

# 1 Incoherence-Based Experiment Analysis

This report presents a statistical analysis of the model’s performance across tasks, focusing on the relationship between incoherence scores (Incoherence) and execution errors (Error).

Number of tasks analyzed: 818

## 2 Introduction

This report summarizes the results of an automatic evaluation of code generation using the following configuration parameters.

Parameter	Value
Language Model	llama_4_maverick_17b
Temperature	0.2
$m$ (number of candidates)	50
$n$ (number of samples used to estimate metrics)	1000
Timeout per metric estimation (s)	60.0

The model was tested across a suite of programming tasks. We aim to explore how the model’s incoherence signal relates to execution-time failures.

### 2.1 Summary Statistics

Metric	Mean	Std	Min	Max
Raw Incoherence	0.047	0.130	0.000	0.817
Raw Error	0.289	0.381	0.000	1.000

### 2.2 Error Detection Analysis

Metric	Value
Errors (Error > 0)	474
Error Rate	57.95%
Detected Errors (Error > 0 and Incoherence > 0)	190
Detection Rate	40.08%
Confident (Incoherence = 0)	625
Confident Error Count	284
Confident Error Rate	45.44%
Mean Error When Confident	0.2279

## 2.3 Correlation Analysis

Metric	Pearson r	Pearson p	Spearman $\rho$	Spearman p
Incoherence vs Error	0.338	2.527e-23	0.411	1.219e-34

## 2.4 Bubble Plot of Incoherence and Error

This plot shows the density of (Incoherence, Error) points using bubble size to indicate frequency.




Figure 1: Bubble Plot: Incoherence vs Error

## 2.5 Log-Log Plot of Incoherence and Error

This plot displays the relationship between Incoherence and Error in log-log scale. Only data points where both values are strictly positive are included.




Figure 2: Log-Log Scatter Plot: Incoherence vs Error