

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: 412

2 Introduction

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

Parameter	Value
Language Model	llama_3_1_8b_instruct
Temperature	0.6
\$m\$ (number of candidates)	10
\$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	0.290	0.268	0.000	0.968
Raw Error	0.387	0.362	0.000	1.000

2.2 Error Detection Analysis

Metric	Value
Errors (Error > 0)	353
Error Rate	85.68%
Detected Errors (Error > 0 and Incoherence > 0)	336
Detection Rate	95.18%
Confident (Incoherence = 0)	75
Confident Error Count	17
Confident Error Rate	22.67%
Mean Error When Confident	0.1092

2.3 Correlation Analysis

Metric	Pearson r	Pearson p	Spearman ρ	Spearman p
Incoherence vs Error	0.640	9.015e-49	0.712	5.029e-65

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