
Hints-In-Browser: Benchmarking Language Models for Programming Feedback Generation

Nachiket Kotalwar
MPI-SWS
nkotalwa@mpi-sws.org

Alkis Gotovos
MPI-SWS
agkotovo@mpi-sws.org

Adish Singla
MPI-SWS
adishs@mpi-sws.org

Abstract

Generative AI and large language models hold great promise in enhancing programming education by generating individualized feedback and hints for learners. Recent works have primarily focused on improving the quality of generated feedback to achieve human tutors' quality. While quality is an important performance criterion, it is not the only criterion to optimize for real-world educational deployments. In this paper, we benchmark language models for programming feedback generation across several performance criteria, including quality, cost, time, and data privacy. The key idea is to leverage recent advances in the new paradigm of in-browser inference that allow running these models directly in the browser, thereby providing direct benefits across cost and data privacy. To boost the feedback quality of small models compatible with in-browser inference engines, we develop a fine-tuning pipeline based on GPT-4 generated synthetic data. We showcase the efficacy of fine-tuned Llama3-8B and Phi3-3.8B 4-bit quantized models using WebLLM's in-browser inference engine on three different Python programming datasets. We also release the full implementation along with a web app and datasets to facilitate further research on in-browser language models.

1 Introduction

Generative AI and large language models have the potential to drastically improve the landscape of computing and programming education by empowering next-generation tutoring systems. In particular, this potential lies in the advanced capabilities of state-of-the-art models like OpenAI's GPT-4 [1] to automatically generate high-quality programming feedback and provide 24/7 digital assistance to novice learners [2, 3, 4]. A series of recent works have studied these models for programming feedback generation, including benchmarking the models' performance with human tutors in terms of generated feedback quality [5], developing techniques to further improve the generation quality [6, 7, 8, 9], and deploying feedback generation technologies in classrooms to measure pedagogical benefits and students' perception of quality [10, 11, 12].

While quality is an important performance criterion, it is not the only criterion to optimize in real-world educational deployments. Let us look at a typical workflow of existing (pilot) applications that employ programming feedback techniques (see Figure 1a) [10, 11, 12]: (1) an educator deploys their technique on a server, which then communicates with state-of-the-art models like OpenAI's GPT-4 [1], and then exposes this technique to learners via an app; (2) when a learner requests a hint, metadata such as the buggy program and the learner's specific question is sent to the server to be processed by the technique; (3) once the technique generates the hint, the learner receives it back via the app. Three key issues emerge with this workflow: (i) the running costs for an educator could be 0.01–0.1 USD for a single hint request [9, 12], making it infeasible to provide large-scale free access to such technology; (ii) the waiting times for a learner could be over 30 seconds making the experience and feedback loop less interactive [9]; (iii) data privacy concerns creep in as the learner's




Figure 1: Deployment workflows for generating programming feedback; see Section 1 for details.

metadata gets sent to external servers and further to closed-access corporate-run models [3, 11, 13]. While some of these concerns can be partially alleviated with alternative deployment workflows that leverage open-access models like Llama-3-70B [14, 15] (see Figure 1b), the underlying issues of cost (for hosting/serving models), time, and data privacy remain.

Hints-In-Browser. In this paper, we benchmark language models for programming feedback generation while considering different performance criteria important for real-world deployments, including quality, cost, time, and data privacy. To tackle the above-mentioned issues, we leverage recent advances in the new paradigm of in-browser inference that allow these models to be run directly in the end user’s browser. In fact, we show how to directly integrate such an in-browser inference engine with modern browser-based programming environments [16, 17]. We refer to this new deployment workflow of in-browser feedback generation as *hints-in-browser* (see Figure 1c).

Summary of Results. Compared to existing workflows discussed earlier (see Figure 1), hints-in-browser provides clear benefits across two of our new performance criteria: (i) no running costs for an educator or learner; (ii) complete data privacy as the learner’s data does not leave their machine. In fact, after an initial download and caching of the model inside the browser, the learner can continue to benefit from hints-in-browser even without internet connectivity. Given that in-browser inference engines are still in their infancy, they do put stringent requirements on feasible model sizes and consumer hardware. To further enhance and demonstrate the utility of hints-in-browser, we take the following steps:

- We develop a fine-tuning pipeline using GPT-4 generated synthetic data to boost the feedback quality of small models compatible with in-browser engines.¹ We showcase the efficacy of fine-tuned Llama-3-8B [14, 15] and Phi-3-3.8B [18] 4-bit quantized models using the WebLLM engine [19] on different Python programming datasets and highlight competitive quality surpassing GPT-3.5 [20].
- We build a web app to demonstrate and reliably measure the performance of hints-in-browser in terms of inference times and functionality across different hardware configurations.² We highlight that inference times are competitive with existing feedback generation workflows for compatible machines (e.g., a GPU-equipped consumer laptop, starting at the 1200 USD price range).
- We release the full implementation of our work along with the web app and datasets to facilitate further research and development on hints-in-browser.

2 Related Work

Small Models and In-Browser Inference. There have been increasing efforts to democratize generative AI technology. On the one hand, this has led to a surge of increasingly powerful small open-access models like Llama-3-8B [14, 15] and Phi-3-3.8B [18], thereby reducing the inference-time compute requirements. On the other hand, this has led to new in-browser inference engines such as WebLLM and ONNX Runtime that enable inference directly in browser [19, 21], without even requiring any installation as needed by end-user technologies like Ollama [22]. Recent works have also evaluated small open-access models for program repair, highlighting their potential in educational settings [23]. We contribute to this ecosystem by benchmarking feedback generation techniques across important real-world performance criteria.

Deployment of Feedback Generation Techniques. There has been an increasing interest in deploying feedback-generation techniques for learners/teachers in real-world settings. Recent research works have demonstrated pilot deployment of programming feedback techniques in classrooms based on OpenAI’s models [10, 11, 24]. However, given the running costs involved, it

¹Github repository: <https://github.com/machine-teaching-group/neurips2024-hints-in-browser-finetuning>.

²Github repository: <https://github.com/machine-teaching-group/neurips2024-hints-in-browser-demo>.




Figure 2: Illustration of different steps in the feedback generation technique (adapted from [5, 9]).

is infeasible for educators to provide large-scale free access to such technology. Beyond research, educational websites have also been integrating generative feedback techniques: Khanmigo by Khan Academy [25] and Q-Chat by Quizlet [26] are AI-powered systems based on OpenAI’s GPT-4 models. However, these systems are typically subscription-based to cover the running costs. These recent developments and limitations motivate our work to study and benchmark new deployment workflows.

3 Programming Feedback and Performance Metrics

Next, we introduce programming feedback scenarios and technique along with performance metrics.

3.1 Programming Feedback Scenarios and Technique

Hints Scenario. Given a programming task T and a learner’s buggy program P_b , we aim to generate a natural language hint H as feedback to aid the learner in resolving programming errors and making progress. The buggy program P_b fails to pass at least one of the test cases in the task T ’s test suite Ω_T and may contain various error types, including syntax and semantic errors. The objective is primarily to aid the learner with a concise hint without directly revealing the solution or required fixes [5, 9, 11].

Program Repair Scenario. Given a programming task T and a learner’s buggy program P_b , we aim to generate a repaired (fixed) program P_r . The objective is to make minimal edits to the buggy program P_b , and preserve context and style as much as possible. While this fixed program P_r is not directly used to provide feedback to learners, it is typically used as an intermediate step when generating hints. For a given generative model, the quality of generated program repairs is a good proxy for the quality of generated hints, and can be assessed automatically [5].

Feedback Generation Technique. Figure 2 illustrates the feedback generation technique we consider in this paper adapted from existing techniques [5, 9]. We provide an overview of the key steps and hyperparameters, which inspire the fine-tuning pipeline in Section 4 and affect our results on inference time in Section 5. The starting point is a learner working on a programming task T who has written a buggy program P_b and requests a hint. The first step obtains a small set of failing test cases from the test suite Ω_T , denoted as ω_{T,P_b} . The second step generates a repaired program using the generative model by prompting it with (T, P_b, ω_{T,P_b}) . More specifically, we request the model to generate a candidate repaired program, and independently repeat this process n_r times with temperature t_r . Then, from this set of n_r programs, we choose the program that passes the test suite Ω_T and is closest to P_b in terms of token-edit distance. This is based on the Levenshtein edit distance on strings obtained by tokenizing the programs, as done in previous work [9]. Henceforth, we refer to this repaired program as P_r ; if no repaired program is found, we define P_r to be empty. The next step uses all this information and makes a new query to the model asking to generate a concise hint H along with an auxiliary detailed explanation X as part of Chain-of-Thought reasoning [27]. Finally, the hint H is provided to the learner as feedback. The prompts used are adapted from existing literature [9, 11] and are provided in our Github repository.

3.2 Performance Metrics

Quality. We use existing quality metrics for hints and repair as considered in [5, 9]. For hints, we assess the quality of generated hints along four binary attributes, which are computed based on expert ratings: (a) *HCorrect* captures whether the generated hint provides correct information for resolving issues in the buggy program; (b) *HInformative* captures whether the generated hint provides useful information to help the learner resolve bug(s); (c) *HConceal* captures that the information in the generated hint is not too detailed, so the learner would also have to reason about implementing the fixes; (d) *HComprehensible* captures whether the generated hint is easy to understand, presented in




Figure 3: Illustration of the hints-in-browser deployment workflow; see Section 4 for details.

a readable format, and does not contain redundant information. Following the setup from existing literature [5, 9], we measure the overall quality of the generated hint by $HGood$ that takes the value of 1 (good quality) when all the four attributes are rated as 1. For repair, we assess the quality of generated programs along two quality attributes: (a) $RPass$ measures whether any of the n_r candidate repaired programs passes the T 's test suite Ω_T (i.e., $pass@n_r$ rate [28]); (b) $REdit$ captures the token-based edit distance between the repaired program and the buggy program (computed when a repaired program is found).


Cost, Time, and Data Privacy. We use a richer set of performance criteria important for real-world deployments, including cost, time, and data privacy. The *cost* metric here refers to the running monetary costs for an educator or learner for a single hint request. The *time* metric here refers to waiting times for a learner while the technique generates and serves hints. The *data privacy* metric here refers to privacy from the learner's perspective of how their data is sent to external services.

4 Hints-In-Browser Workflow and Fine-Tuning Pipeline


In this section, we provide an overview of the methodology, including the hints-in-browser deployment workflow and the fine-tuning pipeline.

Hints-In-Browser Workflow. Figure 3 provides an overview of the hints-in-browser deployment workflow and its interaction with a learner requesting hints on a programming task. The starting point is a small language model as a base model in 16-bit format; we will use Llama-3-8B [14, 15] or Phi-3-3.8B [18] throughout this paper. The next stage is to optionally fine-tune the base model to boost the feedback generation quality using the pipeline discussed below. Next, the model is converted to its web version, which also quantizes the model to a 4-bit format suitable for an in-browser inference engine. In this paper, we use the WebLLM engine [19], which makes use of recently added WebGPU capabilities in several modern browsers to enable fast in-browser inference. Next, the web version of the model and auxiliary inference files are hosted in a publicly accessible space such as on HuggingFace [29]. Finally, the hints-in-browser workflow is deployed and accessed by a learner in the form of a web app, which includes a programming environment along with the option to request hints (see Section 6). When the learner accesses the app for the first time, the model is downloaded and cached locally. On subsequent hint requests, our technique runs in the browser and utilizes WebLLM-powered inference to directly provide feedback to the learner. As discussed in Section 1, hints-in-browser provide direct benefits across the performance criteria of cost and data privacy.

Fine-Tuning Pipeline to Boost Quality. We use the smallest models from Llama-3 and Phi-3 families for hints-in-browser to keep inference times low. To boost the feedback quality of these small models, we develop a fine-tuning pipeline; see Figure 3. The training process involves standard supervised fine-tuning with LoRA [30] and uses GPT-4 generated synthetic training data. Next, we discuss the main steps involved in this synthetic training data generation process; see Figure 4a. The starting point is a set of programming tasks $\{T\}$ that are used for training; this set corresponds to a (sub)set of tasks in the domain that a learner will be working on. The first step is to obtain buggy programs $\{P_b\}$ for each task T along with failing test cases ω_{T, P_b} (see Section 3.1 for this notation). These buggy programs can be real-world learner submissions or synthetic programs obtained by prompting GPT-4 – we will consider both settings in the experiments. When using GPT-4 to generate buggy programs, we prompt it for types of real-world mistakes (e.g., syntactical errors, incorrect loop range); see Figure 4b. The second step is to prompt the GPT-4 model with $(T, P_b, \omega_{T, P_b})$ and ask it to generate a repaired program P_r , a detailed explanation X , and a hint H in a single prompt shown in Figure 4c; here, we adapt the prompts used in the feedback generation technique. From $(T, P_b, \omega_{T, P_b}, P_r, X, H)$, we assemble four types of training data instances as shown in Figure 4a. We provide further implementation details of our synthetic training data generation process in our Github repository.



(a) Illustration of the synthetic training data generation process; see Section 4 for details.



(b) Prompt for synthetic data (buggy programs)

(c) Prompt for synthetic data (repairs and feedback)

Figure 4: Synthetic training data generation process along with *shortened version* of prompts used for generation. Details are skipped for brevity and full prompts are provided in our Github repository.

5 Evaluation: Fine-Tuning Experiments and Feedback Quality

In this section, we evaluate different model variants to assess the impact of web conversion and effectiveness of our fine-tuning pipeline in terms of feedback quality.

5.1 Programming Domains and Datasets

We consider three domains/datasets representing a variety of Python programming tasks; see Figure 5. We provide a high-level overview here and defer the full details to the our Github repository.

BASICALGO [5, 9]. The first dataset, BASICALGO, has been introduced in the literature to benchmark generative models and human tutors in terms of feedback generation quality [5, 9]. It comprises 5 popular Python programming tasks that involve writing basic algorithms, namely GCD, FIBONACCI, DIVISORSDIV3, PALINDROME, and MERGESTRS. For each task, the dataset contains 5 buggy programs based on bugs in real-world submissions on the *geeksforgeeks.org* platform [31]. These buggy programs represent a variety of non-trivial bugs, including algorithmic mistakes, time/space complexity issues, and Python-specific errors like incorrect string indexing. We use these 25 buggy programs for evaluation. For the fine-tuning pipeline, we begin by generating synthetic buggy programs using GPT-4 in Step-1 of the synthetic training data generation process in Figure 4a. Then, for each buggy program in the training set, we use GPT-4 to obtain up to 5 independent tuples (P_r, X, H) ; here, we filter invalid tuples, e.g., where P_r is not a correct repair. Finally, we assemble 4 training instances per tuple, which leads to a total of 3304 instances as reported in Figure 5a.

INTROPYNUS [32, 33]. The second dataset, INTROPYNUS, has been introduced in the literature to benchmark program repair techniques [32, 33]. It comprises 5 Python programming tasks that involve writing functions, namely DUPLICATEELIMINATION, SORTINGTUPLES, TOP-K ELEMENTS, SEQUENTIALSEARCH, and UNIQUEDATESMONTHS. For each task, the dataset contains (buggy and correct) submissions from 361 students from an introductory Python course taught at the National Univer-

Properties	Domain: BASICALGO	Domain: INTROPNUS	Domain: KARELALGO
Domain and concepts	Basic algorithms in Python	Basic functions in Python	Specialized linked lists
Type of programming tasks	Real-world	Real-world	Designed
Number of programming tasks	5	5	7
Avg. lines in solution programs	7.4	8.4	11.3
Anticipated difficulty level	Medium	Easy	Hard
Evaluation: Type of buggy programs	Real-world	Real-world	Designed
Evaluation: Number of buggy programs	25	25	21
Evaluation: Avg. lines in buggy programs	11.8	11.0	10.3
Fine-tuning: Type of buggy programs	GPT-4 generated	Real-world	GPT-4 generated
Fine-tuning: Number of buggy programs	191	1758	301
Fine-tuning: Number of training instances	3304	30576	3676

(a) Summary of important properties across domains/datasets.

Given a string `s`, return 1 if `s` is a palindrome, otherwise return 0. Expected time complexity should be $O(\text{Length of } s)$ and expected auxiliary space should be $O(1)$. Example: `is_palindrome("abba")` \rightarrow 1.

(b) PALINDROME task from BASICALGO.

Write a function that takes in a list `lst` and returns a new list with all repeated occurrences of any element removed. Relative order of the elements should be preserved. Example: `remove_extras([5, 2, 1, 2, 3])` \rightarrow `[5, 2, 1, 3]`.

(c) DUPLICATEELIMINATION task from INTROPNUS.

Given a linklist `a`, check if it is a palindrome. This linklist `a` is palindrome if the values of its elements and elements in its reverse are the same. You are also given an additional linklist `b` that can be used to reverse linklist `a`, and then compare. Note that the initial pointers for linklist `a` and linklist `b` are at their first elements. Your function should return a boolean value `True` or `False`. Example: `is_palindrome(a:[4, 5, 7, 5, 4], b:[0, 0, 0, 0, 0])` \rightarrow `True`.

This domain has specialized linked-lists inspired by Karel environment. The possible operations on linklist `a` are: `a.go_next()`, `a.go_prev()`, `a.get_value()`, `a.set_value()`, `a.has_next()`, `a.has_prev()`.

(d) PALINDROME task from KARELALGO.

Figure 5: Overview of domains and datasets used for evaluation, along with example tasks.

sity of Singapore. We select a small set of diverse buggy programs, 5 per task, to curate an evaluation set of 25 buggy programs. For the fine-tuning pipeline, we use the remaining buggy programs as real-world buggy programs in Step-1 of the synthetic training data generation process in Figure 4a. Then, for each buggy program in the training set, we use GPT-4 to obtain 5 independent tuples (P_r, X, H) . Finally, we assemble 4 training instances per tuple, which leads to a total of 30576 instances.

KARELALGO. The third dataset, KARELALGO, has been designed by us and involves writing Python programs in a new domain inspired by the Karel visual programming environment [34, 35]. Importantly, these tasks require using domain-specific operations that would have not been seen by the generative models during training. In short, we consider 1-D Karel-worlds which leads to solving linked-list variant of problems, with environment-specific operations (see Figure 5d). This dataset comprises 7 programming tasks that involve writing functions with environment-specific operations, namely `MOVE`, `COPYENDTOALL`, `SUMOFLIST`, `NTHELEMENTENDOFLIST`, `COMMONDIVISOR`, `PALINDROME`, and `FIBONACCISERIESUPTON`. For each task, the dataset contains 3 buggy programs that we designed to capture a mixture of environment-specific bugs and typical bugs in similar problems. We use these 21 buggy programs for evaluation. For the fine-tuning pipeline, we begin by generating synthetic buggy programs using GPT-4 in Step-1 of the synthetic training data generation process in Figure 4a and follow the same process as used for BASICALGO, which leads to a total of 3676 instances.

5.2 Models Studied and Experimental Details

Models Studied. Next, we summarize different models and variants used in the feedback generation technique. Unless specified, we use the same hyperparameters across all models given by the number of repairs $n_r = 10$, repair temperature $t_r = 0.7$, and hint temperature of $t_h = 0.1$.

Table 1: Results for feedback quality performance for technique with different models. Averaged results are reported as mean (stderr) and rounded off for brevity. See details in Section 5.3.

Technique	Domain: BASICALGO			Domain: INTROPYNUS			Domain: KARELALGO			All Domains
$n_r = 10$	HGood%	RPass%	REdit	HGood%	RPass%	REdit	HGood%	RPass%	REdit	HGood%
GPT-4	76	97 (1)	45 (1)	100	97 (1)	15 (1)	90	100 (0)	30 (1)	89 (7)
GPT-4o	68	96 (0)	29 (1)	92	100 (0)	14 (0)	90	95 (0)	20 (0)	83 (8)
GPT-4o mini	60	96 (0)	44 (1)	88	99 (1)	16 (1)	67	76 (3)	31 (0)	72 (8)
GPT-3.5	24	88 (0)	39 (2)	48	95 (3)	14 (1)	29	75 (3)	13 (1)	34 (7)
Llama-3-8B	32	83 (1)	44 (1)	52	93 (1)	19 (2)	24	41 (3)	19 (1)	36 (8)
Llama-3-8B-dom	64	83 (1)	35 (2)	96	100 (0)	17 (0)	71	90 (3)	22 (0)	77 (10)
Llama-3-8B-web	16	67 (5)	55 (3)	36	89 (1)	21 (2)	10	40 (3)	20 (1)	21 (8)
Llama-3-8B-dom-web	52	83 (1)	40 (0)	84	100 (0)	21 (1)	57	84 (2)	23 (1)	64 (10)
Phi-3-3.8B	36	84 (4)	43 (1)	32	71 (5)	29 (2)	14	33 (3)	39 (6)	27 (7)
Phi-3-3.8B-dom	48	73 (3)	40 (1)	68	100 (0)	13 (0)	38	67 (3)	14 (1)	51 (9)
Phi-3-3.8B-web	4	55 (4)	51 (5)	16	71 (4)	26 (3)	5	29 (7)	31 (8)	8 (4)
Phi-3-3.8B-dom-web	24	56 (2)	43 (2)	64	93 (1)	12 (1)	19	46 (4)	18 (4)	36 (14)

Table 2: Results for feedback quality performance with a lower value of n_r (total number of program repairs generated by the model as part of the hint generation process). Choosing a higher value can increase hint quality but also increase the inference time. See details in Sections 5.3 and 6.

Technique	Domain: BASICALGO			Domain: INTROPYNUS			Domain: KARELALGO			All Domains
$n_r = 3$	HGood%	RPass%	REdit	HGood%	RPass%	REdit	HGood%	RPass%	REdit	HGood%
GPT-4	68	97 (1)	48 (1)	96	91 (1)	17 (2)	86	97 (2)	37 (0)	83 (8)
GPT-4o mini	56	92 (2)	45 (3)	88	96 (2)	18 (1)	52	59 (2)	28 (2)	65 (11)
Llama-3-8B-dom-web	36	67 (5)	46 (2)	84	100 (0)	25 (1)	57	71 (7)	26 (1)	59 (14)
Phi-3-3.8B-dom-web	24	36 (2)	36 (6)	60	87 (1)	15 (0)	14	37 (2)	19 (3)	33 (14)

- **OpenAI’s GPT family.** We consider models from OpenAI’s GPT family, including GPT-4 (model=*gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09*) [1, 20], GPT-4o (model=*gpt-4o-2024-08-06*), GPT-4o mini (model=*gpt-4o-mini-2024-07-18*), and GPT-3.5 (model=*gpt-3.5-turbo-0125*) [20]. These models are popularly used in current deployments of programming feedback techniques [10, 11].
- **Base and fine-tuned models before web conversion.** As base models, we consider the smallest models from Llama-3 and Phi-3 families, namely Llama-3-8B (model=*Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct*) [14, 15] and Phi-3-3.8B (model=*Phi-3-mini-4k-instruct*) [18]. For each of the three domains, we use our fine-tuning pipeline to obtain a domain-specific model, referred to by the suffix *-dom*. We use the same fine-tuning hyperparameters throughout the model families and domains.
- **Base and fine-tuned models after web conversion.** For each of the base models and their fine-tuned variants, we perform web conversion using WebLLM libraries [19]. As part of this conversion, we quantize the model to a 4-bit format suitable for the WebLLM inference engine. We refer to a web version of a model with the suffix *-web*.

Quality Assessment. As discussed in Section 3.2, we use quality metrics from literature and report performance for the two scenarios of hint generation and program repair. For the program repair quality metrics, we use test suites to automatically compute correctness and edit tokens. For hint quality performance, we follow the procedure used in literature [5, 9] where we ask human evaluators to assess the quality of generated hints w.r.t. the quality attributes. To begin, we did a small-scale investigation to establish the reliability of the rating criteria, where two human evaluators (comprising one author and one external researcher) independently rated 90 generated feedback instances; we obtained a Cohen’s kappa reliability value of 0.644, which indicates *substantial agreement* between evaluators [36] and matches values observed in the literature [9]. Afterward, given the scale of annotations, we did one human annotation per generated feedback for the final evaluation. In our results, we use *HGood%* and *RPass%* to denote the percentage of evaluation examples that have *HGood* equal to 1 and *RPass* equal to 1, respectively.

Technique	Domain:KARELALGO			Domain:KARELALGO:NEW			Dataset (%) Domain:INTROPYNUS			
	$n_r = 10$	HGood%	RPass%	REdit	HGood%	RPass%	REdit	$n_r = 10$	minEdit	RPass%
Llama-3-8B	24	41 (3)	19 (1)	22	37 (10)	18 (2)	0	82 (10)	93 (1)	52
Llama-3-8B-dom	71	90 (3)	22 (0)	67	74 (7)	33 (4)	10	24 (4)	91 (1)	60
Phi-3-3.8B	14	33 (3)	39 (6)	0	7 (4)	17 (10)	50	10 (2)	92 (0)	68
Phi-3-3.8B-dom	38	67 (3)	14 (1)	33	48 (7)	21 (2)	100	6 (1)	100 (0)	96

(a) Results on new tasks in a domain.

(b) Results with varying dataset sizes.

Figure 6: (a) Results for KARELALGO and KARELALGO:NEW; (b) Results for Llama-3-8B-dom for INTROPYNUS when varying the size of the training dataset.

Details About Fine-Tuning Experiments. We use the same hyperparameters across all models and domains. For training, we use standard supervised fine-tuning with LoRA [30]. Full implementation details are available in our Github repository. We conducted both the training and inference of the open-access models on a cluster of machines with Nvidia A-100 GPUs.

5.3 Results for Quality Performance

For each model and domain, we report aggregated performance over (T, P_r) instances in the evaluation set. For the program repair scenario, we compute performance from three independent runs and report averaged results as mean (stderr). For models with fine-tuning, a run refers to training a new model using our fine-tuning pipeline followed by inference. For the hints generation scenario, we report performance for only the first run, given the scale of annotations; here, we also report aggregate results across domains. Table 1 shows the results for quality performance and we summarize the main takeaways below.

Effect of Fine-Tuning. We first look at the effectiveness of the fine-tuning pipeline. The performance of base models (Llama-8B and Phi-3.8B) is substantially lower than GPT-4 and on par with GPT-3.5. After fine-tuning, the models’ performance (Llama-8B-dom and Phi-3.8B-dom) surpasses GPT-3.5 on all domains; in particular, Llama-8B-dom’s performance surpasses GPT-4o-mini on all domains and comes close to GPT-4 on INTROPYNUS.

Effect of Web Conversion. An important question is how web conversion and quantization from 16-bit to 4-bit representation affects the quality of feedback generation, as model sizes reduce by a factor of over 3.5 times. Table 1 showcases the performance of 4 models along with their web versions. When looking at aggregated results for all domains on hints quality, we see that Llama-3 models show a smaller drop in performance after web conversion, in contrast to drop for Phi-3 models.

Effect of Number of Repairs. An important hyperparameter is n_r , i.e., the total number of program repairs generated by the model as part of the hint generation process. Choosing a higher value can increase hint quality but also increase the inference time. Table 2 shows results for feedback quality performance with a lower value of $n_r = 3$, in contrast to $n_r = 10$ in Table 1. These results show that $n_r = 3$ could provide a reasonable quality-time trade-off, especially, on INTROPYNUS.

Generalization for New Tasks in a Domain. In Figure 6a, we report additional results on how the fine-tuned models perform on new tasks in the same domain that were unseen during training. Here, we consider the KARELALGO domain and introduce 3 new programming tasks in the domain, namely ARITHMETICSERIESUPTON, REVERSELIST and CONCATENATELISTS. We call this new evaluation set as KARELALGO:NEW that also includes 3 buggy programs for each of the new tasks. We see that the performance boost by fine-tuning is transferred to new problems in the same domain.

Varying the Size of the Training Dataset. In Figure 6b, we show additional results where we vary the percentage of the training dataset used for the INTROPYNUS domain. The column labeled *minEdit* measures the token edit distance between a buggy program in the evaluation set and its closest counterpart in the corresponding training set, reported as mean (stderr).

6 Evaluation: Web App And Inference Times

As noted earlier, in-browser inference engines are still in their infancy and put stringent requirements on consumer hardware and feasible model sizes. We build a web app to demonstrate and reliably measure the performance across different hardware configurations, and facilitate further research on hints-in-browser. Next, we provide an overview of the web app and then report on the results.




Figure 7: Screenshot of hints-in-browser app at <https://hints-in-browser.netlify.app/>.

Web App. The web app demonstrating the hints-in-browser workflow is accessible at <https://hints-in-browser.netlify.app/>; see a screenshot in Figure 7. This web app provides a Python programming environment for learners: they can select a programming task in the domain and write/execute programs. This programming environment uses Pyodide [17], a popular browser-based Python interpreter that allows for in-browser Python execution without the need to interact with a server. The feedback generation technique is exposed to learners as a hint button. The model is downloaded and cached locally when the learner accesses the web app for the first time. When a learner requests a hint in the web app, our technique runs on the browser using the WebLLM engine and provides hints to the learner directly in the app. After an initial download and caching of the model, a learner can continue to work on programming tasks and benefit from hints-in-browser without internet connectivity. We provide the full implementation in our Github repository.

Results Across Hardware Configurations. Next, we report results regarding the inference time during hint generation, model reloading time from the browser cache whenever the app is refreshed, and model downloading time initially.³ In-browser inference engines require a GPU-equipped machine; hence, we only consider compatible hardware configurations accessible to us. Table 3 provides a comparison of different deployment workflows for feedback generation, as shown in Figure 1, while considering different hardware configurations. More concretely, we consider the INTROPYNUS domain, set $n_r = 3$, and report results averaged over five programming tasks. Our results highlight that the inference times for in-browser inferences are competitive with existing feedback generation workflows for compatible machines (e.g., a GPU-equipped consumer laptop starting at 1200 USD); machines with more powerful GPUs report a drop in inference times to 20 seconds for the Phi-3-3.8B model. It is worth noting that we could achieve lower inference times by reducing the number of intermediate repairs and potentially by fine-tuning a base model to reduce the number of output tokens generated, e.g., fewer tokens generated as part of the chain-of-thought process. Table 3 further reports on the performance criteria of cost per hint request and privacy aspects of the learner’s data.

Results for Local Models Running Natively. We further evaluated the latencies of a 4-bit quantized Llama-3-8B model running natively on an Apple M1 Pro Laptop, using the same evaluation setup as in Table 3 in two formats: GGUF [37] and MLX [38]. The GGUF format model executed using Ollama had an inference time of about 70 seconds, while the MLX format model (optimized for Apple silicon via the MLX framework) had an inference time of 35 seconds. In comparison, the web version of the model using the WebLLM in-browser inference engine had an inference time of about 70 seconds, thereby closely matching the inference time of the GGUF format model. Notably, in comparison to local models running natively, in-browser inference engines offer significant practical advantages, such as cross-platform compatibility through WebGPU, ease of access without additional setup, and enhanced security via a sandboxed environment.

³For the web models, typical initial download times on a 100 Mbps connection are around 6 mins for Llama-3-8B (4.2GB file) and 3 mins for Phi-3-3.8B (2GB file).

Table 3: Comparison of different deployment workflows for feedback generation, as shown in Figure 1. Results are reported for the INTRoPYNUS domain and $n_r = 3$. Under the “Hardware Configuration”, L: indicates laptops and D: indicates desktops. Under the “Performance”, the “Inference (s)” and “Cost (USD)” columns report results per hint request, and the “Privacy” column highlights privacy aspects of the learner’s data across different workflows. (*We estimated the energy cost of locally invoking the domain-specific web models on a Apple M1 Pro, i.e., L:M1 Pro and it was approximately 6.8×10^{-5} USD.)

Model	Hardware Configuration			Performance			
	Machine	Year	Price (USD)	Inference (s)	Reload (s)	Cost (USD)	Privacy
GPT-4	n/a	n/a	n/a	34	0	5.7×10^{-2}	Fig 1a: External org
GPT-4o mini	n/a	n/a	n/a	15	0	1.0×10^{-3}	Fig 1a: External org
Llama-3-8B-dom	n/a	n/a	n/a	31	0	2.1×10^{-3}	Fig 1b: External server
Llama-3-8B-dom-web	L:M3 Max	2024	3500	28	7		
	L:M2 Pro	2023	2200	56	9		
	L:M1 Pro	2021	1600	71	12		
	L:M2 Air	2022	1100	129	12	0*	Fig 1c: User local
	D:RTX 3080 Ti	2021	2000	38	22		
	L:RTX 3060	2021	1200	48	25		
	L:RTX 2060	2021	850	624	30		
Phi-3-3.8B-dom-web	L:M3 Max	2024	3500	20	4		
	L:M2 Pro	2023	2200	34	4		
	L:M1 Pro	2021	1600	45	6		
	L:M2 Air	2022	1100	54	10	0*	Fig 1c: User local
	D:RTX 3080 Ti	2021	2000	36	11		
	L:RTX 3060	2021	1200	44	15		
	L:RTX 2060	2021	850	310	14		

7 Concluding Discussions

We investigated language models for programming feedback generation and benchmarked their performance across several criteria crucial for real-world educational deployments. We showed how to leverage the new paradigm of in-browser inference that allows these models to run directly inside the browser and introduced *hints-in-browser* as a new deployment workflow. As a concrete instance of hints-in-browser, we showcased the efficacy of a fine-tuned Llama-3-8B and Phi-3-3.8B 4-bit quantized models using the WebLLM engine across different performance criteria.

Limitations and Future Work. Next, we discuss some limitations of our current work and ideas for tackling them in the future. First, we experimented with Llama-3-8B and Phi-3-3.8B as base models; it would be interesting to consider variants of Llama-3-8B and Phi-3-3.8B fine-tuned on programming datasets and even smaller models possibly obtained by distilling these base models. In particular, it would be useful to experiment with new small models from the Llama-3.2 family, which also have the potential to perform well on mobile and edge hardware [39]. Second, we leveraged WebLLM’s in-browser inference engine; it would be useful to compare it with alternatives such as the ONNX Runtime engine. Third, we studied the scenario of programming feedback generation; it would be worth exploring in-browser language models for other domains. Last, it would be interesting to examine how this workflow performs in terms of sustainability. While we compared different workflows primarily based on quality and cost, it would also be useful to conduct a systematic evaluation based on energy usage.

Broader Implications. Our experimental results and the web app demonstrate the potential of in-browser models in powering next-generation technologies for programming education. While we do not foresee any negative societal impacts of our work, we note that in-browser inference engines are still in their infancy and have stringent requirements on feasible model sizes and consumer hardware. In the coming years, we expect rapid advances in this ecosystem, fueled by upcoming in-browser inference engines, increasing capabilities of small generative models, and growing compute resources in consumer hardware. The results in this paper and the implementation, along with the web app and datasets, contribute to this ecosystem and will facilitate further research on hints-in-browser.

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

Funded/Co-funded by the European Union (ERC, TOPS, 101039090). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

References

- [1] OpenAI. GPT-4 Technical Report. *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774, 2023.
- [2] Sébastien Bubeck et al. Sparks of Artificial General Intelligence: Early Experiments with GPT-4. *CoRR*, abs/2303.12712, 2023.
- [3] Paul Denny, Sumit Gulwani, Neil T. Heffernan, Tanja Käser, Steven Moore, Anna N. Rafferty, and Adish Singla. Generative AI for Education (GAIED): Advances, Opportunities, and Challenges. *CoRR*, abs/2402.01580, 2024.
- [4] James Prather, Paul Denny, Juho Leinonen, Brett A. Becker, Ibrahim Albluwi, Michelle Craig, Hieke Keuning, Natalie Kiesler, Tobias Kohn, Andrew Luxton-Reilly, Stephen MacNeil, Andrew Petersen, Raymond Pettit, Brent N. Reeves, and Jaromír Savelka. The Robots Are Here: Navigating the Generative AI Revolution in Computing Education. In *Proceedings of the Working Group Reports on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education (ITiCSE-WGR)*, 2023.
- [5] Tung Phung, Victor-Alexandru Pădurean, José Cambronero, Sumit Gulwani, Tobias Kohn, Rupak Majumdar, Adish Singla, and Gustavo Soares. Generative AI for Programming Education: Benchmarking Chatgpt, GPT-4, and Human Tutors. In *Proceedings of the Conference on International Computing Education Research (ICER) - Volume 2*, 2023.
- [6] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Teaching Large Language Models to Self-Debug. *CoRR*, abs/2304.05128, 2023.
- [7] Tung Phung, José Cambronero, Sumit Gulwani, Tobias Kohn, Rupak Majumdar, Adish Singla, and Gustavo Soares. Generating High-Precision Feedback for Programming Syntax Errors using Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Educational Data Mining (EDM)*, 2023.
- [8] Theo X. Olausson, Jeevana Priya Inala, Chenglong Wang, Jianfeng Gao, and Armando Solar-Lezama. Is Self-Repair a Silver Bullet for Code Generation? In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- [9] Tung Phung, Victor-Alexandru Padurean, Anjali Singh, Christopher Brooks, José Cambronero, Sumit Gulwani, Adish Singla, and Gustavo Soares. Automating Human Tutor-Style Programming Feedback: Leveraging GPT-4 Tutor Model for Hint Generation and GPT-3.5 Student Model for Hint Validation. In *Proceedings of the International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference (LAK)*, 2024.
- [10] Sierra Wang, John C. Mitchell, and Chris Piech. A Large Scale RCT on Effective Error Messages in CS1. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*, 2024.
- [11] J.D. Zamfirescu-Pereira, Laryn Qi, Bjorn Hartmann, John DeNero, and Narges Norouzi. Conversational Programming with LLM-Powered Interactive Support in an Introductory Computer Science Course. *NeurIPS'23 Workshop on Generative AI for Education (GAIED)*, 2023.
- [12] Rongxin Liu, Carter Zenke, Charlie Liu, Andrew Holmes, Patrick Thornton, and David J. Malan. Teaching CS50 with AI: Leveraging Generative Artificial Intelligence in Computer Science Education. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*, 2024.
- [13] Josephine Wolff, William Lehr, and Christopher S Yoo. Lessons from GDPR for AI Policymaking. *U of Penn Law School, Public Law Research Paper No. 23-32*, 2023.

- [14] Meta. Llama-3. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>, 2024.
- [15] Hugo Touvron et al. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288, 2023.
- [16] Thomas Jefferson, Chris Gregg, and Chris Piech. PyodideU: Unlocking Python Entirely in a Browser for CS1. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*, 2024.
- [17] Pyodide. pyodide/pyodide. <https://github.com/pyodide/pyodide>, 2023.
- [18] Marah I Abdin et al. Phi-3 Technical Report: A Highly Capable Language Model Locally on Your Phone. *CoRR*, abs/2404.14219, 2024.
- [19] WebLLM. Webllm: High-Performance In-Browser LLM Inference Engine. <https://webllm.mlc.ai/>.
- [20] OpenAI. OpenAI Platform Models. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models>, 2024.
- [21] ONNX. Open Neural Network Exchange. <https://onnx.ai/>.
- [22] Ollama. <https://ollama.com/>.
- [23] Charles Koutchme, Nicola Dainese, Sami Sarsa, Juho Leinonen, Arto Hellas, and Paul Denny. Benchmarking Educational Program Repair. *NeurIPS'23 Workshop on Generative AI for Education (GAIED)*, 2023.
- [24] Majeed Kazemitabaar, Runlong Ye, Xiaoning Wang, Austin Zachary Henley, Paul Denny, Michelle Craig, and Tovi Grossman. CodeAid: Evaluating a Classroom Deployment of an LLM-based Programming Assistant that Balances Student and Educator Needs. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*, 2024.
- [25] Khan Academy. Khanmigo. <https://www.khanacademy.org/khan-labs>, 2023.
- [26] Quizlet. Q-chat. <https://quizlet.com/qchat-personal-ai-tutor>, 2023.
- [27] 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 *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- [28] Mark Chen et al. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *CoRR*, abs/2107.03374, 2021.
- [29] HuggingFace. <https://huggingface.co/>.
- [30] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- [31] geeksforgeeks.org. GeeksforGeeks: A Computer Science Portal for Geeks. <https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/>, 2009.
- [32] Yang Hu, Umair Z. Ahmed, Sergey Mehtaev, Ben Leong, and Abhik Roychoudhury. Refactoring Based Program Repair Applied to Programming Assignments. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, 2019.
- [33] Charles Koutchme. Training Language Models for Programming Feedback Using Automated Repair Tools. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED)*, 2023.
- [34] Richard E Pattis. *Karel the Robot: A Gentle Introduction to the Art of Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1981.

- [35] Rudy Bunel, Matthew J. Hausknecht, Jacob Devlin, Rishabh Singh, and Pushmeet Kohli. Leveraging Grammar and Reinforcement Learning for Neural Program Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- [36] Jacob Cohen. A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20:37 – 46, 1960.
- [37] Huggingface. GGUF. <https://huggingface.co/docs/hub/en/gguf/>, 2024.
- [38] Apple. MLX. <https://opensource.apple.com/projects/mlx/>, 2024.
- [39] Meta. Llama-3.2. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/llama-3-2-connect-2024-vision-edge-mobile-devices/>, 2024.

Checklist

1. For all authors...
 - (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope? [\[Yes\]](#) See Sections 4, 5, and 6.
 - (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [\[Yes\]](#) See Section 7.
 - (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [\[Yes\]](#) See Section 7.
 - (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? [\[Yes\]](#)
2. If you are including theoretical results...
 - (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [\[N/A\]](#)
 - (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [\[N/A\]](#)
3. If you ran experiments (e.g. for benchmarks)...
 - (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [\[Yes\]](#) See the supplemental material.
 - (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen)? [\[Yes\]](#) See the supplemental material.
 - (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? [\[Yes\]](#) See Section 5.
 - (d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [\[Yes\]](#) See the supplemental material.
4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...
 - (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [\[Yes\]](#) See Section 5 and the supplemental material.
 - (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [\[N/A\]](#)
 - (c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [\[Yes\]](#) See the supplemental material.
 - (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating? [\[N/A\]](#)
 - (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [\[N/A\]](#)
5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...
 - (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [\[N/A\]](#)
 - (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [\[N/A\]](#)
 - (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [\[N/A\]](#)

A Datasheet

We include the datasheet for both our curated benchmark and the synthetically generated dataset.

A.1 Motivation

For what purpose was the dataset created?

The evaluation datasets were curated to benchmark language models for programming feedback generation across several performance criteria. The synthetic datasets were generated to improve the models' performance on generating program repairs and feedback. These datasets were used for fine-tuning with the aim to improve the feedback quality in introductory Python programming domains.

Who created the dataset (e.g., which team, research group) and on behalf of which entity (e.g., company, institution, organization)?

We have three different Python programming domains: BASICALGO, INTROPNUS, and KARELALGO. Each domain has a training set and an evaluation set. For BASICALGO, the evaluation set was curated by the authors of [9, 5] and the training set was generated by us (the authors of this paper). For INTROPNUS, the evaluation set and the starter buggy programs were curated by the authors of [32], and the training set was generated by us (the authors of this paper). For KARELALGO, the tasks, evaluation sets, and training sets were curated/generated by us (the authors of this paper).

Who funded the creation of the dataset?

Details about funding for this work are provided in the acknowledgements.

Any other comments?

None.

A.2 Composition

What do the instances that comprise the dataset represent (e.g., documents, photos, people, countries)?

The dataset consists of Python programming tasks, buggy attempts on those tasks, a fixed version of each attempt, along with explanations and hints. Prompt templates are also included.

How many instances are there in total (of each type, if appropriate)?

BASICALGO:

Tasks: 5, Evaluation Program: 25, Training Instances: 3304

INTROPYNUS:

Tasks: 5, Evaluation Programs: 25, Training Instances: 30576

KARELALGO:

Tasks: 7, Evaluation Programs: 21, Training Instances: 3676

Does the dataset contain all possible instances or is it a sample (not necessarily random) of instances from a larger set?

It contains all possible instances.

What data does each instance consist of?

Each instance of a task consists of a task description, task constraints, and a set of test cases for the task. Each instance in the evaluation set consists of a pair of buggy and fixed Python programs for a specific task. Each instance in the training set consists of a buggy Python program, a fixed program, an explanation for the bugs, and a hint.

Is there a label or target associated with each instance?

Yes, all the training instances have input and output labels.

Is any information missing from individual instances?

Not to the best of our knowledge.

Are relationships between individual instances made explicit (e.g., users’ movie ratings, social network links)?

N/A.

Are there recommended data splits (e.g., training, development/validation, testing)?

Yes, the data is naturally split into evaluation and training segments as discussed in the paper.

Are there any errors, sources of noise, or redundancies in the dataset?

The evaluation sets for the benchmark are created by experts and do not have errors to the best of our knowledge. The synthetically generated training data is validated automatically during creation. No part of the synthetic data has been checked manually for errors, sources of noise or redundancies which go beyond automated checks.

Is the dataset self-contained, or does it link to or otherwise rely on external resources (e.g., websites, tweets, other datasets)?

A part of the datasets we use are from previously published works [9, 5, 32].

Does the dataset contain data that might be considered confidential (e.g., data that is protected by legal privilege or by doctor–patient confidentiality, data that includes the content of individuals’ non-public communications)?

The dataset for the KARELALGO domain that is specifically designed by us doesn’t contain any confidential data.

Does the dataset contain data that, if viewed directly, might be offensive, insulting, threatening, or might otherwise cause anxiety?

No.

Does the dataset identify any subpopulations (e.g., by age, gender)?

No.

Is it possible to identify individuals (i.e., one or more natural persons), either directly or indirectly (i.e., in combination with other data) from the dataset?

No.

Does the dataset contain data that might be considered sensitive in any way (e.g., data that reveals race or ethnic origins, sexual orientations, religious beliefs, political opinions or union memberships, or locations; financial or health data; biometric or genetic data; forms of government identification, such as social security numbers; criminal history)?

No.

Any other comments?

None.

A.3 Collection Process

How was the data associated with each instance acquired?

The tasks and evaluation datasets for the BASICALGO and the INTROPYNUS domains are based on their respective sources [9, 5, 32]. The tasks and the evaluation dataset for KARELALGO is designed by the authors of this paper. For all the domains, the synthetic training datasets were generated by the authors of this paper using OpenAI’s GPT-4 model.

What mechanisms or procedures were used to collect the data (e.g., hardware apparatuses or sensors, manual human curation, software programs, software APIs)?

The evaluation datasets were collected or curated manually, while the training datasets were generated using OpenAI’s GPT-4 model.

If the dataset is a sample from a larger set, what was the sampling strategy (e.g., deterministic, probabilistic with specific sampling probabilities)?

N/A.

Who was involved in the data collection process (e.g., students, crowdworkers, contractors) and how were they compensated (e.g., how much were crowdworkers paid)?

Only the authors were involved in the data collection process.

Over what timeframe was the data collected?

The training datasets for all the domains were collected from March to May 2024. For BASICALGO, we also used a part of datasets previous published work in 2023 [5]; for INTROPYNUS, we also used a part of datasets from previous published work in 2019 [32].

Were any ethical review processes conducted (e.g., by an institutional review board)?

N/A.

Did you collect the data from the individuals in question directly, or obtain it via third parties or other sources (e.g., websites)?

N/A.

Were the individuals in question notified about the data collection?

N/A.

Did the individuals in question consent to the collection and use of their data?

N/A.

If consent was obtained, were the consenting individuals provided with a mechanism to revoke their consent in the future or for certain uses?

N/A.

Has an analysis of the potential impact of the dataset and its use on data subjects (e.g., a data protection impact analysis) been conducted?

N/A.

Any other comments?

None.

A.4 Preprocessing/cleaning/labeling

Was any preprocessing/cleaning/labeling of the data done (e.g., discretization or bucketing, tokenization, part-of-speech tagging, SIFT feature extraction, removal of instances, processing of missing values)?

In our synthetic data generation process, we have automated checks to validate generated buggy programs and their repairs. We do not do any manual cleaning of the data beyond the automated checks.

Was the “raw” data saved in addition to the preprocessed/cleaned/labeled data (e.g., to support unanticipated future uses)?

N/A.

Is the software that was used to preprocess/clean/label the data available?

The full implementation is provided as part of our Github repository.

Any other comments?

None.

A.5 Uses

Has the dataset been used for any tasks already?

The data from BASICALGO and INTROPNUS was previously used in their intended ways by the authors of their papers [9, 5, 32]. The synthetic dataset was only used in this paper.

Is there a repository that links to any or all papers or systems that use the dataset?

N/A.

What (other) tasks could the dataset be used for?

The dataset can be used for evaluation and fine-tuning generative models for programming feedback generation. In future, the datasets could potentially be used by researchers in other suitable ways as well.

Is there anything about the composition of the dataset or the way it was collected and pre-processed/cleaned/labeled that might impact future uses?

Not to the best of our knowledge.

Are there tasks for which the dataset should not be used?

Training on this data does not guarantee generalization to other domains.

Any other comments?

None.

A.6 Distribution

Will the dataset be distributed to third parties outside of the entity (e.g., company, institution, organization) on behalf of which the dataset was created?

Our Github repository contains the full evaluation and training dataset for the KARELALGO domain.

How will the dataset will be distributed (e.g., tarball on website, API, GitHub)?

The KARELALGO domain dataset will be available on our Github repository.

When will the dataset be distributed?

The KARELALGO domain dataset will be available on our Github repository at the time of publication.

Will the dataset be distributed under a copyright or other intellectual property (IP) license, and/or under applicable terms of use (ToU)?

The KARELALGO domain dataset will be available on our Github repository under CC license.

Have any third parties imposed IP-based or other restrictions on the data associated with the instances?

No.

Do any export controls or other regulatory restrictions apply to the dataset or to individual instances?

No.

Any other comments?

None.

A.7 Maintenance

Who will be supporting/hosting/maintaining the dataset?

The authors of the paper will provide the required maintenance to the dataset.

How can the owner/curator/manager of the dataset be contacted (e.g., email address)?

Yes, the authors can be contacted by email for any queries related to the datasets.

Is there an erratum?

Not at this point of time.

Will the dataset be updated (e.g., to correct labeling errors, add new instances, delete instances)?

We may update the dataset to correct any labeling errors or improve its quality. For any such updates, a versioning system will be used to keep track of versions.

If the dataset relates to people, are there applicable limits on the retention of the data associated with the instances (e.g., were the individuals in question told that their data would be retained for a fixed period of time and then deleted)?

N/A.

Will older versions of the dataset continue to be supported/hosted/maintained?

In case new data will be released, a versioning system will be used to keep track of versions.

If others want to extend/augment/build on/contribute to the dataset, is there a mechanism for them to do so?

We plan to use GitHub for maintaining both the source code and datasets. Others who are interested in extending or contributing to this work can contact authors.

Any other comments?

None.