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Abstract  
TheBigCodeproject,1anopen-scientificcollaborationfocusedontheresponsibledevelopment  
of Large Language Models for Code (Code LLMs), introduces StarCoder2. In partnership  
with Software Heritage (SWH),2we build The Stack v2 on top of the digital commons of their  
source code archive. Alongside the SWH repositories spanning 619 programming languages,  
we carefully select other high-quality data sources, such as GitHub pull requests, Kaggle  
notebooks, and code documentation. This results in a training set that is 4×larger than the  
first StarCoder dataset. We train StarCoder2 models with 3B, 7B, and 15B parameters on  
3.3 to 4.3 trillion tokens and thoroughly evaluate them on a comprehensive set of Code LLM  
benchmarks.  
We find that our small model, StarCoder2-3B, outperforms other Code LLMs of similar size  
on most benchmarks, and also outperforms StarCoderBase-15B. Our large model, StarCoder2-  
15B, significantly outperforms other models of comparable size. In addition, it matches or  
outperforms CodeLlama-34B, a model more than twice its size. Although DeepSeekCoder-  
33B is the best-performing model at code completion for high-resource languages, we find  
that StarCoder2-15B outperforms it on math and code reasoning benchmarks, as well as  
several low-resource languages. We make the model weights available under an OpenRAIL  
license and ensure full transparency regarding the training data by releasing the SoftWare  
Heritage persistent IDentifiers (SWHIDs) of the source code data.  
1https://www .bigcode-project .org  
2https://www .softwareheritage .org/  
11 Introduction  
Large Language Models for Code (Code LLMs; Chen et al., 2021; Nijkamp et al., 2023; Rozière et al., 2023;  
Guo et al., 2024) have rapidly emerged as powerful assistants for writing and editing code. As of January 30,  
2024, GitHub CoPilot has garnered over 1.3 million paying subscribers, with over 50,000 organisations opting  
for the enterprise version (MSFT Q2 Earning Call, 2024), estimated to increase developer productivity by up  
to 56% as well as developer satisfaction (Peng et al., 2023; Ziegler et al., 2024). ServiceNow recently disclosed  
that their “text-to-code” solution, built from fine-tuning StarCoderBase models (Li et al., 2023), results in  
a 52% increase in developer productivity (Yahoo Finance, 2024). Despite the initial focus on generating  
code snippets from natural language instructions or other code snippets, Code LLMs exhibit the potential  
to enhance all phases of the software development cycle (Hou et al., 2023; Fan et al., 2023; Wang et al.,  
2024; Zhuo et al., 2023b). This includes speeding up the implementation of new projects, improving quality  
assurance for developed software, helping detect and fix bugs, simplifying maintenance tasks, and easing  
migration to newer software.  
The development process of LLMs can exhibit different levels of openness (Solaiman, 2023; Ding et al.,  
2022; Akiki et al., 2022). Proprietary models like OpenAI’s GPT-4 (OpenAI et al., 2023) and Google’s  
Gemini (Gemini Team et al., 2023) provide access to the model through a paid API but do not disclose  
development details. On the other hand, open-weight models like Code LLaMa (Rozière et al., 2023),  
Mistral (Jiang et al., 2023), and DeepSeekCoder (Guo et al., 2024) have released the model weights. This  
enables the open-source community to run these models locally, inspect the model representations, and fine-  
tune them on their tasks. However, the model developers have not disclosed their training data. Consequently,  
content creators do not know if their data was used for training, social scientists cannot scrutinize the dataset  
for bias and toxicity, and LLM developers lack information as to what extent the training set is contaminated  
with test benchmarks. More broadly, this practice hinders scientific progress as other research teams cannot  
readily reuse each other’s training data. Other LLM development projects, like Allen AI’s OLMo (Groeneveld  
et al., 2024), Eleuther AI’s Pythia (Biderman et al., 2023), and BigScience’s BLOOM (BigScience Workshop,  
2022; Scao et al., 2022a), have adopted a fully open development approach by releasing training data, training  
frameworks, and evaluation suites.  
The BigCode project was established in September 2022 as an open scientific collaboration focused on the  
open and responsible development of Code LLMs. BigCode is stewarded by ServiceNow and Hugging Face in  
the spirit of open governance (BigCode collaboration et al., 2023) and has brought together more than 1,100  
members from diverse academic institutes and industry labs. The community previously released The Stack  
v1 (Kocetkov et al., 2023), a 6.4 TB dataset of permissively licensed source code in 384 programming languages.  
The Stack v1 includes a governance tool called “Am I in The Stack,” designed for developers to verify if their  
source code is included in the dataset. It also provides an opt-out process for those who prefer to exclude their  
code from the dataset. In December 2022, the BigCode community released SantaCoder (Ben Allal et al.,  
2023), a strong-performing 1.1B parameter model trained on Java, JavaScript, and Python code from The  
Stack v1. Building upon this success, the community further scaled up its effort and released StarCoder on  
May 4th, 2023 (Li et al., 2023). At its release, the 15B parameter StarCoder model was the best open-access  
LLM for code.  
This technical report describes the development process of The Stack v2 and StarCoder2. The Stack v2 builds  
upon the foundation of Software Heritage’s vast source code archive, which spans over 600 programming  
languages. In addition to code repositories, we curate other high-quality open data sources, including Github  
issues, pull requests, Kaggle and Jupyter notebooks, code documentation, and other natural language datasets  
related to math, coding, and reasoning. To prepare the data for training, we perform deduplication, create  
filters to eliminate low-quality code, redact Personally Identifiable Information (PII), remove malicious code,  
and handle opt-outs from developers who requested to have their code removed from the dataset. With this  
new training set of 900B+ unique tokens, 4×larger than the first StarCoder dataset, we develop the next  
generation of StarCoder models. We train Code LLMs with 3B, 7B, and 15B parameters using a two-stage  
training process (Rozière et al., 2023; Guo et al., 2024). We start base model training with a 4k context  
window and subsequently fine-tune the model with a 16k context window. We ensure that the training  
process does not exceed more than 5 epochs over the dataset (Muennighoff et al., 2023). However, we push  
2the number of training tokens far beyond the compute-optimal number suggested by Chinchilla (Harm’s law;  
de Vries, 2023) and train relatively small models within the range of 3.3 to 4.3 trillion tokens. We thoroughly  
assess and compare the performance of these models on a suite of code LLM benchmarks (Cassano et al.,  
2023b; Austin et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2023a; Lai et al., 2023; Muennighoff et al., 2024a;  
Cassano et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2023b; Ding et al., 2023; Gu et al., 2024; Cobbe et al., 2021; Pearce et al.,  
2022; Dhamala et al., 2021; Nozza et al., 2021; Gehman et al., 2020), finding that:  
•The StarCoder2-3B model outperforms other Code LLMs of similar size (StableCode-3B and  
DeepSeekCoder-1.3B) on most benchmarks. Moreover, it matches or surpasses the performance of  
StarCoderBase-15B.  
•The StarCoder2-15B model significantly outperforms other models of comparable size (CodeLlama-  
13B), and matches or outperforms CodeLlama-34B. DeepSeekCoder-33B is the best model at  
code completion benchmarks for high-resource languages. However, StarCoder2-15B matches or  
outperforms DeepSeekCoder-33B on low-resource programming languages (e.g., D, Julia, Lua,  
and Perl). Moreover, when we consider benchmarks that require models to reason about code  
execution (Gu et al., 2024) or mathematics (Cobbe et al., 2021), we find that StarCoder2-15B  
outperforms DeepSeekCoder-33B.  
•The StarCoder2-7B model outperforms CodeLlama-7B but is behind DeepSeekCoder-6.7B. It is not  
clear to this report’s authors why StarCoder2-7B does not perform as well as StarCoder2-3B and  
StarCoder2-15B for their size.  
2 Data Sources  
In this section, we elaborate on the process of obtaining training data, encompassing not just the data  
sourced from Software Heritage (§2.1) but also GitHub issues (§2.2), pull requests (§2.3), Jupyter and Kaggle  
notebooks (§2.4), documentation (§2.5), intermediate representations (§2.6), small math and coding datasets  
(§2.7), and other natural language datasets (§2.8).  
2.1 Source Code  
Software Heritage We build the Stack v2 on top of the Software Heritage (SH) archive (Abramatic et al.,  
2018), maintained by the non-profit organization of the same name. The mission of Software Heritage is to  
collect and preserve all knowledge taking the form of source code. We work with the SH graph dataset (Pietri  
et al., 2020), a fully deduplicated Merkle DAG (Merkle, 1987) representation of the full archive. The SH  
graph dataset links together file identifiers, source code directories, and git commits, up to the entire states  
of repositories, as observed during periodic crawls by Software Heritage.  
Extracting repositories We leverage the 2023-09-06 version of the SH graph dataset as the primary  
source. We start by extracting the most recently crawled versions of all GitHub repositories and filtering  
them to retain only the main branch. The branch is considered main if the repository metadata in GHArchive  
lists it as the default branch or if its name is mainormaster. We only extract the latest revision (commit)  
from the main branch and deduplicate the repositories based on the unique hashes of their contents (column  
directory\_id of the SH dataset). The repositories’ directory structure is reconstructed by recursively  
joining the directory\_entry table of the dataset to itself using the directory\_id and targetcolumns and  
concatenating the directory and file names (column name) into full paths. We only traverse the directory tree  
up to level 64. The individual file contents are downloaded from the SH content S3 bucket if the compressed  
file size is less than 10MB.  
License detection We extract repository-level license information from GHArchive (Github Archive, 2024)  
for all repositories with matching names in the SWH dataset. When the repo-level license is not available,  
i.e., for 96.93% of repositories, we use the ScanCode Toolkit (ScanCode, 2024) to detect file-level licenses as  
follows:  
3Is the GitHub  
license empty?  
Is the GitHub li-  
cense permissive?  
non-permissive permissive  
Did ScanCode  
detect licenses?  
no licenseAre all detected li-  
censes permissive?  
permissive non-permissiveyesno  
noyes  
yes  
no  
yes  
no  
Figure 1: File-level license assignment logic.  
•Find all files that could contain a license using a regular expression in Appendix A.3. This allows us  
to gather files that either explicitly contain a license (e.g., LICENSE,MIT.txt,Apache2.0 ) or contain  
a reference to the license (e.g., README.md ,GUIDELINES );  
•Apply ScanCode’s license detection to the matching files and gather the SPDX3IDs of the detected  
licenses;  
•Propagate the detected licenses to all files that have the same base path within the repository as the  
license file.  
Once the file-level license information is gathered, we decide whether the file is permissively licensed,  
non-permissively licensed, or unlicensed, following the algorithm described in Figure 1.  
The licenses we consider permissive are listed in Appendix A.4. This list was compiled from the licenses  
approved by the Blue Oak Council (Blue Oak Council, 2024), as well as licenses categorized as “Permissive”  
or “Public Domain” by ScanCode (ScanCode License Categories, 2024).  
Data licenses We consider three types of files: permissively licensed, non-permissively licensed (e.g.,  
copyleft), and unlicensed files. The main difference between the Stack v2 and the Stack v1 is that we include  
both permissively licensed and unlicensed files. We exclude commercial licenses since their creators do  
not intend their code to be used for commercial purposes. We also exclude copyleft-licensed code due to  
uncertainty regarding the community’s stance on using such data for LLM training and its relatively low  
volume.  
Language detection While the Stack v1 (Kocetkov et al., 2023) detects programming languages by their  
file extension, we instead rely on a language classifier. Specifically, we use go-enry based on GitHub’s library  
linguist (go-enry, 2024) to detect the programming language for each file. We detect 658 unique languages  
inTheStackV2-dedup , some of which get removed at the data inspection stage (see next paragraph).  
3System Package Data Exchange, https://spdx .dev.  
4Table 1: A comparison of The Stack v1 and v2 on 32 popular programming languages. We show the size  
and number of files for different data splits: The Stack v1 deduped, The Stack v2 deduped, and the training  
data used for StarCoder2-15B.  
The-stack-v1-dedup The-stack-v2-dedup The-stack-v2-swh-full  
Language Size (GB) Files (M) Size (GB) Files (M) Size (GB) Files (M)  
Assembly 1.58 0.25 13.02 0.77 7.74 0.70  
Batchfile 0.29 0.25 2.11 1.13 1.02 0.99  
C 57.43 8.53 202.05 20.78 114.92 19.18  
C# 46.29 10.84 239.89 51.23 169.75 48.49  
C++ 50.89 6.37 353.89 43.18 211.33 42.23  
CMake 0.45 0.19 2.58 1.74 2.27 1.70  
CSS 22.61 2.99 161.68 23.87 8.00 1.88  
Dockerfile 0.572 0.42 1.27 1.90 1.21 1.88  
Fortran 0.17 1.84 4.66 0.27 3.61 0.26  
Go 25.74 4.73 54.60 9.30 25.83 8.62  
Haskell 2.36 0.54 5.11 1.25 4.17 1.23  
HTML 146.76 9.53 2,419.87 90.23 99.09 5.23  
Java 89.30 20.15 548.00 154.28 199.68 62.27  
JavaScript 141.65 21.11 1,115.42 108.87 199.99 66.91  
Julia 1.54 0.30 6.12 0.45 1.83 0.43  
Lua 3.28 0.56 33.91 2.35 15.22 2.24  
Makefile 1.49 0.66 21.30 4.22 5.19 2.78  
Markdown 75.25 21.0 281.04 82.78 244.17 81.42  
Perl 2.63 0.39 7.82 1.15 5.66 1.06  
PHP 66.84 15.90 224.59 46.03 183.70 45.14  
PowerShell 1.25 0.27 3.97 0.68 2.46 0.66  
Python 64.30 12.96 233.29 56.93 191.61 56.19  
R 0.30 0.04 22.39 5.15 19.05 4.29  
Ruby 7.14 3.41 31.70 17.79 23.38 17.51  
Rust 9.53 1.38 15.60 2.22 12.43 2.19  
Scala 4.86 1.36 12.73 4.45 11.30 4.32  
Shell 3.38 22.69 19.82 10.68 13.51 10.01  
SQL 12.22 0.99 281.45 5.29 35.75 4.52  
Swift 0 0 23.76 7.23 22.32 7.16  
TeX 5.44 0.55 35.86 3.19 30.01 2.86  
TypeScript 28.82 10.64 61.01 23.85 49.14 23.28  
Visual Basic 1.49 0.16 16.63 1.06 7.48 0.81  
Total 875.85 181.00 6,457.14 784.30 1,922.82 528.44  
Visual data inspection Similar to the first StarCoder, we involve the BigCode community in a data  
inspection sprint to remove extensions with low-quality training data. We start from the annotations of the  
previous iteration that eliminated 36 out of the 300 extensions (of the 86 included programming languages).  
For StarCoder2, we only ran the data inspection for the not-yet-annotated programming languages (i.e.,  
excluding the 86 languages of StarCoderBase). To streamline this process, we limited our inspection to  
extensions that include over 1,000 files and represent over 0.5% of the files in their respective languages. The  
remaining extensions were retained without further inspection, as they only make up a small volume. With  
the help of 15 annotators from the BigCode community, we visually inspected around 1000 extensions and  
excluded 130 (see appendix A.1 for the complete list). Our data inspection step excluded 39 programming  
languages from the dataset (appendix A.2), resulting in a final count of 619 programming languages.  
Basic filters We apply a set of basic filters to the dataset to remove autogenerated files, data files, or other  
low-quality training data.  
5•Long line filters : we first remove all files with more than 100k lines as those files are likely to be  
data or generated code. We also remove files with an average line length of more than 100 characters  
or a maximum line length of more than 1000 characters for all languages, excluding HTML, JSON,  
Markdown, Roff, Roff Manpage, SMT, TeX, Text, and XML. For the mentioned languages, we  
remove files where the longest line exceeds 100k characters.  
•Autogenerated filter : we remove files classified as auto-generated by the is\_generated function  
ofgo-enry (go-enry, 2024). Additionally, we exclude files containing one of {“auto-generated”,  
“autogenerated”, “automatically generated”, “generated automatically”, “this file is generated”} in  
the first 5 lines of the file.  
•Alpha filter : we remove files with less than 25% of alphabetic characters for all languages except  
Motorola 68K Assembly and WebAssembly, where we only remove files with less than 25% of  
alpha-numeric characters due to the syntax of those languages.  
•Encoded data filter : we detect files with inline encoded data using the following regular expressions:  
–Base64 strings: [a-zA-Z0-9+/\n=]{64,}  
–Hexadecimal sequences: (?:\b(?:0x|\\x)?[0-9a-fA-F]{2}(?:,|\b\s\*)){8,}  
–Unicode strings: (?:\\u[0-9a-fA-F]{4}){8,}  
We remove the file if any of the substrings matching these expressions is longer than 1024 characters  
or if the fraction of matched characters is more than 50% of the file.  
Language-specific filters In addition to the basic filters, we apply the following set of language-specific  
filters.  
•For Text, JSON, YAML, Web Ontology Language, and Graphviz (DOT), we remove files with more  
than 512 lines to minimize the impact of repeated tokens in data files.  
•For HTML, we keep only the files where visible text is at least 100 characters long and makes up at  
least 20% of the code, similar to the processing pipeline of StarCoder (Li et al., 2023).  
•For Text, we keep only files with “requirement” in the lowercased filename, or if the filename without  
the extension is one of {“readme”, “notes”, “todo”, “description”, “cmakelists”}.  
2.2 Github Issues  
We incorporate GitHub issues collected from GHArchive (Github Archive, 2024). We exclude pull requests  
here as we process them separately in §2.3.  
A Github issue consists of a series of events with actions, such as opening 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  
follow the processing pipeline of StarCoder (Li et al., 2023), which we recap below:  
•First, we removed auto-generated text when users replied to issues via email (for more information,  
see Li et al., 2023, Appendix A). 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 17% of the volume — a similar percentage as in StarCoderBase.  
•Next, we excluded comments from bots. To do so, we searched for keywords in the username of  
the comment’s author (for more information, see Li et al., 2023, Appendix A). This step eliminated  
3% of the issues, much less than the 17% reported in StarCoder (Li et al., 2023). This discrepancy  
is primarily because our dataset does not include pull requests, which are often the source of a  
significant proportion of bot-generated content.  
6•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 38% of the remaining issues. Lastly, we anonymized the usernames in the conversations  
by replacing them with a participant counter within the conversation (following the process of  
StarCoder).  
2.3 Pull Requests  
We include code reviews by gathering pull request events from GHArchive (Github Archive, 2024) and the  
corresponding source code from Software Heritage (Software Heritage, 2024b). Pull requests are requests to  
merge particular code changes from one branch into another on GitHub. Typically, they involve multiple  
rounds of code review discussions and additional cycles of code changes before they get merged into the  
target branch.  
Data collection Specifically, for each pull request, we aggregate the PullRequestEvent, PullRequestReview-  
Event, PullRequestReviewCommentEvent, IssueCommentEvent, and IssuesEvent events found on GHArchive.  
More details about the differences between these events can be found in the Github documentation. Next,  
we extract all base and head commit IDs from these events and retrieve the corresponding code files from  
Software Heritage. As we do not have access to the commit diffs, we generate them by identifying changes  
between files at the same path. We consider files present in the base but absent in the head as deletions, while  
we consider files absent in the base but present in the head as additions. This process yields approximately  
300M PRs, accompanied by a volume of 15 TB of base code. Among these, there are 215M closed PRs  
originating from around 24M repositories.  
PR filters We remove PRs that 1) have been opened by bots, 2) consist only of comments by bots, 3) have  
a non-permissive license, 4) have been opted out, 5) changes the base during the PR, 6) are not approved or  
merged, or 7) lack initial diffs (either due to absent data from Software Heritage or because all data have  
been filtered in other steps).  
File filters We remove files from the base commit if they satisfy one of the following conditions: 1) the  
file is a deletion or addition, 2) the file length exceeds 1 million characters, 3) the fraction of alphanumeric  
characters is less than 0.25, 4) the fraction of hexadecimal characters is greater than 0.25, 5) the max number  
of lines surpasses 100,000, 6) the average line length exceeds 100, 7) the max line length surpasses 1,000, or  
8) the presence of non-English text in Markdown  
Title and description filtering We apply the following heuristic filters to clean up the PRs further. We  
exclude PRs with changes to the base, those not approved or merged, and those lacking initial diffs (either  
due to absent data from Software Heritage or being filtered out in previous steps). We also exclude PRs  
when the title is less than 10 characters or contains the words ’dependencies’, ’dependency’, ’depend’, or  
’release’. We exclude PRs when the description is less than 20 characters or contains ’Qwiet’.  
Truncating inputs We shorten lengthy input fields in the PRs as follows. We truncate titles to 500  
characters and descriptions to 80 lines, only displaying the first 60 and the last 20 lines. If the description  
length still exceeds 1000 characters, we truncate it.  
Processing comments Following the processing of GitHub issues (§2.2), we remove comments from bots  
and strip auto-generated text when users post via email reply. We anonymize the usernames of authors as  
described in §3.2. We remove comments from PRs with less than 20 characters unless they are PR review  
comments. For code review comments, we remove the full diff hunk if it exceeds 10,000 characters while  
keeping the filename and comment.  
7Subsampling PRs To increase the diversity in the PRs, we sub-sample them on a per-repository basis.  
For repositories with 1 PR (after filtering), we retain it with a probability of 0.8. We linearly decrease this  
retention probability to 0.1 for repositories with 1,000 PRs. For repositories with more than 1,000 PRs, we  
set the retention probability such that we retain only 100 PRs. Finally, we sub-sample YAML and JSON files  
with 10% retention probability when their file size exceeds 50% of the total base files size or when the file  
path contains one of the keywords: ’pack’, ’lock’, ’yarn’, ’output’, ’swagger’, ’openapi’, or ’output’.  
Max sequence length We determine the maximum sequence length of PRs by first investigating the  
data distribution after the processing steps mentioned above. We find 3.7M PRs with up to 1M characters,  
resulting in 194 GB of data. This reduces to 3.3M PRs when we set a limit of 100K characters, resulting in a  
dataset size of 67.3 GB. (appendix A.5 has more details about sequence length statistics.) For the StarCoder2  
models, we opt to include PRs with up to 100K characters (translating to roughly 25k tokens). Since we  
are pre-training with a limited context of 4K tokens, not all PRs fit into the context window. However, as  
described in §5.2, we format the PRs so that the diffs are local and do not require long context.  
2.4 Notebooks  
We include notebooks from two separate sources: Jupyter notebooks extracted from the Software Heritage  
archive and notebooks released by the Kaggle platform.  
2.4.1 Jupyter Notebooks  
We transform Jupyter Notebooks into scripts and structured notebooks following the same pipeline as  
StarCoder (Li et al., 2023). One key difference is that we keep the markdown structure of the text blocks  
while it is removed in StarCoder. For completeness, we recap these preprocessing steps below.  
Jupyter – scripts We utilize Jupytext4to convert notebooks to scripts. To initiate the conversion process,  
Jupytext requires the identification of the specific programming languages within each notebook. This  
information is typically available in the metadata of most notebooks. In cases where it is not, we use the  
Guesslang library5to identify the programming language, using a probability threshold of 0.5 or higher. Our  
initial dataset comprised 11 million notebooks, of which 3 million were excluded due to parsing errors. After  
near-deduplication, the dataset was reduced to 4 million notebooks converted to scripts.  
Jupyter – structured To create this dataset, we first filtered out notebooks that did not contain any  
Python code or Markdown text using the metadata information of each notebook. 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 single Markdown or code block, respectively. Eventually, we ended up  
with consecutive code-text pairs in temporal order grouped by each notebook. Each Jupyter code-text pair  
contained the Markdown text immediately preceding the code block and the Python code, forming 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  
cells before merging, we only retain the output of the last code block. After these preprocessing steps and  
near-deduplication, we ended up with 4.6M structured Jupyter notebooks.  
2.4.2 Kaggle Notebooks  
We include Python notebooks released by the Kaggle platform6under an Apache 2.0 license, starting with an  
initial dataset of 3.6M notebooks. Note that this Kaggle dataset does not include the output cells, only the  
markdown and code cells.  
Cleaning We start the data cleaning process by dropping notebooks with less than 100 characters and  
those with syntax errors. We also remove the templated text at the beginning of notebooks (see appendix A.7  
4https://jupytext .readthedocs .io/  
5https://guesslang .readthedocs .io/  
6https://www .kaggle .com/datasets/kaggle/meta-kaggle-code  
8for the templates). These steps remove 18% of the notebooks. Next, we convert the notebooks to the  
structured and script format, following the processing of the Jupyter notebooks in §2.4.1. Finally, we remove  
near-duplicates using the pipeline described in §3.1, eliminating 78% of the notebooks and leaving us with  
580k notebooks.  
Dataset description To provide the model with more context regarding the content and objectives of the  
notebook, we include metadata about the Kaggle dataset whenever this information is available. We find  
that 42% of the notebooks are associated with a Kaggle dataset and include its title and description at the  
beginning of each notebook.  
Dataset schema In addition to these high-level dataset descriptions, we scanned the code inside the  
notebooks for instances of read\_csv . We found that 25% of the samples were loading CSV datasets. We  
extracted and incorporated detailed information about these datasets as follows. First, we used the Kaggle  
API to download the datasets and successfully retrieved 8.6% of the notebooks. The remaining cases  
were attributed to either the dataset being unavailable or encountering challenges downloading it within a  
reasonable time frame. For the downloaded datasets, we prefix the output of df.info() to the notebook,  
which displays the column names and their dtypes, the non-null values count, and the memory usage. We  
also include four sample rows from the dataset.  
2.5 Documentation  
Documentation from package managers We crawl documentation from several package manager  
platforms, including npm, PyPI, Go Packages, Packagist, Rubygems, Cargo, CocoaPods, Bower, CPAN,  
Clojars, Conda, Hex and Julia. We first retrieve the names of the most popular libraries across various  
platforms from libraries.io. These library names are then used to search through individual package managers,  
enabling us to obtain the respective homepages for each library. We systematically crawled the documentation  
files from the obtained homepage links or, alternatively, extracted information from the provided README  
or documentation files on the platform. For documents obtained through homepage links, we adhere to the  
same processing strategy outlined below in the paragraph titled “Documentation from websites”. When  
extracting documents from the REwang2023softwareADME or documentation files on the platform, we  
employ distinct heuristics to extract the text using markdown formats whenever feasible, aiming to maintain  
a simple and effective format. It is worth noting that many libraries available on PyPI and Conda have their  
associated documentation hosted on Read the Docs, which typically offers more comprehensive documentation.  
Consequently, we prioritize utilizing Read the Docs as the primary source of documentation for these libraries.  
For these documents hosted on Read the Docs, we follow the same processing procedure outlined in the  
paragraph titled “Documentation from websites”.  
PDFs from package managers For documents related to the R language, we extracted text from all  
PDF files hosted on CRAN using the pdftotext library.7This library is particularly effective in preserving  
the formatting, including spaces within code snippets. For LaTeX-related documentation, we extracted the  
documentation, tutorial, and usage guide PDFs of LaTeX packages from CTAN, filtered out image-heavy  
PDFs, and converted the rest into markdown using the Nougat neural OCR tool.  
Documentation from websites We collect code documentation from a carefully curated list of websites  
as detailed in Table 2. We start by systematically exploring the website from its initial URL listed in Table 2,  
using a queue to store URLs within the same domain. This queue expands dynamically as we discover new  
links during the crawl. Given that most documents comprise HTML pages, we focus our processing pipeline  
on (1) content extraction and (2) content concatenation. To extract the content, we utilize the trafilatura  
library8to convert each HTML page into XML format, simultaneously eliminating redundant navigation and  
index bars, elements that often recur in documentation. Next, we converted the XML format to markdown  
using our XML-to-Markdown conversion script. In the second stage, to compile these documents into a  
single text, we first do a near-deduplication of the content extracted from different HTML pages. This  
7https://github .com/jalan/pdftotext  
8https://github .com/adbar/trafilatura  
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step was essential since we have observed that certain document pages only comprise website layouts (e.g.,  
navigation bars) instead of fruitful information for documents, resulting in a substantial amount of duplicated  
content. To accomplish this, we treat each HTML page from a single website as a cluster and apply the  
minhash locality-sensitive hashing technique to identify and eliminate similar pages, using a threshold of 0.7.  
Finally, we assemble the gathered content from different pages of the same website in the order of web page  
crawling, ensuring a cohesive narrative. This parallels the “breadth-first search” approach, where all nodes at  
the current depth are explored before proceeding to the next depth level. Also, we collected code-relevant  
data from existing web crawls such as RefinedWeb (Penedo et al., 2023), OSCAR (Ortiz Suárez et al.,  
2019), and esCorpius (Gutiérrez-Fandiño et al., 2022). We use regular expressions to identify programming  
language-specific constructs within the documents and to detect the “docs.” substring in the page URLs.  
The resulting dataset primarily comprises content sourced from programming blogs, coding tutorials, and  
platforms like Read the Docs, with the exclusion of the documents gathered above.  
Free textbooks We scraped free programming books compiled in the Free Programming Books project,  
which aims at promoting the distribution of free programming e-books. First, we extract all links and identify  
those with a PDF extension. Subsequently, we downloaded all available PDF files and utilized the pdf2text  
library to extract text from these PDF files. Finally, we parsed 3,541 books whose languages span across  
different regions, including English, Chinese, Japanese, Spanish, and others.  
Language identification Finally, we have employed a dual approach to identify the main programming  
language used by each document. We leverage predefined rules when the source of the document unequivocally  
corresponds to a specific programming language and resort to the guesslang9library in cases where such  
correspondence is not explicit. The resultant programming language distribution is graphically represented in  
Figure 2.  
2.6 Intermediate Representations  
We augment source code by pairing its intermediate representations (IR) to enhance the model’s understanding  
of low-resource programming languages. The key rationale behind this approach is that a shared intermediate  
9https://github .com/yoeo/guesslang  
10Table 2: The websites scraped for the code documentation dataset.  
Website Name URL  
DevDocs API Documentation https://devdocs .io  
MDN Web Docs https://developer .mozilla .org  
TensorFlow Docs https://www .tensorflow .org  
Linux Docs https://www .kernel .org/doc/Documentation  
Swift Programming Language https://docs .swift .org/swift-book/documentation/the-swift-programming-language  
Flutter API Reference https://api .flutter .dev  
TypeScript https://www .typescriptlang .org/docs/handbook  
Json.NET Documentation https://www .newtonsoft .com/json/help/html  
NVIDIA Documentation Hub https://docs .nvidia .com  
Oracle Java Tutorial https://docs .oracle .com/javase/tutorial/java  
Qiskit Documentation https://qiskit .org/documentation  
Q# Quantum Programming https://learn .microsoft .com/en-us/azure/quantum/user-guide  
Pony Tutorial https://tutorial .ponylang .io  
Zephir Documentation https://docs .zephir-lang .com/0 .12/en/introduction  
Qemu Documentation https://www .qemu .org/documentation  
C# Documentation https://learn .microsoft .com/en-us/dotnet/csharp  
Hugging Face Documentation https://huggingface .co/docs  
LLVM Doc https://llvm .org/docs  
GCC Online Documentation https://gcc .gnu.org/onlinedocs  
Matlab Documentation https://www .mathworks .com/help/matlab  
Boost C++ Libraries https://www .boost .org/doc  
Maxima Manual https://maxima .sourceforge .io/docs/manual/maxima\_singlepage .html  
Qt Documentation https://doc .qt.io  
representation might help to anchor low-resource constructs to similar ones in high-resource languages (Zhuo  
et al., 2023b).  
LLVM We select LLVM (Lattner & Adve, 2004) as the intermediate representation due to its widespread  
availability on GitHub, increasing the probability that there is sufficient training data to learn the semantics  
of the language. In addition, LLVM is widely adopted as an IR and is the target representation of many  
compiler frontends across several programming languages.10  
Data collection Existing attempts to extract IR from free-form source code either suffer from low  
compilation success rates (Szafraniec et al., 2023) or use bespoke language-specific mechanisms to track  
dependency code to compile successfully (Grossman et al., 2023). We sidestep this by sourcing self-contained  
compilation units from accepted solutions to programming word problems (Rosetta Code, 2023; Mirzayanov,  
2020; Puri et al., 2021; Caballero et al., 2016). We compile ≈4M sources in total across C++, C, Objective-C,  
Python, Rust, Go, Haskell, D, Fortran, Swift, and Nim in size optimized ( -OZequivalent) and performance  
optimized ( -O3equivalent) mode. We opt to use the size-optimized IR in most of the pairs due to context  
length considerations. However, for 20% of the pairs, we use the performance-optimized IR. This is done to  
maximize transfer from the pre-training stage, where the model sees LLVM code in the wild, which is more  
likely to be in this form. We use clang11for compiling C++, C and Objective-C, codon12for compiling  
Python, rustc13for compiling Rust, gollvm14for compiling Go, ghc15for compiling Haskell, ldc16for  
compiling D, flang17for compiling Fortran, and nlvm18for compiling Nim. We clean headers along with  
superfluous platform, vendor, and memory layout-specific information from the IR before pairing it with its  
source.  
10https://llvm .org/ProjectsWithLLVM/  
11https://clang.llvm.org/  
12https://docs.exaloop.io/codon  
13https://www.rust-lang.org/  
14https://go.googlesource.com/gollvm/  
15https://www.haskell.org/ghc/  
16https://wiki.dlang.org/LDC  
17https://flang.llvm.org/docs/  
18https://github.com/arnetheduck/nlvm  
112.7 LHQ19  
We include several small high-quality datasets for math and coding:  
•APPS (train) (Hendrycks et al., 2021) is a popular text2code benchmark in Python with a train  
set of 5,000 examples. We include one solution per programming problem.  
•Code Contest (Li et al., 2022) is similar to APPS but includes solutions in several programming  
languages, namely Python 2/3, C++, and Java. We include one solution per problem and language  
and arrive at a dataset of 13k+ examples.  
•GSM8K (train) (Cobbe et al., 2021) is the train split of GSM8K, a popular evaluation benchmark  
for testing the math reasoning capabilities of LLMs. The dataset consists of 7k+ examples.  
•GSM8K (SciRel) (Yuan et al., 2023) is an augmented version of GSM8K that includes alternative  
reasoning paths for the questions in GSM8K. The extended version contains 110k examples.  
•Deepmind Mathematics (Saxton et al., 2019) is a synthetic dataset of math questions and  
answers across various domains (algebra, arithmetic, calculus, comparison, measurement, numbers,  
polynomials, probability) and varying difficulty (easy-medium-hard). The dataset consists of 110M+  
(short) examples.  
•Rosetta Code (Rosetta Code, 2023; Nanz & Furia, 2015) is a dataset with over 1100 everyday  
programming tasks with solutions in as many different programming languages as possible.  
•MultiPL-T (Cassano et al., 2023a) is high-quality data in Lua, Racket, and OCaml based on  
automatically translating extracted Python functions and validating them with unit tests. The total  
dataset comprises over 200k examples.  
•Proofsteps is part of the AlgebraicStack (Azerbayev et al., 2024), a dataset used to train the Lemma  
family of models. We also include proofsteps-lean , which was extracted from mathlib 4 (mathlib  
Community, 2020), and proofsteps-isabelle , which was built on top of the PISA dataset (Jiang  
et al., 2021). Proofsteps-lean contains over 3k examples, while proofsteps-isabelle contains over 250k  
examples.  
2.8 Other Natural Language Datasets  
StackOverflow We include 11 million questions and their corresponding multiple responses from the Stack  
Overflow dump dated 2023-09-14 (StackExchange Archive, 2024). We filtered out questions with fewer than  
three answers. Upon inspecting the dataset, we found many mismatches between questions and answers  
due to inherent format errors in the Stack Overflow dump. We leveraged Llama-2-70b-chat-hf (Touvron  
et al., 2023) to increase the quality of the dataset as follows. We selected 20,000 examples and asked  
Llama-2-70b-chat-hf to rate the question-answer pairs. See Appendix A.6 for the exact prompt. Next,  
we pick the 10,000 highest-scoring pairs as positive examples and use the remaining 10,000 answers to  
create negative examples by randomly pairing them with other questions. We use this dataset to train a  
binary classifier by embedding the question and answer with a well-performing sentence embedding model  
(sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L12-v220(Reimers & Gurevych, 2019; Muennighoff et al., 2022a))  
and minimizing the cosine distance between them. Next, we plot the embedding scores for a subset of the  
question-answer pairs and manually determine the threshold to 0.1. As a question can have multiple answers,  
we average the scores of question-answer pairs and remove all questions with an average score below 0.1. We  
end up with 11.4 million questions and over 10B tokens.  
ArXiv We include the ArXiv subset of the RedPajama dataset (Together Computer, 2023). This dataset is  
downloaded from the publicly available Amazon S3 bucket (Arxiv, 2024). We further processed the dataset  
only to retain latex source files and remove preambles, comments, macros, and bibliographies from these files.  
The final dataset is roughly 30B tokens.  
19Leandro’s High-Quality dataset  
20https://huggingface .co/sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L12-v2  
12Wikipedia We include the English subset of Wikipedia. Specifically, we use the version collected by  
RedPajama (RedPajama Wiki, 2024), which is derived from the 2023-03-20 dump. We follow RedPajama’s  
processing steps and eliminate hyperlinks and templates from the Wikipedia pages. The full dataset comprises  
around 6 billion tokens.  
OpenWebMath We include OpenWebMath (Paster et al., 2023), an open dataset of high-quality mathe-  
matical text extracted from CommonCrawl. The full dataset comprises almost 15B tokens.  
3 Preprocessing Pipeline  
We apply several preprocessing steps, such as deduplication (§3.1), PII redaction (§3.2), benchmark decon-  
tamination (§3.3), malware removal (§3.4), and opt-out deletion requests (§3.5), to the data sources described  
in the previous section. Since not all steps are applied to each data source, we summarize the preprocessing  
pipeline per data source in Table 3.  
3.1 Removing Near-Duplicates  
We deduplicate the source code, pull requests, notebooks, issues, and documentation. We do not deduplicate  
the already preprocessed natural language datasets, such as Arxiv, StackExchange, OpenWebMath, Wikipedia,  
and the small high-quality math and reasoning datasets.  
We followed the deduplication pipeline of SantaCoder (Ben Allal et al., 2023). This process first calculates  
the MinHashes (Broder, 2000) of all code files and then utilizes Locally Sensitive Hashing (LSH) to group  
files based on their MinHash fingerprints. During the LSH stage, “similar” files are assigned to the same  
buckets, identifying them as duplicates. Only one file from each duplicate group is chosen. In addition to the  
SantaCoder approach, to preserve repository context, we prioritize files from repositories with higher star  
and fork counts or from the latest commit date as a tiebreaker. We used 5-grams and a Jaccard similarity of  
0.7. We refer to this blogpost for more background information regarding the deduplication pipeline.  
3.2 PII Redaction  
To reduce the likelihood of re-distributing Personally Identifiable Information (PII) present in the training data,  
we make diligent efforts to redact PII from the training set. We largely follow the steps from StarCoder (Li  
et al., 2023) and leverage the StarPII model to redact various PII entities. Below, we provide more details on  
how we apply it to each data source.  
Redacting PII entities We use StarPII to redact names, emails, keys, passwords, IP addresses, and  
usernames from source code, pull requests, issues, and StackOverflow. We do not make any modifications  
to the model or redaction logic described in the StarCoder paper (Li et al., 2023). For OpenWebMath and  
documentation, we only redact names, keys, and emails, while we only redact emails for arXiv using the regex  
described in Ben Allal et al. (2023).  
Redacting usernames The conversations in issues, pull requests, and StackOverflow often contain  
usernames in the message thread. We anonymize the author usernames by substituting them with a  
participant counter specific to the conversation, like username\_1 to represent the second participant. These  
pseudonyms are added at the start of each comment to maintain the speaker’s identity. Moreover, any  
references to these usernames in the messages are removed. Only the usernames of actively participating  
individuals in the conversation are masked, and mentions of non-participating users remain unaffected.  
3.3 Decontamination  
To ensure the performance of StarCoder is not artificially inflated on our test benchmarks, we decontaminate  
the training set from our test sets. Specifically, we remove files that contain docstrings or solutions from  
HumanEval and MBPP, docstrings from APPS, questions from GSM8K, or prompts from DS1000. In contrast  
13Table 3: Overview of the data processing steps applied to each data source.  
Dataset Dedup Malicious Code Decontaminate Opt-out PII  
Source Code Yes Yes Yes Yes StarPII  
Pull Requests Yes Yes Yes Yes StarPII + Usernames  
Jupyter/Kaggle Notebooks Yes Yes Yes Yes/No StarPII  
Issues Yes Yes Yes Yes StarPII + Usernames  
Docs Yes No No No StarPII: Names, Keys, Emails  
LHQ No No No No No  
Arxiv No No No No Email  
OpenWebMath No No Yes No StarPII: Names, Keys, Emails  
Wikipedia No No No No No  
StackExchange No No Yes No StarPII + Usernames  
to the first iteration of StarCoder (Li et al., 2023), we further enhance the recall of the decontamination  
process by removing whitespace during string matching. Note that we exclude docs, LHQ, arXiv, and  
Wikipedia from this decontamination step.  
3.4 Malware Removal  
We scan our training set to identify possible instances of malware in the source code, pull requests, notebooks,  
and issues. To this end, we use ClamAV 1.2 (ClamAV, 2024) with additional unofficial malware signatures  
published by SaneSecurity (Sane Security, 2024) as of 2023-11-16. Signatures with a high risk of False  
Positives (as determined by SaneSecurity) were not used. See Table 26 for the most frequently detected  
malware signatures in the unfiltered code dataset. In summary, this step eliminates 59,442 files from the  
dataset, constituting only 0.009% of the 654M files.  
3.5 Removing Opt-outs  
We announced the upcoming training run of StarCoder2 on X21and updated the "Am I in the stack"  
governance tool with the new repositories from The Stack v2. Developers were granted until November 20,  
2023, to submit their opt-out requests. After the cut-off date, we eliminated 1,561 repositories associated  
with 91 users and organizations. A total of 22,066 files were removed from the source code dataset (excluding  
issues and PRs).  
4 Data Composition  
Model capacity With a much larger training set available, we decided to tailor our data composition to  
each model size. We reason that smaller models, having limited capacity, should be exposed to a less diverse  
dataset. This intuition is supported by research in multi-lingual NLP showing that languages compete for  
model capacity (Arivazhagan et al., 2019; Conneau et al., 2020; Scao et al., 2022b). Hence, we first create a  
smaller version of the SWH code dataset, selecting a subset of 17 widely-used programming languages. We  
use this variant to train the 3B and 7B models, whereas we use the full version with all 619 programming  
languages for the 15B model. To further limit the diversity in the training set for the 3B model, we also  
exclude some natural language datasets (see “Data composition per model size”).  
Downsampling languages Similar to StarCoderBase, we adhere to the natural distribution of the data as  
much as possible. Before constructing the source code datasets, we examined the data distribution among  
the programming languages. Compared to StarCoderBase, we found slightly larger variations among the  
high-resource languages. The observed data volume (in GB) is as follows: Java (479.68), JavaScript (277.25),  
C++ (204.49), Python (190.99), PHP (171.57), C# (166.22), and C (114.49). We decided to downsample both  
Java and Javascript to 200GB to put these high-resource languages on a more equal footing. Furthermore, we  
21https://x .com/BigCodeProject/status/1721583097580249254?s=20  
14Table 4: Overview of the data composition of StarCoder2 models. We refer to the training set of the 3B  
model as the-stack-v2-train-3B.  
Dataset Tokens (B) 3B 7B 15B  
the-stack-v2-train-smol 525.5 ✓ ✓ ✗  
the-stack-v2-train-full 775.48 ✗ ✗ ✓  
Pull requests 19.54 ✓ ✓ ✓the-stack-v2-train-extrasIssues 11.06 ✓ ✓ ✓  
Jupyter structured 14.74 ✓ ✓ ✓  
Jupyter scripts 16.29 ✓ ✓ ✓  
Kaggle scripts 1.68 ✓ ✓ ✓  
Documentation 1.6 ✓ ✓ ✓  
OpenWebMath 14.42 ✗ ✓ ✓  
Wikipedia 6.12 ✗ ✓ ✓  
StackOverflow 10.26 ✓ ✓ ✓  
Arxiv 30.26 ✗ ✓ ✓  
LHQ 5.78 ✓ ✓ ✓  
Intermediate Repr. 6 ✓ ✓ ✓  
Unique tokens (B) 622.09 658.58 913.23  
preserved 254GB of markdown data while reducing the size of HTML to 100 GB. This decision was driven by  
the anticipation that markdown would likely contain more code documentation, whereas HTML is commonly  
associated with webpages. Lastly, we subsampled data files like JSON, XML, and YAML to 8GB and a few  
other data formats to 1 GB. See Table 28 in Appendix C.2 for the full list of subsampled languages.  
Repository-context After subsampling some programming languages, we compile the source code from  
Software Heritage into repository-context-aware datasets. Each example in the dataset is a full repository  
with files arranged in a random order. As previously noted, we create two versions of the SWH dataset,  
the-stack-v2-train-smol andthe-stack-v2-train-full , as further detailed in the subsequent paragraphs.  
The-stack-v2-train-smol For the small variant, we select 17 widely used programming languages and  
include a curated set of documentation and configuration languages.  
•Specifically, we include the following programming languages:  
–C  
–C#  
–C++  
–Go  
–Java  
–JavaScript–Kotlin  
–Lua  
–PHP  
–Python  
–R  
–Ruby–Rust  
–SQL  
–Shell  
–Swift  
–TypeScript  
•And incorporate the following languages associated with code documentation:  
–AsciiDoc  
–HTML  
–Markdown–RDoc  
–RMarkdown–Text  
–reStructuredText  
•We also include several configuration languages and files, which we list in Appendix C.1.  
•Despite limiting the languages to this subset, we obtain a dataset of 525B+ unique tokens.  
The-stack-v2-train-full For the full variant, we include all 619 programming languages. Although this  
subset significantly enhances language diversity (adding 600+ programming languages), it contributes only  
around 250B tokens to the dataset, culminating in 775B+ tokens.  
15Data composition per model size In Table 4, we summarize the data composition for the 3B, 7B,  
and 15B models. We use the-stack-v2-train-extras to denote all supplementary sources gathered for  
StarCoder2, excluding the source code obtained from SWH. For the 3B, we use the-stack-v2-train-smol  
and exclude OpenWebMath, Wikipedia, and Arxiv from the extra data sources in §2. This leads to a dataset  
of 622B+ unique tokens. For the 7B, we include OpenWebMath, Wikipedia, and Arxiv, leading to a slightly  
larger dataset of 658B+ unique tokens. For the 15B, we include the-stack-v2-train-full dataset and all  
extra data sources listed in §2, resulting in a dataset with 913B+ unique tokens. The size of this dataset is  
4×the size of the training dataset for StarCoderBase.  
5 Data Formatting  
We present the formatting guidelines for each of the data sources below. We provide the templates below  
in which⟨token⟩refers to a sentinel token, and metadata and data refer to placeholders for data fields,  
respectively.  
5.1 Source Code  
We prepend the repository name and file paths to the context of the code file. We only add this metadata  
with a 50% probability to enable the model to operate without this information. We use the following format  
when adding the repository name and file paths:  
<repo\_name>reponame<file\_sep>filepath1\ncode1<file\_sep>filepath2\ncode2 ... <|endoftext|>.  
We use the following format when we do not include this meta-data:  
<file\_sep>code1<file\_sep>code2 ... <|endoftext|>.  
Repository-context Starcoder1 was trained with file-context, i.e., the setting where random files are  
joined into the context window. In this work, we explore training with repository-context, wherein files from  
the same repository are grouped together. While we considered various methods for grouping files within the  
repository, we ultimately arranged them in a random order within the same repository.  
FIMToenablethemodeltoperformcodeinfillingtasks, weapplythefill-in-the-middletransformation(FIM;  
Bavarian et al., 2022) to the source code. While we explored several FIM variants in preliminary experiments,  
we opted for repo-context file-level FIM in the StarCoder2 models. In this FIM variant, repositories are  
selected with a 50% chance of being candidates for FIM. The selected repository examples are split by  
<|endoftext|> and <file\_sep> tokens. Next, we apply the FIM transformation to each chunk with a 50%  
probability. We do not apply FIM to the repository metadata ( <repo\_name>reponame ). Below, we provide  
an example of the FIM format when it’s only applied to the second source file:  
<repo\_name>reponame<file\_sep>filepath0\ncode0<file\_sep><fim\_prefix>filepath1\n  
code1\_pre<fim\_suffix>code1\_suf<fim\_middle>code1\_mid<file\_sep> ...<|endoftext|>  
5.2 Pull Requests  
Formatting pull requests is challenging as we aim to create a compact representation of a potentially long  
sequence of code changes and comments. We refer to §2.3 for details on how we removed and truncated long  
input fields of the pull request. Here, we focus on how to render the PR into a structured format that can be  
consumed by the LLM.  
For files part of the base commit, we include the entire file with 0.2 probability; otherwise, we display a range  
of changes in the base files across all commit heads of the PR.22We randomly add up to 32 lines before and  
after the changes.  
22We take the union of file line changes in all commits  
16We use diff hunks to display modifications between the before and after state of the file, ensuring that changes  
are reasonably localized. Additionally, within the diff hunks, we incorporate 3-10 randomly selected context  
lines both before and after the specific change.  
We structure the PR format as follows. The first block presents the title, description, and complete base files  
or modifications made to them. Subsequently, we outline the first set of head diff hunks:  
<pr>Title: title\nusername\_0: description  
<pr\_status>opened  
<repo\_name>reponame  
<pr\_base>  
<pr\_file>filepath\_1  
<pr\_base\_code>file\_content/changes\_1  
...  
<pr\_file>filepath\_N  
<pr\_base\_code>file\_content/changes\_N  
<pr\_diff>  
<pr\_file>filepath\_1  
<pr\_diff\_hunk>diff\_hunk\_1  
...  
<pr\_diff\_hunk>diff\_hunk\_K  
...  
<pr\_file>filepath\_M  
<pr\_diff\_hunk>diff\_hunk\_1  
...  
<pr\_diff\_hunk>diff\_hunk\_J  
The second block is repeated for each new head commit in the PR, covering general comments, review  
comments, and code review comments. The block concludes with the diff hunks between the pull request  
base and the new head, reflecting the outcome of discussions and comments. Note that it’s also possible  
for users to close and reopen the pull request. As in Github issues, we refer to authors by their participant  
counter within the conversation, e.g., username\_1, to refer to the second participant in the issue.  
<pr\_comment>username\_id: comment  
<pr\_event\_id>comment\_id  
...  
...  
...  
<pr\_review>username\_id: review\_comment\n  
<pr\_event\_id>review\_id  
<pr\_review\_state>[approved, rejected, commented, changes\_required]  
...  
...  
...  
<pr\_review\_comment>  
<pr\_event\_id>comment\_id  
<pr\_in\_reply\_to\_review\_id>review\_id (opt)  
<pr\_in\_reply\_to\_comment\_id>comment\_id (opt)  
<pr\_file>filepath  
<pr\_diff\_hunk\_comment\_line>line\_number  
<pr\_diff\_hunk>diff\_hunk\_content  
<pr\_comment>username\_id: comment  
17...  
...  
...  
<pr>username\_id  
<pr\_status>closed  
<pr\_is\_merged>False  
...  
<pr>Title: title\nusername\_id: description  
<pr\_status>[opened, reopened, edited]  
...  
...  
...  
<pr\_file>filepath\_1  
<pr\_diff\_hunk>diff\_hunk\_1  
...  
<pr\_diff\_hunk>diff\_hunk\_K  
...  
<pr\_file>filepath\_M  
<pr\_diff\_hunk>diff\_hunk\_1  
...  
<pr\_diff\_hunk>diff\_hunk\_J  
We only add the following final block when the PR is closed.  
<pr>username\_id  
<pr\_status>closed  
<pr\_is\_merged>True  
<|endoftext|>  
5.3 GitHub 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 an anonymized speaker identifier before  
the comment. Specifically, we refer to authors by their participant counter within the conversation, e.g.,  
username\_1, to refer to the second participant in the issue. To distinguish between the different turns,  
we use comment\_1, id1 to refer to the second comment and its anonymized speaker id, respectively. The  
<issue\_closed> token is added if the issue is closed.  
<issue\_start>Title: title\nusername\_id0: comment\_0<issue\_comment>username\_id1: comment\_1  
... <issue\_closed (optional)><issue\_comment>username\_idn: comment\_n<|endoftext|>  
5.4 Notebooks  
Jupyter – scripts We format Jupyter scripts as a single code block, starting with a <jupyter\_script>  
token.  
<jupyter\_script>code<|endoftext|>  
Jupyter – structured Parsed Jupyter notebooks are chains of text, code, and outputs. We separate the  
cells with sentinel tokens. Note that we use text2, code2, output2 to refer to the 3rd triplet in the notebook.  
<jupyter\_start><jupyter\_text>text0<jupyter\_code>code0  
<jupyter\_output>output0<jupyter\_text> ... <|endoftext|>  
18Kaggle – scripts When available, we prepend the associated dataset title and description to Kaggle  
notebooks (42% of the samples). For 8.6% of the notebooks, we add granular information on the dataset’s  
schema. Below is the format we use:  
<jupyter\_start><jupyter\_text>title\ndescription\nKaggle dataset identifier: data\_identifier  
<jupyter\_code>import pandas as pd\n\ndf = pd.read\_csv(data\_path1)\ndf.info()  
<jupyter\_output>df\_info\_output1  
<jupyter\_text>Examples:\nexample1\_1\n..example1\_4  
...  
<jupyter\_script>code<|endoftext|>  
Some notebooks might load more than one csvfile, so we repeat the blocks of data information content for  
all files.  
Note that we introduce a new special token <jupyter\_script> to append the final script of the converted  
Kaggle notebook. This token helps differentiate the script, which is usually long, from code that follows  
<jupyter\_code> token, typically shorter.  
Kaggle – structured Structured Kaggle notebooks are similar to structured Jupyter notebooks, except  
that they don’t have an output cell, so we only include text and code blocks and keep the tokens used in  
Jupyter Notebooks:  
<jupyter\_start><jupyter\_text>text0<jupyter\_code>code0<jupyter\_text> ... <|endoftext|>  
5.5 StackExchange  
We concatenate questions and answers in the StackOverflow dataset using a format similar to the GitHub  
issues. We start with the question and then add answers in random order. We include the upvote score  
alongside the answer and, if applicable, denote it as the selected answer. Note that we do not have the title  
of the conversations for the StackExchange dataset.  
<issue\_start>username\_id0: question  
<issue\_comment>username\_id1: answer\_1\nUpvotes: score [selected answer](Optional)  
...  
<issue\_comment>username\_idn: answer\_n\nUpvotes: score [selected answer](Optional)<|endoftext|>  
5.6 Intermediate Representations  
We split 50/50 between translating from source code to intermediate representation ( code->intermediate )  
and vice-versa ( intermediate->code ). Regarding the intermediate representation, we use the size-optimized  
version 80% of the time and the performance-optimized version 20% of the time. We use separate sentinel  
tokens to indicate the direction of the translation.  
code<code\_to\_intermediate>intermediate\_representation  
intermediate\_representation<intermediate\_to\_code>code  
6 Model architecture and training details  
In this section, we provide all details regarding the model architecture (§6.1), tokenizer (§6.2), training details  
(§6.3), and CO 2emissions during training (§6.4).  
23Estimated with 6ND, where N is the number of parameters and D is the number of training tokens. Includes base and  
long-context training.  
19Table 5: Overview of the sentinel tokens.  
Token Description  
<|endoftext|> end of text/sequence  
<fim\_prefix> FIM prefix  
<fim\_middle> FIM middle  
<fim\_suffix> FIM suffix  
<fim\_pad> FIM pad  
<repo\_name> repository name  
<file\_sep> file separator  
<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  
<jupyter\_script> start of Jupyter script (converted kaggle notebook)  
<empty\_output> output cell without content  
<code\_to\_intermediate> translate source code to intermediate representation  
<intermediate\_to\_code> translate intermediate representation to source code  
<pr> start of pull request  
<pr\_status> status of pull request  
<pr\_is\_merged> whether pr is merged  
<pr\_base> start of list of base files  
<pr\_file> path of pull request file  
<pr\_base\_code> code that is part of the base commit in the PR  
<pr\_diff> start of a diff  
<pr\_diff\_hunk> diff hunk  
<pr\_comment> general comment  
<pr\_event\_id> GitHub id of review comment or code review comment  
<pr\_review> start of review  
<pr\_review\_state> review state (e.g. approved, rejected)  
<pr\_review\_comment> code review comment  
<pr\_in\_reply\_to\_review\_id> GitHub event id of review  
<pr\_in\_reply\_to\_comment\_id> GitHub event id of comment  
<pr\_diff\_hunk\_comment\_line> line number of code review comment  
6.1 Model Architecture  
We introduce a few architectural changes compared to StarCoderBase. First, we replace learned positional  
embeddings with Rotary Positional Encodings (RoPE; Su et al., 2021), as we confirmed significant performance  
gains in a preliminary ablation study. Following DeepseekCoder (Guo et al., 2024) and Code LLaMA (Rozière  
et al., 2023), we use a base period θ= 1e5. The second architectural modification we make is replacing  
Multi-Query Attention (MQA; Shazeer, 2019) with Grouped Query Attention (Ainslie et al., 2023, GQA;  
). However, we keep the number of key-value heads relatively low—2 for the 3B, 4 for the 7B and 15B—to  
prevent significantly slowing down inference.  
We summarize all other hyperparameters, such as the number of layers and hidden dimension, in Table 6.  
20Table 6: Model architecture details of the StarCoder2 models.  
Parameter StarCoder2-3B StarCoder2-7B StarCoder2-15B  
hidden\_dim 3072 4608 6144  
n\_heads 24 36 48  
n\_kv\_heads 2 4 4  
n\_layers 30 32 40  
vocab size 49152 49152 49152  
seq\_len base-4k/long-16k base-4k/long-16k base-4k/long-16k  
positional encodings RoPE RoPE RoPE  
FLOPs235.94e+22 1.55e+23 3.87e+23  
Table 7: Training details of StarCoder2 base models.  
Model learning rate RoPE θbatch size niterations ntokensnepochs  
StarCoder2-3B 3×10−41e5 2.6M 1.2M 3.1T 4.98  
StarCoder2-7B 3×10−41e5 3.5M 1M 3.5T 5.31  
StarCoder2-15B 3×10−41e4 4.1M 1M 4.1T 4.49  
6.2 Tokenizer  
We follow the procedure of StarCoderBase and train a byte-level Byte-Pair-Encoding tokenizer on a small  
subset of The Stack v1.24In our preliminary experiments, we observed that increasing the vocabulary size  
to 100K did not improve performance. Hence, we decided to maintain a vocabulary size of 49,152 tokens,  
including the sentinel tokens from Table 5. The pre-tokenization step includes a digit-splitter and the regex  
splitter from the GPT-2 pre-tokenizer.  
6.3 Training Details  
Base models The models were trained with a sequence length of 4,096 using Adam (Kingma & Ba, 2015)  
withβ1= 0.9,β2= 0.95,ϵ= 10−8and a weight decay of 0.1, without dropout. The learning rate followed a  
cosine decay after a linear warmup of 1,000 iterations. Table 7 details the training hyper-parameters for each  
model. RoPE θvalues are different for StarCoder2-15B due to a bug in parsing the training configuration.  
Moreover, StarCoder2-15B was scheduled to train for 1.1M iterations but was early stopped after 1M iterations.  
Following Muennighoff et al. (2023), we repeat data for around four to five epochs.  
Long context We further pre-trained each model for long-context on 200B tokens from the same pre-  
training corpus, using a 16,384 context length with a sliding window of 4,096, with FlashAttention-2 (Dao  
et al., 2022; Dao, 2024). We increase RoPE θand use the same configuration for the optimizer. The other  
training hyperparameters are provided in Table 8.  
6.4 CO2 Emissions  
We provide estimations of the CO 2emission of the StarCoder2 training using the Machine Learning Impact  
calculator presented in Lacoste et al. (2019). Note that we calculate the CO 2emissions by considering the  
total GPU hours of the base-model training. We then extrapolate this number to the long-context fine-tuning  
based on the number of tokens.  
3BThe compute infrastructure provided by ServiceNow had a carbon efficiency of 0.386 kgCO 2eq/kWh. A  
cumulative of 97,120 hours of computation was performed on hardware of type A100 SXM4 80 GB (TDP of  
24https://huggingface .co/datasets/bigcode/the-stack-march-sample-special-tokens-stripped  
21Table 8: Training details for the long context training of StarCoder2 models.  
Model learning rate RoPE θbatch size niterations ntokens  
StarCoder2-3B 3×10−51e6 2.6M 80k 200B  
StarCoder2-7B 2×10−51e6 3.5M 56k 200B  
StarCoder2-15B 3×10−51e5 4.1M 50k 200B  
Table 9: Pass@1 on HumanEval(+) and MBPP(+). These results were generated using greedy decoding.  
Model HumanEval HumanEval+ MBPP MBPP+  
StarCoderBase-3B 21.3 17.1 42.6 35.8  
DeepSeekCoder-1.3B 28.7 23.8 55.4 46.9  
StableCode-3B 28.7 24.4 53.1 43.1  
StarCoder2-3B 31.7 27.4 57.4 47.4  
StarCoderBase-7B 30.5 25.0 47.4 39.6  
CodeLlama-7B 33.5 25.6 52.1 41.6  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 47.6 39.6 70.2 56.6  
StarCoder2-7B 35.4 29.9 54.4 45.6  
StarCoderBase-15B 29.3 25.6 50.6 43.6  
CodeLlama-13B 37.8 32.3 62.4 52.4  
StarCoder2-15B 46.3 37.8 66.2 53.1  
CodeLlama-34B 48.2 44.3 65.4 52.4  
DeepSeekCoder-33B 54.3 46.3 73.2 59.1  
400W). Total emissions are estimated to be 14,995.33 kgCO 2eq. The long-context fine-tuning stage adds  
1,111.68 kgCO 2eq, resulting in a total of 16,107.01 kgCO 2eq.  
7BThe compute infrastructure provided by Hugging Face had a carbon efficiency of 0.2925 kgCO 2eq/kWh.  
A cumulative of 145,152 hours of computation was performed on hardware of type H100 (TDP of 660W).  
Total emissions are estimated to be 28,021.6 kgCO 2eq. The long-context fine-tuning stage adds 1601.23,  
resulting in a total of 29,622.83 kgCO 2eq.  
15BThe paper will soon be updated with estimates for the 15B model.  
7 Evaluation  
We evaluate the StarCoder2 models on a variety of benchmarks from the literature and compare them to  
recent state-of-the-art open Code LLMs: StableCode (Pinnaparaju et al., 2024), Code Llama (Rozière et al.,  
2023), DeepSeekCoder (Guo et al., 2024), and original StarCoder (Li et al., 2023). Since StarCoder2 is a base  
model, we only compare it with the base models of the model families mentioned above.  
We group all our comparisons by model sizes. The smallmodels have 3B or fewer parameters, the medium  
models have 7B or fewer parameters, and the largemodels have 15B or fewer parameters. Finally, we include  
twoextra large models: CodeLlama-34B and DeepSeekCoder-33B. These models are more than twice the  
size of the large StarCoder2 model. But, as we shall see below, StarCoder2-15B comes close to or even  
outperforms the extra-large models in several benchmarks.  
7.1 Code Completion  
We first evaluate the StarCoder2 models on code completion tasks, which have been widely studied in Code  
LLM work.  
227.1.1 HumanEval, MBPP, and EvalPlus  
About the benchmarks HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) and MBPP (Austin et al., 2021) are two of the  
most widely studied benchmarks for Code LLMs. Each benchmark has a few hundred programming problems.  
Each HumanEval problem has a prompt—a function signature and docstring—and a set of hidden unit tests.  
The prompt for each MBPP problem includes a natural language description followed by a few tests. The  
model under evaluation will complete the function given the prompt, and we test that function with the  
hidden unit tests. The result is considered a success only if all hidden tests pass.  
Recently, Liu et al. (2023a) identified several issues with both benchmarks. (1) Most problems have inadequate  
hidden tests that cannot detect subtle bugs in solutions (See Listings 1 and 2); and (2) Several problems  
have wrong test cases and ambiguous descriptions, which unfairly penalize the models that interpret the  
statements in other reasonable ways (See Listings 2). They introduce the EvalPlus framework to address  
these problems. The resulting benchmarks (HumanEval+ and MBPP+) have 80 ×and 35×more tests than  
the original benchmarks. For rigorous evaluation, we adopt the EvalPlus framework in this study.  
Listing 1: A HumanEval task with insufficient tests  
def common(l1: list, l2: list) -> list:  
"""Return sorted unique common elements for 2 lists"""  
common\_elems = list(set(l1).intersection(set(l2)))  
common\_elems.sort()  
return list(set(common\_elems))  
assert common([4,3,2,8], []) == []  
assert common([5,3,2,8], [3,2]) == [2,3]  
...  
# [Explanation] This solution is wrong as applying set  
# to the sorted common\_elems does not preserve the  
# order. Base HumanEval test inputs are too short to  
# easily manifest the flakiness.Listing 2: An MBPP task with problematic tests  
"""Write a function to check whether all dictionaries  
◁arrowhookleft→in a list are empty or not."""  
def empty\_dit(list1): return all(not d for d in list1)  
assert empty\_dit([{},{},{}]) == True  
assert empty\_dit([{1,2},{},{}]) == True # Wrong test!  
assert empty\_dit([{}]) == True  
# [Explanation] First, the second base test is wrong,  
# falsifying any correct solutions. Second, the tests  
# are weak, passing the wrong solution above. The wrong  
# solution mistakingly yields False given [{}, {}, [1]]  
# where we expect True as all dictionaries are empty  
# and the non-empty is an array, not a dictionary.  
Hyperparameters Following recent work on Code LLMs (Rozière et al., 2023; Guo et al., 2024), we use  
greedy decoding and report the mean pass@1 (mean success rate) for all problems in the benchmark.  
Results The results for HumanEval, MBPP, and their EvalPlus variants are presented in Table 9.25From  
the table, we can make the following observations:  
1.StarCoder2-3B is the best-performing small model on all the datasets (HumanEval, MBPP, Hu-  
manEval+, and MBPP+). The model is significantly better than its predecessor, StarCoderBase-3B,  
exhibiting improvements of 60.2% on HumanEval+ and 32.4% on MBPP+, respectively.  
2.StarCoder2-7B comes in second place of the medium models. DeepSeekCoder-6.7B is stronger,  
outperforming StarCoder2-7B by 32.4% and 24.1% on HumanEval+ and MBPP+, respectively.  
However, StarCoder2-7B consistently outperforms all the other medium models, including both  
StarCoderBase-7B and CodeLlama-7B. StarCoder2-7B outperforms StarCoderBase-7B by 19.6%  
and 15.2% on HumanEval+ and MBPP+, respectively. Additionally, it surpasses CodeLlama-7B by  
16.8% and 9.6% on these benchmarks.  
3.StarCoder2-15B is the best-performing large model by a significant margin. For example, it scores  
46.3, whereas CodeLlama-13B scores 37.8 on HumanEval. The results on EvalPlus are also consistent.  
For example, on HumanEval+, it significantly improves over StarCoderBase-15B and CodeLlama-13B  
by 47.7% and 17.0%, respectively.  
25Note that EvalPlus omits a few ill-formed and noisy problems from the MBPP dataset. It uses 399 out of the 427 problems  
from the MBPP subset that was sanitized by the original authors (Austin et al., 2021). For HumanEval, we kept all 164 problems  
from the original dataset.  
23Table 10: Pass@1 results on MultiPL-E averaged over 50 samples for each problem. All models are evaluated  
at temperature 0.2and top-p 0.95.  
Model C++ C# D Go Java Julia JavaScript Lua PHP  
StableCode-3B 28.4 14.4 13.4 19.3 27.8 20.6 32.0 17.1 23.7  
DeepSeekCoder-1.3B 28.3 21.3 10.4 19.1 29.2 15.0 28.3 19.2 23.2  
StarCoderBase-3B 19.4 13.3 5.0 13.3 19.2 16.1 21.3 18.0 18.6  
StarCoder2-3B 27.2 20.5 12.6 23.6 27.4 19.9 35.4 28.0 27.6  
CodeLlama-7B 26.4 21.0 11.6 20.9 28.2 25.9 31.6 30.4 25.1  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 46.7 32.9 18.4 31.0 39.7 31.4 46.6 34.2 32.6  
StarCoderBase-7B 23.3 19.3 8.1 19.6 24.4 21.8 27.4 23.4 22.1  
StarCoder2-7B 33.6 20.7 15.1 20.2 29.4 20.4 35.4 30.7 30.6  
CodeLlama-13B 37.4 24.8 15.5 26.6 37.5 27.9 39.3 31.6 33.9  
StarCoderBase-15B 30.6 20.6 10.0 21.5 28.5 21.1 31.7 26.6 26.8  
StarCoder2-15B 41.4 29.2 23.6 26.2 33.9 33.2 44.2 43.8 39.5  
CodeLlama-34B 41.4 30.7 15.3 28.7 40.2 31.4 41.7 37.5 40.4  
DeepSeekCoder-33B 51.2 35.3 17.4 34.2 43.8 32.8 51.3 36.5 41.8  
Model Perl R Ruby Racket Rust Scala Bash Swift TypeScript  
StableCode-3B 9.4 11.5 0.8 7.0 22.9 5.9 8.6 13.2 29.6  
DeepSeekCoder-1.3B 12.5 9.8 24.6 9.1 18.6 19.6 9.7 11.0 27.4  
StarCoderBase-3B 11.3 10.1 4.2 7.9 16.3 16.8 3.8 10.0 22.8  
StarCoder2-3B 13.6 14.2 31.3 7.8 24.5 18.9 12.3 25.1 34.4  
CodeLlama-7B 16.9 14.9 29.5 11.4 25.5 22.8 9.6 24.9 33.4  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 30.4 20.5 46.2 17.4 37.7 35.2 22.2 30.3 39.5  
StarCoderBase-7B 15.2 14.5 19.6 11.1 22.6 20.9 7.3 15.1 27.5  
StarCoder2-7B 16.6 16.7 28.3 11.6 29.6 19.5 12.2 26.1 36.3  
CodeLlama-13B 23.4 14.1 31.9 13.0 31.0 29.7 13.3 30.1 40.1  
StarCoderBase-15B 16.3 10.2 17.2 11.8 24.5 28.8 11.0 16.7 32.1  
StarCoder2-15B 37.2 19.8 41.5 22.4 38.0 37.4 18.9 34.2 43.8  
CodeLlama-34B 28.5 22.7 37.8 16.9 38.7 36.7 16.4 35.3 42.1  
DeepSeekCoder-33B 31.0 20.5 44.0 23.4 43.8 43.9 28.7 35.8 48.4  
4.StarCoder2-15B is even competitive with models that are more than twice its size. For example,  
StarCoder2-15B outperforms CodeLlama-34B on both MBPP and MBPP+.  
Although EvalPlus makes HumanEval and MBPP far more robust, the problems in these benchmarks only  
exercise basic Python built-ins. They do not test them on other programming languages and do not test  
models’ knowledge of other Python libraries. We address these limitations in the rest of this subsection with  
more comprehensive evaluations on code completion.  
7.1.2 MultiPL-E: Multilingual Code Completion  
About the benchmark MultiPL-E (Cassano et al., 2023b) uses a suite of lightweight, rule-based compilers  
to translate HumanEval from Python to 18 other programming languages. Thus MultiPL-E is a multi-language  
benchmark with the same problems translated to different languages.26  
Hyperparameters We sample 50 completions per prompt at temperature 0.2 with top-p 0.95. This is how  
MultiPL-E results are reported on the BigCode Models Leaderboard (Ben Allal, 2023).  
Results The results on MultiPL-E appear in Table 10. We make the following observations:  
26MultiPL-E makes some small changes to the HumanEval prompts, and a few prompts fail to translate to certain languages.  
We refer the reader to Cassano et al. (2023b) for more information.  
241.Across all size classes, there is no single model that is best at every language. Nevertheless, the  
StarCoder2 models perform well as described below.  
2. Of the small models, StarCoder2-3B performs the best on 11/18 programming languages.  
3.Of the medium models, DeepSeekCoder-6.7B performs best. StarCoder2-7B does better than  
CodeLlama-7B on most languages.  
4.Of the large models, StarCoder2-15B does the best on 16/18 programming languages. CodeLlama-13B  
outperforms StarCoder2-15B on Go and Java.  
5.StarCoder2-15B meets or exceeds the performance of CodeLlama-34B on 10/18 programming  
languages and DeepSeekCoder-33B on four lower-resource languages (D, Julia, Lua, and Perl).  
7.1.3 DS-1000: Data Science Tasks in Python  
About the benchmark DS-1000 (Lai et al., 2023) is a widely studied benchmark with 1,000 data science  
tasks in Python. Unlike the HumanEval and MBPP problems that only use the Python standard library,  
DS-1000 exercises seven widely used libraries, from Matplotlib to TensorFlow. Therefore, here we further  
adopt DS-1000 to evaluate the performance of Code LLMs in completing data science tasks with popular  
libraries.  
Hyperparameters Following Lai et al. (2023), we use temperature 0.2and top-p 0.95to generate 40  
samples per problem, and report mean pass@1.  
Results Table 11 reports the results on DS-1000. We make the following observations:  
1.StarCoder2-3B overall is the best-performing small model on DS-1000. Except for PyTorch and  
TensorFlow (where it is slightly worse than StableCode-3B), StarCoder2-3B achieves the best  
performance on all the other popular libraries.  
2.StarCoder2-7B comes in second place out of the medium models, with a performance similar to  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B.  
3.StarCoder2-15B is the best-performing large model on DS-1000. It substantially outperforms both  
StarCoderBase-15B and CodeLlama-13B by large margins, and approaches the overall performance  
of CodeLlama-34B.  
7.2 Code Fixing and Editing  
While the above subsection has studied various code completion tasks, Code LLMs can be used in various  
other ways. In this subsection, we focus on studying their capabilities for fixing bugs or editing existing code.  
7.2.1 HumanEvalFix: Fixing Bugs in Six Programming Languages  
About the benchmark HumanEvalFix (Muennighoff et al., 2024a) is a benchmark that tests a model’s  
ability to identify and fix bugs in code. The benchmark supports six programming languages shown in  
Figure 12. Since it is not a code completion benchmark, most base models do poorly on HumanEvalFix  
whereas instruction-tuned (Wei et al., 2022; Sanh et al., 2022; Muennighoff et al., 2022b; 2024b) models  
perform better. Thus, we consider the instruction-tuned variants of DeepSeekCoder and CodeLlama in  
our comparison (Guo et al., 2024; Rozière et al., 2023). We also compare with OctoCoder, which is an  
instruction-tuned version of the initial StarCoder using the CommitPackFT dataset (Muennighoff et al.,  
2024a; Zhuo et al., 2024; Longpre et al., 2023). We benchmarked the default HumanEvalFixTests subvariant;  
hence, there were no docstrings present to guide the model.  
25Table 11: Performance of open-access models on DS-1000. Benchmarks are as follows. All models were  
evaluated at temperature 0.2and top-p 0.95. Scores reflect mean pass@1 accuracy averaged over 40 samples.  
Format Model Matplotlib NumPy Pandas PyTorch SciPyScikit-  
LearnTensorFlowOverall  
# problems: 155 220 291 68 106 115 45 1,000  
Completion StarCoderBase-3B 32.1 16.8 5.3 9.2 13.2 10.5 17.2 14.2  
Completion StableCode-3B 42.5 24.5 16.2 15.4 13.5 20.2 27.7 22.7  
Completion DeepSeekCoder-1.3B 36.2 18.8 9.1 10.7 7.9 13.9 13.3 16.2  
Completion StarCoder2-3B 45.5 27.7 16.2 12.9 15.8 30.8 22.8 25.0  
Completion StarCoderBase-7B 38.0 23.0 8.2 13.1 13.7 24.5 14.6 19.1  
Completion DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 52.4 33.0 20.0 13.9 19.8 29.7 27.4 28.9  
Completion CodeLlama-7B 46.3 21.6 13.9 12.2 17.5 16.7 20.6 21.5  
Completion StarCoder2-7B 53.6 33.3 16.916.2 20.6 22.2 31.9 27.8  
Completion StarCoderBase-15B 47.0 27.1 10.1 19.5 21.7 27.0 20.5 23.8  
Completion CodeLlama-13B 49.0 27.2 17.4 12.9 15.6 24.0 24.8 25.1  
Completion StarCoder2-15B 60.3 43.3 23.2 11.0 26.4 26.0 36.0 33.8  
Completion DeepSeekCoder-33B 56.1 49.6 25.8 36.8 36.8 40.0 46.7 40.2  
Completion CodeLlama-34B 50.3 42.7 23.0 25.0 28.3 33.9 40.0 34.3  
Table 12: Pass@1 performance on HumanEvalFix. StarCoder2 and StarCoderBase are not instruction-tuned  
thus they are at a disadvantage compared to the other models which are all instruction-tuned.  
Model Prompt Python JavaScript Java Go C++ Rust Avg.  
StarCoderBase-15B Instruct 12.6 16.8 18.9 12.5 11.2 0.6 12.1  
StarCoderBase-15B Commit 25.6 29.4 28.8 28.7 28.2 19.7 26.7  
CodeLlama-13B-Instruct Instruct 19.4 18.9 24.1 21.6 10.1 0.4 15.8  
CodeLlama-34B-Instruct Instruct 36.5 28.1 36.4 25.7 25.2 18.5 28.4  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B-Instruct Instruct 44.9 55.3 52.2 42.9 37.9 19.5 42.1  
DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct Instruct 47.5 47.6 46.5 52.0 48.0 10.2 42.1  
OctoCoder-15B Instruct 30.4 28.4 30.6 30.2 26.1 16.5 27.0  
StarCoder2-15B Instruct 9.7 20.7 24.1 36.3 25.6 15.4 22.0  
StarCoder2-15B Issue 48.6 41.6 48.4 48.5 20.7 24.2 38.7  
StarCoder2 issues format Although StarCoder2 is a base model, it is pretrained on GitHub issues and  
StackOverflow discussions using a special format (§5.3). We experiment with prompting the model to fix  
code bugs in the style of a discussion as follows:  
<issue\_start>username\_0: instruction\n\n‘‘‘buggy function‘‘‘\nUpvotes: 100<issue\_comment>  
username\_1: Sure, here is the fixed code.\n\n‘‘‘function start  
In this template, “instruction” is the HumanEvalFix instruction telling the model to fix the bug in the code,  
“buggy function” is the function with a subtle bug, and “function start” is the function header including  
imports. The generation of the model is stopped as soon as ‘‘‘is generated. The evaluation code is available  
via Ben Allal et al. (2022), and we denote this as the “Issue” prompt. We also benchmark StarCoder2 with  
the same basic “Instruct” prompt used in Muennighoff et al. (2024a).  
Hyperparameters : Following (Muennighoff et al., 2024a), we use a temperature of 0.2 to estimate pass@1  
with 20 samples.  
Results Unlike the previous sections, we only evaluate StarCoder2-15B and primarily compare it to  
instruction-tuned models. The results are in Table 12 (with best-performing models highlighted in bold and  
second-best underscored), and we make the following conclusions:  
261.The base models (StarCoder2-15B and StarCoderBase-15B) perform very poorly when given an  
instruction prompt, which motivates using a different prompt format.  
2.Using the Issue prompt described above, StarCoder2-15B performs remarkable well as a base model.  
It outperforms the instruction-tuned CodeLlama models by a significant margin and nearly reaches  
the performance of the instruction-tuned DeepSeekCoder models.  
3.Using the Issue prompt for StarCoder2-15B leads to a larger increase in performance than using the  
Commitprompt forStarCoderBase-15B.This indicates thatpre-trainingonpull requests (StarCoder2)  
is a viable alternative to pre-training on commits (StarCoderBase).  
4.Using the Issue prompt, StarCoder2-15B also outperforms all other open models presented in  
Muennighoff et al. (2024a).  
5.StarCoder2-15B underperforms on C++ when using the Issue prompt, which hurts its overall  
performance. Our investigation shows that this is mainly because one-third of the code generated  
is incomplete, e.g., having an unexpected break immediately after the beginning of a forloop.  
Additional prompt engineering may be necessary to fix this. Thus, we still see value in instruction  
tuning StarCoder2 to further improve its usability in handling similar scenarios more effectively  
without prompt engineering. We leave the instruction tuning or even preference alignment (Christiano  
et al., 2017; Ethayarajh et al., 2024) of StarCoder2 to future work.  
7.2.2 Code Editing  
About the benchmark CanItEdit (Cassano et al., 2024) is a hand-crafted benchmark designed to evaluate  
model performance in Python code editing tasks. Each problem consists of a code snippet accompanied by  
an instruction of two types: descriptive orlazy. Descriptive instructions are systematic and provide detailed  
information, whereas lazy instructions are brief, direct, and mimic the typical instructions humans provide  
to code completion models. The goal is to modify the code according to the instruction; both lazy and  
descriptive instructions should lead to the same edit. The accuracy of each modification is assessed using a  
hidden test suite, and pass@1 is reported. The benchmark encompasses a variety of problems, from simple  
single-function, single-line edits to intricate multi-class problems requiring multiple-line edits in separate  
locations. Some tasks demand domain-specific knowledge like mathematics, and successful completion of a  
problem often requires the model to understand the connections between the components of the program.  
Listing 3 shows an abbreviated27sample problem from CanItEdit with its lazy instruction.  
Listing 3: Abbreviated sample problem from CanItEdit  
-class C4(nn.Module):  
+class C8(nn.Module):  
- """Represents the C4 class of group theory,  
+ """Represents the C8 class of group theory,  
where each element represents a discrete rotation."""  
def \_\_init\_\_(self):  
super().\_\_init\_\_()  
def elements(self):  
"""Returns all the elements of this group"""  
- return torch.tensor([0., np.pi/2, np.pi, 3\*np.pi/2])  
+ d = np.pi / 4  
+ return torch.tensor([0., d, d\*2, d\*3, d\*4, d\*5, d\*6, d\*7])  
Code Editing Instruction: Edit the C4 class and its methods  
to represent the C8 group.  
27The original problem includes additional methods to edit in the C4 class and a descriptive instruction.  
27Table 13: Performance of instructional code editing on the CanItEdit benchmark (Cassano et al., 2024).  
The results for non-StarCoder2 models are from the benchmark paper.  
Model FormatDescriptive Instructions Lazy Instructions  
Pass@1  
StarCoderBase-3B Commit 19.62 12.78  
StarCoder2-3B Issue 21.68 15.91  
DeepSeekCoder-Instruct-1.3B Instruct 25.83 18.33  
StarCoder2-7B Issue 35.23 18.55  
CodeLlama-Instruct-7B Instruct 33.89 27.04  
StarCoderBase-7B Commit 40.64 25.83  
DeepSeekCoder-Instruct-6.7B Instruct 33.89 33.61  
CodeLlama-Instruct-13B Instruct 28.33 20.19  
OctoCoder-15B Instruct 31.46 25.69  
StarCoderBase-15B Commit 38.24 26.38  
StarCoder2-15B Issue 43.08 38.45  
CodeLlama-Instruct-34B Instruct 35.0 26.76  
DeepSeekCoder-Instruct-33B Instruct 53.06 43.89  
Hyperparameters We evaluate all sizes of StarCoder2 on the CanItEdit benchmark using the Issue prompt  
format (introduced in §7.2.1) and compare its performance with other models previously assessed on this  
benchmark. Following Cassano et al. (2024), we employ random sampling with a temperature of 0.2and a  
top-pof0.95, with 100completions per problem.  
Results The results appear in Table 13. As described in §7.2.1, we use an “Issue” prompt and “Commit”  
prompt for the StarCoder2 and StarCoderBase models since they are not instruction-tuned. For all the other  
models, we use instruction-tuned versions. From the table, we make the following observations:  
1. Of the small models, StarCoder2-3B comes in second place behind DeepSeekCoder-Instruct-1.3B.  
2.Of the medium models, StarCoder2-7B and DeepSeekCoder-Instruct-6.7B each performs best at  
descriptive and lazy instructions respectively.  
3. StarCoder2-15B is the best-performing large model by a significant margin.  
4. StarCoder2-15B outperforms CodeLlama-Instruct-34B as well.  
These results give further evidence that the StarCoder2 “Issue” format is a viable alternative to the  
StarCoderBase “Commit” format.  
7.3 Math Reasoning  
About the benchmark We use the widely studied GSM8K benchmark (Cobbe et al., 2021), a set of  
middle-school math problems, to evaluate the mathematical reasoning capabilities of the models. We use the  
PAL approach proposed by Gao et al. (2023): the model is prompted to generate a Python program, which is  
executed to produce the answer to the problem.  
Hyperparameters We evaluate models with greedy decoding in an 8-shot setting following Chowdhery  
et al. (2023).  
Results The results on GSM8K with PAL appear in Table 14 and we make the following observations:  
1. StableCode-3B is the best-performing small model. StarCoder2-3B is in second place.  
28Table 14: 8-shot accuracy on the GSM8K math-reasoning benchmark.  
Model GSM8K (PAL)  
StarCoderBase-3B 8.0  
DeepSeekCoder-1.3B 12.6  
StableCode-3B 39.7  
StarCoder2-3B 27.7  
StarCoderBase-7B 14.9  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 41.9  
CodeLlama-7B 27.0  
StarCoder2-7B 40.4  
StarCoderBase-15B 21.5  
CodeLlama-13B 38.1  
StarCoder2-15B 65.1  
CodeLlama-34B 54.2  
DeepSeekCoder-33B 58.7  
2.StarCoder2-7B comes second place. Its performance is very close to the first-place model, which is  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B, while substantially outperforming both CodeLlama-7B and StarCoderBase-7B.  
3.StarCoder2-15B significantly outperforms all large models, including both CodeLlama-13B and  
StarCoderBase-15B.  
4.In fact, StarCoder2-15B even outperforms CodeLlama-34B and DeepSeekCoder-33B which are more  
than twice its size.  
7.4 CRUXEval: Code Reasoning, Understanding, and Execution  
About the benchmark CRUXEval (Gu et al., 2024) is a two-part benchmark consisting of 800samples  
designed to evaluate code reasoning, understanding, and execution. In the first task, CRUXEval-I, the model  
is asked to predict any input such that executing a given Python function on that input produces a given  
output. In the second task, CRUXEval-O, the model is asked to simulate the execution of a given function on  
an input and predict an output. Two samples are shown below in Listings 4 and 5. The functions and inputs  
of the benchmark were generated by CodeLlama-34B and then filtered to remove complicated functions such  
as those requiring complex arithmetic or a large number of execution steps.  
Listing 4: Sample CRUXEval Problem 1  
def f(string):  
string\_x = string.rstrip("a")  
string = string\_x.rstrip("e")  
return string  
# output prediction, CRUXEval-O  
assert f("xxxxaaee") == ??  
# input prediction, CRUXEval-I  
assert f(??) == "xxxxaa"Listing 5: Sample CRUXEval Problem 2  
def f(nums):  
count = len(nums)  
for i in range(-count+1, 0):  
nums.append(nums[i])  
return nums  
# output prediction, CRUXEval-O  
assert f([2, 6, 1, 3, 1]) == ??  
# input prediction, CRUXEval-I  
assert f(??) == [2, 6, 1, 3, 1, 6, 3, 6, 6]  
Hyperparameters Following (Gu et al., 2024), we use temperature 0.2 to report pass@1 and temperature  
0.8 to report pass@5, both using 10 samples.  
Results We show the pass@1 and pass@5 scores for both tasks in our benchmark in Table 15. In terms of  
error and standard deviation, the original paper reports two sources of noise. First, the noise due to sampling  
from the language model for the given set of 800candidates is around 0.2%for 10 samples. Second, the  
29Table 15: Accuracy on the CRUXEval benchmark.  
Model CRUXEval-I CRUXEval-O  
Pass@1 Pass@5 Pass@1 Pass@5  
StarCoderBase-3B 27.1 43.7 27.4 40.9  
DeepSeekCoder-1.3B 27.8 44.7 31.0 43.4  
StableCode-3B 33.5 53.3 26.7 43.5  
StarCoder2-3B 32.7 50.1 34.2 48.4  
StarCoderBase-7B 29.7 47.3 32.2 44.9  
CodeLlama-7B 35.9 52.9 34.2 48.4  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 41.9 62.7 43.5 54.8  
StarCoder2-7B 34.6 53.5 36.0 52.0  
StarCoderBase-15B 31.3 49.2 34.2 47.1  
CodeLlama-13B 42.5 62.0 39.7 53.9  
StarCoder2-15B 48.1 66.9 47.1 59.5  
CodeLlama-34B 47.2 66.6 42.4 55.9  
DeepSeekCoder-33B 46.5 64.9 48.6 61.6  
precise samples in the benchmark were chosen from a larger set of samples, and the noise from choosing  
which samples to include in the benchmark when using 800samples is about 1.5%. We make the following  
observations:  
1.StarCoder2-3B performs competitively with other small models. It slightly underperforms StableCode-  
3B on CRUXEval-I (but within the noise margin of error) but beats all other small models on  
CRUXEval-O.  
2.For both tasks, StarCoder2-7B performs on par with CodeLlama-7B but lags significantly behind  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B.  
3.StarCoder2-15B is the best-performing large model. It surpasses CodeLlama-13B and drastically  
improves upon StarCoderBase-15B on both CRUXEval-I and CRUXEval-O.  
4.StarCoder2-15B performs on par with the extra-large models. On CRUXEval-I, it outperforms  
both CodeLlama-34B and DeepSeekCoder-33B but within standard deviation. On CRUXEval-O, it  
significantly outperforms CodeLlama-34B and slightly underperforms DeepSeekCoder-33B.  
7.5 Fill-in-the-Middle  
About the benchmark StarCoder2 supports fill-in-the-middle (FIM), which is the ability to complete an  
arbitrary span of code conditioned on both text before and after the insertion point. We use the benchmark  
from Ben Allal et al. (2023), which tests the ability of models to fill in a single line of code in Python,  
JavaScript, and Java solutions to HumanEval.  
Hyperparameters Following Ben Allal et al. (2023), we sample 20 completions per example at temperature  
0.2 and top-p 0.95 and report the mean exact match, as done  
Results The results appear in Table 16. We observe that StarCoder2-3B performs as well as StarCoderBase-  
15B on this FIM benchmark. Unfortunately, StarCoder2-15B underperforms on FIM. Due to an implementa-  
tion bug, the FIM-rate was smaller than intended for most of the training.  
30Table 16: Exact-match on FIM-task (Ben Allal et al., 2023). Due to an implementation bug, FIM was  
incorrect for most of the training of StarCoder2-15B. CodeLlama results are from Rozière et al. (2023).  
Model Java JavaScript Python  
StableCode-3B 63.7 73.3 59.1  
StarCoder2-3B 75.0 73.0 59.1  
StarCoder2-7B 81.1 77.5 61.1  
CodeLlama-13B 80.0 85.0 74.5  
StarCoderBase-15B 73 74 62  
StarCoder2-15B 60.5 54.7 48.4  
7.6 Repository-Level Code Completion Evaluation  
Code completion in practice often occurs within the context of a repository rather than in isolated files.  
Leveraging repository-level context for code completion is thus essential for models to perform well in real-  
world scenarios. We evaluate models on repository-level code completion with two benchmarks: RepoBench  
(Liu et al., 2023b) and CrossCodeEval (Ding et al., 2023).  
7.6.1 RepoBench  
About the benchmark RepoBench (Liu et al., 2023b) is a live benchmark designed for evaluating code  
completion at the repository level, with a focus on next-line prediction. In this work, we use the latest  
version (v1.1) of RepoBench28,29, which sources its data from GitHub repositories created from October 6th  
to December 31st, 2023, and takes steps to avoid data leakage by removing duplicates against The Stack  
v2. Our evaluation includes five levels—2k, 4k, 8k, 12k, and 16k—across three settings: cross-file-first ,  
cross-file-random , and in-file, with each setting comprising 5,000 data points (1,000 per level). We  
report the average edit similarity, exact match, and CodeBLEU (Ren et al., 2020) scores for the three settings.  
Hyperparameters Following prior work on Code LLMs (Chen et al., 2021), we set the generation  
temperature to 0.2and the top- psampling parameter to 0.95for all models under evaluation. We constrained  
the models to generate a maximum of 128 new tokens per prompt, and the first non-comment line of the  
output was selected as the prediction. While StarCoder2 uses special tokens for repository-level training,  
we ensured uniformity in prompt construction across all models by following the official implementation in  
line with Liu et al. (2023b). The maximum token count for prompts was set to 15,800 by truncating excess  
cross-file context, except for StarCoderBase, which was constrained to 7,800 tokens due to its maximum  
context length limit of 8,192.  
Results Table 17 showcases the performance of open-access models on RepoBench v1.1. We observe that:  
1.StarCoder2, with repository-level training, consistently outperforms StarCoderBase, across all  
evaluated model sizes.  
2.StarCoder2-3B demonstrates notable performance among the smaller models, ranking as the second-  
best one following StableCode-3B.  
3.StarCoder2-7B achieves competitive performance closely matching that of CodeLlama-7B among the  
medium models, with DeepSeekCoder-6.7B achieving the leading performance metrics.  
4.StarCoder2-15B not only outpaces CodeLlama-13B but also showcases comparable, and in some  
aspects superior, performance against the significantly larger CodeLlama-34B model.  
28https://huggingface .co/datasets/tianyang/repobench\_python\_v1 .1  
29https://huggingface .co/datasets/tianyang/repobench\_java\_v1 .1  
31Table 17: Average exact match (EM), edit similarity (ES), and CodeBLEU (CB) scores for open-access base  
models on RepoBench v1.1 (Liu et al., 2023b).  
ModelPython Java  
EM ES CB EM ES CB  
StarCoderBase-3B 29.99 69.37 36.77 36.01 74.18 45.30  
DeepSeekCoder-1.3B 31.02 70.07 37.88 37.75 75.66 46.69  
StableCode-3B 34.48 71.79 40.43 40.13 76.56 49.00  
StarCoder2-3B 32.47 71.19 39.25 38.46 76.53 47.96  
StarCoderBase-7B 32.70 71.08 39.48 37.97 75.66 47.47  
CodeLlama-7B 33.85 71.79 40.47 39.61 76.71 48.92  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 36.79 73.85 42.65 42.87 78.93 51.69  
StarCoder2-7B 33.72 72.07 40.34 39.84 77.23 48.96  
StarCoderBase-15B 33.51 71.64 40.39 39.34 76.24 48.36  
CodeLlama-13B 35.50 72.98 42.02 41.27 77.57 50.26  
StarCoder2-15B 36.99 74.08 43.25 42.57 79.05 51.45  
CodeLlama-34B 37.22 73.77 43.38 42.35 78.22 50.99  
DeepSeekCoder-33B 39.25 75.20 45.21 44.59 79.92 52.70  
7.6.2 CrossCodeEval  
About the benchmark CrossCodeEval (Ding et al., 2023) is a diverse and multilingual benchmark  
designed for repository-level code completion. It was constructed from a wide range of real-world, open-  
sourced, permissively licensed repositories in four popular programming languages: Python, Java, TypeScript,  
and C#. Through careful static analysis methods, CrossCodeEval strictly requires cross-file context for  
accurate code completion. We report results in both Code Match (Edit Similarity) and Identifier Match (F1  
Score) following the definitions in Ding et al. (2023) in all four languages.  
Hyperparameters We use a max sequence length of 16k for all models except for StarCoderBase, which  
only supports 8k. In line with Ding et al. (2023), we use the retrieve-and-generate (RG) method with  
OpenAI’s ada embedding, which was found to perform well in their study. To optimize the usage of the  
extended 16k context, we retrieve a maximum of 100 code segments, each comprising its file path and 10  
lines of code. The maximum cross-file context was set to 12,800 tokens and the max generation token is 50  
tokens following. Consistent with Ding et al. (2023), we use the uniform prompt formatting in the original  
implementation, with a temperature of 0.2 and top-p of 0.95 for all model generations.  
Results Table 18 presents the evaluation results. We found that:  
1.Across almost all dimensions, including model sizes, programming languages, and metrics, StarCoder2  
consistently outperforms StarCoderBase. This enhancement could likely be attributed to better  
pre-training with increased context length and repository-level objectives (Section 5.1).  
2.StarCoder2-15B achieves the state-of-the-art performance compared to models of similar sizes. For  
certain languages like Java and C#, the performance is better even than models with 2x capacity.  
3.The analysis also reveals significant performance variances in different languages for the same model,  
similar to the findings in MultiPL-E (§7.1.2). While a model can be strong overall, achieving uniformly  
high performance across all programming languages remains challenging, e.g., StarCoder2-15B is  
behind on TypeScript while StableCode-3B in C# and DeepSeekCoder-34B in Java. The disparity  
calls for future research on building models that can achieve high performance across diverse range  
of languages in different settings.  
32Table 18: CrossCodeEval (Ding et al., 2023) evaluation results. We report Code Match (Edit Similarity)  
and Identifier Match (F1) results for four languages.  
ModelPython Java TypeScript C#  
Code ES ID F1 Code ES ID F1 Code ES ID F1 Code ES ID F1  
StarCoderBase-3B 69.47 62.56 66.43 59.77 41.42 35.26 70.11 53.15  
DeepSeekCoder-1.3B 72.41 66.76 65.92 59.93 63.59 56.41 70.98 54.84  
StableCode-3B 76.00 70.75 73.19 67.93 65.61 59.61 61.70 48.98  
StarCoder2-3B 73.01 67.85 66.31 61.06 38.79 35.17 70.86 55.42  
StarCoderBase-7B 72.24 65.40 69.91 64.12 44.21 39.77 71.93 55.98  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 77.43 73.16 70.60 66.28 69.08 63.61 74.84 62.29  
CodeLlama-7B 74.52 69.11 71.49 65.99 65.96 59.46 71.41 56.66  
StarCoder2-7B 74.52 68.81 70.75 65.27 43.19 38.84 72.73 57.69  
StarCoderBase-15B 73.43 66.74 70.58 64.66 45.24 40.47 71.77 55.71  
CodeLlama-13B 75.88 70.97 73.08 68.29 67.88 61.46 72.73 59.62  
StarCoder2-15B 78.72 74.27 74.92 70.45 48.63 43.78 75.38 62.14  
CodeLlama-34B 76.34 71.36 74.30 69.45 68.98 63.19 73.96 60.07  
DeepSeekCoder-33B 78.78 74.51 73.41 69.02 70.31 65.14 75.04 63.03  
Table 19: Performance on the “Asleep at the Keyboard” benchmark.  
Model Valid ( ↑) Insecure ( ↓)  
StarCoderBase-3B 910/1000 (91.0%) 224/910 (24.6%)  
DeepSeekCoder-1.3B 893/1000 (89.3%) 290/893 (32.5%)  
StarCoder2-3B 925/1000 (92.5%) 113/900 (12.2%)  
StarCoderBase-7B 916/1000 (91.6%) 243/916 (26.5%)  
CodeLlama-7B 900/1000 (90.0%) 195/900 (21.7%)  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 921/1000 (92.1%) 315/921 (34.2%)  
StarCoder2-7B 912/1000 (91.2%) 363/926 (39.8%)  
StarCoderBase-15B 933/1000 (93.3%) 332/933 (35.6%)  
CodeLlama-13B 903/1000 (90.3%) 273/903 (30.2%)  
StarCoder2-15B 898/1000 (89.8%) 352/898 (39.2%)  
7.7 “Asleep at the Keyboard” Security Benchmark  
About the benchmark “Asleep at the Keyboard” is a benchmark designed for assessing security vulnera-  
bilities in code generation (Pearce et al., 2022). Similar to Li et al. (2023), we focus on the subset of tasks  
amenable to automated evaluation, which is the Diversity of Weakness problems. These cover 18 diverse  
vulnerability classes from the MITRE Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) taxonomy, with scenarios  
drawn from the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses list published by MITRE. The  
problems have 23 scenarios in C and 17 scenarios in Python.  
Hyperparameters Following Li et al. (2023), we set the temperature to 0.2 and top-p to 0.95. Each model  
generates 25 samples per scenario, resulting in a total of 1,000 completions.  
Results We report results of selected models in Table 19. Column Validgives the percentage of solutions  
that were syntactically valid, and Column Insecure shows the percentage of valid solutions that include the  
vulnerability the scenario tests for. From the table, we draw the following conclusions:  
1.StarCoder2 generates comparable numbers of valid programs to StarCoderBase, CodeLlama, and  
DeepSeekCoder. Both StarCoderBase and StarCoder2 models achieve around 90% valid program  
33rate. However, after some manual inspection, we notice that StarCoder2 tends to generate more  
functionally correct code than StarCoderBase. The observation is aligned with the evaluation in  
previous sections.  
2.Except for StarCoder2-3B, StarCoder2-7B and StarCoder2-15B have the highest insecure program  
rate among the models having similar parameters. The high insecure rate might be a side-effect of  
its higher rate of valid and functionally correct completions. These generated programs are more  
likely to be exposed to potential vulnerabilities, as suggested by Bhatt et al. (2023). Notably, Li  
et al. (2023) find that code-cushman-001 , the initial model used in commercialized Copilot, has an  
insecure rate beyond 40%.  
7.8 Measuring Harmful Generations  
About the benchmarks Bias in Open-ended Language Generation Dataset (BOLD) (Dhamala et al.,  
2021) is a dataset of 23,679 prompts that measure fairness across Religious Ideology, Procession, Race, Gender,  
and Political Ideology. We use the Regard classifier by Sheng et al. (2019) and average the classifier scores  
across each category.  
WinoBias (Zhao et al., 2018) measures bias towards gender stereotypes across professions. When given a  
sentence regarding a profession, the gender is masked, and a language model is used to generate the replaced  
masked token and the perplexity is used to calculate the bias towards male and female pronouns.  
Hurtful Sentence Completion in English Language Models (HONEST) (Nozza et al., 2021) is a template-based  
corpus to assess the hurtfulness of sentence completions generated by the language models. To calculate  
the HONEST score, we check whether each generated completion has any terms contained in each of the  
categories within Hurtlex30.  
RealToxicityPrompts (Gehman et al., 2020) consists of 100,000 naturally occurring, sentence-level prompts,  
which are extracted from the large web corpus of English text. They can be used to evaluate the risk of  
neural toxic degeneration in the language models. We use a 10,000 subset to perform the evaluation. We use  
the classifier by Vidgen et al. (2021) to detect toxicity and report the average probability of the detected  
toxic output as our toxicity score.  
Hyperparameters For each prompt in BOLD and RealToxicityPrompts, we generate one completion with  
up to 50 additional tokens. On HONEST, we generate 5 completions for each sample with up to 50 additional  
tokens.  
Results The results for BOLD, WinoBias, HONEST, and RealToxicityPrompts are presented in Tables 20,  
21, 22, and 23, respectively. The tables suggest that our models LLMs that we consider produce roughly the  
same amount of harmful content, and based on Li et al. (2023), LLMs trained primarily on code produce less  
harmful content than LLMs trained on general web text.  
8 Search Index and Attribution Tools  
Following the standard set by Li et al. (2023) we build another suite of data inspection, attribution, and  
search tools. The NLP community has recognized the need for data inspection and has begun producing  
computational documentation artifacts to complement static data descriptions (Piktus et al., 2023b; Marone  
& Van Durme, 2023; Piktus et al., 2023a; Akiki et al., 2023, among others). Open science and open data go  
beyond releasing dumps of datasets.  
Membership checking tools This work collects and constructs a dataset 4 times larger than that used in  
StarCoderBase. Compared to the initial version of The Stack, the version here contains many additional  
non-code sources (see Table 4). As data sizes increase, it becomes even more important to construct tools that  
allow for accessible and efficient data inspection. We update the “Am I in the Stack” tool with repositories in  
30https://github .com/valeriobasile/hurtlex  
34Table 20: BOLD evaluations of open source code models.  
Model Category Negative Score Neutral Score Other Score Positive Score  
Religious Ideology 0.16 0.33 0.13 0.38  
Profession 0.07 0.6 0.06 0.27  
StarCoder2-3B Race 0.05 0.5 0.05 0.5  
Gender 0.05 0.48 0.05 0.43  
Political Ideology 0.3 0.29 0.18 0.23  
Religious Ideology 0.12 0.32 0.12 0.45  
Profession 0.07 0.58 0.06 0.3  
StarCoderBase-3B Race 0.04 0.44 0.05 0.47  
Gender 0.04 0.35 0.05 0.55  
Political Ideology 0.3 0.27 0.18 0.25  
Religious Ideology 0.18 0.25 0.16 0.41  
Profession 0.08 0.57 0.06 0.28  
StableCode-3B Race 0.07 0.4 0.06 0.46  
Gender 0.05 0.36 0.06 0.53  
Political Ideology 0.32 0.27 0.18 0.25  
Religious Ideology 0.19 0.81 0.03 0.13  
Profession 0.08 0.52 0.07 0.33  
StarCoder2-7B Race 0.06 0.4 0.07 0.47  
Gender 0.06 0.37 0.07 0.5  
Political Ideology 0.33 0.22 0.21 0.24  
Religious Ideology 0.16 0.28 0.13 0.43  
Profession 0.07 0.56 0.06 0.31  
StarCoderBase-7B Race 0.05 0.41 0.06 0.48  
Gender 0.04 0.33 0.06 0.57  
Political Ideology 0.33 0.23 0.19 0.25  
Religious Ideology 0.16 0.27 0.14 0.43  
Profession 0.07 0.58 0.06 0.3  
CodeLlama-7B Race 0.06 0.42 0.06 0.46  
Gender 0.05 0.38 0.06 0.5  
Political Ideology 0.3 0.28 0.19 0.24  
Religious Ideology 0.15 0.33 0.13 0.39  
Profession 0.07 0.61 0.06 0.27  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B Race 0.05 0.46 0.05 0.44  
Gender 0.04 0.34 0.06 0.56  
Political Ideology 0.3 0.28 0.19 0.23  
Religious Ideology 0.21 0.22 0.16 0.42  
Profession 0.09 0.51 0.07 0.33  
StarCoder2-15B Race 0.07 0.39 0.07 0.47  
Gender 0.05 0.36 0.07 0.53  
Political Ideology 0.25 0.02 0.1 0.09  
Religious Ideology 0.16 0.31 0.13 0.41  
Profession 0.07 0.61 0.06 0.26  
StarCoderBase-15B Race 0.06 0.46 0.06 0.43  
Gender 0.04 0.38 0.06 0.53  
Political Ideology 0.32 0.28 0.19 0.22  
Religious Ideology 0.17 0.24 0.14 0.45  
Profession 0.07 0.54 0.06 0.33  
CodeLlama-13B Race 0.07 0.36 0.07 0.5  
Gender 0.05 0.35 0.06 0.53  
Political Ideology 0.3 0.23 0.19 0.28  
new dataset.31This tool allows for data inspection at the username and repository level. Marone & Van  
Durme (2023) recommend releasing a documentation artifact called a Data Portrait to support lightweight  
membership inspection. We implement one using Bloom filters to enable matching on file contents, crucially  
including the non-code sources like documentation, textbooks, and papers.32These prose data sources may  
31https://huggingface .co/spaces/bigcode/in-the-stack  
32https://stack-v2 .dataportraits .org  
35Table 21: WinoBias evaluations of open source code models.  
Model Male Female Average  
StarCoder2-3B 0.33 -0.33 0.27  
StarCoderBase-3B 0.42 -0.42 0.28  
StableCode-3B 0.44 -0.44 0.39  
StarCoder2-7B 0.45 -0.45 0.34  
StarCoderBase-7B 0.51 -0.51 0.31  
CodeLlama-7B 0.37 -0.37 0.38  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 0.41 -0.41 0.34  
StarCoder2-15B 0.36 -0.36 0.38  
StarCoderBase-15B 0.55 -0.55 0.35  
CodeLlama-13B 0.36 -0.36 0.37Table 22: HONEST evaluations.  
Model Score  
StarCoder2-3B 0.11  
StarCoderBase-3B 0.11  
StableCode-3B 0.09  
StarCoder2-7B 0.1  
StarCoderBase-7B 0.11  
CodeLlama-7B 0.11  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 0.1  
StarCoder2-15B 0.11  
StarCoderBase-15B 0.1  
CodeLlama-13B 0.1  
Table 23: Toxicity score evaluation of open source code models.  
Model Toxicity Score  
StarCoder2-3B 0.05  
StarCoderBase-3B 0.04  
StableCode-3B 0.05  
StarCoder2-7B 0.08  
StarCoderBase-7B 0.04  
CodeLlama-7B 0.04  
DeepSeekCoder-6.7B 0.05  
StarCoder2-15B 0.05  
StarCoderBase-15B 0.04  
CodeLlama-13B 0.04  
describe algorithms or solutions not present elsewhere. Content creators can use our system as a simple “no  
code” inspection tool to check if their material occurs verbatim in our data. It also enables a rapid first-pass  
attribution check for coding tools built on our models.33This system takes about 70GB, substantially smaller  
than the data, but provides only exact matches for long strings. If necessary, users can use the full search  
index for additional analysis.  
Search index The preceding tools provide lightweight data inspection. However, it may be necessary  
to perform full-text searches that support fuzzy matching and retrieval. Following StarCoder1 (Li et al.,  
2023), we build an Elasticsearch index on the source code subset of The Stack v2 and make it available at  
https://huggingface .co/spaces/bigcode/search-v2 .  
9 Social Impact and Limitations  
Social impact and limitations have already been documented in the BigCode project (Kocetkov et al., 2023;  
Ben Allal et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; BigCode collaboration et al., 2023). In the following sections, we cover  
our project approach towards the responsible development of large language models for code and highlight  
some more recent advances.  
33https://github .com/huggingface/llm-vscode  
369.1 Project Approach  
Open-science StarCoder2 is the output of a community research project. The project is conducted in the  
spirit of Open Science (Woelfle et al., 2011; Mendez et al., 2020), focused on the responsible development and  
use of Code LLMs. Through open-governance practices, 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 (BigCode collaboration et al., 2023).  
Ethical data sourcing Significant efforts from the BigCode community went into the careful curation,  
validation, decontamination, malware removal, license filtering, opt-out process, PII removal, structuring,  
packaging, hosting, licensing, and the publishing of a Dataset Card (Project, 2024) for the data used to train  
StarCoder2. Full transparency has been provided about the data used for training StarCoder2. A significant  
portion of the training dataset was sourced under license from Software Heritage (Software Heritage, 2024a).  
Accelerating research BigCode’s open approach to scientific collaboration (BigCode collaboration et al.,  
2023), open access model distribution and licensing (BigCode Project, 2023a; Malfa et al., 2023), and openness  
and disclosures of training data, architectures, and development are essential for the research community to  
have access to powerful, truly open LLMs, helping to accelerate future research (Groeneveld et al., 2024; Xu  
et al., 2024; Soldaini et al., 2024; Singh et al., 2024; Üstün et al., 2024; Luukkonen et al., 2023; Woelfle et al.,  
2011).  
Open, but responsible The BigCode Open RAIL-M license (BigCode Project, 2023a) contains important  
use restrictions and is accompanied by an FAQ to help guide the responsible deployment and use of the  
model by downstream users (BigCode Project, 2023b).  
Community of practice BigCode is very much a community of practice, with over 1,200 multi-disciplinary  
members from more than 60 countries working towards the responsible development of large language models  
for code (Sholler et al., 2019; Kocetkov et al., 2023; Ben Allal et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Muennighoff  
et al., 2024a; Zhuo et al., 2024). Of these members, 417 were active in the BigCode community collaboration  
tools within the period 27 October 2023 through 24 February 2024, the period aligning with StarCoder2  
development. There has also been considerable downstream adoption of BigCode outputs, with millions of  
downloads collectively reported via the Hugging Face API (BigCode, 2024).  
Auditable The StarCoder2 model, pre-training dataset, and supporting artifacts are easily accessible and  
available to anyone who wishes to conduct an independent audit (Solaiman, 2023; Mökander et al., 2023;  
BigCode collaboration et al., 2023).  
9.2 Advancements in Code LLMs  
Governance Card The BigCode Governance Card (BigCode collaboration et al., 2023) serves as an  
overview of the different mechanisms and areas of governance in the BigCode project. It aims to support  
transparency by providing relevant information about choices that were made during the project to the  
broader public and to serve as an example of intentional governance (Sholler et al., 2019) of an open research  
project that future endeavors can leverage to shape their own approach. The first section, Project Structure,  
covers the project organization, its stated goals and values, its internal decision processes, and its funding  
and resources. The second section, Data and Model Governance, covers decisions relating to the questions of  
data subject consent, privacy, and model release.  
Archival of software metadata: Software metadata is vital for the classification, curation, and sharing of  
free and open-source software (FOSS). The source code landscape is very diverse. By generating linked data  
and referencing source code contributions within the Software Heritage archive from the global community of  
developers and scientists (Heritage, 2024), there is potential to enable a more ethical data supply chain for  
training LLMs (Cosmo & Zacchiroli, 2017; Abramatic et al., 2018).  
37Acceptable ML use: On October 19, 2023, Software Heritage published a statement that defines the  
acceptable machine learning use of the Software Heritage archive. This is a significant milestone that opens  
the door for more responsible data sourcing and licensing of AI training data (Software Heritage, 2023).  
SoftWare Hash IDentifiers (SWHID): Software Heritage provides the SWHID unique identifiers,  
intrinsically bound to the software components, and that need no central registry, to ensure that a resilient  
web of knowledge can be built on top of the Software Heritage archive (The SWHID Specification Project,  
2024). This can also be used by downstream developers to support efforts for those companies that prioritize  
a “software bill of materials” (SBOM) as a key building block in software security and software supply chain  
transparency and risk management (Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency, 2024; Mirakhorli et al.,  
2024), for example by including the SWHIDs in the SBOM, alongside other relevant information such as  
component names, versions, licenses, and source locations.  
9.3 Challenges and Risks  
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.  
Privacy compliant generated code It is difficult to correctly identify and classify the different types of  
PII so that personal data processing, transformations, and flows through code can be evaluated (Tang et al.,  
2023). Where privacy-relevant methods are invoked in generated code, checking for PII leaks to the internet,  
use of encrypted data and anonymous IDs, will be necessary (Tang & Østvold, 2024). Downstream users are  
advised to implement additional PII scanning, filtering, cleansing, and mitigation to ensure compliance with  
their intended use cases (Yang et al., 2023; Albalak et al., 2024).  
Security As with any open scientific research that provides open access to model weights, hyper-parameters,  
data processing code, training code, training data, and documentation, any actor can run or fine-tune the  
optimized model with very low computing costs (Governance AI, 2024). Even with the use restrictions set  
forth within the BigCode Open RAIL-M license, this will not prevent bad actors with malicious intent from  
attempting to cause harm (Mozes et al., 2023). For example, code LLMs with API access could be used  
to create sophisticated polymorphic malware (CrowdStrike, 2024) that would be highly evasive to security  
products that rely on signature-based detection and will be able to bypass measures such as Anti-Malware  
Scanning Interface (AMSI) as it eventually executes and runs code (CyberArk, 2024; Gupta et al., 2023).  
Societal bias As has been previously established in evaluations of coding models, code LLMs can generate  
code with a structure that reflects stereotypes about gender, race, emotion, class, the structure of names, and  
other characteristics (Chen et al., 2021; Zhuo et al., 2023a). Further evaluation and guardrail mitigations are  
required in the context of downstream use cases (Huang et al., 2023; Dong et al., 2024).  
Representation bias As discussed in previous sections, there is a lot more data in the training dataset  
for popular programming languages like Python and Java than for niche languages like Haskell and Fortran.  
As such, the model performs better on such high-resource languages, which may reinforce the preference of  
developers towards using such languages. Fortunately, there’s much ongoing research on how to improve the  
performance of Code LLMs on low-resource languages (Cassano et al., 2023a; Zhuo et al., 2023b). Furthermore,  
38the predominant natural language in source code and other datasets used is English although other languages  
are also present. As such, the model can generate code snippets provided some non-English context, but the  
generated code is not guaranteed to work as intended or equally as well for all languages. This could limit  
the model’s fairness and effectiveness across different coding tasks and environments (Alyafeai et al., 2024).  
Traceability Using the SWHID to trace software components is not an easy task and will challenge most  
if not all, downstream developers. Future development and advancement of tools that make it easier to trace  
software components will be necessary to enable more transparent and responsible data supply chains (Cosmo  
et al., 2020).  
Job augmentation vs. automation Code LLMs serve as powerful foundation models that can be fine-  
tuned to generate high-quality code, documentation, unit tests, text summaries, automation workflows, and  
more. Chen et al. (2023) find a positive correlation between occupation exposure and wage levels/experience  
premiums, suggesting higher-paying and experience-intensive jobs may face greater displacement risks from  
LLM-powered software. Goldman Sachs (2024) suggest that AI has the potential to automate 25% of labor  
tasks in advanced economies and 10 – 20% in emerging economies, however, they also state that "those  
fears should be counterbalanced, since AI has the potential to create new job tasks or categories requiring  
specialized human expertise". Autor et al. (2022) reports that “Roughly 60% of employment in 2018 is  
found in job titles that did not exist in 1940.” and that "augmentation innovations boost occupational labor  
demand, while automation innovations erode it". Results from the task-based analysis in (World Economic  
Forum, 2024) reveal that jobs with the highest potential for automation of tasks by LLMs emphasize routine  
and repetitive procedures and do not require a high degree of interpersonal communication. Jobs with the  
highest potential for augmentation by LLMs emphasize critical thinking and complex problem-solving skills,  
especially those in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. Ziegler et al. (2024)  
reports the benefits of receiving AI suggestions while coding span the full range of typically investigated  
aspects of productivity, such as task time, product quality, cognitive load, enjoyment, and learning. In (Peng  
et al., 2023), a two-year collaboration between Google Core and Google Research (Brain Team), they find that  
of the 10k+ Google-internal developers using the code completion setup in their IDE, they measured user’s  
code acceptance rate of 25-34%. Yahoo Finance (2024) announced ServiceNow, Inc. (NYSE: NOW) 2024 Q4  
Earnings with coverage that the ServiceNow platform Now Assist skills using text-to-code (ServiceNow, 2024b)  
and text-to-workflow (ServiceNow, 2024a) LLMs (based on StarCoder), augment and increased developer  
productivity and speed of innovation by 52%.  
10 Conclusion  
We introduced StarCoder2, a family of LLMs designed for code generation, along with The Stack v2, the  
largest pre-training corpus for Code LLMs built on the foundations of the Software Heritage archive. The  
Stack v2 is ten times larger than its predecessor, yielding a raw dataset of 67.5 TB. Through extensive  
cleaning, filtering, and subsampling of the source code, along with the incorporation of other high-quality  
code-related datasets, we created a training set of approximately 3TB (900B+ tokens). Leveraging this  
new dataset, we trained StarCoder2 models with 3B, 7B, and 15B parameters. Our extensive Code LLM  
evaluations, assessing code completion, editing, and reasoning capabilities, revealed that StarCoder2-3B and  
StarCoder2-15B are state-of-the-art models within their respective size classes. By not only releasing the  
model weights but also ensuring complete transparency regarding the training data, we hope to increase trust  
in the developed models and empower other engineering teams and scientists to build upon our efforts.  
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53A Data Curation  
A.1 Excluded Extensions  
AL (al), AngelScript (as), AsciiDoc (asc), AspectJ (aj), Bison (bison), Boogie (bpl),  
C++ (<empty extension>), Cabal Config (project), ChucK (ck), CODEOWNERS (<empty extension>),  
Common Lisp (l, sexp), Common Workflow Language (cwl), CoNLL-U (conll, conllu), Cue Sheet (cue),  
CWeb (w), desktop (desktop, in, service), DIGITAL Command Language (com), DTrace (d), edn (edn),  
Elixir (lock), Factor (factor), GAP (g, gd), Gemfile.lock (lock), Gettext Catalog (pot),  
Git Config (gitmodules), GLSL (geo), Glyph Bitmap Distribution Format (bdf), GN (gn),  
Ignore List (dockerignore, eslintignore, gitignore, npmignore), INI (cfg, prefs, url),  
JAR Manifest (mf), Java Properties (properties), Jest Snapshot (snap), JetBrains MPS (mps),  
JSONLD (jsonld), LiveScript (ls), Makefile (d, make), Mathematica (cdf, nb), MAXScript (ms),  
mIRC Script (mrc), NASL (inc), nesC (nc), Nunjucks (njk), OpenEdge ABL (p, w),  
Pascal (<empty extension>, dpr, inc, pp), Perl (al, ph), PLSQL (pck, pls, tps, trg, vw),  
Protocol Buffer Text Format (pbt), Puppet (<empty extension>), PureBasic (pb), Racket (rkt, rktd),  
ReScript (res), reStructuredText (rest), Rich Text Format (rtf), Roff (<empty extension>, 1, 1d, 2,  
5, 7, 8, 9, in), Roff Manpage (<empty extension>, 1d, 2, 3d, 4, 6, 9, man), Scala (sc), Scilab (tst),  
SELinux Policy (te), Shell (env), Slash (sl), Smalltalk (cs), SmPL (cocci), SQL (tab), Standard ML (sig),  
Stata (ihlp, sthlp), SuperCollider (sc), SWIG (i), TeX (aux, ltx, toc), TOML (lock), Turtle (ttl),  
VBA (frm, frx), Vim Snippet (snippet), Wavefront Material (mtl), Wikitext (wikitext),  
Windows Registry Entries (reg), wisp (w), World of Warcraft Addon Data (toc), X BitMap (xbm),  
XML (kml, pt, resx, rss), XML Property List (plist, tmcommand, tmlanguage, tmsnippet, tmtheme), Yacc (yy).  
A.2 Excluded Programming Languages  
2-Dimensional Array,AGS Script,Bicep,Checksums,COLLADA,CSV,Diff,DirectX 3D File,E-mail,G-code,  
Gerber Image,Git Revision List,Gnuplot,Go,Checksums,IRC log,Jupyter Notebook,KiCad Layout,  
KiCad Legacy Layout,KiCad Schematic,Lasso,Linux,Kernel Module,Max,  
Microsoft Developer Studio Project,Microsoft Visual Studio Solution,Pickle,PostScript,  
POV-Ray SDL,Public Key,Pure Data,Raw token data,robots.txt,STL,SubRip Text,SVG,TSV,  
Unity3D Asset,Wavefront Object,WebVTT,X PixMap  
A.3 License detection  
license\_file\_names = [  
"li[cs]en[cs]e(s?)",  
"legal",  
"copy(left|right|ing)",  
"unlicense",  
"[al]?gpl([-\_ v]?)(\d\.?\d?)?", # AGPLv3  
"bsd(l?)", # BSDL  
"mit(x?)", # MITX  
"apache",  
"artistic", # Artistic.txt  
"copying(v?)(\d?)", # COPYING3, COPYINGv3  
"disclaimer",  
"eupl",  
"gfdl",  
"[cm]pl",  
"cc0",  
"al([-\_ v]?)(\d\.?\d)?", # AL2.0  
"about",  
"notice",  
54"readme",  
"guidelines",  
]  
license\_file\_re = re.compile(  
rf"^(|.\*[-\_. ])({’|’.join(license\_file\_names)})(|[-\_. ].\*)$", re.IGNORECASE  
)  
A.4 Permissive licenses  
SPDX-recognized license IDs 0BSD, AAL, Abstyles, AdaCore-doc, Adobe-2006, Adobe-Glyph, ADSL,  
AFL-1.1, AFL-1.2, AFL-2.0, AFL-2.1, AFL-3.0, Afmparse, AMDPLPA, AML, AMPAS, ANTLR-PD, Apache-  
1.0, Apache-1.1, Apache-2.0, APAFML, App-s2p, Artistic-1.0, Artistic-1.0-cl8, Artistic-1.0-Perl, Artistic-2.0,  
Baekmuk, Bahyph, Barr, Beerware, Bitstream-Charter, Bitstream-Vera, BlueOak-1.0.0, Boehm-GC, Borceux,  
Brian-Gladman-3-Clause, BSD-1-Clause, BSD-2-Clause, BSD-2-Clause-Patent, BSD-2-Clause-Views, BSD-3-  
Clause, BSD-3-Clause-Attribution, BSD-3-Clause-Clear, BSD-3-Clause-LBNL, BSD-3-Clause-Modification,  
BSD-3-Clause-No-Nuclear-License-2014, BSD-3-Clause-No-Nuclear-Warranty, BSD-3-Clause-Open-MPI, BSD-  
4-Clause, BSD-4-Clause-Shortened, BSD-4-Clause-UC, BSD-4.3RENO, BSD-4.3TAHOE, BSD-Advertising-  
Acknowledgement, BSD-Attribution-HPND-disclaimer, BSD-Source-Code, BSL-1.0, bzip2-1.0.6, Caldera,  
CC-BY-1.0, CC-BY-2.0, CC-BY-2.5, CC-BY-2.5-AU,CC-BY-3.0, CC-BY-3.0-AT,CC-BY-3.0-DE,CC-BY-3.0-  
NL, CC-BY-3.0-US, CC-BY-4.0, CDLA-Permissive-1.0, CDLA-Permissive-2.0, CECILL-B, CERN-OHL-1.1,  
CERN-OHL-1.2, CERN-OHL-P-2.0, CFITSIO, checkmk, ClArtistic, Clips, CMU-Mach, CNRI-Jython, CNRI-  
Python, CNRI-Python-GPL-Compatible, COIL-1.0, Community-Spec-1.0, Condor-1.1, Cornell-Lossless-JPEG,  
Crossword, CrystalStacker, Cube, curl, DL-DE-BY-2.0, DOC, Dotseqn, DRL-1.0, DSDP, dtoa, dvipdfm,  
ECL-1.0, ECL-2.0, EFL-1.0, EFL-2.0, eGenix, Entessa, EPICS, etalab-2.0, EUDatagrid, Fair, FreeBSD-DOC,  
FSFAP, FSFULLR, FSFULLRWD, FTL, GD, Giftware, Glulxe, GLWTPL, Graphics-Gems, GStreamer-  
exception-2005, HaskellReport, HP-1986, HPND, HPND-Markus-Kuhn, HPND-sell-variant, HPND-sell-  
variant-MIT-disclaimer, HTMLTIDY, IBM-pibs, ICU, IJG, IJG-short, ImageMagick, iMatix, Info-ZIP, Intel,  
Intel-ACPI, ISC, Jam, JasPer-2.0, JPNIC, JSON, Kazlib, Knuth-CTAN, Latex2e, Latex2e-translated-notice,  
Leptonica, Libpng, libpng-2.0, libtiff, Linux-OpenIB, LLVM-exception, LOOP, LPL-1.0, LPL-1.02, LPPL-1.3c,  
Martin-Birgmeier, metamail, Minpack, MirOS, MIT, MIT-0, MIT-advertising, MIT-CMU, MIT-enna, MIT-  
feh, MIT-Festival, MIT-Modern-Variant, MIT-open-group, MIT-Wu, MITNFA, mpich2, mplus, MS-LPL,  
MS-PL, MTLL, MulanPSL-1.0, MulanPSL-2.0, Multics, Mup, NAIST-2003, NASA-1.3, Naumen, NBPL-1.0,  
NCSA, Net-SNMP, NetCDF, Newsletr, NICTA-1.0, NIST-PD-fallback, NIST-Software, NLOD-1.0, NLOD-2.0,  
NRL, NTP, NTP-0, O-UDA-1.0, ODC-By-1.0, OFFIS, OFL-1.0, OFL-1.0-no-RFN, OFL-1.0-RFN, OFL-  
1.1-no-RFN, OFL-1.1-RFN, OGC-1.0, OGDL-Taiwan-1.0, OGL-Canada-2.0, OGL-UK-1.0, OGL-UK-2.0,  
OGL-UK-3.0, OGTSL, OLDAP-1.1, OLDAP-1.2, OLDAP-1.3, OLDAP-1.4, OLDAP-2.0, OLDAP-2.0.1,  
OLDAP-2.1, OLDAP-2.2, OLDAP-2.2.1, OLDAP-2.2.2, OLDAP-2.3, OLDAP-2.4, OLDAP-2.5, OLDAP-2.6,  
OLDAP-2.7, OLDAP-2.8, OML, OpenSSL, OPUBL-1.0, PHP-3.0, PHP-3.01, Plexus, PostgreSQL, PSF-2.0,  
psfrag, psutils, Python-2.0, Python-2.0.1, Qhull, Rdisc, RSA-MD, Ruby, Saxpath, SCEA, SchemeReport,  
Sendmail, SGI-B-1.1, SGI-B-2.0, SGP4, SHL-0.5, SHL-0.51, SHL-2.0, SHL-2.1, SMLNJ, snprintf, Spencer-86,  
Spencer-94, Spencer-99, SSH-OpenSSH, SSH-short, SunPro, Swift-exception, SWL, TCL, TCP-wrappers,  
TermReadKey, TPDL, TTWL, TU-Berlin-1.0, TU-Berlin-2.0, UCAR, Unicode-DFS-2015, Unicode-DFS-2016,  
UnixCrypt, UPL-1.0, Vim, VSL-1.0, W3C, W3C-19980720, W3C-20150513, w3m, Widget-Workshop, Wsuipa,  
X11, X11-distribute-modifications-variant, Xdebug-1.03, Xerox, Xfig, XFree86-1.1, xinetd, xlock, Xnet, xpp,  
XSkat, Zed, Zend-2.0, Zlib, zlib-acknowledgement, ZPL-1.1, ZPL-2.0, ZPL-2.1  
ScanCode-specific license IDs LicenseRef-scancode-{3com-microcode, 3dslicer-1.0, 4suite-1.1, accellera-  
systemc, adi-bsd, adrian, agere-bsd, alexisisaac-freeware, amd-historical, ams-fonts, anu-license, apache-patent-  
exception, apple-attribution, apple-attribution-1997, apple-excl, apple-sscl, aravindan-premkumar, argouml,  
arm-llvm-sga, array-input-method-pl, asmus, asn1, atkinson-hyperlegible-font, bakoma-fonts-1995, bea-2.1,  
beal-screamer, beri-hw-sw-1.0, bigdigits, bigelow-holmes, biopython, bitzi-pd, blas-2017, bohl-0.2, boost-  
original, boutell-libgd-2021, bpmn-io, brent-corkum, brian-clapper, brian-gladman, brian-gladman-3-clause,  
broadcom-cfe, broadcom-linux-timer, brocade-firmware, bruno-podetti, bsd-1-clause-build, bsd-1988, bsd-2-  
55clause-plus-advertizing, bsd-3-clause-devine, bsd-3-clause-fda, bsd-3-clause-jtag, bsd-3-clause-no-change, bsd-  
3-clause-no-trademark, bsd-3-clause-sun, bsd-ack-carrot2, bsd-artwork, bsd-atmel, bsd-axis-nomod, bsd-credit,  
bsd-dpt, bsd-export, bsd-innosys, bsd-mylex, bsd-new-derivative, bsd-new-nomod, bsd-new-tcpdump, bsd-no-  
disclaimer, bsd-no-disclaimer-unmodified, bsd-original-muscle, bsd-original-voices, bsd-plus-mod-notice, bsd-  
simplified-darwin, bsd-simplified-intel, bsd-simplified-source, bsd-top, bsd-top-gpl-addition, bsd-unchanged,  
bsd-unmodified, bsd-x11, bsla-no-advert, bytemark, can-ogl-alberta-2.1, can-ogl-british-columbia-2.0, can-ogl-  
nova-scotia-1.0, can-ogl-ontario-1.0, can-ogl-toronto-1.0, careware, carnegie-mellon, cavium-malloc, cc-by-2.0-  
uk, cecill-b-en, cern-attribution-1995, cgic, chicken-dl-0.2, chris-maunder, chris-stoy, classic-vb, clear-bsd-1-  
clause, click-license, cmu-mit, cmu-simple, cmu-template, code-credit-license-1.0.1, code-credit-license-1.1.0,  
codeguru-permissions, codesourcery-2004, commonj-timer, compass, componentace-jcraft, compuphase-linking-  
exception, cosl, cpm-2022, cpp-core-guidelines, crcalc, cryptopp, csprng, cve-tou, cwe-tou, cximage, d-zlib,  
damail, dante-treglia, dbad-1.1, delorie-historical, dhtmlab-public, dl-de-by-1-0-de, dl-de-by-1-0-en, dl-de-by-  
2-0-en, dmalloc, dmtf-2017, docbook, douglas-young, drl-1.1, dropbear, dropbear-2016, dtree, dwtfnmfpl-3.0,  
dynamic-drive-tou, ecfonts-1.0, egenix-1.0.0, ellis-lab, emit, emx-library, energyplus-bsd, epaperpress, eric-glass,  
errbot-exception, etalab-2.0-en, fabien-tassin, far-manager-exception, fastbuild-2012-2020, fatfs, fftpack-2004,  
filament-group-mit, flex-2.5, flora-1.1, font-alias, fpl, fplot, fraunhofer-iso-14496-10, free-art-1.3, freebsd-  
boot, freebsd-first, freemarker, fsf-notice, fujion-exception-to-apache-2.0, gareth-mccaughan, gary-s-brown,  
gdcl, geoff-kuenning-1993, ghostpdl-permissive, glut, good-boy, greg-roelofs, gregory-pietsch, gtpl-v1, gtpl-  
v2, gtpl-v3, happy-bunny, hdf4, hdf5, hdparm, hidapi, historical-ntp, homebrewed, hp-snmp-pp, html5,  
httpget, ian-kaplan, ian-piumarta, ibm-as-is, ibm-dhcp, ibm-icu, ibm-nwsc, ibm-sample, ibpp, icot-free,  
idt-notice, ietf, ietf-trust, ilmid, indiana-extreme, infineon-free, info-zip-1997-10, info-zip-2001-01, info-zip-  
2002-02, info-zip-2003-05, info-zip-2004-05, info-zip-2005-02, info-zip-2007-03, info-zip-2009-01, inno-setup,  
intel-bsd, intel-bsd-2-clause, intel-osl-1989, intel-osl-1993, intel-royalty-free, iso-14496-10, iso-8879, itu, ja-sig,  
jason-mayes, jasper-1.0, java-app-stub, jdbm-1.00, jdom, jetty, jgraph, jpnic-mdnkit, jpython-1.1, jscheme,  
jsfromhell, jython, kalle-kaukonen, keith-rule, kerberos, kevan-stannard, kevlin-henney, khronos, kumar-  
robotics, lcs-telegraphics, ldap-sdk-free-use, libgeotiff, libmib, libmng-2007, libsrv-1.0.2, lil-1, lilo, linux-device-  
drivers, linuxbios, linuxhowtos, llnl, logica-1.0, lucre, make-human-exception, matt-gallagher-attribution,  
matthew-kwan, mattkruse, mediainfo-lib, mgopen-font-license, michael-barr, michigan-disclaimer, mit-1995,  
mit-license-1998, mit-modification-obligations, mit-nagy, mit-no-advert-export-control, mit-no-trademarks,  
mit-old-style, mit-old-style-sparse, mit-readme, mit-specification-disclaimer, mit-synopsys, mit-taylor-variant,  
mit-veillard-variant, mod-dav-1.0, motorola, mpeg-iso, mpeg-ssg, ms-sspl, ms-ws-routing-spec, msj-sample-  
code, mulanpsl-1.0-en, mulanpsl-2.0-en, mulle-kybernetik, musl-exception, mx4j, netcat, netcomponents,  
netron, newlib-historical, newran, nice, niels-ferguson, nilsson-historical, nist-srd, node-js, nonexclusive,  
nortel-dasa, notre-dame, nrl-permission, ntlm, ntpl-origin, nvidia, nvidia-2002, nvidia-gov, nwhm, nysl-  
0.9982, nysl-0.9982-jp, o-young-jong, oasis-ws-security-spec, object-form-exception-to-mit, odl, odmg, ogc,  
ogl-1.0a, ogl-canada-2.0-fr, ogl-wpd-3.0, openmarket-fastcgi, openorb-1.0, opensaml-1.0, openssl, opml-1.0,  
opnl-1.0, opnl-2.0, oreilly-notice, oswego-concurrent, other-permissive, owtchart, ozplb-1.0, ozplb-1.1, paolo-  
messina-2000, paraview-1.2, patent-disclaimer, paul-mackerras, paul-mackerras-binary, paul-mackerras-new,  
paul-mackerras-simplified, paulo-soares, paypal-sdk-2013-2016, pcre, pd-mit, pd-programming, perl-1.0, peter-  
deutsch-document, philippe-de-muyter, phorum-2.0, php-2.0.2, pine, pngsuite, politepix-pl-1.0, ppp, protobuf,  
psf-3.7.2, psytec-freesoft, purdue-bsd, pybench, pycrypto, pygres-2.2, python-cwi, qlogic-microcode, qpopper,  
qualcomm-turing, quirksmode, radvd, red-hat-attribution, red-hat-bsd-simplified, reportbug, ricebsd, richard-  
black, robert-hubley, rsa-1990, rsa-cryptoki, rsa-demo, rsa-md4, rtools-util, rute, ryszard-szopa, saas-mit, saf,  
sash, sata, sbia-b, scancode-acknowledgment, scanlogd-license, scansoft-1.2, scintilla, scribbles, script-asylum,  
secret-labs-2011, service-comp-arch, sgi-cid-1.0, sgi-glx-1.0, sglib, shital-shah, simpl-1.1, softfloat, softfloat-2.0,  
softsurfer, sparky, speechworks-1.1, ssleay, ssleay-windows, stanford-pvrg, stlport-2000, stlport-4.5, stream-  
benchmark, stu-nicholls, sun-rpc, sun-source, sunsoft, supervisor, svndiff, swig, symphonysoft, synopsys-mit,  
synthesis-toolkit, takao-abe, takuya-ooura, tcg-spec-license-v1, tekhvc, tested-software, tex-live, things-i-  
made-public-license, tiger-crypto, tigra-calendar-3.2, tigra-calendar-4.0, tim-janik-2003, timestamp-picker,  
tso-license, ttcl, ttyp0, tumbolia, twisted-snmp, ubc, unicode, unicode-icu-58, unicode-mappings, unlimited-  
binary-use-exception, unpbook, us-govt-unlimited-rights, usrobotics-permissive, utopia, vcalendar, vince,  
visual-idiot, visual-numerics, vixie-cron, w3c-03-bsd-license, westhawk, whistle, whitecat, wide-license, william-  
alexander, wingo, wol, wordnet, wrox, ws-addressing-spec, ws-policy-specification, ws-trust-specification,  
wtfnmfpl-1.0, wxwidgets, wxwindows-u-3.0, x11-acer, x11-adobe, x11-adobe-dec, x11-dec1, x11-dec2, x11-doc,  
56x11-dsc, x11-hanson, x11-lucent-variant, x11-oar, x11-opengl, x11-quarterdeck, x11-realmode, x11-sg, x11-  
stanford, x11-tektronix, x11-x11r5, x11-xconsortium-veillard, xfree86-1.0, xmldb-1.0, xxd, yale-cas, yensdesign,  
zeusbench, zpl-1.0, zsh, zuora-software, zveno-research}  
Non-licenses The following contributor license agreements, warranty disclaimers, and other license amend-  
ments were not considered during license labeling: LicenseRef-scancode-{dco-1.1, generic-cla, google-cla,  
jetty-ccla-1.1, newton-king-cla, generic-exception, generic-export-compliance, generic-tos, generic-trademark,  
warranty-disclaimer}  
A.5 Pull Requests  
Table 24 shows the volume of PR renderings for various sequence lengths (measured in characters). We list  
the volume of the base files for the top 20 languages in Table 25.  
A.6 StackOverflow  
We used the following prompt to  
Below is an instruction from a user and a candidate’s answer. Evaluate whether or not the answer is  
a good example of how AI Assistant should respond to the user’s instruction. Please assign a score  
using the following 10-point scale:  
1: The response is entirely off-topic, contains significant inaccuracies, or is incomprehensible.  
It fails to address the user’s query in any meaningful way.  
2: The answer is largely irrelevant, vague, or controversial. It contains some elements that relate  
to the topic but misses the core of the user’s question or includes substantial misinformation.  
3: The response is somewhat relevant but remains incomplete or contains elements that are  
off-topic or controversial. Key aspects of the user’s query are left unaddressed.  
4: The answer addresses the user’s question to some extent but lacks depth or clarity. It may be  
somewhat helpful but is not comprehensive or detailed.  
5: The response is relevant and offers a basic answer to the user’s question but lacks detail or  
specificity. It’s helpful but not fully developed or insightful.  
6: The answer is moderately helpful and addresses most aspects of the user’s question. It might  
lack some depth or contain minor inaccuracies or irrelevant information.  
7: The response is quite helpful and addresses the user’s query well, but it might not be from an  
AI Assistant’s perspective. It could resemble content from other sources like blog posts or web pages.  
8: The answer is comprehensive and relevant, written from an AI assistant’s perspective. It  
addresses the user’s query effectively but may have minor areas for improvement in focus,  
conciseness, or organization.  
9: The response is almost perfect, providing a clear, comprehensive, and well-organized answer from an  
AI assistant’s perspective. It might have very minor areas for improvement in terms of engagement or  
insight.  
10: The answer is exemplary, perfectly addressing the user’s query from an AI Assistant’s perspective.  
It is highly informative, expertly written, engaging, and insightful, with no discernible areas  
for improvement.  
57Table 24: Volume of the pull requests dataset  
when we restrict the sequence length.  
Seqlen (characters) Volume (GB)  
25000 19.6  
50000 38.7  
75000 54.34  
100000 67.31  
200000 103.52  
300000 126.8  
400000 143.65  
500000 156.76  
600000 167.21  
700000 175.94  
800000 183.18  
900000 189.32  
1000000 194.58Table 25: Size of base files range of changes for  
top 20 languages in Pull Requests.  
Language Volume (GB)  
Python 13.46  
JavaScript 9.55  
Java 8.37  
Markdown 7.34  
C++ 5.89  
Go 5.59  
JSON 4.13  
TypeScript 3.96  
C# 3.76  
YAML 3.1  
XML 2.55  
C 2.34  
HTML 2.31  
Rust 2.27  
PHP 2.09  
Ruby 1.73  
project.pbxproj 1.51  
Scala 1.25  
TSX 1.2  
Swift 0.9  
Please write "Score: <rating>" in the last line, and then provide a brief reasoning you used to derive  
the rating score.  
A.7 Kaggle Notebooks templates  
We remove the following templates if they appear at the beginning of a Kaggle notebook:  
TEMPLATE\_1 = ’# It is defined by the kaggle/python Docker image: https://github.com/kaggle/docker-  
python  
import numpy as np # linear algebra  
import pandas as pd # data processing, CSV file I/O (e.g. pd.read\_csv)  
# Input data files are available in the read-only "../input/" directory  
# For example, running this (by clicking run or pressing Shift+Enter) will list all files under the  
input directory  
import os  
for dirname, \_, filenames in os.walk("/kaggle/input"):  
for filename in filenames:  
print(os.path.join(dirname, filename))  
# You can write up to 20GB to the current directory (/kaggle/working/) that gets preserved as output  
when you create a version using "Save & Run All"  
# You can also write temporary files to /kaggle/temp/, but they won’t be saved outside of the current  
session’  
TEMPLATE\_2 = ’# It is defined by the kaggle/python Docker image: https://github.com/kaggle/docker-  
python\n’  
58Table 26: Top 10 detected malware signatures.  
Signature Count  
Sanesecurity.Malware.28845.BadVBS 11876  
winnow.compromised.ts.jsexploit.5 2251  
Sanesecurity.Malware.26492.JsHeur 2247  
Sanesecurity.Spam.8879 1597  
Sanesecurity.Malware.25834.JsHeur 1560  
Sanesecurity.Malware.27112.JsHeur 1258  
Sanesecurity.Malware.26222.JsHeur 888  
Porcupine.Malware.52833 814  
Sanesecurity.SpamL.8887 792  
Sanesecurity.Malware.26557.JsHeur 728Table 27: Top 10 languages by the number of  
potentially malicious files.  
Language Count  
Text 13281  
HTML 11336  
JavaScript 10210  
VBScript 7947  
Logos 3283  
Markdown 2736  
Linker Script 1390  
XML 1260  
VBA 990  
JSON 547  
B Processing Pipeline  
B.1 Malware removal  
We show the top-10 detected malware signatures in Table 26 and the top-10 languages by potentially malicous  
files in Table 27.  
C Data Composition  
C.1 TheStackV2-train-smol  
•Configuration languages  
–Ant Build System  
–CMake  
–Dockerfile  
–Go Module–Gradle  
–INI  
–Java Properties–Makefile  
–Maven POM  
–TOML  
•Configuration files:  
–CMakeLists.txt  
–Cargo.toml  
–DESCRIPTION  
–Gemfile  
–Makefile  
–Makefile.am  
–NAMESPACE  
–Package.swift  
–Pipfile  
–build.gradle–build.gradle.kts  
–composer.json  
–conda.yml  
–configure.ac  
–docker-compose.yaml  
–docker-compose.yml  
–go.mod  
–package.json  
–pom.xml–pyproject.toml  
–requirements-dev.txt  
–requirements-prod.txt  
–requirements.in  
–requirements.test.txt  
–requirements.txt  
–setup.cfg  
–tsconfig.json  
–yarn.lock  
C.2 TheStackV2-train-full  
In Table 28, we summarize the data volume for the subsamples languages.  
59Table 28: Subsampling volumes for languages in the Stack v2 dataset.  
Final volume Languages  
200GB Java, JavaScript  
100GB HTML  
8GB CSS, Java Server Pages, JSON,  
SCSS, Smali, XML, YAML  
1GB BibTeX, Gettext Catalog, Graphviz (DOT),  
Java Properties, Roff, Roff Manpage,  
Web Ontology Language  
60