whether the given two integers have opposite sign or not. Your code should satisfy these tests: assert opposite_Signs(1,-2) == True	assert opposite_Signs(-1,2) == True assert opposite_Signs(1,1) == False assert opposite_Signs(-1,-1) == False
<b>response from untuned-RL: correct</b>	
```python def opposite_Signs(a,b): return (a<0 and b>0) or (a>0 and b<0) ```	

MBPP Example	
prompt	response from SFT-RL: wrong
Write a function to merge multiple sorted inputs into a single sorted iterator using heap queue algorithm. Your code should satisfy these tests: assert merge_sorted_list([25, 24, 15, 4, 5, 29, 110],[19, 20, 11, 56, 25, 233, 154],[24, 26, 54, 48])==[4, 5, 11, 15, 19, 20, 24, 24, 25, 25, 26, 29, 48, 54, 56, 110, 154, 233]	from heapq import heappush, heappop def merge_sorted_list(arrays): # merge multiple sorted inputs into a single sorted iterator using heap queue algorithm it = heappush([], arrays[0]) for array in arrays[1:]: heappush(it, array[0]) for num in array[1:]: if num < it[0]: heappush(it, num) else: heappushpop(it, num) return it
response from untuned-RL: correct	
```python from heapq import heappush, heappop def merge_sorted_list(*lists): result = [] for lst in lists: for item in lst: heappush(result, item) return [heappop(result) for _ in range(len(result))] ```	

MBPP Example	
<b>prompt</b>	<b>response from SFT-RL: wrong</b>
Write a function to calculate the sum of the positive integers of $n+(n-2)+(n-4)\dots$ (until $n-x \leq 0$ ). Your code should satisfy these tests: assert sum_series(6)==12	def sum_series(n): # Write a function to calculate the sum of the positive integers of $n+(n-2)+(n-4)\dots$ (until $n-x \leq 0$ ). Your code should satisfy these tests: sum_n = n n2 = n - 2 n4 = n - 4 for i in range(n2): sum_n += n2 n2 -= 2 for i in range(n4): sum_n += n4 n4 -= 4 return sum_n
<b>response from untuned-RL: correct</b>	
```python def sum_series(n): total = 0 for i in range(n, 0, -2): total += i return total ```	

Figure 21: Cases from MBPP generated by SFT-RL and untuned-RL