💫 StarCoder: may the source be with you!

Anonymous authors
Paper under double-blind review

Abstract

The ANONYMIZED community, an open-scientific collaboration working on the responsible development of Large Language Models for Code (Code LLMs), introduces StarCoder and StarCoderBase: 15.5B parameter models with 8K context length, infilling capabilities and fast large-batch inference enabled by multi-query attention. StarCoderBase is trained on 1 trillion tokens sourced from The Stack (Kocetkov et al., 2022), a large collection of permissively licensed GitHub repositories with inspection tools and an opt-out process. We fine-tuned StarCoderBase on 35B Python tokens, resulting in the creation of StarCoder. We perform the most comprehensive evaluation of Code LLMs to date and show that StarCoderBase outperforms every open Code LLM that supports multiple programming languages and matches or outperforms the OpenAI code-cushman-001 model. Furthermore, StarCoder outperforms every model that is fine-tuned on Python and still retains its performance on other programming languages. We take several important steps towards a safe open-access model release, including an improved PII redaction pipeline and a novel attribution tracing tool, and make the StarCoder models publicly available under a more commercially viable version of the Open Responsible AI Model license.

1 Introduction

Generative AI and large language models (LLMs; Brown et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021; Chowdhery et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022; OpenAI, 2023a) are predicted to significantly impact the workforce in the coming years (Eloundou et al., 2023; Bommasani et al., 2021; World Economic Forum, 2023) by boosting worker productivity. LLMs trained on code (Code LLMs) have seen particularly fast adoption: Microsoft's Copilot has attracted over 1 million professional developers (Euronews, 2023) and GitHub reports that Copilot users rely on it to produce 35% of the code they write for some languages (Thompson, 2022). However, the development and use of LLMs has raised concerns of copyright, privacy, and openness.

Copyright concerns arise in many jurisdictions, including the U.S. and E.U. , regarding the rights of content creators whose public data is used to train language models. It has been questioned whether machine learning models trained on such data fall under fair-use doctrine in the U.S. (Kuhn, 2022; Butterick, 2022; Rothchild & Rothchild, 2022), with fair use being most likely when the model generates novel content dissimilar to any copyrighted training data (Lemley & Casey, 2020; Levendowski, 2018). Henderson et al. (2023), therefore, suggest LLM developers should provide additional tools to ensure these models comply with current copyright laws. It is important to mention that these legal issues are not only the subject of scholarly debates: lawsuits have already been filed against GitHub Copilot (DOE 1 v. and GitHub, Inc., 2022) as well as Stable Diffusion (Andersen et al v. Stability AI et al, 2023).

Concerns about personal information led Italy to temporarily ban ChatGPT and launch an ongoing investigation into OpenAI's compliance with the E.U.'s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (BBC, 2023). According to these regulations (European Council, 2018; Lomas, 2022), organizations that process personal information must have a valid legal basis. These laws could potentially affect LLM developers who gather vast amounts of public data from the internet, which may include personal information. Obtaining explicit consent from data creators is difficult at this scale, and it is uncertain whether other legal grounds exist for processing this personal information. Moreover, even with a valid legal basis, GDPR mandates that data

processors inform individuals as to how their data is being processed and provide data access controls, such as the right to have data deleted or to modify erroneous data. This would require LLM providers to be transparent about the data they have collected and provide tooling for individuals to inspect their data and have the possibility to delete it.

The lack of transparency and openness surrounding the development processes of generative AI models has also raised concerns in the scientific community. Many models are closed-access to varying degrees: from being available only within the organization that developed them (Chowdhery et al., 2022; Hoffmann et al., 2022) to being accessible publicly through a paid API but with many details on their development process hidden (Brown et al., 2020; OpenAI, 2023a). While API access allows researchers to experiment with these models, it limits their ability to research LLM safety (Perez et al., 2022), inspect the models' inner workings (Olsson et al., 2022), and contribute to model improvements (Togelius & Yannakakis, 2023).

We use "open-access" to refer to models whose weights are public. Although other open-access models exist, the level of openness still varies across these projects; and some models with released weights have restrictions on model distribution (Touvron et al., 2023), or do not release their training datasets (Nijkamp et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022; Fried et al., 2022). Even in cases when models and training data are both released permissively (Raffel et al., 2020; Tay et al., 2022), external researchers typically do not have an opportunity to participate in guiding the development of industry-produced models. In contrast, other LLM development projects have taken a fully open approach which aims to allow for community inputs into model development, release training data, and enable external audits throughout the full development process (Solaiman, 2023). One example is the BigScience research workshop (BigScience Workshop, 2022), an open scientific collaboration (Akiki et al., 2022) comprising hundreds of researchers collaborating to release BLOOM, a multi-lingual LLM (Scao et al., 2022; Muennighoff et al., 2022). Similarly, EleutherAI, a grassroots-turned-nonprofit research initiative, has released open-access LLMs including GPT-NeoX (Black et al., 2022), GPT-J (Wang & Komatsuzaki, 2021), and Pythia (Biderman et al., 2023), as well as the associated training data (Gao et al., 2021a).

In this paper, we describe StarCoder and StarCoderBase, open-access code LLMs developed and released by the ANONYMIZED community, with a focus on respecting copyright, privacy, transparency, and community-driven model development. The project is an open-scientific collaboration focusing on the responsible development of LLMs for code. It is co-stewarded by two industry research labs and comprises more than 600 members from diverse academic institutes and industry labs. The Stack (Kocetkov et al., 2022) is a publicly available pre-training dataset for Code LLMs with a transparent data governance framework. The Stack consists of 6.4 TB of permissively licensed source code in 384 programming languages, and includes 54 GB of GitHub issues and repository-level metadata in the v1.2 version of the dataset. The dataset comes with "Am I in The Stack", a governance tool for developers to check whether their source code is part of the dataset, and an opt-out process for those who wish to have their code removed from the dataset.

StarCoder and StarCoderBase are both 15.5B parameter models trained on permissively licensed data from The Stack. We trained StarCoderBase on 1 trillion tokens sourced from 80+ programming languages, GitHub issues, Git commits, and Jupyter notebooks. We fine-tuned StarCoderBase on another 35B Python tokens, leading to the StarCoder model. Both StarCoder models come with a novel combination of architectural features, such as an 8K token context length (Dao et al., 2022), infilling capabilities through Fill-in-the-Middle (FIM; Bavarian et al., 2022), and fast large-batch inference through Multi-Query-Attention (MQA; Shazeer, 2019). We present an extensive evaluation of the StarCoder models and release a demo along with an integrated attribution tool that can help users locate model generations that may have been copied from the training set. Overall, our contributions can be summarized as follows.

- We release StarCoderBase and StarCoder, open-access Code LLMs trained on 80+ programming languages that support a novel combination of capabilities and architectural features unavailable in other open Code LLMs.

- We perform the most comprehensive evaluation of Code LLMs to date using a diverse set of benchmarks (Lai et al., 2022; Cassano et al., 2023; Pearce et al., 2022; Fried et al., 2022; Yee & Guha, 2023; Austin et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Ben Allal et al., 2022; Hendrycks et al., 2020; Reddy

et al., 2019; Cobbe et al., 2021; Nadeem et al., 2021; Gehman et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2022), and show that:

  - *StarCoder outperforms every open LLM for code that supports multiple programming languages* (Nijkamp et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2023);
  - *StarCoder matches or outperforms the OpenAI code-cushman-001 model*; and
  - When fine-tuned on Python, *StarCoder substantially outperforms existing LLMs that are also fine-tuned on Python.*

- We take important steps towards a safe open model release:
  - We release StarCoder under an *OpenRAIL-M license agreement*, which enables royalty-free access, use, and distribution of the model while embedding a set of use restrictions in identified critical scenarios. We have worked on a version of the license agreement that: (i) is more commercially viable for companies wishing to use and distribute the model and (ii) promotes transparency and understanding through the sharing of AI documentation such as model cards (Mitchell et al., 2019);
  - We incorporate a *new attribution tool into the VSCode demo that can help users detect and locate model generations that may have been copied from the training set.* This is achieved through a two-step process that involves a lightweight membership check followed by a search over a BM25 index (Section 9); and
  - *We have significantly improved the PII redaction pipeline by collecting a PII dataset containing 12,000 files with 22,950 annotated entities.* We fine-tuned our own encoder model (StarEncoder) on this dataset, resulting in a robust PII detection model (Section 4).

2 Related Work

Language models Early efforts to build large-scale language models used n-grams and simple smoothing techniques (Brants et al., 2007; Heafield et al., 2013; Buck et al., 2014). Other approaches applied various types of neural networks architectures, such as feedforward networks (Bengio et al., 2000) and recurrent networks (Mikolov et al., 2010; Jozefowicz et al., 2016), to the language modeling task. The Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017) led to the development of highly scalable language models (Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020), which have shown a predictable relationship between language modeling loss and scaling factors such as the model size, number of training tokens, and compute budget (Kaplan et al., 2020; Hoffmann et al., 2022).

Language Models for Code Language models were initially applied to code by Hindle et al. (2012), but relied on n-gram models trained at comparatively small scale. Many neural architectures developed in NLP were also applied successfully to code, including encoder-only models for producing code representations (Feng et al., 2020; Kanade et al., 2020) and encoder-decoder models for translation, editing, summarization, and language-to-code tasks (Wang et al., 2021; Ahmad et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022). Decoder-only Transformer architectures have produced strong generative models of code, typically by training on mixtures of text and code from GitHub (Chen et al., 2021; Austin et al., 2021; Fried et al., 2022; Zheng et al., 2023; Nijkamp et al., 2023). Most of these models have not been fully open, but PolyCoder (Xu et al., 2022) and SantaCoder (Ben Allal et al., 2023) are notable exceptions and have both open models and training data. However, these models are relatively small (2.7B and 1.1B parameters, respectively) and are trained on less data (< 300GB of code) than we explore in this work.

Closed-access LLMs Several large tech companies have developed top-performing LLMs without releasing them. Examples include Google's PaLM (Chowdhery et al., 2022) and LaMDA (Thoppilan et al., 2022), DeepMind's Chinchilla (Hoffmann et al., 2022) and Gopher (Rae et al., 2021), and NVIDIA's Megatron-Turing NLG (Smith et al., 2022). OpenAI and other AI startups, including Cohere[1], Anthropic[2], and Aleph Alpha[3],

[1] https://cohere.com/
[2] https://www.anthropic.com/
[3] https://www.aleph-alpha.com/

offer LLMs as a paid API service. These companies did not release model weights nor provide comprehensive information on the methodology used to create these models. OpenAI has published several technical reports of the GPT family of models (Brown et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021; OpenAI, 2023a), showcasing the capabilities of their models.

Open-access LLMs Numerous open-access LLMs have been released to the AI community, although they are generally not as strong as closed-access ones. In this paper, we use the term "open-access LLM" when the model weights are publicly available. We still note that there are significant differences between open-access models in how transparent they have been about the training data and filtering techniques. For instance, EleutherAI released GPT-NeoX-20B (Black et al., 2022) and GPT-J-6B (Wang & Komatsuzaki, 2021), as well as the dataset these models were trained on (Gao et al., 2021a). Google released UL2-20B (Tay et al., 2022), an encoder-decoder model trained on the publicly available C4 (Raffel et al., 2020). Tsinghua University released the weights of GLM-130B (Zeng et al., 2022), a Chinese-English LLM, and CodeGeeX-13B (Zheng et al., 2023), a LLM for coding applications, without releasing the training sets. Salesforce released CodeGen-Mono-16B (Nijkamp et al., 2023) without disclosing a proprietary Python dataset. Meta released the OPT (Zhang et al., 2022), LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023), and InCoder models (Fried et al., 2022) under a non-commercial license and only provided high-level details about the data collection and filtering process.

3 Data Curation and Cleaning

This section describes how we processed the training data of StarCoderBase. We restrict the training set to The Stack v1.2 (Kocetkov et al., 2022), which exclusively contains data from permissively licensed[4] GitHub repositories. At the time of the data processing, 44 people opted out of The Stack. Below, we describe how we further cleaned the data by combining heuristic filtering and manual inspection.

3.1 Programming Languages

Selection of programming languages From the 358 programming languages in The Stack, we selected 86 languages. The assignment of data to programming languages was performed based solely on file extension (Kocetkov et al., 2022). We included all programming languages with more than 500 MB of data, as well as languages that were ranked in the top 50 on Githut 2.0 or the December 2022 TIOBE Index of programming language popularity. In addition, we included dialects of already selected programming languages (e.g., Racket and Scheme for Lisp). We excluded configuration languages (Nix, Puppet, etc.) and languages that are no longer actively supported (ActionScript). We also included data formats like JSON and YAML but limited its data volume (see "JSON and YAML" paragraph for details). The full list of selected programming languages can be found in Tables 1 and 2. Out of the languages present in MultiPL-E (Cassano et al., 2023), only D and Swift were not included in the training set. For D, language misclassification of the files led to less than 2MB of data in The Stack (Kocetkov et al., 2022). Swift was excluded from the final list of languages due to human error.

Visual inspection We performed a visual inspection to ensure that we only retain data of high quality. To achieve this, we randomly selected 30,000 files from The Stack for each programming language, categorized them by extension, and kept a maximum of 1,000 files for each extension. We then reached out to our community for assistance with data inspection. We instructed the annotators to go through 50–100 files and confirm if the data appeared to be normal code written by humans, as opposed to text, data, or a single long line of autogenerated code. We also asked annotators to determine whether we should use our default alpha-numeric filter (which requires over 25% alpha-numeric symbols) and long-line filter (which requires lines to be less than 1,000 characters) for a given file extension. Eighteen community annotators evaluated 300 programming language extensions. After inspection, we excluded 36 extensions and eliminated the long-line filter for 27 extensions. The complete outcomes of the data inspection, including annotator remarks, can be found in this Google sheet.

[4]See https://blueoakcouncil.org/ to learn more about permissive licenses and access a comprehensive collection of such licenses.

XML filter As we inspected the data, we noticed that certain extensions often consisted of XML files. For example, the `.sld` extension had more than 50% of its files in XML format. To address this, we implemented a simple XML filter that checked for the presence of "`<?xml version=`" within the first 100 characters of the file. This filter proved to be effective and produced few false positives. Hence, we applied it to all programming languages except for XSLT, which uses XML syntax.

Alpha filter During our investigation, we discovered that certain extensions, such as MATLAB, contained numerous data files that frequently stored large tensors. To identify these files, we developed an alpha filter that removed files with fewer than 25% alphabetic characters. However, when we tested this filter on a small subset of data, we observed a high rate of false positives for certain programming languages, such as Assembly. To address this issue, we focused on the 25 extensions with the highest number of detections and manually verified whether or not the alpha filter should be applied.

HTML We designed a custom HTML filter that targets excessive HTML boilerplate and links. We took into account the ratio of visible text in each file and only kept those files where the visible text makes up at least 20% of the HTML code and has a minimum length of 100 characters.

JSON and YAML JSON and YAML files are naturally more data-heavy than other languages in The Stack. To remove most of the data files, we applied the following filters. For YAML, we kept files with 50–5000 characters, an average line length smaller than 100, a maximum line length smaller than 1000, and more than 50% alphabetic characters. These filters remove around 20% of the files and 90% of the volume. For JSON, we kept files with 50–5000 characters and more than 50% alphabetic characters, which removes around 70% of the files and 98% of the volume.

3.2 Jupyter notebooks

All Jupyter notebooks were retrieved from the Stack. We transformed Jupyter notebooks into two different datasets: Jupyter – scripts and Jupyter – structured.

Jupyter – scripts We utilize Jupytext[5] to convert notebooks to scripts. It is an actively maintained software that currently supports 31 programming languages. To initiate the conversion process, Jupytext requires the identification of the specific programming languages within each notebook. We extracted this information from the metadata of each respective notebook. However, more than 30,000 notebooks lacked any programming language information, making it difficult to convert them to the script format. To address this issue, we incorporated the use of Guesslang,[6] an open-source library that employs machine learning techniques to identify the programming languages of source code. By applying a probability threshold greater than or equal to 0.5, we successfully reduced the number of unidentified notebooks to 6,400 using Guesslang. Ultimately, we amassed 1,432,992 scripts through the utilization of Jupytext. The distribution of programming languages among these scripts is presented in Table 3. We evaluated language coverage by randomly selecting 100 files from the transformed scripts, ensuring that all programming languages were represented within this sample.

Jupyter – structured To create this dataset, we first filtered out notebooks that did not contain any Python code or Markdown text. The information on the programming language in the metadata of each notebook was used as the criterion to filter out non-Python notebooks. Only notebooks explicitly marked as 'Python' in the metadata were kept. Then for each notebook, consecutive Markdown blocks or code blocks were merged into a large Markdown or code block respectively. Eventually, we ended up with consecutive code-text pairs in temporal order grouped by each notebook. In general, each Jupyter code-text pair contained the Markdown text immediately preceding the code block and the Python code, which forms a natural instruction pair. We also included the formatted output of a code block if the output cell was non-empty; otherwise, it was marked by a special `<empty_output>` token. If consecutive code blocks have multiple output

[5] https://jupytext.readthedocs.io/
[6] https://guesslang.readthedocs.io/

Language	After dedup		After filters and decont.		Weight	Percentage
	Num. files	Volume (GB)	Num. files	Volume (GB)		
ada	31,291	0.30	30,934	0.26	0.26	0.034
agda	17,608	0.07	17,554	0.07	0.07	0.009
alloy	5,374	0.01	5,368	0.01	0.01	0.001
antlr	7,983	0.05	7,917	0.05	0.05	0.007
applescript	4,906	0.01	4,737	0.01	0.01	0.001
assembly	248,396	1.58	247,919	1.56	1.56	0.203
augeas	195	0.00	180	0.00	0.00	0
awk	10,430	0.02	10,289	0.02	0.02	0.003
batchfile	252,514	0.29	239,568	0.23	0.23	0.03
bluespec	5,940	0.03	5,928	0.03	0.03	0.004
c	8,625,559	57.43	8,536,791	53.89	53.89	7.027
c-sharp	10,839,399	46.29	10,801,285	44.66	44.66	5.823
clojure	126,191	0.49	125,163	0.46	0.46	0.06
cmake	186,517	0.45	186,375	0.45	0.45	0.059
coffeescript	227,889	0.69	226,209	0.64	0.64	0.083
common-lisp	101,370	1.68	98,733	1.40	1.40	0.183
cpp	6,377,914	50.89	6,353,527	48.92	48.92	6.379
css	2,994,829	22.61	2,721,616	11.93	3.00	0.391
cuda	58,355	0.59	58,151	0.56	0.56	0.073
dart	932,583	3.86	928,415	3.66	3.66	0.477
dockerfile	572,186	0.42	571,506	0.42	0.42	0.055
elixir	282,110	0.74	281,016	0.71	0.71	0.093
elm	62,861	0.34	62,033	0.30	0.30	0.039
emacs-lisp	54,768	0.43	52,838	0.41	0.41	0.053
erlang	99,368	0.73	98,447	0.70	0.70	0.091
f-sharp	127,161	0.90	124,066	0.61	0.61	0.08
fortran	165,446	1.84	158,792	1.78	1.78	0.232
glsl	175,576	0.57	167,701	0.40	0.40	0.052
go	4,730,461	25.74	4,700,526	23.78	23.78	3.101
groovy	251,627	0.94	250,834	0.91	0.91	0.119
haskell	544,969	2.36	541,454	2.23	2.23	0.291
html	9,533,367	146.76	3,299,965	29.36	29.36	3.828
idris	8,060	0.03	8,042	0.03	0.03	0.004
isabelle	5,086	0.09	5,001	0.08	0.08	0.01
java	20,151,565	89.30	20,071,773	86.94	86.94	11.336
java-server-pages	214,133	1.03	210,816	0.98	0.98	0.128
javascript	21,108,587	141.65	19,544,285	64.71	64.71	8.437
json	17,012,912	338.34	4,751,547	5.62	1.00	0.13
julia	298,672	1.54	295,364	1.31	1.31	0.171
kotlin	2,242,771	5.77	2,239,354	5.68	5.68	0.741
lean	16,891	0.10	16,870	0.09	0.09	0.012
literate-agda	523	0.01	523	0.01	0.01	0.001
literate-coffeescript	1,138	0.01	1,133	0.01	0.01	0.001
literate-haskell	6,135	0.05	6,104	0.05	0.05	0.007
lua	558,861	3.28	549,459	2.87	2.87	0.374
makefile	661,424	1.49	657,349	1.31	1.31	0.171
maple	1,259	0.01	1,152	0.01	0.01	0.001
markdown	21,045,171	75.25	21,029,287	74.93	74.93	9.77
mathematica	26,895	1.72	22,653	1.25	1.25	0.163
matlab	967	0.04	93	0.00	0.00	0

Table 1: Overview of the training data for StarCoder. For the selected programming languages, we show the number of files and data volume after near-deduplication, as well as after filtering. See also Table 2.

Language	After dedup		After filters and decont.		Weight	Percentage
	Num. files	Volume (GB)	Num. files	Volume (GB)		
ocaml	159,734	1.11	158,356	1.03	1.03	0.134
pascal	118,675	1.71	110,981	1.68	1.68	0.219
perl	392,108	2.63	365,491	2.23	2.23	0.291
php	15,904,518	66.84	15,683,017	60.89	60.89	7.939
powershell	271,487	1.25	267,627	1.12	1.12	0.146
prolog	1,023	0.01	968	0.01	0.01	0.001
protocol-buffer	98,246	0.44	97,167	0.31	0.31	0.04
python	12,962,249	64.30	12,866,649	60.40	60.40	7.875
r	39,194	0.30	39,042	0.30	0.30	0.039
racket	4,201	0.04	3,688	0.03	0.03	0.004
restructuredtext	905,679	3.42	896,880	3.32	3.32	0.433
rmarkdown	5,389	0.06	5,386	0.06	0.06	0.008
ruby	3,405,374	7.14	3,390,320	6.81	6.81	0.888
rust	1,386,585	9.53	1,380,468	9.11	9.11	1.188
sas	9,772	0.13	9,226	0.12	0.12	0.016
scala	1,362,426	4.86	1,355,788	4.69	4.69	0.612
scheme	44,261	0.30	41,890	0.20	0.20	0.026
shell	2,236,434	3.38	2,206,327	3.09	3.09	0.403
smalltalk	592,999	0.74	587,748	0.58	0.58	0.076
solidity	164,242	1.21	153,194	0.85	0.85	0.111
sparql	14,173	0.04	13,716	0.04	0.04	0.005
sql	994,019	12.22	975,420	11.09	11.09	1.446
stan	5,441	0.01	5,429	0.01	0.01	0.001
standard-ml	48,995	0.52	19,630	0.19	0.19	0.025
stata	31,282	0.41	24,208	0.33	0.33	0.043
systemverilog	46,915	0.41	46,270	0.39	0.39	0.051
tcl	50,579	0.40	49,335	0.35	0.35	0.046
tcsh	4,911	0.02	4,806	0.02	0.02	0.003
tex	547,888	5.44	522,778	5.20	5.20	0.678
thrift	4,663	0.01	4,661	0.01	0.01	0.001
typescript	10,637,070	28.82	10,547,331	26.52	26.52	3.458
verilog	77	0.001	75	0.001	0.001	0
vhdl	60,027	1.12	58,208	0.94	0.94	0.123
visual-basic	163,291	1.49	161,239	1.42	1.42	0.185
xslt	43,095	0.56	6,513	0.05	0.05	0.007
yacc	25,775	0.41	7,451	0.11	0.11	0.014
yaml	5,282,081	28.36	3,995,948	3.76	1.00	0.13
zig	15,913	0.18	15,850	0.18	0.18	0.023
GitHub issues			$\sim$ 30,900,000	54.40	54.40	7.093
Git commits			7,674,345	64.00	32.00	4.172
notebook scripts			914,000	7.12	7.12	0.928
notebook structured			668,743	6.00	6.00	0.782
			305,929,658	815.68	799.37	100

Table 2: Overview of the training data for StarCoder. For the selected programming languages, we show the number of files and data volume after near-deduplication, as well as after filtering. See also Table 1.

cells before merging, we only retain the output of the last code block. After these preprocessing steps, we ended up with 1,045,605 structured Jupyter notebooks.

3.3 GitHub issues

We used natural language conversations from GitHub issues and pull requests, which were collected as a component of The Stack v1.2. Each conversation consists of a series of events with actions, such as opening

Language	Num files	Percentage
python	1,392,432	97.170
julia	16,730	1.167
r	11,034	0.77
scala	1,899	0.133
bash	1,441	0.101
java	1,319	0.092
q-sharp	1,273	0.089
cpp	1,081	0.075
c-sharp	1,048	0.073
matlab	908	0.063
powershell	769	0.054
javascript	592	0.041
haskell	535	0.037
scheme	484	0.034
groovy	432	0.03
f-sharp	385	0.027
ocaml	279	0.019
rust	134	0.009
clojure	96	0.007
typescript	72	0.005
maxima	31	0.002
coconut	6	0
markdown	5	0
wolfram language	4	0
tcl	3	0
Total	1,432,992	100

Table 3: Overview of the initially collected Jupyter scripts, with the number of files and the percentage.

the issue, creating a comment, or closing the issue. Each event includes the author's username, a message, an action, and a creation date. We filtered this data as follows: 1) First, we removed auto-generated text when users replied to issues via email. See Appendix A for the regular expression we used. We also deleted issues with a short message (less than 200 characters) and truncated long comments in the middle to a maximum of 100 lines while retaining the last 20 lines. This removed 18% of the volume. 2) Next, we excluded comments from bots. To do so, we searched for bot keywords in the username of the comment's author (for more information, see Appendix A). This step eliminates 17% of the total events and results in 14.7% of the issues being emptied. We have observed that bot-generated issues tend to be lengthy and contain numerous logs and links. 3) We used the number of users engaged in the conversation as an indicator of quality. Our criterion was to include conversations that have two or more users. However, we also preserved conversations that involved a single user if the total text within comments was less than 7,000 characters (96th percentile). Additionally, we excluded issues authored by a single user if they contained more than ten events, as they tended to be of poor quality or originate from overlooked bots. By implementing these filters, we removed an additional 14% of issues. 4) Finally, we used a model from the *fasttext* library[7] to filter out non-English issues. This step was necessary to enable accurate redaction of names using a PII detection model (see Section 4.3).

Lastly, we would like to point out that we anonymized the usernames in the conversations by replacing them with a participant counter within the conversation. See more details in Section 4.3 and 5.1.

[7]The lid.176.bin version of this language identification model: https://fasttext.cc/docs/en/language-identification.html

Description	Details
Maximum characters	Remove code files with >100k characters.
Small changes	Subsample changes with ≤ 2 lines with 50% probability.
Long-range refactorings	Subsample changes spanning ≥ 200 lines with 10% probability.
Empty commit message	Remove commits with empty commit subject.
Automatic commits	Remove commits that either contain or are equal to a list of stop words.
Hash messages	Remove commits with whitespace-separated words-to-character ratio >20.
Data files	Subsample data formats (JSON, YAML, XML, HTML) with 50% probability.

Table 4: Git commit filters.

3.4 Git commits

The Git commit data was gathered from BigQuery[8] and includes only single-file commits of repositories with the same licenses and file extension as used in The Stack (Kocetkov et al., 2022). We removed all repositories from users that opted out of The Stack. The raw dataset is around 4 TB in size. We sampled 50% of the files and filtered the remaining data with heuristics to build a high-quality dataset. We list and describe all filters in Table 4.

The number of line changes in a commit can be very low compared to the file size. To avoid spending too much compute budget on learning to copy the file content, we only used the full file 20% of the time, and for the remaining 80%, sampled a window between 0 and 32 lines around the first and last changed line. The resulting dataset contains 64 GB of commit data.

3.5 Deduplication

We followed the deduplication pipeline from Ben Allal et al. (2023), which consists of calculating the MinHashes (Broder, 2000) of all source code files, followed by Locally Sensitive Hashing (LSH) to map similar code files to the same bucket. We used 5-grams and a Jaccard similarity of 0.7. See this blogpost for more details regarding the pipeline.

We applied this near-deduplication process to all programming languages and the Jupyter notebooks. However, due to time constraints, we could not apply this procedure to Git commits. Additionally, we deemed it unlikely to discover duplicates in Github issues, so we didn't apply the process to them.

3.6 Weighting of data sources

There were several discussions within the community about whether to up-sample or down-sample certain programming languages, as the amount of compute budget allocated to a data source in a given language can significantly affect the model's performance in that language. However, we realized that the largest amount of available data comes from popular programming languages and would, therefore, benefit a larger group of end-users. Moreover, after the deduplication process, we found that several high-resource programming languages, such as C, C++, C#, Java, Javascript, Python, and PHP, had a similar amount of data ranging from 44–87 GB. This further reinforced our belief that we did not need to drastically re-weigh the existing data distribution. Thus, in this work, we followed the natural distribution of data during training and sampled data sources proportionally to their volume. However, we did make an exception for JSON, YAML, and CSS, as we only want the LLM to learn the data format without wasting compute resources on memorizing the data in such files. For that reason, we re-weighed the volume of the data source to 1 GB for JSON and YAML and 3GB for CSS.

[8] https://cloud.google.com/bigquery/public-data/



Figure 1: Distribution of programming languages in the annotated PII dataset.

4 PII redaction

This section outlines our efforts to remove Personally Identifiable Information (PII) from the training data. In Section 4.1, we first describe how we collected a large set of PII annotations. We used these annotations to explore various techniques to train a PII detection model in Section 4.3, building on top of the encoder model we developed in Section 4.2.

4.1 Data collection

We utilized the Toloka platform[9] to engage 1,399 crowd-workers from 35 countries in annotating a dataset for PII in source code. On average, participants completed 206 tasks, earned about $27, and worked 3.1 hours. Our goal was to identify PII in various forms, such as names, usernames, emails, IP addresses, keys, passwords, and IDs. To ensure that crowd-workers received fair compensation, we established an hourly pay rate of $7.30, taking into consideration different minimum wage rates across countries and their corresponding purchasing power. We limited annotation eligibility to countries where the hourly pay rate of $7.30 was equivalent to the highest minimum wage in the US ($16.50) in terms of purchasing power parity. A complete list of countries that participated in the annotation can be found in Table B.1 of Appendix B. Crowd workers in Toloka can do tasks whenever or wherever; there is no obligation to complete a certain task or spend a fixed amount of time on it. Thus, they utilize free choice when working on the tasks. Out of 1,399 crowd workers, 695 filled a survey on task quality, and 519 completed the survey. The average score for the question asking whether the participant would like to contribute to another project like this is 4.92 on a scale 1–5.

The dataset comprises 12,000 files, each containing approximately 50 lines of code written in 31 programming languages. Figure 1 shows the distribution of programming languages in the dataset. To increase the representation of rare PII types, such as keys and IP addresses, 7,100 files were pre-filtered from a larger sample. We utilized the `detect-secrets` tool[10] with all default plugins activated, along with the regular expressions by Ben Allal et al. (2023) for detecting emails, IPv4 and IPv6 addresses. To prevent biasing the annotation too much towards these detection tools, the remaining 5,100 files were randomly selected from the dataset without pre-filtering.

During annotation, we differentiated between various types of PII based on the specific context in which it appeared. Specifically, we distinguished whether the PII was present in the code's license header, was used as a placeholder, or constituted confidential data. This categorization was necessary because the PII in

[9] https://toloka.ai/
[10] https://github.com/Yelp/detect-secrets

license headers is usually provided voluntarily by authors for code attribution and may not require masking. Similarly, placeholders are not real secrets and do not need to be masked. We applied this categorization to names, emails, and usernames. See Table 5 for an overview of all PII entities.

The annotators detected a total of 22,950 PII entities in the dataset. To evaluate the quality of the dataset, we manually inspected 300 files that contained various PII types and calculated the recall and precision for each type, as shown in Table 5. We found that annotating secret IDs was particularly challenging, as the annotators tended to produce many false positives and negatives. As a result, we decided to exclude this category from the PII detection model training.

PII type	**Count**	**Recall**	**Precision**
IP_ADDRESS	2526	85%	97%
KEY	308	91%	78%
PASSWORD	598	91%	86%
ID	1702	53%	51%
EMAIL	5470	99%	97%
EMAIL_EXAMPLE	1407		
EMAIL_LICENSE	3141		
NAME	2477	89%	94%
NAME_EXAMPLE	318		
NAME_LICENSE	3105		
USERNAME	780	74%	86%
USERNAME_EXAMPLE	328		
USERNAME_LICENSE	503		
AMBIGUOUS	287		

Table 5: Overview of the PII types and the number of collected annotations. We investigate the annotation quality by reporting the precision and recall of a manual inspection on 300 files. Each subcategory was mapped back to its corresponding PII type for the inspection.

4.2 StarEncoder

As part of our PII detection efforts, we trained an encoder-only model (i.e., bi-directionally self-attentive Transformers) that can be efficiently fine-tuned for both code- and text-related tasks. We used the Masked Language Modelling (MLM) and Next Sentence Prediction (NSP) objectives from BERT (Devlin et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2019) and predicted masked-out tokens from an input sentence and whether a pair of sentences occur as neighbors in a document.

We separate code snippets in the input as follows: `[CLS]` Snippet-1 `[SEP]` Snippet-2, where the two code snippets are selected randomly, either from the same source file or from two distinct documents. For the MLM loss, we mask tokens in the input independently with an probability of 15%. For the NSP loss, we use a linear classifier applied to the representation output at the `[CLS]` token. We train for 100,000 steps with a global batch size of 4,096 sequences of a maximum length of 1,024 so that approximately 400B tokens are observed. This takes roughly two days using 64 NVIDIA A100 GPUs. Details about the model architecture are reported in Table 6.

4.3 PII detection model

We fine-tuned StarEncoder on the annotated PII dataset for the Named Entity Recognition (NER) task. We added a linear layer as a token classification head on top of the model, with 6 target classes: names, emails, keys, passwords, IP addresses, and usernames. We excluded IDs due to low annotation quality and did not differentiate between the categorization of PII entities (license headers, placeholders) because of the model's poor performance in distinguishing them. We split the dataset into a training set of 7,878 examples and a

Hyperparameter	Value
Hidden size	768
Intermediate size	3072
Max. position embeddings	1024
Num. of attention heads	12
Num. of hidden layers	12
Attention	Multi-head
Num. of parameters	≈125M

Table 6: Model architecture of StarEncoder.

Entity type	Train	Test
EMAIL	4721	1742
NAME	3847	1298
IP_ADDRESS	1941	521
USERNAME	1320	346
PASSWORD	390	148
KEY	171	118

Table 7: Train-test split of the annotated PII dataset.

test set of 4,000 examples, ensuring that both splits have a balanced representation of the different PII types. See Table 7. We make the training and evaluation splits available under gated access at `ANONYMIZED`.

Fine-tuning baseline We fine-tune StarEncoder on the PII training set, and 400 annotated files from Ben Allal et al. (2023). We achieve F1 scores of more than 90% on names, emails, and IP addresses and 73.39% on passwords. The model's performance is comparatively low on keys and usernames, with F1 scores of only 56.66% and 59.39%, respectively. We attribute the low performance on keys to the limited number of labels for this type of PII, as only 308 instances were available. For usernames, we observed the model often confused them with decorators and values in paths. This is most likely because we annotated usernames inside links for social media platforms.

Pseudo-labels To improve the detection of key and password entities, we employed a pseudo-labeling technique as described by Lee (2013). This method involves training a model on a small set of labeled data and subsequently generating predictions for a larger set of unlabeled data. Specifically, we annotated 18,000 files using an ensemble of two encoder models, which were fine-tuned on the 400-file PII dataset from Ben Allal et al. (2023). To identify reliable pseudo-labels, we calculated the average probability logits from our models and applied filtering criteria. Specifically, we set a minimum threshold of 0.5 for all entities, except for names and usernames, for which we used a higher threshold of 0.6. However, upon reviewing the results, we found a significant number of false positives for keys and passwords. As a result, we decided to only retain entities that were preceded by a trigger word, such as `key`, `auth`, or `pwd`, within the preceding 100 characters. Training on this synthetic dataset before fine-tuning on the annotated one yielded superior results for all PII categories, as demonstrated in Tables 8 and 9. Only the performance for detecting usernames did not show significant improvement, so we decided to exclude it from the PII redaction process.

Comparison against regex baseline We compared our PII detection models against the regular expressions (regexes) employed in Ben Allal et al. (2023). The regexes only support the detection of emails, IP addresses, and keys. Note that we enhanced the email regex, as explained in the Appendix, to address false positives we found during the evaluation on this benchmark. This modification boosted the F1 score of the regex from 81.8% to 96.83%. Nevertheless, our PII detection models still surpassed the regex approach in detecting all three entities, as shown in Table 8. We note that the performance difference was especially large

Method	Email address			IP address			Key		
	Prec.	**Recall**	**F1**	**Prec.**	**Recall**	**F1**	**Prec.**	**Recall**	**F1**
Regex	96.20%	97.47%	96.83%	71.29%	87.71%	78.65%	3.62%	49.15%	6.74%
NER	94.01%	98.10%	96.01%	88.95%	**94.43%**	91.61%	60.37%	53.38%	56.66%
+ pseudo labels	**97.73%**	**98.94%**	**98.15%**	**90.10%**	93.86%	**91.94%**	**62.38%**	**80.81%**	**70.41%**

Table 8: Comparing PII detection performance: Regular Expressions, NER Pipeline with Annotated Data, and NER Pipeline with Annotated Data + Pseudo-Labels

Method	Name			Username			Password		
	Prec.	**Recall**	**F1**	**Prec.**	**Recall**	**F1**	**Prec.**	**Recall**	**F1**
NER	83.66%	95.52%	89.19%	48.93%	**75.55%**	59.39%	59.16%	**96.62%**	73.39%
+ pseudo labels	**86.45%**	**97.38%**	**91.59%**	**52.20%**	74.81%	**61.49%**	**70.94%**	95.96%	**81.57%**

Table 9: Comparison of PII detection performance: NER Pipeline with Annotated Data vs. Annotated Data + Pseudo-Labels

on keys and found that the `detect-secrets` tool generated many false positives, especially in specific programming languages like Go and C-sharp that weren't well represented in the regex evaluation. Consequently, the overall precision of the tool was below 4%.

Post-processing Before applying the best PII detection model to the full dataset, we observed a couple of frequent detection errors. We added the following post-processing techniques to reduce the number of false positives:

- Ignore secrets with fewer than 4 characters.
- Detect full names only by requiring at least one space within the name.
- Ignore detected keys with fewer than 9 characters or that are not gibberish using a `gibberish-detector`.[11]
- Ignore IP addresses that aren't valid or are private (non-Internet facing) using the `ipaddress` python package. We also ignore IP addresses from popular DNS servers. We use the same list as in Ben Allal et al. (2023).

For the GitHub issues, we already employed a regex approach to detect keys, IP addresses, and emails, so we only used the PII detection model to redact names. In addition, we anonymized the usernames of the authors by replacing them with a participant counter within the conversation. See more details in Section in 5.1.

PII placeholders We replaced the detected PII entities with the following tokens:

`<NAME>`, `<EMAIL>`, `<KEY>`, `<PASSWORD>`

To mask IP addresses, we randomly selected an IP address from 5 synthetic, private, non-internet-facing IP addresses of the same type that can be found in Appendix C.

Compute resources We used the PII detection model to identify PII across all programming languages in the training dataset, including GitHub issues, Git commits, and Jupyter notebooks. The total dataset amounts to 815 GB in size. We ran inference on multiple NVIDIA A100 80 GB GPUs, which required 800 GPU-hours.

[11] https://github.com/domanchi/gibberish-detector

5 Model training

This section presents information on the training process of the StarCoder models. Before we proceed, we first clarify the differences between the two models:

StarCoderBase is the first model trained on 1 trillion tokens sourced from the curated dataset described in Section 3.

StarCoder is the fine-tuned version of StarCoderBase, trained on another 35B Python tokens (roughly 2 epochs).

Throughout the following, we show how we formatted the training data (Section 5.1), decontaminated the training data (Section 5.2), and provide details regarding the tokenizer (Section 5.3), the model architecture (Section 5.4), the training process (Section 5.5), multi-node GPU setup (Section 5.6), and CO2 emissions (Section 5.7).

5.1 Data formatting

We present the formatting guidelines for each of the data sources below. We provide the templates in which {VARIABLE} and <token> refer to placeholder variables and sentinel tokens, respectively. These placeholders are filled with the specific values for each example.

Code We prepend the repository name, file name, and the number of stars to the context of the code file. To not overfit on the exact number of stars, we categorized GitHub stars into five buckets: 0, 1–10, 10–100, 100–1000, 1000+. To enable the model to operate without this metadata during inference, we prefixed the repository name, filename, and stars independently at random, each with a probability of 0.2.

```
<reponame>{REPONAME}<filename>{FILENAME}<gh_stars>{STARS}\n{CODE}<eos>
```

To the source code in this template (i.e. {CODE}), we apply the **fill-in-the-middle transformation** (FIM; Bavarian et al., 2022) at the character-level to all the documents in the training data with a FIM-rate of 0.5. We use PSM mode with probability .5 and SPMv2 mode with probability .5.

Issues We use sentinel tokens to mark the opening of an issue and subsequently include its title. We separate the sequence of comments by a <issue_comment> token and include a userid within the text. This userid is a participant counter within the conversation (e.g. User_0) and serves to anonymize the username while preserving the speaker identity. Note that we use {COMMENT}_i to refer to the i-th comment in the conversation.

```
<issue_start>{TITLE} + {USERID}_0: {COMMENT}_0<issue_comment>{USERID}_1: {COMMENT}_1
... <issue_closed (optional)> <eos>
```

Jupyter − scripts Jupyter scripts were formatted in the same manner as code.

Jupyter − structured Parsed Jupyter notebooks come in chains of text, code, and outputs, and we separated them with sentinel tokens. Note that we use {TEXT}_i to refer to the i-th text cell.

```
<jupyter_start><jupyter_text>{TEXT}_0<jupyter_code>{CODE}_0
<jupyter_output>{OUTPUT}_0<jupyter_text> ...
```

Git commits We separate the code before the commit, the commit message, and the code after the commit with sentinel tokens. For 20% of the commits we use the full file while in ofSee Section 3.4 for more details on how we sampled the

```
<commit_before>{CODE}_before<commit_msg>{TEXT}<commit_after>{CODE}_after<eos>
```

We summarize all sentinel tokens in Table 10.

Token	Description
<|endoftext|>	end of text/sequence
<fim_prefix>	FIM prefix
<fim_middle>	FIM middle
<fim_suffix>	FIM suffix
<fim_pad>	FIM pad
<reponame>	repository name
<filename>	file name
<gh_stars>	GitHub stars
<issue_start>	start of GitHub issue
<issue_comment>	start of GitHub issue comment
<issue_closed>	GitHub issue closed event
<jupyter_start>	start of Jupyter notebook
<jupyter_text>	start of Jupyter text cell
<jupyter_code>	start of Jupyter code cell
<jupyter_output>	start of Jupyter output cell
<empty_output>	output cell without content
<commit_before>	code snippet before commit
<commit_msg>	commit message
<commit_after>	code snippet after commit

Table 10: Overview of the sentinel tokens.

5.2 Training data decontamination

The code training data was decontaminated by removing files that contained docstrings or solutions from HumanEval and MBPP, docstrings from APPS, questions from GSM8K, or prompts from DS1000. (These benchmarks are further described in Section 6.) To give an indication of the amount of data removed by decontamination, Python is the language with the highest number of matches, with 558 files removed.

5.3 Tokenizer

The model's tokenizer follows our insights presented in Ben Allal et al. (2023) and uses those same design choices: we use the Hugging Face Tokenizers library (MOI et al., 2022) to train a byte-level Byte-Pair-Encoding with a vocabulary size of 49,152 tokens—including the sentinel tokens from table 10. The pre-tokenization step includes a digit-splitter and the regex splitter from the GPT-2 pre-tokenizer.

5.4 Model Architecture

We trained a 15.5B parameter model with the same architecture as SantaCoder (Ben Allal et al., 2023). It is a decoder-only Transformer with Multi-Query-Attention (MQA; Shazeer, 2019), and learned absolute positional embeddings. We also apply Fill-in-the-Middle (FIM; Bavarian et al., 2022) transformations to the training data, see Section 5.1. We used FlashAttention (Dao et al., 2022) to speed up the attention computation and reduce its memory footprint, allowing us to scale to a 8K context length. To make FlashAttention work with MQA during training, we simply expand the key and value before calling the attention kernel. The architecture hyper-parameters are given in Table 11. In addition, we have included the hyperparameters of SantaCoder(Ben Allal et al., 2023) for comparison.

5.5 Training details

StarCoderBase The model was trained for 250k iterations, with a batch size of 4M tokens, for a total of one trillion tokens. We used Adam (Kingma & Ba, 2015) with $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.95$, $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$ and a weight

Hyperparameter	SantaCoder	StarCoder
Hidden size	2048	6144
Intermediate size	8192	24576
Max. position embeddings	2048	8192
Num. of attention heads	16	48
Num. of hidden layers	24	40
Attention	Multi-query	Multi-query
Num. of parameters	$\approx$ 1.1B	$\approx$15.5B

Table 11: Model architecture of StarCoder. We also include SantaCoder (prior work by the community).

decay of 0.1. The learning rate followed a cosine decay from 3×10^{-4} to 3×10^{-5} after a linear warmup of 2,000 iterations.

StarCoder Starting from StarCoderBase, we fine-tuned a Python variant of the model for 2 epochs on the Python subset of the training data. We used the same settings as StarCoderBase, except that we used a learning rate of 5×10^{-5} and decayed it to 5×10^{-6} after 1,000 iterations of linear warmup. We trained for 8,500 steps.

5.6 Multi-Node GPU Setup

We trained our model on a GPU cluster with 512 A100 80 GB GPUs distributed across 64 nodes. We partitioned the model with a 3D-parallel layout that shards the model with both tensor and pipeline parallelism rank 4, requiring 16 GPUs (two nodes) for one replica. To fully leverage the cluster's capabilities, we used 32-fold data parallelism. To optimize GPU utilization and reduce idle compute bubbles, we maintained a micro-batch size of 1 and accumulated for 16 steps, resulting in a global batch size of 512 (equivalent to 4M tokens). We used Megatron-LM's distributed optimizer because we found that it leads to slightly higher throughput in this configuration. Since it requires the gradient reduction step in FP32, the training in BF16 leads to 10% lower throughput than FP16, but we used it anyway to avoid training instabilities.

Except for a few restarts, we did not experience significant training instabilities.

5.7 CO2 emissions

StarCoderBase We report the carbon footprint (Lacoste et al., 2019) of training StarCoderBase. Based on the total number of GPU hours that training took (320,256) and an average power usage of 280W per GPU, this adds up to 89671.68 kWh of electricity consumed during the training process. Multiplied by the carbon intensity of the energy of the us-west-2 AWS location (0.15495 kgCO2e per kWh) and the average Power Usage Effectiveness of 1.2 across AWS datacenters, this results in 16.68 tonnes of CO2eq emitted.

StarCoder The fine-tuned model adds 3.5% of training time, which translates to an additional estimated emission of 0.58 tonnes of CO2eq.

6 Evaluation

In this section, we first outline the models we evaluated in addition to StarCoder and StarCoderBase. Then we report on the Python language performance of all models on the HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021), MBPP (Austin et al., 2021), and DS-1000 (Lai et al., 2022) evaluation benchmarks. Then we cover multi-language evaluation using a variety of benchmarks and tasks.

A Code LM Evaluation Harness To enable reproducible and centralized evaluation of StarCoder and other Code LLMs, we developed a Code LM Evaluation Harness (Ben Allal et al., 2022), inspired by the LM

Evaluation-Harness (Gao et al., 2021b). This harness provides a framework for the efficient evaluation of code models, utilizing data parallelism and docker containers for execution. It supports several benchmarks, including HumanEval, MultiPL-E, and DS-1000.

Other Models Evaluated We compare StarCoder and StarCoderBase to the following models.

1. **CodeGen-16B-Multi** (Nijkamp et al., 2023) is an open-access, 16B parameter model that is trained on the Pile (Gao et al., 2021a), and then on additional code written in C, C++, Go, Java, JavaScript, and Python from the GitHub BigQuery dataset (Smith, 2016).
2. **CodeGen-16B-Mono** is a version of CodeGen-16B-Multi that is fine-tuned on additional Python code from GitHub, though the dataset is not publicly available.
3. **CodeGeeX** (Zheng et al., 2023) is an open-access 13B parameter model trained on 23 programming languages selected from the Pile, the CodeParrot dataset (Wolf et al., 2020), and additional data for Python, Java, and C++. CodeGeeX also includes its own multi-language benchmark suite, HumanEval-X, which we discuss below.
4. **code-cushman-001** is a 12B parameter model by OpenAI and was the initial model for GitHub Copilot (Chen et al., 2021). The details of its training set are unknown. This model has been deprecated by OpenAI but was available from the Microsoft Azure OpenAI Service at the time of writing.[12]
5. Finally, although they are not specifically trained for code generation, we include some results from the LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023), PaLM (Chowdhery et al., 2022), and LaMDA (Thoppilan et al., 2022) papers. LLaMA's license prohibits commercial use, and PaLM and LaMDA are not publicly available.

6.1 StarCoder: Python Evaluation

In this section, we evaluate the performance of StarCoder on Python, comparing it to both open-access and closed-access models. We first report performance on HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) and MBPP (Austin et al., 2021), which are two widely used benchmarks of Python performance. However, we also measure performance on DS-1000 (Lai et al., 2022), a code completion benchmark of 1,000 Python data science problems based on StackOverflow questions.

6.1.1 The HumanEval and MBPP Benchmarks

HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021), and MBPP (Austin et al., 2021) are widely-used benchmarks for Code LLMs consisting of hundreds of Python programming problems that use test cases to validate the code produced by a Code LLM. Code LLMs generate code by sampling from their output distribution. We report performance using the pass@k metric (Chen et al., 2021): the total fraction of benchmark problems solved, where a problem is considered solved if any one of k code samples passes every test case. Like Chen et al. (2021), we use sampling temperature 0.2 for pass@1, and temperature 0.8 for $k > 1$. We generate $n = 200$ samples for all experiments with open-access models. For API models, we use $n = 20$ samples, which is enough to estimate pass@1. We focus on the simplest version of pass@k, which is pass@1: the likelihood that a problem is solved in a single attempt by the model.

Table 12 compares StarCoder (and StarCoderBase) on HumanEval and MBPP to several open-access and closed-access models:

1. *StarCoder is the highest-performing open-access model on both benchmarks.*
2. *StarCoder outperforms the largest models*, including PaLM, LaMDA, and LLaMA, despite being significantly smaller.

[12]There had been a code-cushman-002, but it is not available at the time of writing.

Model	Size	HumanEval	MBPP
Open-access			
LLaMA	7B	10.5	17.7
LLaMA	13B	15.8	22.0
CodeGen-Multi	16B	18.3	20.9
LLaMA	33B	21.7	30.2
CodeGeeX	13B	22.9	24.4
LLaMA-65B	65B	23.7	37.7
CodeGen-Mono	16B	29.3	35.3
StarCoderBase	12B	30.4	49.0
StarCoder	12B	33.6	52.7
Closed-access			
LaMDA	137B	14.0	14.8
PaLM	540B	26.2	36.8
code-cushman-001	12B	33.5	45.9
code-davinci-002	175B	45.9	60.3

Table 12: Comparing StarCoder's performance (pass@1) on the HumanEval and MBPP Python with several other models. StarCoder and StarCoder base obtain the highest performance of open-access models, and comparable performance to the code-cushman-001 closed access model.

Format	Model	Matplotlib	NumPy	Pandas	PyTorch	SciPy	Scikit-Learn	TensorFlow	Overall
	Number of problems:	155	220	291	68	106	115	45	1,000
Completion	InCoder-6B	28.3	4.4	3.1	4.4	2.8	2.8	3.8	7.4
Completion	CodeGen-16B-Mono	31.7	10.9	3.4	7.0	9.0	10.8	15.2	11.7
Completion	code-cushman-001	40.7	21.8	7.9	12.4	11.3	18.0	12.2	18.1
Completion	StarCoderBase	47.0	27.1	10.1	19.5	**21.7**	27.0	20.5	23.8
Completion	StarCoder	**51.7**	**29.7**	**11.4**	**21.4**	20.2	**29.5**	**24.5**	**26.0**
Insertion	InCoder-6B	28.3*	4.6	2.9	4.4	2.8	3.1	7.8	7.5
Insertion	StarCoderBase	47.0*	26.3	**10.9**	16.6	**20.2**	**30.2**	**22.3**	24.0
Insertion	StarCoder	**51.7***	**30.8**	10.3	**21.0**	**20.2**	27.4	20.0	**25.4**

Table 13: Performance of open-access and closed-access models on DS-1000. Benchmarks are as follows. All models evaluated at temperature=0.2, top_p=0.5, max_length=1024. Scores reflect mean pass@1 accuracy averaged over 40 samples. *: Matplotlib task does not have right sided context, so insertion and completion formats are identical.

3. *StarCoderBase is also very capable on Python* and outperforms CodeGen-16B-Mono, a similarly-sized open-access model that was fine-tuned on Python.
4. *StarCoder outperforms OpenAI's code-cushman-001 (12B) model.*

6.1.2 The DS-1000 Python Data Science Benchmarks

A major limitation of HumanEval and MBPP is that they are simple programming puzzles that are not representative of the code that most programmers write. In contrast, the DS-1000 benchmark (Lai et al., 2022) has a suite of 1,000 realistic and practical data science workflows across seven libraries and evaluates generations in execution against test cases.

DS-1000 supports two evaluation modes: completion and insertion (via FIM). We report completion scores for all models but insertion scores only for models that support it: the StarCoder models and InCoder-6B (Fried et al., 2022). DS-1000 also categorizes problems based on the libraries used: Matplotlib, NumPy, Pandas,

SciPy, Scikit-Learn, PyTorch, and TensorFlow. We report pass@1 for each library and an overall score in Table 13 and draw the following conclusions:

1. *StarCoder substantially outperforms all other models on data science problems* from the DS-1000 benchmark. Moreover, this is true across every kind of data science library.

2. *StarCoderBase also outperforms every other model*, but is slightly behind StarCoder on DS-1000.

3. We confirm the finding by Lai et al. (2022): *model performance on HumanEval and MBPP benchmarks does not always correlate with performance on the more realistic DS-1000 benchmarks*. For example, CodeGen-Mono slightly outperforms code-cushman-001 and the StarCoder models on HumanEval and MBPP, but is significantly worse on DS-1000. This demonstrates the importance of evaluating models on a range of benchmarks.

6.1.3 The ODEX Open-Domain Coding Benchmark

Our previous evaluations focus either on *closed domains* (i.e., primarily built-in Python functions, as in MBPP and HumanEval) or specific domains (e.g., data science, as in DS-1000). To evaluate model ability to generate code on a broader set of Python libraries, we use the ODEX benchmark (Wang et al., 2022) containing 505 open-domain and 440 closed-domain Python coding queries, in four natural languages — English, Spanish, Japanese, and Russian — with test-case-based execution evaluation.

We report the pass@1 metric for StarCoder and baseline models, including Codex (code-davinci-001), CodeGen-16B-Mono, and SantaCoder. In addition to the overall execution accuracy, we also categorize problems by languages and domains, which are: (1) queries in the *closed-domain* (using only built-in Python functions) and *open-domain* (using functions from imported libraries), and (2) queries with instructions written in English, Spanish, Japanese, and Russian, respectively. We report overall scores and scores in different domains and languages in Table 14 and draw the following conclusions:

1. *StarCoder substantially outperforms all other models on open-domain coding queries* from the ODEX benchmark.

2. *StarCoderBase also outperforms every other model*, even better than StarCoder in the ODEX English subset, but slightly behind in other languages.

3. Both StarCoder and StarCoderBase models generally exhibit smaller gaps between open- and closed-domain queries than other baseline models, despite the higher overall execution accuracy. This result indicates that StarCoder models acquire more generalized skills about coding queries in the open domain (i.e., concerning diverse Python libraries), while other models exhibit larger performance drops when moving from the closed to open domain.

Model	English			Spanish			Japanese			Russian		
	overall	open	closed	overall	open	closed	overall	open	closed	overall	open	closed
CodeGen-16B-Mono	33.7	25.2	43.1	30.0	25.0	**43.1**	37.8	26.6	**62.8**	46.8	30.4	60.1
code-cushman-001	31.9	24.4	40.2	31.9	27.7	36.7	25.7	21.2	35.5	40.0	26.0	51.6
code-davinci-001	33.6	26.9	41.0	36.9	31.7	42.9	31.0	23.7	47.3	43.2	28.9	55.1
SantaCoder	37.7	30.9	45.1	32.1	26.0	39.1	28.1	23.0	39.4	36.9	23.0	48.3
StarCoderBase	**46.5**	**40.7**	53.0	30.1	25.4	35.5	41.2	37.6	49.2	46.1	34.0	56.1
StarCoder	44.7	37.0	**53.1**	**37.6**	**32.9**	42.9	**44.2**	**39.6**	54.5	**50.4**	**33.8**	**64.1**

Table 14: Performance on the ODEX benchmark by instruction languages and code domains: *open* problems use libraries, while *closed* use only built-in Python functions.

Language	CodeGen-16B-Multi	CodeGeeX	code-cushman-001	StarCoder	StarCoderBase
cpp	21.00	16.87	30.59	**31.55**	30.56
c-sharp	8.24	8.49	**22.06**	21.01	20.56
d	7.68	9.15	6.73	**13.57**	10.01
go	13.54	11.04	19.68	17.61	**21.47**
java	22.20	19.14	**31.90**	30.22	28.53
julia	0.00	0.29	1.54	**23.02**	21.09
javascript	19.15	16.92	31.27	30.79	**31.70**
lua	8.50	10.96	26.24	23.89	**26.61**
php	8.37	13.51	**28.94**	26.08	26.75
perl	3.42	8.09	**19.29**	17.34	16.32
python	19.26	21.62	30.71	**33.57**	30.35
r	6.45	3.92	10.99	**15.50**	10.18
ruby	0.00	3.34	**28.63**	1.24	17.25
racket	0.66	3.31	7.05	0.07	**11.77**
rust	4.21	7.88	**25.22**	21.84	24.46
scala	2.37	8.95	27.62	27.61	**28.79**
bash	0.61	2.75	**11.74**	10.46	11.02
swift	1.25	7.26	22.12	**22.74**	16.74
typescript	20.07	10.11	31.26	**32.29**	32.15

Table 15: Comparing StarCoder to multi-language open-access (e.g., CodeGen-16B-Multi) and closed-access models (e.g., code-cushman-001) on 19 programming languages. We report pass@1 on HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021), which we translate from Python to the other languages using MultiPL-E (Cassano et al., 2023).

6.2 StarCoder and StarCoderBase: Multi-Language Evaluation

In this section, we focus primarily on StarCoderBase, and evaluate its performance on a variety of programming languages and programming tasks, including producing code from natural language descriptions, documenting code, predicting type annotations, and more. This section also shows that StarCoder, despite being fine-tuned on Python, remains a very capable multi-language Code LLM and even outperforms StarCoderBase on some languages.

6.2.1 Evaluation on 19 Programming Languages with MultiPL-E

We evaluate the ability of StarCoder to turn natural language into working code in multiple programming languages using MultiPL-E (Cassano et al., 2023), which translates the HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) and MBPP (Austin et al., 2021) Python benchmarks into 18 other programming languages as follows.

MultiPL-E has a set of rule-based compilers that translate Python benchmarks to each target programming language. Each compiler expects a benchmark in the HumanEval format: 1) a natural language description (in a docstring), 2) a function signature (name, arguments, and, potentially, types), and 3) a set of hidden assertions. The MultiPL-E compilers translate the function signature, assertions, and docstring (which may have doctests) into a target language. Thus, MultiPL-E gives us a parallel set of benchmarks derived from HumanEval and MBPP to compare model performance across programming languages.[13] The MultiPL-E languages include both high and low-resource languages, statically and dynamically typed languages, and a variety of other programming language features.

Table 15 shows how these models perform on 19 programming languages, and from it, we draw the following conclusions:

[13]The MultiPL-E prompts are slightly different from the original HumanEval and MBPP prompts. For example, in HumanEval, some ad hoc examples in docstrings are reformatted to be doctests so that they can be translated into examples in each target language. MultiPL-E also omits three HumanEval benchmarks that do not fit the above format. These changes have a small impact on pass rates.

Format	Model	Valid (↑)	Insecure (↓)
Completion	StarCoderBase	855/1000 (85.50%)	340/855 (39.77%)
Insertion	StarCoderBase	**987/1000 (98.70%)**	354/987 (35.87%)
Completion	InCoder-6B	871/1000 (87.10%)	309/871 (35.48%)
Insertion	InCoder-6B	854/1000 (85.40%)	**293/854 (34.31%)**
Completion	CodeGen-16B-Multi	955/1000 (95.50%)	413/955 (43.25%)
Completion	code-cushman-001	964/1000 (96.40%)	408/964 (42.32%)

Table 16: Performance on the *Asleep at the Keyboard* security benchmark (Pearce et al., 2022).

1. Across all 19 programming languages, *StarCoderBase outperforms other open-access models, sometimes showing more than 2× performance*.
2. *StarCoderBase is competitive with code-cushman-001 on most languages that we evaluate*. There are a few exceptions. For example, code-cushman-001 outperforms StarCoderBase by more than 5% on C++, Java, Ruby, and Swift, and StarCoder outperforms code-cushman-001 by more than 5% on Julia.
3. *Despite fine-tuning on Python, StarCoder remains competitive on most languages*, and also outperforms other open models. What is more surprising is that *StarCoder slightly outperforms StarCoderBase on certain languages*, despite being fine-tuned on Python. At this time, we can only speculate on why this is the case, and further investigation of the open training data is likely to help shed light on this finding.

There are several other conclusions that we can draw from the table. For example, CodeGen-16B-Multi performs better than one might expect on some languages that are reportedly not in its training set, including C#, Lua, PHP, and TypeScript. Its performance on TypeScript is less surprising since simple JavaScript functions often type-check with TypeScript by design. Similarly, StarCoder shows high performance on Swift, even though it was not included in its training set, as explained in Section 3.1.

6.2.2 The "Asleep at the Keyboard" Security Benchmark

A limitation of Code LLMs is that they can generate code with security vulnerabilities (Pearce et al., 2022). The *Asleep at the Keyboard* benchmark by Pearce et al. (2022) has 89 security-sensitive scenarios across three evaluation axes: (1) Diversity of Weakness (DoW) covers 18 different vulnerability classes in MITRE's Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) taxonomy, with scenarios drawn from the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses list published by MITRE; (2) Diversity of Prompt (DoP) evaluates the model's sensitivity to variations in the prompt for a single vulnerability class (SQL injection); (3) Diversity of Domain (DoD) contains security scenarios in the hardware description language Verilog. We focus on the DoW, which contains 54 scenarios (25 in C and 29 in Python) across 18 CWEs. We exclude scenarios that lack an automated test, leaving 40 scenarios (23 in C and 17 in Python).

Pearce et al. (2022) had previously evaluated the security of GitHub Copilot (as of August 2021), and in this paper, we use the same methodology to evaluate StarCoderBase, InCoder-6B, CodeGen-16B-Multi, and OpenAI's code-cushman-001. We use the original benchmarking methodology: generating 25 completions per scenario at temperature 0.2 (1,000 completions per model). The dataset supports fill-in-the-middle, so we include this configuration on models that support it. The results are shown in Table 16; **Valid** gives the percentage of solutions that were syntactically valid (using `py_compile` for Python and `gcc` for C), and **Insecure** shows the percentage of *valid* solutions that contained the vulnerability the scenario tests for. From this table, we draw the following conclusions.

1. *StarCoderBase has the highest rate of valid code.*
2. *InCoder-6B has a slightly lower rate for insecure code generation, but this may be due to its lower rate of valid completions.*

Model	Java	JavaScript	Python
InCoder-6B	0.49	0.51	0.31
SantaCoder	0.62	0.60	0.44
StarCoder	**0.73**	**0.74**	**0.62**

Table 17: Performance on single-line fill-in-the-middle on the FIM benchmark by Ben Allal et al. (2023).

Model	Non-None F1	All F1
InCoder-6B	59.1	46.8
SantaCoder	66.9	78.5
StarCoderBase	**77.4**	**86.6**
StarCoder	77.1	86.4

Table 18: Accuracy of Python return type prediction, using Fried et al. (2022)'s adaptation of the Pradel et al. (2020) benchmarks. We report both the overall F1 scores, which include trivial None-type prediction, and the F1 score for non-None types.

3. Among the models with more than 95% valid code, StarCoder has the lowest rate of insecure completions.

6.2.3 Fill in the Middle Benchmarks

The StarCoder models support *fill in the middle* (FIM) or *infilling*, which allows the model to generate code conditioned on prefix and suffix code surrounding the insertion point. Only a handful of recent models support FIM: from OpenAI (Bavarian et al., 2022), InCoder (Fried et al., 2022), and our prior work on SantaCoder (Ben Allal et al., 2023). FIM opens up the possibility of a variety of tasks that go beyond left-to-right code completion. We evaluate StarCoderBase on four established FIM benchmarks below.

Single-Line Infilling for Python, Java, and JavaScript Fried et al. (2022) present a single-line fill-in-the-middle task for Python that masks one line of code from a HumanEval solution and scores the model's ability to complete the function. They turn every HumanEval solution into several fill-in-the-middle problems by masking each non-blank, non-comment line of code in the solution body into a fill-in-the-middle task. Ben Allal et al. (2023) generalizes this benchmark to also support Java and JavaScript, using model-generated solutions from MultiPL-E's translations. We compare the performance of StarCoderBase, SantaCoder, and InCoder on this task, evaluating using line exact match (Table 17). StarCoderBase significantly outperforms the two smaller models.

Python Return Type Prediction Pradel et al. (2020) introduce methods and datasets for evaluating Python type annotations. Fried et al. (2022) adapt and filter one dataset from this work, consisting of Python functions from GitHub, and use it to evaluate infilling models on function return type prediction. We use this dataset to compare StarCoder, StarCoderBase, and SantaCoder to InCoder on function return type prediction. Our setup follows Fried et al. (2022): each model uses greedy generation to infill return types while conditioning on the imports, body, and signature for each function. We report exact match accuracy on normalized annotations for all functions in the evaluation set and only those with non-None annotations, following Fried et al. (2022). We find that *StarCoder and StarCoderBase outperform existing approaches at Python return type prediction* (Table 18). However, we note that as the functions in this evaluation set were taken from GitHub repositories, they may overlap with the training data for SantaCoder and the StarCoder models.

TypeScript Type Prediction Yee & Guha (2023) evaluate approaches to neural type prediction for TypeScript. However, instead of measuring accuracy, they argue that benchmarks should measure how many

	Packages type check			Files with no errors			Trivial annotations		
	✓	Total	%	✓	Total	%	✓	Total	%
InCoder	30	128	23.4	571	760	75.1	56	117	47.9
StarCoderBase	49	128	38.3	593	760	78.0	135	299	45.2

Table 19: TypeScript type prediction performance using the dataset and metholody from Yee & Guha (2023). We only evaluate JavaScript packages that have never been translated to TypeScript and compare StarCoder to InCoder, the best-performing model by Yee & Guha (2023). StarCoder outperforms InCoder in several ways.

Model	BLEU
InCoder-6B	18.27
SantaCoder	19.74
StarCoderBase	21.38
StarCoder	**21.99**

Table 20: Performance on the Python portion of the CodeXGLUE Code Summarization task, evaluating function docstring generation. Models are evaluated zero-shot using their infilling capability.

projects or files do not have type errors with predicted types. This approach makes it possible to evaluate type prediction for JavaScript programs that have never been translated to TypeScript, which reduces the likelihood of dataset contamination. We add StarCoderBase to their evaluation framework and compare it to InCoder, which performs best at type prediction in the original work. Table 19 shows that StarCoderBase outperforms InCoder: (1) it produces more packages that type check, (2) across all packages, it produces more files that type check, and (3) it produces fewer trivial type annotations than InCoder.

Python Docstring Generation To evaluate models' ability to generate documentation for functions, we use the Python subset of the CodeXGLUE code summarization benchmark (Lu et al., 2021). This benchmark is constructed from the CodeSearchNet dataset (Husain et al., 2019), containing functions from public GitHub repositories. Models infill the documentation string (docstring) for each function using greedy decoding, conditioned on the function signature and body. We follow the evaluation scheme of past work: docstrings are evaluated using smoothed 4-gram BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) against the reference docstring from the original function, using only the first lines of the generated and reference docstrings (removing, e.g., descriptions of function arguments and return types that may appear in later lines). In Table 20, we see that *StarCoder and StarCoderBase obtain higher performance than past work on docstring generation*. However, we note that there may be an overlap between this evaluation dataset and the data used to train SantaCoder and the StarCoder models.

6.3 Performance Improvement Through the Training Process

We evaluate the performance of StarCoderBase at several training checkpoints after every 200B tokens seen out of the total 1000B. Figure 2 (right) shows how performance (pass@1) changes during training for each programming language supported by MultiPL-E. The performance curve for several high-resource programming languages suggests that training longer is likely to improve their performance further.

However, some of the low-resource languages see limited improvement during training or even have a pass@1 decline. For example, R's pass@1 rate drops significantly between the 800B and 1000B (final) checkpoints. The dependence of pass@1 on data size (Figure 2, left) further supports the hypothesis that this is related to the amount of data available. The slope of the linear fit increases between 800B and 1000B checkpoints while the intercept decreases, i.e., performance improves only for languages with large enough amounts of data ($\gtrsim$ 1 GB).



Figure 2: Performance (pass@1) of StarCoderBase at several training checkpoints by data size **(left)** and by programming language **(right)**. The lines in the left plot are a linear fit between pass@1 and log-dataset-size for all the points except the leftmost one, where we expect the linear dependence to break due to transfer learning (dashed line). The goodness of fit ranges between $R^2 = 0.399$ for the 600B checkpoint to $R^2 = 0.510$ for the 1000B checkpoint.

We manually inspected the completions generated by R over several checkpoints to better understand model performance. One might hypothesize that some problems are harder than others, and so the model gains and loses the ability to solve them in R over the 600B, 800B, and 1000B checkpoints, but we find that this is *not* the case. Instead, we find significant variance in per-problem success rates for several problems (Table D.3). For these problems, the pass rate between different checkpoints varies in what appears to be a completely uncorrelated manner. Moreover, manual inspection shows that the failures are caused by minor mistakes, e.g., not taking the absolute value when computing GCD, not converting a string to a character array, or not checking edge cases.

6.4 Perplexity With Long Contexts

StarCoderBase was trained with an 8K token window, allowing conditioning on and generating long code files. To evaluate the ability of the model to benefit from this larger context, we compare its perplexity (Bahl et al., 1983) when using a full window size of 8K tokens versus a window size of 2K tokens (as used in many prior code models).

To ensure no overlap between the training data for StarCoderBase and the perplexity computation data, we downloaded 10 GNU Public License (GPL) repositories from GitHub in each of the languages in Table 21. We compiled all files from the repositories into a single document for each language. We then divided these documents into 8K token chunks and computed perplexity on the last 1K tokens in each chunk[14] in two conditions: (1) the model window only contains the final 2K tokens in the chunk (i.e., the 1K being predicted and the previous 1K), and (2) the model window contains all 8K tokens in the chunk (i.e., the 1K tokens being predicted and the previous 7K). This evaluates the ability of the model to benefit from additional file- and repo-level context when predicting code. In Table 21, we report the average perplexity of the 1K token regions across all chunks. We see that StarCoderBase indeed benefits from the extra token conditioning afforded by its 8K context window, with substantially lower perplexities across all languages.

[14]We evaluate perplexity on the final 1K tokens in each 8K chunk so that both conditions have the same evaluation tokens, and to avoid overly penalizing the 2K condition, as tokens at the beginning of a window tend to have higher perplexity as there is less context available to predict them.

Window Size	Language									
	cpp	c-sharp	c	go	java	javascript	php	r	ruby	rust
2K tokens	2.01	1.90	1.71	1.35	1.65	1.98	1.73	1.72	2.16	1.84
8K tokens	**1.79**	**1.66**	**1.61**	**1.21**	**1.54**	**1.68**	**1.43**	**1.48**	**2.02**	**1.65**

Table 21: Perplexity of StarCoderBase on evaluation regions (of size 1K tokens) when using a window size of 2K or 8K tokens across repositories from 10 languages. The larger window size substantially reduces perplexity, demonstrating a benefit of StarCoder's 8K token window.

7 Natural Language Evaluation

Although the StarCoder models are principally developed to be Code LLMs, they have also been trained on a significant amount of natural language text. Roughly 20% of its training tokens are natural language data: 7% GitHub issues, 10% Markdown, 2% Jupyter notebooks, and 4% HTML. In this section, we evaluate StarCoderBase on several natural language tasks: natural language reasoning and understanding tasks that might benefit from the combination of code and text training data; and natural language generation tasks that evaluate the model's tendencies to produce undesirable text outputs, e.g., in a documentation generation or interactive assistant setting.

7.1 Math Reasoning

Recent work has shown that Code LLMs can be effective arithmetic and symbolic reasoners by using a technique called Program-Aided Language models (PAL; Gao et al., 2022). With PAL, the LLM reads the reasoning problem and generates Python programs as the intermediate reasoning steps, which are then executed by the Python interpreter to produce the answer. In contrast, the Chain-of-Thought method (CoT; Wei et al., 2022) prompts the LLM to produce the reasoning steps in natural language before generating the answer.

We investigate the reasoning capabilities of StarCoderBase on GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), a set of middle-school math word problems. We compare with the two CodeGen-16B models (Nijkamp et al., 2023) and the family of LLaMA models (Touvron et al., 2023). The results of our evaluation are presented in Table 22, where we provide both CoT and PAL results for StarCoderBase and LLaMA.

In line with previous results comparing PAL to CoT on Code LLMs (Gao et al., 2022), we find that StarCoderBase performs better with PAL (21.5%) than with CoT (8.4%). StarCoderBase substantially outperforms CodeGen-16B-Mono and CodeGen-16B-Multi, which achieve 13.1% and 8.6% with PAL, respectively. These differences carry over to the setting where majority voting is applied. The difference between CoT and PAL is much smaller for the LLaMA models, although we observe that CoT performs slightly better for the 7B and 13B LLaMA models. Interestingly, we find that StarCoderBase outperforms LLaMA-13B (17.8%) on this reasoning benchmark. However, its performance still lags behind LLaMA-33B (38.7%).

7.2 World Knowledge and Reading Comprehension

MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2020) is a massive multitask language understanding benchmark, covering multiple-choice questions in 57 knowledge domains, including the humanities, STEM, and social sciences. CoQA (Reddy et al., 2019) is a large-scale dataset for Conversational Question Answering systems, measuring the model's ability to process a text passage and answer a series of interconnected questions. We compare StarCoderBase and StarCoder with CodeGen-16B-Multi (Nijkamp et al., 2023), GPT-NeoX (Black et al., 2022), LLaMA-7B, and LLaMA-13B (Touvron et al., 2023).

We present the 5-shot accuracy for MMLU in Table 23, and the zero-shot F1 scores for CoQA in Table 24. On MMLU, StarCoderBase outperforms CodeGen-16B-Multi significantly (34.2% to 27.8%), and even outperforms GPT-NeoX by a small margin (32.9%). Nevertheless, both LLaMA models outperform StarCoderBase. On

Model	Size	GSM8K CoT	+maj1@100	GSM8K PAL	+maj1@40
StarCoderBase	15.5B	8.4	—	21.5	31.2
CodeGen-Multi	16B	3.18	—	8.6	15.2
CodeGen-Mono	16B	2.6	—	13.1	22.4
LLaMA	7B	11.0	18.1	10.5	16.8
	13B	17.8	29.3	16.9	28.5
	33B	35.6	53.1	38.7	50.3
	65B	**50.9**	**69.7**	—	—

Table 22: 8-shot accuracy on the GSM8K math-reasoning benchmark. Samples are generated with greedy decoding. `maj1@k` denotes a majority vote over k generations. For the majority vote, we instead generate samples using nucleus sampling with $p = 0.95$ and temperature 0.7, following Gao et al. (2022). We use "—" when a model was not evaluated on a given metric, or the metric is not supported in Language Model Evaluation Harness. The LLaMA CoT numbers are from Touvron et al. (2023).

Model	Size	MMLU 5-shot acc, %
CodeGen-Multi	16B	27.8
GPT-NeoX	20B	32.9
StarCoder	15.5B	33.9
StarCoderBase	15.5B	34.2
LLaMA	7B	35.1
LLaMA	13B	**46.9**

Table 23: 5-shot accuracy on the MMLU language understanding benchmark.

CoQA, StarCoderBase performs better than CodeGen-16B-Multi but is outperformed by LLaMA and GPT-NeoX.

7.3 Measuring Harmful Generation

When generating open-ended text such as code documentation or technical dialogue, a Code LLM (similarly to text-only LLMs) might produce harmful outputs. We compare StarCoderBase to previous Code LLMs on benchmarks that measure social bias and toxicity in model-produced text.[15]

7.3.1 Social Bias

Recent work has highlighted that LLMs often capture social biases and stereotypes from their pre-training corpora (Kurita et al., 2019; May et al., 2019; Hutchinson et al., 2020; Meade et al., 2023). To quantify social bias within our model, we use StereoSet (Nadeem et al., 2021).

StereoSet consists of a collection of fill-in-the-blank-style tests for measuring social biases within language models.[16] Each example in StereoSet consists of an incomplete sentence (e.g., *our housekeeper is* `BLANK`) alongside three possible completions. Of these completions, one is stereotypical (e.g., *Mexican*), another is anti-stereotypical (e.g., *Italian*) and a third is unrelated (e.g., *computer*). StereoSet defines three metrics: a stereotype score, a language modeling score, and an ICAT score. The stereotype score is the percentage of examples for which a model *prefers* the stereotypical completion for a sentence over the anti-stereotypical completion. The language modeling score is the percentage of examples for which a model prefers a meaningful completion (stereotype or anti-stereotype) over an unrelated completion. Finally, Nadeem et al. (2021) define

[15]Code for the evaluations is available here: https://github.com/McGill-NLP/StarCoderSafetyEval
[16]We only evaluate against the intrasentence task in this work.

Model	Size	CoQA zero-shot F1 score
CodeGen-Multi	16B	0.59
StarCoderBase	15.5B	0.67
StarCoder	15.5B	0.67
LLaMA	7B	0.71
LLaMA	13B	**0.73**
GPT-NeoX	20B	**0.73**

Table 24: Zero-shot accuracy on the CoQA question answering challenge.

Model	Stereotype Score	Language Model Score	ICAT Score
		Gender	
LLaMA-13B	66.54	**88.09**	58.95
CodeGen-Multi-16B	67.34	86.41	56.44
StarCoderBase	**58.76**	86.82	**71.60**
		Profession	
LLaMA-13B	60.95	**86.74**	67.74
CodeGen-Multi-16B	60.67	85.67	67.38
StarCoderBase	**53.24**	84.70	**79.21**
		Race	
LLaMA-13B	64.94	87.97	61.68
CodeGen-Multi-16B	60.58	**88.60**	69.85
StarCoderBase	**56.48**	86.82	**75.58**
		Religion	
LLaMA-13B	57.95	90.26	75.91
CodeGen-Multi-16B	56.16	88.91	77.96
StarCoderBase	**55.69**	**90.67**	**80.36**
		Overall	
LLaMA-13B	63.40	**87.62**	64.14
CodeGen-Multi-16B	61.29	87.25	67.55
StarCoderBase	**55.53**	86.18	**76.65**

Table 25: StereoSet intrasentence results for gender, professional, racial, and religious bias. Stereotype scores close to 50% are best. Language modeling scores and ICAT scores close to 100% are best.

an idealized context association test (ICAT) score that combines these two metrics:

$$\text{ICAT} = \text{lms} \cdot \frac{\min(\text{ss}, 100 - \text{ss})}{50} \tag{1}$$

where lms and ss denote the language model score and stereotype score, respectively.

We report StereoSet results for StarCoderBase, alongside LLaMA-13B and CodeGen-Multi-16B, in Table 25. Across all four bias domains, we find StarCoderBase obtains the lowest stereotype scores, but also has competitive language modeling scores. This suggests that StarCoderBase's lower stereotype scores are not simply due to worse language modeling (Meade et al., 2022), and also as indicated by the high ICAT score.

We also evaluate StarCoderBase against Crowdsourced Stereotype Pairs (CrowS-Pairs; Nangia et al. 2020) and refer readers to Table D.4 for results.

Model	Classifier	Word List
LLaMA-13B	0.74	1.43
CodeGen-Multi-16B	**0.21**	**0.82**
StarCoderBase	0.42	1.12

Table 26: RealToxicityPrompts response toxicity results. We report the percentage of responses flagged as toxic using a toxicity classifier and an offensive word list. Lower scores are indicative of less toxic generations.

Model	Size	Open Access	Synth. Reason. (AS)	Synth. Reason. (NL)	bAbI	Dyck	GSM8K	MATH	MATH (CoT)	LSAT	Legal Support
code-davinci-002	175B		**54.0**	68.4	**68.6**	80.5	**56.8**	**41.0**	43.3	—	—
text-davinci-003	175B		50.2	**73.4**	65.3	75.1	50.6	39.0	**44.9**	**23.3**	**62.2**
Luminous Supreme	70B		31.2	—	50.4	72.9	11.2	14.9	5.7	21.2	53.0
StarCoderBase	15.5B	✓	44.0	21.0	50.4	**85.4**	8.4	15.1	7.0	19.0	53.2
Cohere Command Beta	52.4B		24.3	24.5	47.3	42.1	13.8	13.3	7.5	22.9	60.6
J1-Jumbo v1	178B		26.3	17.4	54.3	44.5	5.4	8.9	3.3	23.2	48.4
J1-Grande v2 beta	17B		28.6	13.9	47.0	61.7	9.6	12.7	6.8	19.1	56.2
code-cushman-001	12B		34.1	16.4	48.1	45.1	4.9	9.9	7.2	—	—
OPT	175B	✓	22.5	24.8	50.7	49.4	4.0	6.5	2.6	22.0	53.2
GPT-NeoX	20B	✓	20.4	16.7	46.8	74.7	5.3	14.1	7.1	19.1	51.5
BLOOM	176B	✓	30.4	19.7	44.7	54.5	9.5	4.3	5.5	20.9	54.3
GLM	130B	✓	25.2	25.4	44.3	54.9	6.1	0	5.9	19.3	45.1
UL2	20B	✓	20.5	21.7	50.1	14.0	2.4	0	0	20.7	50.6
OPT	66B	✓	19.3	21.3	40.8	47.1	1.8	4.8	2.9	17.5	52.7
YaLM	100B	✓	5.6	6.1	34.6	63.3	0	0	0	2.3	48.4
T5	11B	✓	19.6	10.1	41.2	34.7	2.3	0	0	15.9	55.8

Table 27: Model results on natural language reasoning tasks in the HELM benchmark, with models ordered by their average rank on the tasks. We use "—" when a model was not evaluated on a given metric, or has runtime errors logged in HELM (e.g., "unmapped prediction" for the code-davinci-002 and code-cushman-001 models on LSAT and Legal Support). StarCoder generally substantially outperforms other open-access models, and often outperforms much larger models.

7.3.2 Toxicity

To evaluate toxicity in responses generated from our model, we use RealToxicityPrompts (Gehman et al., 2020), a collection of sentence-level prompts that often elicit undesirable responses from language models. We generate responses to 10K examples from RealToxicityPrompts using StarCoderBase with a minimum length of one token and a maximum length of 128 tokens. We use nucleus sampling (Holtzman et al., 2020) with $p = 0.95$ to generate all of our responses.

We use two methods for automatically evaluating toxicity in responses: (i) a RoBERTa-based (Liu et al., 2019) toxicity classifier (Vidgen et al., 2021) and (ii) a list of potentially offensive words.[17] For the toxicity detector, we report the percentage of responses flagged toxic using a threshold of 0.5. For the offensive word list, we report the percentage of responses which contain an offensive word. We note that while the offensive word list can potentially falsely flag responses, it may provide a crude measure of blatant toxicity. We report our results in Table 26.

In general, we observe that CodeGen-16B-Multi and StarCoderBase both appear to generate less toxic responses than LLaMA-13B. For instance, 1.43% of LLaMA-13B's responses contain potentially offensive tokens compared to the 1.12% of StarCoderBase. We also note that CodeGen-16B-Multi appears to generate less toxic responses than StarCoderBase.

7.4 Reasoning Tasks in HELM

We evaluate StarCoderBase with HELM (Liang et al., 2022), an evaluation suite aiming to increase the transparency of LLMs by reporting their performance on a wide range of tasks. We evaluate the ability of the model to leverage its natural language and code pretraining for natural language *reasoning* tasks from HELM (excluding code tasks, because of our own extensive code evaluations). At the time of writing, the HELM benchmark does not include the CodeGen, CodeGeex, and LLaMA models. Therefore, we compare StarCoderBase with the largest and/or most recent model from each family of "limited" or "open" access models, as classified on the HELM model list,[18] that had been evaluated on a majority of these HELM reasoning tasks as of May 1, 2023. In Table 27 we report the results. We compute each model's ranking on each task, and order models in the table by their average ranking across tasks. StarCoderBase generally obtains substantially stronger performance than all other models with released weights and often performs comparably to or better than much larger models. We speculate that the mixture of code and natural language in the training data contributes to the model's strong performance on these reasoning tasks.

8 Qualitative Evaluation

In Appendix E, we highlight several interesting interactions we had with StarCoderBase. We hope these serve as a starting point for researchers and developers interested in further exploring the model's capabilities. We provide examples of how to elicit interesting model behavior using the templates for Git commits, GitHub issues, and Jupyter notebooks in Section E.1. In Section E.2, we demonstrate how to prompt StarCoder to act as a technical assistant without any instruction-tuning. In Section E.3 we find that it is also possible to prompt the model using a combination of meta-data and natural language to obtain higher pass@1 performance on the HumanEval benchmark.

9 Attribution Tools

As generative language tools become more ubiquitous and data-intensive, the need to understand and inspect the massive amounts of text they were trained on becomes more pressing, both to understand the failure modes of models as well as provide transparent data governance feedback in the form of attribution tracing and provenance management of a model's generated output. This pressing need for understanding data (Mitchell et al., 2022) is being increasingly recognized and operationalized in the form of dataset inspection tools and toolkits (Akiki et al., 2023; Marone & Van Durme, 2023; Piktus et al., 2023). It is from this vantage point that we are releasing two such data inspection tools: a membership-checking tool and a BM25 search index. These complement the existing "Am I in The Stack" tool which operates at the level of GitHub repository names. The two new tools index only the files used for training and allow for matches on file content. These tools are available as standalone sites but are also integrated into our VSCode demo. This helps users identify parts of the model output that may have been copied from the training data. By utilizing the search index, users can locate the corresponding source file and repository of the copied snippets.

9.1 Membership Checking

Marone & Van Durme (2023) propose documenting datasets with membership testing artifacts deemed *Data Portraits*. They provide one specific implementation, based on Bloom Filters (Bloom, 1970), that offers fast and lightweight membership inference. We build a Bloom-filter-based portrait on strings of length 50 characters from the training data. This artifact takes 26 GB, $\sim 3\%$ of the data size. The inference tool is hosted publicly to complement other documentation artifacts. [19]

Generations from the model can be quickly checked to approximately assess the degree of overlap with the training corpus. The VSCode extension supports using this as a rapid, first-pass attribution method. However, this requires that matching strings are longer than a minimum size and does not attempt to filter

[17] https://github.com/LDNOOBW/List-of-Dirty-Naughty-Obscene-and-Otherwise-Bad-Words
[18] https://crfm.stanford.edu/helm/latest/?models=1
[19] http://stack.dataportraits.org/

common or generic code snippets. After the first pass check, users can use the full search index to further assess attribution.

9.2 Search Index

We index the training dataset using Elasticsearch 7.17[20] and provide two search tools to query it: one focused on the Python subset and one covering the entire dataset. The code itself is preprocessed using a lowercase filter and Lucene's `ASCIIFoldingFilter`, tokenized using a 3-gram tokenizer, and indexed using the default Lucene implementation of BM25 as a similarity function. We further index the username and license fields as `keyword` fields allowing for easy filtering and lookup based on these specific metadata fields. Both indexes are currently running in single-node mode on one virtual machine.

10 Social Impact and Limitations

10.1 Project approach

Open-science and open-governance StarCoder is an output of a community research project. The project is conducted in the spirit of Open Science (Woelfle et al., 2011), focused on the responsible development *and* use of Code LLMs. Through open-governance practices conducted throughout the project, priority in decision-making has always yielded to the more responsible option even if this meant introducing limitations that might impact adoption or future research. For example, the Legal, Ethics, Governance Working Group decided to remove and not release a dataset of identified malicious code, even though this data might be useful for future security research.

Openness and safety risks Solaiman (2023) explains how the degree of openness in the LLM development process is connected to the potential risks associated with a model release. When systems are developed in a fully closed manner, it is more likely for power to become concentrated among high-resourced organizations, and the small development team may not fully comprehend the impact and long-term consequences of the model being deployed. In addition, closed-development systems are often less auditable by external experts and can impede scientific progress since researchers cannot build upon each other's work. On the other hand, fully open development allows for community research, democratizes access to the models, and enables audits throughout the whole development process. However, without appropriate guardrails, open LLM development poses a higher risk of misuse, as increased model access also increases the likelihood of harm caused by the model. Even though a released API can be shut down, once the model weights are released, it is nearly impossible to retract them. Discussing and implementing responsible AI practices has, therefore, been front and center during the development of our project's LLMs.

10.2 Limitations

Dataset and data licensing StarCoder was trained on a subset of The Stack v1.2 dataset. This dataset has been filtered using a license detector to only include permissively licensed source code. Nevertheless, the license detector might have incorrectly classified a number of repositories. See Kocetkov et al. (2022) for more details on this license detection process.

Opt-out process Although The Stack offers a way to remove developer code, its opt-out process only applies to individual repositories and could benefit from further enhancements. For example, when code is licensed under a permissive or copy-left license, it can be duplicated to another repository, making it challenging to eliminate such copies if the copyright owner chooses to opt out. More work is necessary to create better data control and consent mechanisms for large-scale training sets of LLMs.

PII detection Despite our best efforts to remove PII (Section 4), StarCoder may still produce PII (however, note that the model license restricts use that aims to generate or disseminate PII with the purpose of harming

[20] https://www.elastic.co/guide/en/elasticsearch/reference/7.17

others). As mentioned in Section 4.2, we trained an encoder-only model to detect PII for both code- and text-related tasks and noted that there is a possibility of false positives and negatives, which could lead to unintended consequences when processing sensitive data. Moreover, the PII detection model's performance may vary across different data types and programming languages, necessitating further validation and fine-tuning for specific use cases. The PII annotations are only available to approved individuals, and researchers and developers who are granted access are expected to uphold ethical standards and data protection measures. By making it accessible, our aim is to encourage further research and development of PII redaction technology.

Malicious code On the Hugging Face platform, where the Stack is hosted, a malicious code detection tool identified 654 files as unsafe. With the help of our community, we removed these files ahead of the release of The Stack v1.2. Nevertheless, The Stack may contain undetected malicious code, and StarCoder might be able to generate malware. The StarCoder OpenRAIL-M license, therefore, includes a use restriction against generating and/or disseminating malware (including — but not limited to — ransomware) or any other content that can be used to harm electronic systems.

Model limitations StarCoder is subject to typical limitations of LLMs, including the potential to generate content that is inaccurate, offensive, misleading, discriminatory towards age or gender, or reinforces other stereotypes. Please refer to Section 7.3 for an investigation into such safety concerns. Deployments of StarCoder need to further challenge and adapt the model to prevent such behavior, e.g., through red-teaming (Perez et al., 2022), adversarial testing (Wan et al., 2023), and/or by adding a robust safety layer (OpenAI, 2023b). The model is released with an OpenRAIL-M license that places enforceable use restrictions that apply to the model and its modifications, and to applications using the model.

English-only evaluations We evaluated the performance of StarCoder solely on English-based benchmarks to understand its coding capabilities and natural language understanding. To make these models more accessible to a wider audience, future research should investigate the performance and limitations of Code LLMs on other natural languages.

Code attribution tools The StarCoder membership-checking tool and BM25 search index are limited to dataset inspection against the subset of The Stack that was used for training and, as such, will not find matches to code that was not included or that was removed from the dataset for this project. The Portraits-based membership testing tool uses hash matching and thus may have false positives. It also has a minimum resolution and requires a certain amount of context to trigger a match. Both attribution tools do not attempt to distinguish between generic code (e.g., boilerplate) or protected content. However, we hope that these tools will support ongoing research on the responsible development of LLMs.

10.3 Social impact

Code LLMs We expect Code LLMs to enable people from diverse backgrounds to learn to write higher-quality code and develop low-code applications (Leinonen et al., 2023). Mission-critical software could become easier to maintain as professional developers are guided by code-generating systems on how to write more robust and efficient code. However, the security implications should also be carefully considered (Sandoval et al., 2023). While the social impact is intended to be positive, the increased accessibility of Code LLMs comes with certain risks such as over-reliance on the generated code and long-term effects on the software development job market. We refer the reader to Chen et al. (2021, Section 7) for a broader impact analysis of Code LLMs, as well as Khlaaf et al. (2022) for an in-depth risk assessment and hazard analysis of this emerging technology.

Data annotation It was important for the project to only use reputable data annotation services. It was also important to balance the constraints of costs (fair compensation), time (the timing and time to complete the work were on the critical path for the project), and quality (to ensure that PII Detection Model training was not impacted). While traditional data annotation services using salaried employees were considered, the decision to work with Toloka crowd-workers was taken after a review of service providers and their compensation practices — most would not provide sufficient transparency and guarantees about worker

compensation. Our determination of compensation took into consideration different minimum wage rates across countries and their corresponding purchasing power. We limited annotation eligibility to countries where the hourly pay rate of $7.30 was equivalent to the highest minimum wage in the US ($16.50) in terms of purchasing power parity.

Feedback opt-out form During the first stage of the opt-out process, individuals were asked to specify the reasons for wanting their code to be excluded from the dataset. The recurring concerns we heard from the individual who wished to opt-out are:

- Preference for an opt-in approach instead of opt-out.
- Perception that it is unfair to use their code without compensation
- Concerns about the current limitations of AI and the potential for model generations to be traced back to their work, resulting in potential legal liability.
- Belief that their code is of poor quality and unsuitable for AI training.
- Presence of PII in their code, which they do not wish to be publicly exposed.

The opt-out form thus provided an opportunity to directly engage with content creators and learn about the impact of our work on them.

Community feedback on opt-out process We conducted community research with individuals at specific organizations whose data is used in The Stack (The Alan Turing Institute and *The Turing Way*) and contributed to two open, international workshops (Open Data Day 2023 and Mozilla Festival 2023 with a session titled 'Designing for Data Rights in the AI Production Pipeline'). These qualitative interviews and participatory co-design workshops included 50 participants, primarily from North America and Europe, with roles including research scientist, community manager, software engineer, and principal investigator (PI).

The outcomes from the community research can be summarized as follows: when it comes to governance of LLM datasets, participants feel that it is both *better to know* and *better to have a choice*. Most participants had neutral to positive feelings about their permissively licensed data being used to train LLMs. While all had positive impressions of the "Am I in The Stack" tool, not one interviewed expressed a desire to actually opt out. The main takeaway seemed to be that participants found the most value in project's governance tools for their ability to raise awareness of data practices and to empower individuals and communities to take action based on their specific needs. These initial conversations also highlighted the importance of bringing governance discussions and decisions directly to impacted communities, an important direction of future work that should extend community research beyond North America and Europe. Participants in the workshops also raised examples of new groups to center in data rights considerations, including artists, data miners, and future generations. The co-created outputs can be viewed on this MozFest Miro Board.

11 Conclusion

In this technical report, we described the efforts of the ANONYMIZED community in creating StarCoderBase and StarCoder, open-access 15.5B parameter large language models trained on code. We provided full transparency on all aspects of the research and development process, including the training data, the data curation process, the PII redaction pipeline, and the model training. We conducted the most extensive evaluation of Code LLMs to date, finding that StarCoder outperforms other Code LLMs like CodeGen (Nijkamp et al., 2023) and CodeGeeX (Zheng et al., 2023), and matches or outperforms the closed-access code-cushman-001 model from OpenAI. By releasing the StarCoder models with an Open Responsible AI Model license, and by open-sourcing all code repositories for building the model on GitHub, we aim to increase access, reproducibility, and transparency of Code LLMs in the research and developer communities. The model license includes use restrictions to ensure that modifications of the model, and applications using the model, adhere to our principles of responsible AI. In addition, we released a novel set of attribution tools to help

end-users of Code LLMs to detect and locate model generations that may have been copied from the training set. We hope these measures contribute towards a safe model release, ensuring that the strong-performing StarCoder models remain a force for good.

References

Wasi Ahmad, Saikat Chakraborty, Baishakhi Ray, and Kai-Wei Chang. Unified pre-training for program understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of NAACL*, 2021. URL https://aclanthology.org/2021.naacl-main.211. (cited on p. 3)

Christopher Akiki, Giada Pistilli, Margot Mieskes, Matthias Gallé, Thomas Wolf, Suzana Ilic, and Yacine Jernite. BigScience: a case study in the social construction of a multilingual large language model. *CoRR*, abs/2212.04960, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2212.04960. URL https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2212.04960. (cited on p. 2)

Christopher Akiki, Odunayo Ogundepo, Aleksandra Piktus, Xinyu Zhang, Akintunde Oladipo, Jimmy Lin, and Martin Potthast. Spacerini: Plug-and-play search engines with Pyserini and Hugging Face. *CoRR*, abs/2302.14534, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2302.14534. URL https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.14534. (cited on p. 29)

Andersen et al v. Stability AI et al. *3:23-cv-00201 N.D. Cal.* 2023. (cited on p. 1)

Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Andy Jones, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Nova DasSarma, Nelson Elhage, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Jackson Kernion, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, and Jared Kaplan. A general language assistant as a laboratory for alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00861*, 2021. (cited on p. 47)

Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, and Charles Sutton. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*, 2021. (cited on pp. 2, 3, 16, 17, and 20)

Lalit Bahl, Frederick Jelinek, and Robert Mercer. A maximum likelihood approach to continuous speech recognition. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, PAMI-5:179 – 190, 04 1983. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.1983.4767370. (cited on p. 24)

Mohammad Bavarian, Heewoo Jun, Nikolas Tezak, John Schulman, Christine McLeavey, Jerry Tworek, and Mark Chen. Efficient training of language models to fill in the middle. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.14255*, 2022. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2207.14255. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.14255. (cited on pp. 2, 14, 15, and 22)

BBC. ChatGPT accessible again in Italy. https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-65431914, 2023. (cited on p. 1)

Loubna Ben Allal, Niklas Muennighoff, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Ben Lipkin, and Leandro Von Werra. A framework for the evaluation of code generation models. https://github.com/bigcode-project/bigcode-evaluation-harness, December 2022. (cited on pp. 2 and 16)

Loubna Ben Allal, Raymond Li, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Christopher Akiki, Carlos Munoz Ferrandis, Niklas Muennighoff, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Manan Dey, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Yangtian Zi, Joel Lamy Poirier, Hailey Schoelkopf, Sergey Troshin, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Manuel Romero, Michael Lappert, Francesco De Toni, Bernardo García del Río, Qian Liu, Shamik Bose, Urvashi Bhattacharyya, Terry Yue Zhuo, Ian Yu, Paulo Villegas, Marco Zocca, Sourab Mangrulkar, David Lansky, Huu Nguyen, Danish Contractor, Luis Villa, Jia Li, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Sean Hughes, Daniel Fried, Arjun Guha, Harm de Vries, and Leandro von Werra. SantaCoder: don't reach for the stars! In *Deep Learning for Code Workshop (DL4C)*, 2023. (cited on pp. 3, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 22)

Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, and Pascal Vincent. A neural probabilistic language model. In T. Leen, T. Dietterich, and V. Tresp (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 13. MIT Press, 2000. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2000/hash/728f206c2a01bf572b5940d7d9a8fa4c-Abstract.html. (cited on p. 3)

Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Anthony, Herbie Bradley, Kyle O'Brien, Eric Hallahan, Mohammad Aflah Khan, Shivanshu Purohit, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Edward Raff, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, and Oskar van der Wal. Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01373*, 2023. (cited on p. 2)

BigScience Workshop. BLOOM (revision 4ab0472), 2022. URL https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom. (cited on p. 2)

Sid Black, Stella Biderman, Eric Hallahan, Quentin Anthony, Leo Gao, Laurence Golding, Horace He, Connor Leahy, Kyle McDonell, Jason Phang, Michael Pieler, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Shivanshu Purohit, Laria Reynolds, Jonathan Tow, Ben Wang, and Samuel Weinbach. GPT-NeoX-20B: an open-source autoregressive language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06745*, 2022. (cited on pp. 2, 4, and 25)

Burton H. Bloom. Space/time trade-offs in hash coding with allowable errors. *Commun. ACM*, 13(7):422–426, jul 1970. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/362686.362692. URL https://doi.org/10.1145/362686.362692. (cited on p. 29)

Rishi Bommasani, Drew A. Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S. Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, Erik Brynjolfsson, Shyamal Buch, Dallas Card, Rodrigo Castellon, Niladri S. Chatterji, Annie S. Chen, Kathleen Creel, Jared Quincy Davis, Dorottya Demszky, Chris Donahue, Moussa Doumbouya, Esin Durmus, Stefano Ermon, John Etchemendy, Kawin Ethayarajh, Li Fei-Fei, Chelsea Finn, Trevor Gale, Lauren Gillespie, Karan Goel, Noah D. Goodman, Shelby Grossman, Neel Guha, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Peter Henderson, John Hewitt, Daniel E. Ho, Jenny Hong, Kyle Hsu, Jing Huang, Thomas Icard, Saahil Jain, Dan Jurafsky, Pratyusha Kalluri, Siddharth Karamcheti, Geoff Keeling, Fereshte Khani, Omar Khattab, Pang Wei Koh, Mark S. Krass, Ranjay Krishna, Rohith Kuditipudi, and et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *CoRR*, abs/2108.07258, 2021. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07258. (cited on p. 1)

Thorsten Brants, Ashok C. Popat, Peng Xu, Franz J. Och, and Jeffrey Dean. Large language models in machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2007 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning (EMNLP-CoNLL)*, pp. 858–867, Prague, Czech Republic, June 2007. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL https://aclanthology.org/D07-1090. (cited on p. 3)

Andrei Z Broder. Identifying and filtering near-duplicate documents. In *Annual symposium on combinatorial pattern matching*, pp. 1–10. Springer, 2000. (cited on p. 9)

Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020. (cited on pp. 1, 2, 3, and 4)

Christian Buck, Kenneth Heafield, and Bas van Ooyen. N-gram counts and language models from the Common Crawl. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'14)*, pp. 3579–3584, Reykjavik, Iceland, May 2014. European Language Resources Association (ELRA). URL http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2014/pdf/1097_Paper.pdf. (cited on p. 3)

Matthew Butterick. This CoPilot is stupid and wants to kill me. https://matthewbutterick.com/chron/this-copilot-is-stupid-and-wants-to-kill-me.html, 2022. (cited on p. 1)

Federico Cassano, John Gouwar, Daniel Nguyen, Sydney Nguyen, Luna Phipps-Costin, Donald Pinckney, Ming-Ho Yee, Yangtian Zi, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Molly Q Feldman, Arjun Guha, Michael Greenberg, and Abhinav Jangda. MultiPL-E: a scalable and polyglot approach to benchmarking neural code generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, pp. 1–17, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TSE.2023.3267446. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.08227. (cited on pp. 2, 4, and 20)

Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint*, 2021. (cited on pp. 1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 20, and 31)

Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayana Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. PaLM: scaling language modeling with pathways. *CoRR*, abs/2204.02311, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2204.02311. URL https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.02311. (cited on pp. 1, 2, 3, and 17)

Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021. (cited on pp. 3 and 25)

Tri Dao, Daniel Y. Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. FlashAttention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with IO-awareness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. (cited on pp. 2 and 15)

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1423. URL https://aclanthology.org/N19-1423. (cited on p. 11)

DOE 1 v. and GitHub, Inc. *4:22-cv-06823 N.D. Cal.* 2022. (cited on p. 1)

Tyna Eloundou, Sam Manning, Pamela Mishkin, and Daniel Rock. GPTs are GPTs: An early look at the labor market impact potential of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10130*, 2023. (cited on p. 1)

Euronews. Microsoft attracting users to its code-writing, generative AI software. https://www.euronews.com/next/2023/01/25/microsoft-results-ai, 2023. (cited on p. 1)

European Council. The general data protection regulation. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/data-protection/data-protection-regulation/, 2018. (cited on p. 1)

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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08155*, 2020. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2002.08155. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08155. (cited on p. 3)

Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida 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 preprint arXiv:2204.05999*, 2022. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2204.05999. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.05999. (cited on pp. 2, 3, 4, 18, and 22)

Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, Shawn Presser, and Connor Leahy. The Pile: An 800GB dataset of diverse text for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027*, 2021a. (cited on pp. 2, 4, and 17)

Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Eric Tang, Anish Thite, Ben Wang, Kevin Wang, and Andy Zou. A framework for few-shot language model evaluation, September 2021b. URL https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5371628. (cited on p. 17)

Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. PAL: Program-aided language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.10435*, 2022. (cited on pp. 25, 26, and 47)

Samuel Gehman, Suchin Gururangan, Maarten Sap, Yejin Choi, and Noah A. Smith. RealToxicityPrompts: Evaluating Neural Toxic Degeneration in Language Models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pp. 3356–3369, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.findings-emnlp.301. URL https://aclanthology.org/2020.findings-emnlp.301. (cited on pp. 3 and 28)

Kenneth Heafield, Ivan Pouzyrevsky, Jonathan H. Clark, and Philipp Koehn. Scalable modified Kneser-Ney language model estimation. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pp. 690–696, Sofia, Bulgaria, August 2013. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL https://aclanthology.org/P13-2121. (cited on p. 3)

Peter Henderson, Xuechen Li, Dan Jurafsky, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Mark A Lemley, and Percy Liang. Foundation models and fair use. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15715*, 2023. (cited on p. 1)

Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2020. (cited on pp. 2 and 25)

Abram Hindle, Earl T Barr, Zhendong Su, Mark Gabel, and Premkumar Devanbu. On the naturalness of software. In *2012 34th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pp. 837–847. IEEE, 2012. (cited on p. 3)

Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, Tom Hennigan, Eric Noland, Katie Millican, George van den Driessche, Bogdan Damoc, Aurelia Guy, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Erich Elsen, Jack W. Rae, Oriol Vinyals, and Laurent Sifre. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*, 2022. (cited on pp. 2 and 3)

Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. The curious case of neural text degeneration. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=rygGQyrFvH. (cited on p. 28)

Hamel Husain, Ho-Hsiang Wu, Tiferet Gazit, Miltiadis Allamanis, and Marc Brockschmidt. CodeSearchNet challenge: Evaluating the state of semantic code search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09436*, 2019. (cited on p. 23)

Ben Hutchinson, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Denton, Kellie Webster, Yu Zhong, and Stephen Denuyl. Social biases in NLP models as barriers for persons with disabilities. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 5491–5501, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.487. URL https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.487. (cited on p. 26)

Rafal Jozefowicz, Oriol Vinyals, Mike Schuster, Noam Shazeer, and Yonghui Wu. Exploring the limits of language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.02410*, 2016. (cited on p. 3)

Aditya Kanade, Petros Maniatis, Gogul Balakrishnan, and Kensen Shi. Learning and evaluating contextual embedding of source code. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML'20. JMLR.org, 2020. (cited on p. 3)

Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020. (cited on p. 3)

Heidy Khlaaf, Pamela Mishkin, Joshua Achiam, Gretchen Krueger, and Miles Brundage. A hazard analysis framework for code synthesis large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.14157*, 2022. (cited on p. 31)

Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun (eds.), *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980. (cited on p. 15)

Denis Kocetkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Jia Li, Chenghao Mou, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Yacine Jernite, Margaret Mitchell, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. The Stack: 3 TB of permissively licensed source code. *Preprint*, 2022. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.15533. (cited on pp. 1, 2, 4, 9, and 30)

Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11916*, 2022. (cited on p. 47)

Bradley M. Kuhn. If software is my copilot, who programmed my software? https://sfconservancy.org/blog/2022/feb/03/github-copilot-copyleft-gpl/, 2022. (cited on p. 1)

Keita Kurita, Nidhi Vyas, Ayush Pareek, Alan W Black, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Measuring bias in contextualized word representations. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Gender Bias in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 166–172, Florence, Italy, August 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/W19-3823. URL https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W19-3823. (cited on p. 26)

Alexandre Lacoste, Alexandra Luccioni, Victor Schmidt, and Thomas Dandres. Quantifying the carbon emissions of machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.09700*, 2019. (cited on p. 16)

Yuhang Lai, Chengxi Li, Yiming Wang, Tianyi Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, Scott Wen tau Yih, Daniel Fried, Sida Wang, and Tao Yu. DS-1000: a natural and reliable benchmark for data science code generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2211.11501, 2022. (cited on pp. 2, 16, 17, 18, and 19)

Dong-Hyun Lee. Pseudo-label: The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks. In *Workshop on challenges in representation learning, ICML*, number 2, pp. 896, 2013. (cited on p. 12)

Juho Leinonen, Paul Denny, Stephen MacNeil, Sami Sarsa, Seth Bernstein, Joanne Kim, Andrew Tran, and Arto Hellas. Comparing code explanations created by students and large language models, 2023. (cited on p. 31)

Mark A Lemley and Bryan Casey. Fair learning. *Tex. L. Rev.*, 99:743, 2020. URL https://texaslawreview.org/fair-learning/. (cited on p. 1)

Amanda Levendowski. How copyright law can fix artificial intelligence's implicit bias problem. *Wash. L. Rev.*, 93:579, 2018. (cited on p. 1)

Yujia Li, David 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 Mankowitz, Esme Sutherland Robson, Pushmeet Kohli, Nando de Freitas, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Oriol Vinyals. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07814*, 2022. (cited on p. 3)

Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, et al. Holistic evaluation of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09110*, 2022. (cited on pp. 3 and 29)

Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. RoBERTa: a robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019. (cited on pp. 11 and 28)

Natasha Lomas. Unpicking the rules shaping generative AI. https://techcrunch.com/2023/04/13/generative-ai-gdpr-enforcement/, 2022. (cited on p. 1)

Shuai Lu, Daya Guo, Shuo Ren, Junjie Huang, Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Ambrosio Blanco, Colin Clement, Dawn Drain, Daxin Jiang, Duyu Tang, Ge Li, Lidong Zhou, Linjun Shou, Long Zhou, Michele Tufano, Ming Gong, Ming Zhou, Nan Duan, Neel Sundaresan, Shao Kun Deng, Shengyu Fu, and Shujie Liu. CodeXGLUE: A machine learning benchmark dataset for code understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04664*, 2021. (cited on p. 23)

Marc Marone and Benjamin Van Durme. Data portraits: Recording foundation model training data. *CoRR*, abs/2303.03919, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2303.03919. URL https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.03919. (cited on p. 29)

Chandler May, Alex Wang, Shikha Bordia, Samuel R. Bowman, and Rachel Rudinger. On measuring social biases in sentence encoders. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 622–628, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1063. URL https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N19-1063. (cited on p. 26)

Nicholas Meade, Elinor Poole-Dayan, and Siva Reddy. An empirical survey of the effectiveness of debiasing techniques for pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 1878–1898, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.132. URL https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.132. (cited on p. 27)

Nicholas Meade, Spandana Gella, Devamanyu Hazarika, Prakhar Gupta, Di Jin, Siva Reddy, Yang Liu, and Dilek Hakkani-Tür. Using in-context learning to improve dialogue safety, February 2023. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.00871. arXiv:2302.00871 [cs]. (cited on p. 26)

Tomás Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukás Burget, Jan Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. Recurrent neural network based language model. In Takao Kobayashi, Keikichi Hirose, and Satoshi Nakamura (eds.), *INTERSPEECH 2010, 11th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Makuhari, Chiba, Japan, September 26-30, 2010*, pp. 1045–1048. ISCA, 2010. URL http://www.isca-speech.org/archive/interspeech_2010/i10_1045.html. (cited on p. 3)

Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasserman, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timnit Gebru. Model cards for model reporting. In danah boyd and Jamie H. Morgenstern (eds.), *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAT* 2019, Atlanta, GA, USA, January 29-31, 2019*, pp. 220–229. ACM, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3287560.3287596. URL https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287596. (cited on p. 3)

Margaret Mitchell, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, Nathan Lambert, Marissa Gerchick, Angelina McMillan-Major, Ezinwanne Ozoani, Nazneen Rajani, Tristan Thrush, Yacine Jernite, and Douwe Kiela. Measuring data. *CoRR*, abs/2212.05129, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2212.05129. URL https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2212.05129. (cited on p. 29)

Anthony MOI, Nicolas Patry, Pierric Cistac, Pete, Funtowicz Morgan, Sebastian Pütz, Mishig, Bjarte Johansen, Thomas Wolf, Sylvain Gugger, Clement, Julien Chaumond, Lysandre Debut, François Garillot, Luc Georges, dctelus, JC Louis, MarcusGrass, Taufiquzzaman Peyash, 0xflotus, Alan deLevie, Alexander Mamaev, Arthur, Cameron, Colin Clement, Dagmawi Moges, David Hewitt, Denis Zolotukhin, and Geoffrey Thomas. huggingface/tokenizers: Rust 0.13.2, November 2022. URL https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7298413. (cited on p. 15)

Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, Lintang Sutawika, Adam Roberts, Stella Biderman, Teven Le Scao, M Saiful Bari, Sheng Shen, Zheng-Xin Yong, Hailey Schoelkopf, Xiangru Tang, Dragomir Radev, Alham Fikri Aji, Khalid Almubarak, Samuel Albanie, Zaid Alyafeai, Albert Webson, Edward Raff, and Colin Raffel. Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01786*, 2022. (cited on p. 2)

Moin Nadeem, Anna Bethke, and Siva Reddy. StereoSet: Measuring stereotypical bias in pretrained language models. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 5356–5371, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.416. URL https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.416. (cited on pp. 3 and 26)

Nikita Nangia, Clara Vania, Rasika Bhalerao, and Samuel R. Bowman. CrowS-Pairs: a challenge dataset for measuring social biases in masked language models. *arXiv:2010.00133 [cs]*, September 2020. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.00133. arXiv: 2010.00133. (cited on p. 27)

Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. CodeGen: an open large language model for code with multi-turn program synthesis. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=iaYcJKpY2B_. (cited on pp. 2, 3, 4, 17, 25, and 32)

Catherine Olsson, Nelson Elhage, Neel Nanda, Nicholas Joseph, Nova DasSarma, Tom Henighan, Ben Mann, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, Tom Conerly, Dawn Drain, Deep Ganguli, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Scott Johnston, Andy Jones, Jackson Kernion, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, and Chris Olah. In-context learning and induction heads. *Transformer Circuits Thread*, 2022. https://transformer-circuits.pub/2022/in-context-learning-and-induction-heads/index.html. (cited on p. 2)

OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2023a. (cited on pp. 1, 2, and 4)

OpenAI. GPT-4 system card. https://cdn.openai.com/papers/gpt-4-system-card.pdf, 2023b. (cited on p. 31)

Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, July 2002. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/1073083.1073135. URL https://aclanthology.org/P02-1040. (cited on p. 23)

Hammond Pearce, Baleegh Ahmad, Benjamin Tan, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, and Ramesh Karri. Asleep at the keyboard? Assessing the security of GitHub Copilot's code contributions. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, San Francisco, CA, 2022. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.09293. (cited on pp. 2 and 21)

Ethan Perez, Saffron Huang, Francis Song, Trevor Cai, Roman Ring, John Aslanides, Amelia Glaese, Nat McAleese, and Geoffrey Irving. Red teaming language models with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03286*, 2022. (cited on pp. 2 and 31)

Aleksandra Piktus, Christopher Akiki, Paulo Villegas, Hugo Laurençon, Gérard Dupont, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, Yacine Jernite, and Anna Rogers. The ROOTS search tool: Data transparency for LLMs. *CoRR*, abs/2302.14035, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2302.14035. URL https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.14035. (cited on p. 29)

Michael Pradel, Georgios Gousios, Jason Liu, and Satish Chandra. TypeWriter: Neural Type Prediction with Search-Based Validation. In *ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3368089.3409715. (cited on p. 22)

Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. (cited on p. 3)

Jack W. Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susannah Young, Eliza Rutherford, Tom Hennigan, Jacob Menick, Albin Cassirer, Richard Powell, George van den Driessche, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Maribeth Rauh, Po-Sen Huang, Amelia Glaese, Johannes Welbl, Sumanth Dathathri, Saffron Huang, Jonathan Uesato, John Mellor, Irina Higgins, Antonia Creswell, Nat McAleese, Amy Wu, Erich Elsen, Siddhant Jayakumar, Elena Buchatskaya, David Budden, Esme Sutherland, Karen Simonyan, Michela Paganini, Laurent Sifre, Lena Martens, Xiang Lorraine Li, Adhiguna Kuncoro, Aida Nematzadeh, Elena Gribovskaya, Domenic Donato, Angeliki Lazaridou, Arthur Mensch, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Maria Tsimpoukelli, Nikolai Grigorev, Doug Fritz, Thibault Sottiaux, Mantas Pajarskas, Toby Pohlen, Zhitao Gong, Daniel Toyama, Cyprien de Masson d'Autume, Yujia Li, Tayfun Terzi, Vladimir Mikulik, Igor Babuschkin, Aidan Clark, Diego de Las Casas, Aurelia Guy, Chris Jones, James Bradbury, Matthew Johnson, Blake Hechtman, Laura Weidinger, Iason Gabriel, William Isaac, Ed Lockhart, Simon Osindero, Laura Rimell, Chris Dyer, Oriol Vinyals, Kareem Ayoub, Jeff Stanway, Lorrayne Bennett, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Geoffrey Irving. Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training Gopher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11446*, 2021. (cited on p. 3)

Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551, 2020. (cited on pp. 2 and 4)

Siva Reddy, Danqi Chen, and Christopher D. Manning. CoQA: A conversational question answering challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:249–266, 2019. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a_00266. URL https://aclanthology.org/Q19-1016. (cited on pp. 2 and 25)

John A. Rothchild and Daniel Rothchild. Copyright implications of the use of code repositories to train a machine learning model. https://www.fsf.org/licensing/copilot/copyright-implications-of-the-use-of-code-repositories-to-train-a-machine-learning-model, 2022. (cited on p. 1)

Gustavo Sandoval, Hammond Pearce, Teo Nys, Ramesh Karri, Siddharth Garg, and Brendan Dolan-Gavitt. Lost at C: A user study on the security implications of large language model code assistants, 2023. (cited on p. 31)

Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. BLOOM: a 176B-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100*, 2022. (cited on p. 2)

Noam Shazeer. Fast transformer decoding: One write-head is all you need. *CoRR*, abs/1911.02150, 2019. URL http://arxiv.org/abs/1911.02150. (cited on pp. 2 and 15)

Arfon Smith. Kernel description. https://github.blog/2016-06-29-making-open-source-data-more-available/, 2016. (cited on p. 17)

Shaden Smith, Mostofa Patwary, Brandon Norick, Patrick LeGresley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Jared Casper, Zhun Liu, Shrimai Prabhumoye, George Zerveas, Vijay Korthikanti, Elton Zhang, Rewon Child, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Julie Bernauer, Xia Song, Mohammad Shoeybi, Yuxiong He, Michael Houston, Saurabh

Tiwary, and Bryan Catanzaro. Using DeepSpeed and Megatron to train Megatron-Turing NLG 530B, a large-scale generative language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11990*, 2022. (cited on p. 3)

Irene Solaiman. The gradient of generative AI release: Methods and considerations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04844*, 2023. (cited on pp. 2 and 30)

Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Vinh Q Tran, Xavier Garcia, Dara Bahri, Tal Schuster, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Neil Houlsby, and Donald Metzler. Unifying language learning paradigms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.05131*, 2022. (cited on pp. 2 and 4)

Clive Thompson. How an ai became my code-writing genie, Mar 2022. URL https://www.wired.com/story/openai-copilot-autocomplete-for-code/. (cited on p. 1)

Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, YaGuang Li, Hongrae Lee, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Amin Ghafouri, Marcelo Menegali, Yanping Huang, Maxim Krikun, Dmitry Lepikhin, James Qin, Dehao Chen, Yuanzhong Xu, Zhifeng Chen, Adam Roberts, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Yanqi Zhou, Chung-Ching Chang, Igor Krivokon, Will Rusch, Marc Pickett, Pranesh Srinivasan, Laichee Man, Kathleen Meier-Hellstern, Meredith Ringel Morris, Tulsee Doshi, Renelito Delos Santos, Toju Duke, Johnny Soraker, Ben Zevenbergen, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Mark Diaz, Ben Hutchinson, Kristen Olson, Alejandra Molina, Erin Hoffman-John, Josh Lee, Lora Aroyo, Ravi Rajakumar, Alena Butryna, Matthew Lamm, Viktoriya Kuzmina, Joe Fenton, Aaron Cohen, Rachel Bernstein, Ray Kurzweil, Blaise Aguera-Arcas, Claire Cui, Marian Croak, Ed Chi, and Quoc Le. Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*, 2022. (cited on pp. 3 and 17)

Julian Togelius and Georgios N. Yannakakis. Choose your weapon: Survival strategies for depressed AI academics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06035*, 2023. (cited on p. 2)

Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. LLaMA: open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. (cited on pp. 2, 4, 17, 25, and 26)

Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 5998–6008, 2017. (cited on p. 3)

Bertie Vidgen, Tristan Thrush, Zeerak Waseem, and Douwe Kiela. Learning from the worst: Dynamically generated datasets to improve online hate detection. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 1667–1682, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.132. URL https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.132. (cited on p. 28)

Alexander Wan, Eric Wallace, Sheng Shen, and Dan Klein. Poisoning language models during instruction tuning, 2023. (cited on p. 31)

Ben Wang and Aran Komatsuzaki. GPT-J-6B: a 6 billion parameter autoregressive language model, 2021. (cited on pp. 2 and 4)

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 *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 8696–8708, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.685. URL https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.685. (cited on p. 3)

Zhiruo Wang, Shuyan Zhou, Daniel Fried, and Graham Neubig. Execution-based evaluation for open-domain code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10481*, 2022. (cited on p. 19)

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=_VjQlMeSB_J. (cited on pp. 25 and 47)

Michael Woelfle, Piero Olliaro, and Matthew H. Todd. Open science is a research accelerator. *Nature Chemistry*, 3(10):745–748, October 2011. ISSN 1755-4349. doi: 10.1038/nchem.1149. (cited on p. 30)

Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pp. 38–45, Online, October 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.emnlp-demos.6. (cited on p. 17)

World Economic Forum. Future of jobs report. https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Future_of_Jobs_2023.pdf, 2023. (cited on p. 1)

Frank F. Xu, Uri Alon, Graham Neubig, and Vincent Josua Hellendoorn. A systematic evaluation of large language models of code. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming*, MAPS 2022, pp. 1–10, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450392730. doi: 10.1145/3520312.3534862. URL https://doi.org/10.1145/3520312.3534862. (cited on p. 3)

Ming-Ho Yee and Arjun Guha. Do machine learning models produce TypeScript types that type check? In *European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP)*, 2023. (cited on pp. 2, 22, and 23)

Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, Weng Lam Tam, Zixuan Ma, Yufei Xue, Jidong Zhai, Wenguang Chen, Peng Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. GLM-130B: an open bilingual pre-trained model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02414*, 2022. (cited on p. 4)

Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Myle Ott, Sam Shleifer, Kurt Shuster, Daniel Simig, Punit Singh Koura, Anjali Sridhar, Tianlu Wang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. OPT: open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022. (cited on pp. 1, 2, and 4)

Qinkai Zheng, Xiao Xia, Xu Zou, Yuxiao Dong, Shan Wang, Yufei Xue, Zihan Wang, Lei Shen, Andi Wang, Yang Li, Teng Su, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. CodeGeeX: A pre-trained model for code generation with multilingual evaluations on HumanEval-X. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17568*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2303.17568. (cited on pp. 3, 4, 17, and 32)

Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, and Ed Chi. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625*, 2022. (cited on p. 47)