

AgentCoder: Multi-Agent-based Code Generation with Iterative Testing and Optimisation

Anonymous authors

Abstract

The advancement of natural language processing (NLP) has been significantly boosted by the development of transformer-based large language models (LLMs). These models have revolutionized NLP tasks, particularly in code generation, aiding developers in creating software with enhanced efficiency. Despite their advancements, challenges in balancing code snippet generation with effective test case generation and execution persist. To address these issues, this paper introduces Multi-Agent-based Code Generation (AgentCoder), a novel solution comprising a multi-agent framework with specialized agents: the programmer agent, the test designer agent, and the test executor agent. During the coding procedure, the programmer agent will focus on the code generation and refinement based on the test executor agent’s feedback. The test designer agent will generate test cases for the generated code, and the test executor agent will run the code with the test cases and write the feedback to the programmer. This collaborative system ensures a more effective code generation, surpassing the limitations of single-agent models and previous strategies. Our extensive experiments on 12 LLMs and 13 optimisation approaches showcase AgentCoder’s superior performance over existing code generation models and prompt engineering techniques across various benchmarks. For example, AgentCoder achieves 77.4% and 89.1% pass@1 in HumanEval-ET and MBPP-ET with GPT-3.5, while SOTA baseline obtains only 69.5% and 63.0%.

1 Introduction

In recent years, natural language processing (NLP) has been dramatically transformed by transformer-based large language models (LLMs). These models, notably exemplified by the GPT-x series [Brown *et al.*, 2020b; OpenAI, 2023] developed by OpenAI, have consistently set the benchmark for performance across a wide array of standard NLP tasks. One of the most pivotal applications for these LLMs is code generation for downstream tasks, where they play a vital role

in aiding developers in creating software [Feng *et al.*, 2020; Wang *et al.*, 2021; Wang *et al.*, 2023b; Nijkamp *et al.*, 2023b; Nijkamp *et al.*, 2023a; Li *et al.*, 2023b]. Through extensive pretraining on substantial code-related datasets, such as publicly available data on GitHub, these code LLMs acquire intricate contextual understanding that can be effectively applied to diverse code-related tasks.

In recent times, numerous efforts have been made to improve the effectiveness of code generation models by incorporating in-context learning and its variations [Dong *et al.*, 2023b; Wei *et al.*, 2022; Le *et al.*, 2023; Huang *et al.*, 2023; Zhang *et al.*, 2023b; Chen *et al.*, 2023b; Madaan *et al.*, 2023], where an important optimization path is self-refinement. For example, Zhang *et al.* proposed Self-Edit to enhance the performance of LLMs in code generation. In particular, Self-Edit runs the code generation model’s generated code against test cases that are manually written by developers. If the function fails to pass these test cases, Self-Edit prompts the code generation model to refine the function using the provided error messages with its fault-aware code editor. Nevertheless, Self-Edit requires that developers write test cases to verify the correctness of the generated function. This requirement can be particularly demanding and challenging for users who lack expertise in the specific domain, which potentially impedes the effectiveness of the self-editing process.

To overcome this challenge, Huang *et al.* introduced CodeCoT, which adopts a step-by-step strategy for code generation, tasking the code generation model to generate both the function and the corresponding test cases. CodeCoT also establishes a connection with a terminal interface, instructing the code generation model to self-refine the code based on the error messages returned by the terminal. This approach not only reduces the burden on developers in terms of writing test cases but also ensures that the generated code undergoes software testing and refinement.

Although CodeCoT makes substantial strides in enhancing the effectiveness of code generation models, the tests and code are generated within the same conversation. In other words, the code generation and test generation processes are not independent. This practice brings constraints that arise from the potential trade-off between excelling in code generation and maintaining the effectiveness of test case generation: as the model achieves high performance in generating code snippets, there may be a corresponding decrease in

the effectiveness of test case generation [Chen *et al.*, 2023a; Zhang *et al.*, 2023a]. This trade-off scenario occurs due to the model’s limited resources and its focus on optimizing one aspect of the code generation process, which might inadvertently compromise the quality of other tasks [Chen *et al.*, 2023a; Zhang *et al.*, 2023a]. In addition, the tests generated immediately following the code in one conversation can be biased and affected by the code, losing objectivity and diversity in the testing (See Tab. 5).

In this paper, we address the above-mentioned problems by proposing Multi-Agent-based Code Generation, namely AgentCoder. AgentCoder contains three different agents, i.e., the programmer agent, the test designer agent, and the test executor agent. The programmer agent interacts with advanced code generation models to create code based on coding requirements. The test designer agent designs diverse and comprehensive test cases with code generation models independently based on the coding requirements. The test executor agent interacts with both the programmer agent and the test designer agent: it executes the tests from the test designer agent against the code generated by the programmer agent and then provides test execution results to the programmer agent. Once the feedback is obtained by the test executor agent from the local environment (i.e., local terminal), it will check whether the feedback contains error information (e.g., runtime error and assertion error). If all test cases pass the generated code, the test executor agent will report the code snippets to the human developer, else the test executor agent will feed the feedback to the programmer agent and then require it to fix the bug reported in the feedback. Then the iteration will continue once the feedback is all test cases pass the code snippets or the iteration budget is done, and then the code snippets will report to the human developer even if the code is still buggy.

Our extensive experiments with 12 LLMs and 13 enhancement approaches demonstrate that AgentCoder significantly improves the effectiveness of existing code generation models, outperforming all baseline approaches. In particular, AgentCoder obtains an average of 91.5% and 84.1% pass@1 on all the datasets with GPT-4 and GPT-3.5, respectively, while the state-of-the-arts obtain 86.8% and 75.3%. On HumanEval-ET and MBPP-ET, AgentCoder obtains 77.4% and 89.1% pass@1 with GPT-3.5, while SOTA baselines obtain only 69.5% and 63.0%. The effectiveness of AgentCoder is driven by the motivation to harness the collaborative synergy among its multi-agent system. Within this system, the programmer agent excels in crafting high-quality code snippets, complemented by the test designer agent’s expertise in designing varied, challenging, and objective test cases. The test executor agent plays a pivotal role by critically evaluating the code using these test cases, ensuring both functionality and reliability. Such collaboration fosters a dynamic feedback loop that facilitates progressive enhancements. AgentCoder overcomes the constraints inherent in single-agent code generation models by allocating distinct tasks to different agents. This division not only balances the focus between code and test case generation but also fortifies a more objective testing process. Additionally, its modular design provides the flexibility and scalability crucial to adapting to technological ad-

vancements. Agents within AgentCoder can be individually updated or replaced with more sophisticated models, maintaining the framework’s technological edge. This adaptability positions AgentCoder as an effective and evolving solution in the ever-changing landscape of software development.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- We propose AgentCoder, a novel multi-agent framework for code generation that contains three agents, i.e., the programmer agent, the test designer agent, and the test executor agent.
- We conduct an extensive evaluation with 12 LLMs and 13 LLM-based optimisation approaches which demonstrates that AgentCoder outperforms all the baselines in code generation. In particular, AgentCoder obtains 77.4% and 89.1% pass@1 with GPT-3.5, while SOTA baselines obtain only 69.5% and 63.0%.
- We conduct a deep analysis of our results and ablation studies, which demonstrate the contribution of different agents, the effectiveness of the tests generated by the test designer agent, and the necessity of using separate agents for code generation and test case design.
- Our framework’s modular design offers adaptability and scalability, allowing for future enhancements and integration with advanced models, positioning AgentCoder as a resilient solution in the evolving landscape of automated code generation.

2 Related Work

2.1 Large Language Model for Code Generation

Recently, Large Language Models (LLMs) have been widely studied for code generation tasks. Various architectures have been explored in these models, some notable examples being CodeBERT [Feng *et al.*, 2020], PLBART [Ahmad *et al.*, 2021], and CodeGPT [Zan *et al.*, 2022]. These models are pre-trained on code corpora to develop a deep understanding of code syntax, semantics, and idiomatic constructs. Some innovative approaches integrate structured representations to enhance their comprehension of the complexities in code. For example, GraphCodeBERT [Guo *et al.*, 2020] incorporates graph-based representations, while CodeT5+ [Wang *et al.*, 2023b] combines the encoder-decoder paradigm with the structural essence of code. These enhancements aim to give the models a more fine-grained understanding of code relationships and dependencies beyond just syntactic patterns. A current trend is the construction of large-scale models (e.g., Codex [Chen *et al.*, 2021b] and CodeGen [Nijkamp *et al.*, 2023b]) with billions of parameters, which have illustrated the performance of SOTA in code generation tasks. Recently, foundation models (e.g., GPT-3.5-turbo, GPT-4) are also used for code generations [Madaan *et al.*, 2023; Huang *et al.*, 2023]. These foundation models illustrated the SOTA performance for code generation tasks.

2.2 Enhancing Code Generation through Prompt Engineering

Recent advancements in code generation have been significantly influenced by the integration of few-shot learning tech-

niques with LLMs. A notable contribution in this realm is the concept of self-refinement with few-shot prompting, as proposed by Madaan *et al.*. This approach involves LLM iteratively refining its own generated code, leading to significant improvements in code quality. Another approach is the Self-Debugging technique introduced by Chen *et al.*. This method involves testing the generated code against user-provided test cases. In scenarios where such test cases are unavailable, the model engages in direct debugging by explaining the code, thus addressing potential issues. Complementing these methods, Huang *et al.* introduced CodeCoT, employing a Self-Exam Chain of Thought (CoT) process. This technique guides the model to generate code alongside test cases, particularly useful when external test cases are not available. CodeCoT adds a layer of logical reasoning to the code generation process. However, it's important to note that while this method can identify syntax errors, functional errors may still go undetected as both the code and its test cases are generated by the same model. Building upon these concepts, Dong *et al.* proposed the Self-Collaboration model, which divides the LLM's role into three distinct agents: an analyst, a coder, and a tester. The tester analyzes code by feeding it directly into the tester component. However, a potential risk arises that the tester may not find all bugs in the code since the code is not executed in the local environments. To address this potential risk, in this paper, we require the local environment to also participate in the code generation procedure to analyze whether bugs existed in the generated code.

2.3 Multi-agent Collaboration

A multi-agent system (MAS) is a framework where multiple autonomous agents interact with each other. These agents, which can be program scripts, software bots, or robots, operate in a shared environment and can communicate, cooperate, compete, or negotiate with each other. Each agent in a multi-agent system has its own capabilities, goals, and perceptions, and they work either independently or together to achieve complex goals or solve problems. The integration of LLMs within multi-agent collaboration systems represents a cutting-edge area of research in a deep learning community. For example, HuggingFace proposes HuggingGPT to solve complex AI tasks with HuggingFace models. Zhang *et al.* propose ProAgent to address robotic tasks by analyzing the current context, anticipating teammates' intentions, and formulating its strategies based on the above reasoning. Chen *et al.* propose VisualGPT to utilize vision PLM to address image captioning tasks.

3 Methodology

The framework of AgentCoder and its pipeline are illustrated in Fig. 1. The process begins by inputting tasks/code generation requirements/descriptions into the code generation agent (i.e., Agent#1: the programmer agent). Subsequently, the test case generator (i.e., Agent#2: the test designer agent) is tasked with generating test cases, which are used to evaluate the correctness of the code snippets produced by the programmer agent. The code snippets and test cases are collected by the test executor agent (i.e., Agent#3) and executed in the

local environment (local terminal) to obtain feedback (i.e., whether the code passes all tests and the error message if the code fails for some tests). If the test executor agent finds that the code snippets pass all test cases, it will return the code to the user and finish the iteration. Otherwise, the test executor agent will return the test execution error messages to the programmer agent. The iteration then continues, with the programmer agent regenerating code snippets to address the issues identified in the feedback, and the test executor agent re-executes the new code and provides new feedback to the programmer agent, until the test executor agent finds that the code passes all the tests.

3.1 Programmer agent: code generation with Chain-of-Thought instruction

In our framework, The programmer agent is powered by LLMs. It needs to consider two scenarios, i.e., code generation and code refinement. Specifically, as shown in Fig. 1, during the code generation stage, the human developer will require the programmer agent to generate code snippets to complete specific tasks, the programmer agent employs a Chain-of-Thought approach to simulate the typical programming process, methodically breaking down the task into smaller, manageable steps. The Chain-of-Thought process is instructed to contain four steps, i.e., problem understanding and clarification, algorithm and method selection, pseudocode creation, and code generation (the prompt and response example is shown in Appendix A.3 Figure 6 and 7).

Take coding task *Check if in given list of numbers, are any two numbers closer to each other than given threshold* (shown in Figure 1) as an example, during the initial code generation, the programmer agent will try to understand and clarify the given task. In this case, interpreting the requirement to identify pairs of numbers in a list that are within a specified threshold of each other. The programmer agent will then decide on an algorithm or method to solve the problem. This could involve choosing an efficient way to compare each pair of numbers in the list. Next, during the pseudocode creation stage, the programmer agent will develop a step-by-step guide or pseudocode for the solution, ensuring a logical flow of operations. Finally, in the code generation stage, the programmer agent will translate the pseudocode into executable code.

Code snippets generated by the programmer agent can be incorrect, containing various types of errors (e.g., syntax errors and runtime errors), leading to failed test cases provided by the test designer agent. Under such circumstances, the programmer agent will take feedback from other agents and refine the code snippets. The refinement process is iterative, with the programmer agent continuously enhancing the code based on feedback until the code successfully passes all test cases.

3.2 Test designer agent: generating basic, edge, and large scale tests

The test designer agent is also powered by LLMs. It is a crucial component of our AgentCoder's framework to test the code and provide reliable feedback for the programmer agent to optimise the code iteratively. We carefully designed the




Figure 1: Pipeline of AgentCoder with a code generation example from HumanEval

prompts for the test designer agent to satisfy the following three expectations: 1) to generate basic test cases, 2) to cover edge test cases, and 3) to cover large-scale inputs (the test designer agent prompt and response example is shown in Appendix Figure 8 and 9). The first aspect expects that the test designer agent design test cases that cover the fundamental functionality of the code. These tests are designed to ensure that the code performs as expected under normal conditions. For instance, in a task that involves sorting a list, the basic test cases verify that the list is sorted correctly for typical inputs. The second aspect ensures that the code performs well under edge scenarios, which are critical for evaluating the code’s behavior under extreme or unusual conditions. These tests are designed to challenge the code with boundary conditions, unexpected inputs, and rare scenarios, to help in identifying potential bugs or weaknesses in the code that might not be evident during basic testing. For example, using an empty list or a list with extremely large numbers to test the sorting algorithm. Finally, the test designer agent will also generate test cases with large scale values to assess the code’s performance and scalability (e.g., testing the sorting algorithm with a list of millions of elements). This involves testing the code under high-load conditions to evaluate whether it maintains its functionality and performance.

3.3 Test executor agent: code validation and feedback Integration

Distinct from the programmer agent and test designer agent that are powered by LLMs, the test executor agent in our framework is implemented through a Python script interacting with a local environment and the other two agents (an example of the test executor agent is shown in Appendix Figure 10). As illustrated in Fig. 1, the test executor agent plays a pivotal role in the final stage of the code generation process. Upon receiving code snippets generated by the programmer agent and test cases generated by the test designer agent, the test executor agent validates these code snippets along with the test cases in a local environment. The test executor agent closely monitors the return information from the execution environment (i.e., the terminal). This involves analyzing the output and determining whether the code snippets successfully pass all the test cases. If all test cases are passed, it returns the code to the human developer. Otherwise, if the ex-

ecution results contain error information (e.g., assertion and syntax errors), the test executor agent will then return the error information to the programmer agent to fix the reported error.

4 Evaluation

In this section, we conduct experiments to answer the following research questions:

- RQ1: How does AgentCoder perform?
- RQ2: How do different agents contribute to the effectiveness of AgentCoder?
- RQ3: How do code refinement iterations affect AgentCoder’s effectiveness?
- RQ4: How accurate are the tests generated by the test designer agent?
- RQ5: How adequate are the tests generated by the test designer agent?
- RQ6: Should the roles of programmer and test designer be separated and assigned to different agents?

4.1 Experiment Setup

We use pass@1 as the evaluation metric for code correctness, the most widely adopted metric in the literature of automatic code generation [Chen *et al.*, 2021c; Austin *et al.*, 2021; Dong *et al.*, 2023a; Zhang *et al.*, 2023b; Dong *et al.*, 2023b].

Datasets In this paper, we evaluate AgentCoder’s effectiveness with four widely used code generation datasets, i.e., HumanEval [Chen *et al.*, 2021b] and MBPP [Austin *et al.*, 2021], and their enhanced versions, i.e., HumanEval-ET and MBPP-ET [Dong *et al.*, 2023a]. HumanEval and HumanEval-ET focus on a range of programming challenges, offering a diverse set of problems to test the model’s problem-solving skills and adaptability. On the other hand, MBPP and MBPP-ET provide a comprehensive collection of Python programming problems, designed to evaluate the model’s proficiency in Python syntax and its ability to handle a variety of coding scenarios. The enhanced versions, HumanEval-ET and MBPP-ET, include more adequate test cases, making them more challenging and better suited for evaluating advanced models.

Table 1: End-to-end results of AgentCoder and baseline approaches for HumanEval, HumanEval-ET, MBPP, and MBPP-ET datasets. The baseline results are obtained from its paper report. We use “-” to indicate the cases where the results are absent. The percentages in brackets are the improvement rate over the base LLMs. For the last three rows, no baseline optimisation approaches report effectiveness on these LLMs, therefore, we report the results of AgentCoder only. The percentages in parentheses indicate the comparative increase in improvement achieved by LLM-based optimization approaches relative to zero-shot prompting results.

Models		HumanEval	HumanEval-ET	MBPP	MBPP-ET	Mean
LLMs (zero-shot prompting)	AlphaCode (1.1B)	17.1	-	-	-	17.1
	InCoder (6.7B)	15.2	11.6	17.6	14.3	14.7
	CodeGeeX (13B)	18.9	15.2	26.9	20.4	20.4
	StarCoder (15.5B)	34.1	25.6	43.6	33.4	34.2
	CodeGen-Mono (16.1B)	32.9	25.0	38.6	31.6	32.0
	CodeX (175B)	47.0	31.7	58.1	38.8	43.9
	CodeX (175B)+CodeT	65.8	51.7	67.7	45.1	57.6
	GPT-3.5-turbo	57.3	42.7	52.2	36.8	47.3
	PaLM Coder	43.9	36.6	32.3	27.2	35.0
	Claude-instant-1	31.1	28.1	26.9	19.9	26.5
	GPT-4-turbo	57.9	48.8	63.4	47.5	54.4
	GPT-4	67.6	50.6	68.3	52.2	59.7
LLM-based optimisation approaches	Few-Shot	67.7 (18.2%)	54.9 (28.6%)	65.8 (26.1%)	48.3 (31.2%)	59.2 (25.2%)
	CoT	44.6 (-22.2%)	37.2 (-12.9%)	46.1 (-11.7%)	34.8 (-5.4%)	40.7 (-14.0%)
	ReAct	56.9 (-0.7%)	49.4 (15.7%)	67.0 (28.4%)	45.9 (24.7%)	54.8 (15.9%)
	Reflexion	68.1 (18.8%)	50.6 (18.5%)	70.0 (34.1%)	47.5 (29.1%)	59.1 (24.9%)
	ToT	54.4 (-5.1%)	42.7 (0.0%)	65.8 (26.1%)	40.8 (10.9%)	50.9 (7.6%)
	RAP	63.1 (10.1%)	52.4 (22.7%)	71.4 (36.8%)	46.7 (26.9%)	58.4 (23.5%)
	Self-Edit	62.2 (8.6%)	54.3 (27.2%)	56.4 (8.0%)	45.9 (24.7%)	54.7 (15.6%)
	Self-Planing	65.2 (13.8%)	48.8 (14.3%)	58.6 (12.3%)	41.5 (12.8%)	53.5 (13.1%)
	Self-debugging	61.6 (7.5%)	45.8 (7.3%)	60.1 (15.1%)	52.3 (42.1%)	55.0 (16.3%)
	Self-Collaboration	74.4 (29.8%)	56.1 (31.4%)	68.2 (30.7%)	49.5 (34.5%)	62.1 (31.3%)
	INTERVENOR	75.6 (31.9%)	54.8 (28.3%)	69.8 (33.7%)	47.1 (28.0%)	61.8 (30.7%)
	CodeCoT	79.3 (38.4%)	69.5 (62.8%)	89.5 (71.5%)	63.0 (71.2%)	75.3 (59.2%)
	AgentCoder (ours)	79.9 (39.4%)	77.4 (81.3%)	89.9 (72.2%)	89.1 (142.1%)	84.1 (77.8%)
	with GPT-4	Reflexion	91.0 (34.6%)	-	77.1 (12.9%)	84.1 (40.9%)
		Self-Debugging	-	-	80.6 (18.0%)	80.6 (35.0%)
		Self-Collaboration	90.2 (33.4%)	70.7 (39.7%)	78.9 (15.5%)	62.1 (19.0%)
		MetaGPT	85.9 (27.1%)	-	87.7 (28.4%)	-
		AgentCoder (ours)	96.3 (42.5%)	86.0 (70.0%)	91.8 (34.4%)	91.8 (75.9%)
	with PaLM Coder	AgentCoder (ours)	64.0 (45.8%)	55.5 (51.6%)	75.9 (135.0%)	75.5 (177.6%)
	with Claude-instant-1	AgentCoder (ours)	67.7 (117.7%)	57.9 (106.0%)	76.3 (183.6%)	75.1 (277.4%)
	with GPT-4-turbo	AgentCoder (ours)	89.6 (54.7%)	76.2 (56.1%)	91.4 (44.2%)	91.4 (92.4%)
						87.2 (60.3%)

LLMs that power the agents The programmer agent and the test designer agent in AgentCoder are powered by LLMs. We study the effectiveness of AgentCoder powered by five state-of-the-art LLMs in this paper, including GPT-4, GPT-4-turbo, GPT-3.5-turbo, PaLM Coder, and Claude (Claude-instant-1).

Baselines To illustrate the effectiveness of AgentCoder, in this paper, we compare AgentCoder with 12 Large Language Models (LLMs), including open-source and closed-source ones, such as AlphaCode [Li *et al.*, 2022], InCoder [Fried *et al.*, 2022], CodeGeeX [Zheng *et al.*, 2023], StarCoder [Li *et al.*, 2023b], CodeGen-Mono [Nijkamp *et al.*, 2023b], CodeX [Brown *et al.*, 2020a], GPT-3.5-turbo, and GPT4 [OpenAI, 2023]. These models vary in architecture, training methodologies, and application scopes.

Additionally, we compare AgentCoder with 13 state-of-the-art (SOTA) code generation methods that are based on LLMs but with various optimisation strategies, including Few-shot learning, Chain-of-Thought [Wei *et al.*, 2022], ReAct [Yao *et al.*, 2022], Reflexion [Shinn *et al.*, 2023], ToT [Yao *et al.*, 2023], RAP [Hao *et al.*, 2023], Self-Edit [Zhang *et al.*, 2023b], Self-Planing [Jiang *et al.*, 2023], Self-Debugging [Chen *et al.*, 2023b], Self-Collaboration [Dong *et al.*, 2023b], SCOT [Li *et al.*, 2023a], CodeCoT [Huang *et al.*, 2023], and INTERVENOR [Wang *et al.*, 2023a]. These methods have been shown to significantly

Table 2: Contribution of different agents in AgentCoder.

Agents	HumanEval	HumanEval-ET	MBPP	MBPP-ET
programmer agent only	61.0	52.4	47.9	35.0
programmer + test designer	64.0 (11.7%)	54.3 (27.2%)	62.3 (19.3%)	45.9 (24.7%)
programmer + test executor	64.6 (12.7%)	55.5 (30.0%)	69.3 (32.8%)	51.4 (39.7%)
AgentCoder	79.9 (39.4%)	77.4 (81.3%)	89.9 (72.2%)	89.1 (142.1%)

enhance the performance of LLMs in complex problem-solving scenarios.

4.2 RQ1: How does AgentCoder perform?

Setup AgentCoder is a multi-agent-based code generation framework that can be applied to any LLM. To answer the first research question, we evaluate the effectiveness of AgentCoder with five state-of-the-art LLMs, i.e., GPT-4, GPT-4-turbo, GPT-3.5-turbo, PaLM Coder, and Claude (Claude-instant-1). As introduced in Section 4.1, we compare the pass@1 of AgentCoder with 12 LLMs and 13 LLM-based optimisation approaches that enhance the code generation performance with different strategies.

Tab. 1 shows the results. we can observe that AgentCoder obtains SOTA performance compared to the base LLM models and all the baseline optimisation approaches in all the datasets. Specifically, if we focus on the improvement that AgentCoder achieves over the base LLMs, take GPT-3.5-turbo as an example, GPT-3.5-turbo obtains 57.3% pass@1 in the HumanEval dataset, while AgentCoder obtains 79.9%. For GPT-4, the mean pass@1 of AgentCoder is 91.5% across

all the datasets, **32.7% improvement** over the baseline zero-shot GPT-4 model. For PaLM Coder, Claude-instant-1, and GPT-4-turbo, the mean improvement of AgentCoder over the base models are **32.7%**, **42.8%**, **32.8%**, respectively.

AgentCoder also demonstrates superiority over all of the optimisation baselines. For example, for MBPP-ET with GPT-3.5-turbo, AgentCoder has 89.1% pass@1, while CodeCoT, the state-of-the-art approach, achieves only 63.0%. On average, the pass@1 of AgentCoder is 84.1%, **8.8% more than the state-of-the-art approach CodeCoT**. The key reason for AgentCoder obtains higher performance compared with CodeCoT is that during the test case generation, CodeCoT simply generates a few test cases to analyze code behavior, while AgentCoder has the test designer agent which generates much more powerful test cases. RQ4 and RQ5 introduce more analysis regarding the test cases.

The HumanEval-ET and MBPP-ET datasets contain more comprehensive tests and are more challenging for code generation approaches to get high pass@1. We can observe that the base LLMs and the baseline optimisation approaches perform significantly worse on these two enhanced versions. However, AgentCoder’s performance on these enhanced datasets is comparative to the original datasets, which is another superiority of AgentCoder, largely because the test designer agent generates rigorous tests to ensure that the generated code is indeed reliable.

4.3 RQ2: How do different agents contribute to the effectiveness of AgentCoder?

As illustrated in Fig. 1, AgentCoder contains three agents, i.e., the programmer agent, the test designer agent, and the test executor agent, where the programmer agent focuses on generating code snippets based on the code generation requirements and feedback from other agents. The test designer agent focuses on generating test cases, which are used to evaluate the correctness of the code snippets produced by the programmer agent. The test executor agent interacts with the other two agents to collect the code snippets and test cases and executes them in a local environment to prepare feedback. This research question investigates how each agent contributes to AgentCoder’s effectiveness with four agent combination scenarios, i.e., the programmer agent itself, the programmer + test designer agent, where we feed the function and test cases into the programmer agent and require it to analyze whether it needs to refine the code to pass all test cases, and the programmer + test executor agent, where we directly run the generated code with the tests provided in the prompt¹(we provide the programmer + test designer/executor agent prompts in Appendix Figure 11 and 12).

The evaluation results are shown in Tab. 2. We can observe that first, with the assistant of the test designer and the test executor agent, the pass@1 increases compared with the result of only the programmer agent. For example, with both the programmer and the test designer agent, the pass@1 increases from 61.0% to 64.0%. However, without the test executor agent, the programmer agent is not able to get reli-

¹The code generation prompts in HumanEval and MBPP contains a few test cases.

Table 3: Pass@1 of AgentCoder with different number of iterations on GPT-3.5-turbo.

Iterations	HumanEval	HumanEval-ET	MBPP	MBPP-ET
1	74.4 (29.8%)	73.2 (71.4%)	84.1 (61.1%)	80.3 (118.2%)
2	75.6 (31.9%)	73.2 (71.4%)	86.4 (65.5%)	85.6 (132.6%)
3	76.2 (33.0%)	75.0 (75.6%)	87.9 (68.4%)	87.6 (138.0%)
4	78.7 (37.3%)	76.8 (79.9%)	88.7 (69.9%)	88.7 (141.0%)
5	79.9 (39.4%)	77.4 (81.3%)	89.9 (72.2%)	89.1 (142.1%)

able feedback from dynamic test case execution. Therefore, the performance is significantly below AgentCoder. For the programmer + test executor agent, it obtains 64.6% and 69.3% pass@1 in HumanEval and MBPP, which is also higher than the programmer agent itself which obtains 61.0% and 47.9%. This is because test executor agent detects some bugs in the code with the test cases provided by the prompt. However, the number of test cases is very limited, with only two to three tests in HumanEval and MBPP. The effectiveness of these tests are far below from the tests generated by the test designer agent. Therefore, without the test designer agent, the performance is also significantly below AgentCoder.

4.4 RQ3: How do code refinement iterations affect AgentCoder’s effectiveness?

As illustrated in Fig. 1, AgentCoder will refine code snippets based on the feedback information provided by the test executor agent. In this experiment, we evaluate how the number of refinement iterations affect AgentCoder’s effectiveness. Specifically, we analyze AgentCoder’s effectiveness with its result for each refinement iteration. We can observe that the pass@1 increase with more iterations. In particular, when we increase the number of iterations from 1 to 5, the pass@1 of HumanEval and HumanEval-ET increases from 74.4% to 79.9% and 73.2% to 77.4%. We can also observe these behaviors for the MBPP and MBPP-ET datasets, where the pass@1 increases from 84.1% to 89.9% and 80.3% to 89.1%.

4.5 RQ4: How accurate are the tests generated by the test designer agent?

As we mentioned before, the test designer agent focuses on generating test cases to analyze whether the code has bugs and plays a crucial role in AgentCoder. However, once the test cases are incorrect (e.g., with incorrect test oracles), the feedback the test cases provide will be problematic, misleading the programmer agent and decreasing AgentCoder’s overall effectiveness. Therefore, this research question investigates how reliable the test designer agent is in generating accurate tests to aid the programmer agent. We evaluate the accuracy of the test cases under the datasets’ **canonical solution**² on GPT-3.5-turbo. The tests that pass the code canonical solution are correct. To demonstrate the effectiveness and superiority of the test designer agent in AgentCoder, we compare the accuracy of the tests generated by AgentCoder, the default zero-shot GPT-3.5-turbo model, as well as CodeCoT where the tests are generated at the same time with the code.

The evaluation results are shown in Tab. 4. First, we observe that the test case accuracy of the test designer agent in

²Each coding task in the datasets has a canonical solution, which is the ground truth for code generation.

Table 4: Accuracy of the generated test cases

Models	HumanEval	MBPP
GPT-3.5-turbo	47.0	57.2
CodeCoT	67.1	79.0
AgentCoder	87.8	89.9

Table 5: Code line coverage of the generated test cases. In our experiment, we follow CodeCoT to calculate the code line coverage with the first five / all test cases provided by the test designer agent for each function.

Models	HumanEval	MBPP
GPT-3.5-turbo	67.1 / 70.2	58.4 / 61.3
CodeCoT	74.7 / 77.2	79.3 / 82.9
AgentCoder	84.7 / 87.5	85.3 / 89.5

AgentCoder is 87.8% and 89.9% in HumanEval and MBPP datasets, while GPT-3.5-turbo obtains only 47.0% and 57.2%. In addition, we observe that the test designer agent in AgentCoder is also more accurate than CodeCoT in test generation. For example, on HumanEval, the accuracy is 87.8% v.s. 67.1% for AgentCoder and CodeCoT. The superiority of AgentCoder demonstrates the effectiveness of the prompt engineering strategies we designed for the test designer agent.

4.6 RQ5: How adequate are AgentCoder’s test cases in terms of code coverage?

This research question explores the adequacy of the test cases generated by the test designer agent in terms of code coverage. Specifically, we evaluate how many lines of code in the canonical solution are covered by the test cases generated by the original GPT-3.5-turbo, CodeCoT, and AgentCoder. The evaluation results were illustrated in Tab. 5, where we can observe that the tests generated by AgentCoder have the highest code coverage. For example, AgentCoder obtains 84.7 / 87.5% and 85.3 / 89.5% code coverage compared with CodeCoT, which only obtains 74.7 / 77.2% and 79.3 / 82.9%, on the two datasets when we calculate the code line coverage with the first five / all tests generated by each strategy. The results further demonstrate the effectiveness of the prompt engineering strategies we adopt for the test designer agent.

4.7 RQ6: Should the roles of programmer and test designer be separated and assigned to different agents?

As shown in Fig. 1, AgentCoder requires separate agents for generating code and tests (i.e., the programmer agent and the test designer agent). Both agents are powered by LLMs. An alternative way is to let a single agent first generate code and then generate tests, within the same conversation. This research question investigates whether requiring one agent to finish two tasks, i.e., code generation and test case generation, is as effective as using separate agents.

The evaluation results are shown in Tab. 6, Tab. 7, and Tab. 8. We can observe that the pass@1 of using a single agent to generate both code and tests is lower than assigning the two tasks to different agents. For example, the pass@1 of the single agent has only 71.3% and 79.4% pass@1 for

HumanEval and MBPP, while the multi-agent setting (AgentCoder) obtains 79.9% and 89.9% for HumanEval and MBPP. We also observe that the test case accuracy for the single agent is also lower than the multi-agent setting (AgentCoder). Specifically, the single agent only obtains 61.0% and 51.8% in HumanEval and MBPP datasets, while the Multi-agents (AgentCoder) obtains 87.8% and 89.9% in HumanEval and MBPP. Finally, as shown in Tab. 8, we can also observe that the tests’ coverage results of the single agent are also lower than the multi-agent setting. For example, the single agent only obtains 72.5% and 75.9% code line coverage while multiple agents obtain 87.5% and 89.5% code line coverage.

There are two reasons for the superiority of the multi-agent setup. First, letting a single agent do both code generation and test case design distracts the agent’s focus; second, the tests designed by the same agent that generates the code can be biased by the code and lose objectivity.

The key reason is single agent focuses on generating test cases for its previously generated code, while once the code ignores some edge cases in the problem description, the test generation procedure will also ignore these edge cases since the test generator already ignores these edge cases during the code generation procedure.

These results demonstrate the necessity of using multiple agents to collaborate in code generation, with different agents taking different roles, an observation that is also supported by the theory of multi-agent systems [Chen *et al.*, 2023a; Zhang *et al.*, 2023a].

Table 6: Pass@1 for a single agent and multiple agents (AgentCoder).

Models	HumanEval	HumanEval-ET	MBPP	MBPP-ET
Single Agent	71.3	61.6	79.4	59.1
Multiple Agents	79.9	77.4	89.9	89.1

Table 7: Tests accuracy for Single- and Multi-agents (AgentCoder).

Models	HumanEval	MBPP
Single Agent	61.0	51.8
Multiple Agents	87.8	89.9

Table 8: Code line coverage of the generated test cases for single agent and multiple agents (AgentCoder). We calculate the code line coverage with the first five / all test cases provided by the test designer agent for each function.

Models	HumanEval	MBPP
Single Agent	68.5 / 72.5	72.2 / 75.9
Multiple Agents	84.7 / 87.5	85.3 / 89.5

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose AgentCoder, which contains multiple agents to improve the code generation effectiveness of code generation models. AgentCoder contains three agents, i.e., the programmer, test designer, and test executor agent.

During the code generation procedure, the programmer agent will first generate code snippets and then the test designer agent will generate test cases for the code snippets. Next, the test executor agent will test the code snippets with test cases in the local environment. Once the feedback of the local environment contains an error message, the test executor agent will feed it into the programmer and test designer agent to require them fix the error information. Throughout our evaluations, AgentCoder demonstrated SOTA performance, outperforming existing LLMs and prompt engineering methods in a variety of coding scenarios. For example, AgentCoder increases the pass@1 from 79.3% and 76.3% to 79.9% and 89.1% for HumanEval and MBPP datasets.

References

[Ahmad *et al.*, 2021] Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Saikat Chakraborty, Baishakhi Ray, and Kai-Wei Chang. Unified pre-training for program understanding and generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2103.06333, 2021.

[Austin *et al.*, 2021] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie J. Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc V. Le, and Charles Sutton. Program synthesis with large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2108.07732, 2021.

[Brown *et al.*, 2020a] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, T. J. Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeff Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.14165, 2020.

[Brown *et al.*, 2020b] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.

[Chen *et al.*, 2021a] Jun Chen, Han Guo, Kai Yi, Boyang Albert Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Visualgpt: Data-efficient adaptation of pretrained language models for image captioning. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 18009–18019, 2021.

[Chen *et al.*, 2021b] 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. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.

[Chen *et al.*, 2021c] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde, Jared Kaplan, Harrison Edwards, Yura Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke

Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, David W. Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William H. Guss, Alex Nichol, Igor Babuschkin, S. Arun Balaji, Shantanu Jain, Andrew Carr, Jan Leike, Joshua Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew M. Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.03374, 2021.

[Chen *et al.*, 2023a] Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Jingwei Zuo, Cheng Yang, Chenfei Yuan, Cheng Qian, Chi-Min Chan, Yujia Qin, Ya-Ting Lu, Ruobing Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Jie Zhou. Agentverse: Facilitating multi-agent collaboration and exploring emergent behaviors in agents. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.10848, 2023.

[Chen *et al.*, 2023b] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Teaching large language models to self-debug. *ArXiv*, abs/2304.05128, 2023.

[Dong *et al.*, 2023a] Yihong Dong, Ji Ding, Xue Jiang, Zhuo Li, Ge Li, and Zhi Jin. Codescore: Evaluating code generation by learning code execution. *ArXiv*, abs/2301.09043, 2023.

[Dong *et al.*, 2023b] Yihong Dong, Xue Jiang, Zhi Jin, and Ge Li. Self-collaboration code generation via chatgpt. *ArXiv*, abs/2304.07590, 2023.

[Feng *et al.*, 2020] Zhangyin Feng, Daya Guo, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Xiaocheng Feng, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Bing Qin, Ting Liu, Daxin Jiang, and Ming Zhou. CodeBERT: A pre-trained model for programming and natural languages. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1536–1547, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.

[Fried *et al.*, 2022] Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida I. Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Wen tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. Incoder: A generative model for code infilling and synthesis. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.05999, 2022.

[Guo *et al.*, 2020] Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Shuai Lu, Zhangyin Feng, Duyu Tang, Shujie Liu, Long Zhou, Nan Duan, Jian Yin, Daxin Jiang, and M. Zhou. Graphcodebert: Pre-training code representations with data flow. *ArXiv*, abs/2009.08366, 2020.

[Hao *et al.*, 2023] Shibo Hao, Yi Gu, Haodi Ma, Joshuaiah Hong, Zhen Wang, Daisy Zhe Wang, and Zhiting Hu. Reasoning with language model is planning with world model. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.14992, 2023.

[Huang *et al.*, 2023] Dong Huang, Qi Bu, and Heming Cui. Codcot and beyond: Learning to program and test like a developer. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.08784, 2023.

[Jiang *et al.*, 2023] Xue Jiang, Yihong Dong, Lecheng Wang, Qiwei Shang, and Ge Li. Self-planning code gener-

724	ation with large language model. <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2303.06689, 2023.	language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. <i>ICLR</i> , 2023.	781
725			782
726	[Le <i>et al.</i> , 2023] Hung Le, Hailin Chen, Amrita Saha, Akash Gokul, Doyen Sahoo, and Shafiq R. Joty. Codechain: Towards modular code generation through chain of self-revisions with representative sub-modules. <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2310.08992, 2023.	[OpenAI, 2023] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2303.08774, 2023.	783
727			784
728		[Shinn <i>et al.</i> , 2023] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Beck Labash, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. 2023.	785
729			786
730			787
731	[Li <i>et al.</i> , 2022] Yujia Li, David H. Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom, Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, Thomas Hubert, Peter Choy, Cyprien de, Masson d’Autume, Igor Babuschkin, Xinyun Chen, Po-Sen Huang, Johannes Welbl, Sven Gowal, Alexey, Cherepanov, James Molloy, Daniel Jaymin Mankowitz, Esme Sutherland Robson, Pushmeet Kohli, Nando de, Freitas, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Oriol Vinyals. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. <i>Science</i> , 378:1092 – 1097, 2022.	[Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2021] Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven C.H. Hoi. Codet5: Identifier-aware unified pre-trained encoder-decoder models for code understanding and generation. In <i>EMNLP</i> , 2021.	788
732			789
733			790
734			791
735			792
736		[Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2023a] Hanbin Wang, Zhenghao Liu, Shuo Wang, Ganqu Cui, Ning Ding, Zhiyuan Liu, and Ge Yu. Intervenor: Prompt the coding ability of large language models with the interactive chain of repairing. <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2311.09868, 2023.	793
737			794
738			795
739			796
740			797
741			
742	[Li <i>et al.</i> , 2023a] Jia Li, Ge Li, Yongming Li, and Zhi Jin. Structured chain-of-thought prompting for code generation. 2023.	[Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2023b] Yue Wang, Hung Le, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Nghi DQ Bui, Junnan Li, and Steven CH Hoi. Codet5+: Open code large language models for code understanding and generation. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07922</i> , 2023.	798
743			799
744			800
745	[Li <i>et al.</i> , 2023b] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Terry Yue Zhuo, Thomas Wang, Olivier Dehaene, Mishig Davaadorj, Joel Lamy-Poirier, João Monteiro, Oleh Shliazhko, Nicolas Gontier, Nicholas Meade, Armel Zebaze, Ming-Ho Yee, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Jian Zhu, Benjamin Lipkin, Muhtasham Oblokulov, Zhiruo Wang, Rudra Murthy, Jason Stillerman, Siva Sankalp Patel, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Marco Zocca, Manan Dey, Zhihan Zhang, Nourhan Fahmy, Urvashi Bhattacharyya, W. Yu, Swayam Singh, Sasha Luccioni, Paulo Villegas, Maxim Kunakov, Fedor Zhdanov, Manuel Romero, Tony Lee, Nadav Timor, Jennifer Ding, Claire Schlesinger, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jana Ebert, Tri Dao, Mayank Mishra, Alexander Gu, Jennifer Robinson, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Danish Contractor, Siva Reddy, Daniel Fried, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Sean M. Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. Starcoder: may the source be with you! <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2305.06161, 2023.	[Wei <i>et al.</i> , 2022] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Huai hsin Chi, F. Xia, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2201.11903, 2022.	801
746			802
747			803
748			804
749			805
750			806
751			807
752		[Yao <i>et al.</i> , 2022] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2210.03629, 2022.	808
753			809
754			810
755			811
756		[Yao <i>et al.</i> , 2023] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2305.10601, 2023.	812
757			813
758			814
759			815
760			816
761			
762		[Zan <i>et al.</i> , 2022] Daoguang Zan, Bei Chen, Dejian Yang, Zeqi Lin, Minsu Kim, Bei Guan, Yongji Wang, Weizhu Chen, and Jian-Guang Lou. CERT: Continual pre-training on sketches for library-oriented code generation. In <i>The 2022 International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence</i> , 2022.	817
763			818
764			819
765			820
766			821
767	[Madaan <i>et al.</i> , 2023] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, Sean Welleck, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Shashank Gupta, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, and Peter Clark. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2303.17651, 2023.	[Zhang <i>et al.</i> , 2023a] Ceyao Zhang, Kaijie Yang, Siyi Hu, Zihao Wang, Guanghe Li, Yi Eve Sun, Chen Zhang, Zhaowei Zhang, Anji Liu, Song-Chun Zhu, Xiaojun Chang, Junge Zhang, F. Yin, Yitao Liang, and Yaodong Yang. Proagent: Building proactive cooperative ai with large language models. <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2308.11339, 2023.	822
768			823
769			824
770			825
771			826
772			827
773			828
774	[Nijkamp <i>et al.</i> , 2023a] Erik Nijkamp, Hiroaki Hayashi, Caiming Xiong, Silvio Savarese, and Yingbo Zhou. Codegen2: Lessons for training llms on programming and natural languages. <i>ICLR</i> , 2023.	[Zhang <i>et al.</i> , 2023b] Kechi Zhang, Zhuo Li, Jia Li, Ge Li, and Zhi Jin. Self-edit: Fault-aware code editor for code generation. <i>ArXiv</i> , abs/2305.04087, 2023.	829
775			830
776			831
777			
778	[Nijkamp <i>et al.</i> , 2023b] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. Codegen: An open large	[Zheng <i>et al.</i> , 2023] Qinkai Zheng, Xiao Xia, Xu Zou, Yuxiao Dong, Shanshan Wang, Yufei Xue, Zi-Yuan Wang, Lei Shen, Andi Wang, Yang Li, Teng Su, Zhilin Yang, and Jie	832
779			833
780			834

835 Tang. Codegeex: A pre-trained model for code genera-
836 tion with multilingual evaluations on humaneval-x. *ArXiv*,
837 abs/2303.17568, 2023.

A Appendix 838

A.1 Response Setup 839

To ensure that the output of each agent follows our re- 840
quirements for the execution of the test executor agent, 841
we will require each agent’s output follow the architecture 842
of ‘‘py[Code]’’ and ‘‘py[TestCases]’’, where the 843
[Code] and [TestCases] will be in the ‘‘py’’. With this 844
format, the test executor agent can directly obtain [Code] and 845
[TestCases] by removing the other sentences before and after 846
these code blocks, ensuring an accurate and focused analysis. 847

A.2 Case Illustration for CodeCoT and 848 AgentCoder 849

To provide a comprehensive illustration for CodeCoT and 850
AgentCoder, we provide two code and tests generation exam- 851
ples for HumanEval and MBPP datasets from Fig. 2 to Fig. 5. 852
We can observe that AgentCoder can generate more fine- 853
grained tests for the generated code. For example, Agent- 854
Coder will consider the code execution results when the input 855
list does not contain element (Fig. 3 and Fig. 5), which can 856
improve code snippet reliability for edge behaviors. 857

A.3 Case Illustration on HumanEval dataset using 858 AgentCoder 859

We also provide each agent’s prompt and response exam- 860
ple (Fig. 6 to Fig. 10) to illustrate AgentCoder’s workflow. 861

A.4 Case Illustration of the programmer + test 862 executor agent 863

We illustrate the pipeline of the programmer + the test execu- 864
tor agent in Fig. 11. 865

A.5 Case Illustration of the programmer + test 866 designer 867

We illustrate the pipeline of the programmer + the test de- 868
signer agent in Fig. 12. 869

HumanEval Task 1 Code Generation

```
from typing import List

def has_close_elements(numbers: List[float], threshold: float) -> bool:
    """
    Check if in given list of numbers, are any two numbers closer to each other than given threshold.
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0, 3.0], 0.5)
    False
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.8, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 2.0], 0.3)
    True
    """
```

CodeCoT

```
from typing import List

def has_close_elements(numbers: List[float], threshold: float) -> bool:
    """
    Check if in given list of numbers, are any two numbers closer to each other than given threshold.
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0, 3.0], 0.5)
    False
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.8, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 2.0], 0.3)
    True
    """
    for i in range(len(numbers)):
        for j in range(i + 1, len(numbers)):
            if numbers[i] - numbers[j] <= threshold:
                return True
    return False
```

AgentCoder

```
from typing import List

def has_close_elements(numbers: List[float], threshold: float) -> bool:
    """
    Check if in given list of numbers, are any two numbers closer to each other than given threshold.
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0, 3.0], 0.5)
    False
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.8, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 2.0], 0.3)
    True
    """
    for i in range(len(numbers)):
        for j in range(i + 1, len(numbers)):
            if abs(numbers[i] - numbers[j]) <= threshold:
                return True
    return False
```

Figure 2: A case illustration of CodeCoT and AgentCoder generated code for HumanEval task.

HumanEval Task 1 Tests Generation

```
from typing import List

def has_close_elements(numbers: List[float], threshold: float) -> bool:
    """
    Check if in given list of numbers, are any two numbers closer to each other than given
    threshold.
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0, 3.0], 0.5)
    False
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.8, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 2.0], 0.3)
    True
    """
```

CodeCoT

```
# Testing the function with various cases
assert not has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0, 3.0], 0.5)
# No two numbers are closer than 0.5, should return False

assert has_close_elements([1.0, 1.4, 2.5, 3.6], 0.5)
# 1.0 and 1.4 are closer than 0.5, should return True

assert not has_close_elements([], 1.0)
# Empty list, should return False

assert has_close_elements([0.1, 0.15, 0.3], 0.06)
# 0.1 and 0.15 are closer than 0.06, should return True

assert not has_close_elements([10, 20, 30, 40], 5)
# No two numbers are closer than 5, should return False
```

AgentCoder

```
# Basic Cases
# Test 1: Standard list with some close elements
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 2.5, 3.5, 5.0], 1.0) == True

# Test 2: Standard list with no close elements
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 3.0, 5.0, 7.0], 1.5) == False

# Edge Cases
# Test 1: Empty list
assert has_close_elements([], 1.0) == False

# Test 2: List with all elements the same
assert has_close_elements([3.0, 3.0, 3.0], 0.0) == True

# Test 3: Very small threshold
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 1.01, 2.0], 0.005) == False

# Test 4: List with only two elements
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0], 1.5) == True

# Large Cases
large_list = [i * 0.1 for i in range(100000)] # Creates a list [0, 0.1, 0.2, ..., 9999.9]

# Test with a threshold where we know the outcome
# Since the list is in increments of 0.1, a threshold of 0.05 should return False
assert has_close_elements(large_list, 0.05) == False

# Test with a larger threshold where we expect a True result
# With a threshold of 0.15, adjacent elements (0.1 apart) will be within the threshold
assert has_close_elements(large_list, 0.15) == True
```

Figure 3: A case illustration of CodeCoT and AgentCoder generated tests for HumanEval task.

MBPP Example Task Code Generation

Write a python function to check whether the given array is monotonic or not.

CodeCoT

```
def is_Monotonic(array):
    """
    Check whether the given array is monotonic or not.
    :param array: List of integers
    :return: True if the array is monotonic, False otherwise
    """
    increasing = decreasing = True

    for i in range(1, len(array)):
        if array[i] > array[i - 1]:
            decreasing = False
        elif array[i] < array[i - 1]:
            increasing = False

    return increasing or decreasing
```

AgentCoder

```
def is_Monotonic(arr):
    """
    Check whether the given array is monotonic or not.
    Args:
    arr (list): Input list of integers
    Returns:
    bool: True if the array is monotonic, False otherwise
    """

    # Check if array is increasing or decreasing
    increasing = decreasing = True

    for i in range(len(arr)-1):
        if arr[i] > arr[i+1]:
            increasing = False
        if arr[i] < arr[i+1]:
            decreasing = False

    # Check if either increasing or decreasing flag is True
    return increasing or decreasing
```

Figure 4: A case illustration of CodeCoT and AgentCoder generated code for MBPP task.

MBPP Example Task Tests Generation

Write a python function to check whether the given array is monotonic or not.

CodeCoT

```
# Self-examination with test cases
assert isMonotonic([1, 2, 3, 4, 5]) == True # Increasing sequence, should return True
assert isMonotonic([5, 4, 3, 2, 1]) == True # Decreasing sequence, should return True
assert isMonotonic([1, 2, 2, 3, 2]) == False # Non-monotonic sequence, should return False
```

AgentCoder

```
# Basic test cases
assert isMonotonic([1, 2, 3, 4, 5]) == True # Increasing sequence
assert isMonotonic([5, 4, 3, 2, 1]) == True # Decreasing sequence
assert isMonotonic([1, 2, 2, 3, 2]) == False # Non-monotonic sequence

# Edge test cases
assert isMonotonic([1]) == True # Single-element sequence
assert isMonotonic([]) == True # Empty sequence
assert isMonotonic([1, 2]) == True # Two-element increasing sequence
assert isMonotonic([2, 1]) == True # Two-element decreasing sequence
assert isMonotonic([1, 1, 1, 1, 1]) == True # All elements are equal, considered monotonic
assert isMonotonic([1, 1, 1, 2, 1]) == False # Mixed values, not monotonic

# Large input
large_input = [i for i in range(1, 100001)]
# An increasing sequence of 100,000 elements
assert isMonotonic(large_input) == True # Should be considered monotonic

# Create a large decreasing sequence
large_decreasing_input = [i for i in range(100000, 0, -1)]
# A decreasing sequence of 100,000 elements
assert isMonotonic(large_decreasing_input) == True # Should be considered monotonic
```

Figure 5: A case illustration of CodeCoT and AgentCoder generated tests for MBPP task.

AgentCoder: Programmer Prompt

****Role**:** You are a software programmer.

****Task**:** As a programmer, you are required to complete the function. Use a Chain-of-Thought approach to break down the problem, create pseudocode, and then write the code in Python language. Ensure that your code is efficient, readable, and well-commented.

For example:

****Input Code Snippet**:**

```
```python
```

```
from typing import List
```

```
def has_close_elements(numbers: List[float], threshold: float) -> bool:
```

```
 """
```

```
 Check if in given list of numbers, are any two numbers closer to each other than given threshold.
```

```
>>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0, 3.0], 0.5)
```

```
False
```

```
>>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.8, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 2.0], 0.3)
```

```
True
```

```
 """
```

```
 # TODO: Implement the logic to determine if any two numbers are closer than the threshold
```

```
 pass
```

```
Add your code here to complete the function
```

```
```
```

****Instructions**:**

1. ****Understand and Clarify**:** Make sure you understand the task.
2. ****Algorithm/Method Selection**:** Decide on the most efficient way.
3. ****Pseudocode Creation**:** Write down the steps you will follow in pseudocode.
4. ****Code Generation**:** Translate your pseudocode into executable Python code.

Figure 6: AgentCoder programmer prompt example.

AgentCoder: Programmer Response

As a software developer, I'll follow the Chain-of-Thought approach outlined in the prompt to complete the `has_close_elements` function. Let's break it down into the four steps:

1. **Understand and Clarify**:

- The task is to write a function that checks if any two numbers in a given list are closer to each other than a specified threshold.
- The function should return `True` if such a pair exists, otherwise `False`.

2. **Algorithm/Method Selection**:

- A straightforward way to solve this would be to compare each number with every other number in the list.
- We can use a nested loop where each number is compared to every number that comes after it in the list.
- The absolute difference between each pair will be calculated and compared to the threshold.

3. **Pseudocode Creation**:

```
...  
function has_close_elements(numbers, threshold):  
    loop through each number in the list (i)  
        for each number, loop through the remaining numbers in the list (j)  
            if the absolute difference between numbers[i] and numbers[j] is less than or equal to the threshold  
                return True  
    if no such pair is found, return False  
...
```

4. **Code Generation**:

- Now, I'll translate the pseudocode into Python code.

Here's the complete function:

```
```python  
from typing import List

def has_close_elements(numbers: List[float], threshold: float) -> bool:
 """
 Check if in given list of numbers, are any two numbers closer to each other than given threshold.

 >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0, 3.0], 0.5)
 False
 >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.8, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 2.0], 0.3)
 True
 """
 # Loop through each number in the list
 for i in range(len(numbers)):
 # For each number, loop through the remaining numbers
 for j in range(i + 1, len(numbers)):
 # If the absolute difference is less than or equal to the threshold, return True
 if abs(numbers[i] - numbers[j]) <= threshold:
 return True

 # If no such pair is found, return False
 return False
...
```

Figure 7: AgentCoder programmer response example.

## AgentCoder: Test Designer Prompt

**\*\*Role\*\*:** As a tester, your task is to create comprehensive test cases for the incomplete `has_close_elements` function. These test cases should encompass Basic, Edge, and Large Scale scenarios to ensure the code's robustness, reliability, and scalability.

**\*\*Input Code Snippet\*\*:**

```
```python
from typing import List

def has_close_elements(numbers: List[float], threshold: float) -> bool:
```

```
    """
    Check if in given list of numbers, are any two numbers closer to each other than given threshold.
```

```
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0, 3.0], 0.5)
```

```
    False
```

```
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.8, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 2.0], 0.3)
```

```
    True
    """
```

```
```
```

**\*\*1. Basic Test Cases\*\*:**

- **\*\*Objective\*\*:** To verify the fundamental functionality of the `has_close_elements` function under normal conditions.

**\*\*2. Edge Test Cases\*\*:**

- **\*\*Objective\*\*:** To evaluate the function's behavior under extreme or unusual conditions.

**\*\*3. Large Scale Test Cases\*\*:**

- **\*\*Objective\*\*:** To assess the function's performance and scalability with large data samples.

**\*\*Instructions\*\*:**

- Implement a comprehensive set of test cases following the guidelines above.
- Ensure each test case is well-documented with comments explaining the scenario it covers.
- Pay special attention to edge cases as they often reveal hidden bugs.
- For large-scale tests, focus on the function's efficiency and performance under heavy loads.

Figure 8: AgentCoder tester prompt example.

## AgentCoder: Test Designer Response

As a tester responding to the prompt, I will create and execute a series of Basic, Edge, and Large Scale Test Cases for the `has\_close\_elements` function to ensure its robustness and reliability. Let's begin:

### \*\*1. Basic Test Cases:\*\*

```
```python
# Test 1: Standard list with some close elements
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 2.5, 3.5, 5.0], 1.0) == True

# Test 2: Standard list with no close elements
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 3.0, 5.0, 7.0], 1.5) == False
```
```

### \*\*2. Edge Test Cases:\*\*

```
```python
# Test 1: Empty list
assert has_close_elements([], 1.0) == False

# Test 2: List with all elements the same
assert has_close_elements([3.0, 3.0, 3.0], 0.0) == True

# Test 3: Very small threshold
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 1.01, 2.0], 0.005) == False

# Test 4: List with only two elements
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0], 1.5) == True
```
```

### \*\*3. Large Scale Test Cases:\*\*

For large-scale testing, I'll focus on the function's performance with a significantly large list. Due to the constraints of this platform, I'll conceptualize the test case:

```
```python
# Large Scale Test 1: List with 100,000 elements in a predictable pattern
large_list = [i * 0.1 for i in range(100000)] # Creates a list [0, 0.1, 0.2, ..., 9999.9]

# Test with a threshold where we know the outcome
# Since the list is in increments of 0.1, a threshold of 0.05 should return False
assert has_close_elements(large_list, 0.05) == False

# Test with a larger threshold where we expect a True result
# With a threshold of 0.15, adjacent elements (0.1 apart) will be within the threshold
assert has_close_elements(large_list, 0.15) == True
```
```

Figure 9: AgentCoder test designer response example.

## AgentCoder: Test Executor

```
from codegeex.benchmark.execution import check_correctness

def process_humaneval_test(sample, problems, example_test=False, language=language, test_case=True):
 task_id = sample["task_id"]
 task_id = problems.index(sample)
 prompt = sample["prompt"]
 code = sample["completion"]
 # Pre-process for different languages
 if language == "python" or language == "py":
 test_case = sample["test_list"]
 tests = ""
 for test in test_case:
 tests += "\n" + test
 test_string = code + "\n" + tests
 return test_string

def preprocess_data(task):
 if f"```py" in task["completion"]:
 task["completion"] = task["completion"][task["completion"].find(f"```py") + len(f"```py"):]
 task["completion"] = task["completion"][:task["completion"].find("```")]
 elif "```" in task["completion"]:
 task["completion"] = task["completion"][task["completion"].find("```") + 3:]
 task["completion"] = task["completion"][:task["completion"].find("```")]
 return task

def test_report(dataset, lg):
 correct = 0
 for i in tqdm(range(len(dataset))):
 dataset[i]["full_code"] = process_humaneval_test(dataset[i], dataset,
 example_test=False, language=lg, test_case=False)
 result = check_correctness(dataset[i]["task_id"], dataset[i], lg, 5, "/tmp")
 if result["passed"] == True:
 correct += 1
 dataset[i]["report_passed"] = result["passed"]
 dataset[i]["report_result"] = result["result"]
 print("=====Start Report Testing=====")
 correct_percent = correct / len(dataset) * 100
 print(f"test_report, {correct_percent:0.2f}")
 return dataset

def test_agent(dataset, lg):
 correct = 0
 for i in tqdm(range(len(dataset))):
 dataset[i]["full_code"] = process_humaneval_test(dataset[i], dataset,
 example_test=False, language=lg, test_case=False)
 result = check_correctness(dataset[i]["task_id"], dataset[i], lg, 5, "/tmp")
 if result["passed"] == True:
 correct += 1
 dataset[i]["result"] = result["result"]
 dataset[i]["passed"] = result["passed"]
 print("=====Start Agent Testing=====")
 print("test_agent", correct)
 return dataset

model_list = ["gpt-3.5-turbo", "palm-2-codechat-bison", "claude-instant-1", "gpt-4-1106-preview", "gpt-4"]
language = ["py"]
for model_name in model_list:
 print(f"=====({model_name})=====")
 epoch = 5
 path = AgentCoderProgrammerSaveResultPath
 with open(path, "r") as f:
 dataset = json.load(f)
 for current_epoch in range(epoch):
 with open(f"./dataset/{model_name}_{current_epoch}.json", "w") as f:
 json.dump(dataset, f)
 test_report(dataset, lg)
 test_agent(dataset, lg)
 dataset = call_completion(dataset, model_name, lg)
```

Figure 10: AgentCoder test executor script.

# Programmer+Test Designer

**\*\*Role\*\*:** As a programmer, you are required to complete the function `has\_close\_elements`. This function should check if any two numbers in a given list are closer to each other than a specified threshold. Use a Chain-of-Thought approach to break down the problem, create pseudocode, and then write the final code in Python. Ensure that your code is efficient, readable, and well-commented.

**\*\*Input Code Snippet\*\*:**

```
```python
from typing import List

def has_close_elements(numbers: List[float], threshold: float) -> bool:
    """
    Check if in given list of numbers, are any two numbers closer to each other than given threshold.

    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0, 3.0], 0.5)
    False
    >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.8, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 2.0], 0.3)
    True
    """
    for i in range(len(numbers)):
        for j in range(i + 1, len(numbers)):
            if abs(numbers[i] - numbers[j]) <= threshold:
                return True
    return False

# Test 1: Standard list with some close elements
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 2.5, 3.5, 5.0], 1.0) == True

# Test 2: Standard list with no close elements
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 3.0, 5.0, 7.0], 1.5) == False

# Test 1: Empty list
assert has_close_elements([], 1.0) == False

# Test 2: List with all elements the same
assert has_close_elements([3.0, 3.0, 3.0], 0.0) == True

# Test 3: Very small threshold
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 1.01, 2.0], 0.005) == False

# Test 4: List with only two elements
assert has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0], 1.5) == True

# Large Scale Test 1: List with 100,000 elements in a predictable pattern
large_list = [i * 0.1 for i in range(100000)] # Creates a list [0, 0.1, 0.2, ..., 9999.9]

# Test with a threshold where we know the outcome
# Since the list is in increments of 0.1, a threshold of 0.05 should return False
assert has_close_elements(large_list, 0.05) == False

# Test with a larger threshold where we expect a True result
# With a threshold of 0.15, adjacent elements (0.1 apart) will be within the threshold
assert has_close_elements(large_list, 0.15) == True
```
```

**\*\*Instructions\*\*:**

1. **\*\*Understand and Clarify\*\*:** Make sure you understand the task. If necessary, write down what the function should do.
2. **\*\*Algorithm/Method Selection\*\*:** Decide on the most efficient way to compare the numbers in the list to find if any two are within the threshold.
3. **\*\*Pseudocode Creation\*\*:** Write down the steps you will follow in pseudocode. This should outline how you will iterate through the list and compare the numbers.
4. **\*\*Code Generation\*\*:** Translate your pseudocode into executable Python code. Remember to test your function with the provided examples and any additional cases you think are relevant.

Figure 11: Programmer + test executor example.

## Programmer+Test Executor

```
import doctest

Function definition as a string
text = """
from typing import List

def has_close_elements(numbers: List[float], threshold: float) -> bool:
 """
 Check if in given list of numbers, are any two numbers closer to each other than given threshold.

 >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.0, 3.0], 0.5)
 False
 >>> has_close_elements([1.0, 2.8, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 2.0], 0.3)
 True
 """
 for i in range(len(numbers)):
 for j in range(i + 1, len(numbers)):
 if abs(numbers[i] - numbers[j]) <= threshold:
 return True
 return False
"""

Execute the function definition
exec(text)

Run doctest
if __name__ == "__main__":
 doctest.testmod()
```

Figure 12: Programmer + test designer example.