

MapCoder-Lite: Squeezing Multi-Agent Coding into a Single Small LLM

Woongkyu Lee¹ Junhee Cho² Jungwook Choi^{1*}

¹Hanyang University ²Samsung SDS
{lwghanyang, choij}@hanyang.ac.kr
junhee.cho@samsung.com

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have advanced code generation from single-function tasks to *competitive-programming* problems, but existing multi-agent solutions either rely on costly large-scale ($> 30B$) models or collapse when downsized to small open-source models. We present *MapCoder-Lite*, which upgrades a single 7B model into four role-specialised agents—retriever, planner, coder, and debugger—using only rank-32, role-specific LoRA adapters ($< 3\%$ extra parameters). Three lightweight techniques make this possible: (i) *trajectory distillation* from strong LLMs fixes format fragility in retrieval and debugging, (ii) *supervisor-guided correction* strengthens planning and coding agents, and (iii) *agent-wise LoRA fine-tuning* delivers memory-efficient specialisation. Comprehensive evaluation on xCodeEval, APPS, and CodeContests shows that MapCoder-Lite more than doubles xCodeEval accuracy ($13.2\% \rightarrow 28.3\%$), eliminates all format failures, and closes to within six points of a 32B baseline while cutting GPU memory and token-generation time by $4\times$. These results demonstrate that careful agent-wise fine-tuning unleashes high-quality multi-agent coding on a small language model.

1 Introduction

LLMs have revolutionized code synthesis, achieving near-perfect accuracy on function-level tasks like HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021) and MBPP (Austin et al., 2021). Research has now shifted to *competitive programming*, which demands efficient algorithms, robust implementation, and resilience against hidden test cases. Benchmarks like CodeElo (Quan et al., 2025) highlight significant challenges that have spurred the development of massive models, such as OpenAI’s o3 (OpenAI et al., 2025) and the 671 B-parameter DeepSeek-V3 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025b), which

dominate leaderboards despite their computational costs and proprietary nature.

To meet the cognitive breadth of competitive programming, recent research has shifted from monolithic prompting to *multi-agent code-generation* frameworks that allocate distinct roles to specialised language-model agents (Islam et al., 2024). These systems separate problem solving into discrete stages—algorithm selection, planning, coding, and debugging—enabling focused expertise and structured information exchange between agents (Huang et al., 2024; Hong et al., 2024; Islam et al., 2024, 2025). MapCoder (Islam et al., 2024) (Fig. 1) exemplifies this approach with a pipeline where specialized agents handle different aspects of problem solving, narrowing the gap between open-source and proprietary solutions.

However, multi-agent systems present two significant challenges. First, they are computationally intensive when using large models. Our MapCoder implementation with Qwen-2.5-32B on the CodeContests benchmark required 3,000 forward passes, each involving 70 GB of parameter loading, resulting in 27.5 hours of runtime on a single A100 GPU—far exceeding the cost of single-prompt approaches. Second, downsizing the agents to 7B models leads to a sharp decline in reliability (see Fig. 2): (i) format adherence breaks down, with frequent XML schema violations that halt pipeline execution; and (ii) role-specific performance suffers, yielding brittle algorithms, incorrect code, and ineffective debugging. Achieving a balance between competitive performance and computational efficiency remains a key open problem.

We address these challenges with *MapCoder-Lite*, the first multi-agent coding framework that drives a single 7B backbone—extended only by lightweight, role-specific adapters—to performance near that of 32B systems. *MapCoder-Lite* is built on three components:

*Corresponding author.




Figure 1: Overview of the MapCoder system. Given a natural language problem, the retrieval agent fetches relevant algorithmic knowledge, followed by the planning agent generating a solution plan. The coding agent implements the plan, and the debugging agent iteratively refines the code based on test outcomes.

- **Trajectory distillation from strong LLMs (Sec. 3.1):** For retrieval and debugging roles—where small models often fail—we harvest high-quality traces from Qwen-32B and DeepSeek-V3, filtered through execution tests to ensure format correctness and semantic accuracy.
- **Supervisor-aided cross-agent refinement (Sec. 3.2):** For planning and coding roles, we employ a supervisor model that identifies failures, provides targeted feedback, and regenerates problematic steps, creating high-quality training examples without human annotation.
- **Memory-efficient LoRA specialization (Sec. 3.3):** All agents share a frozen Qwen-2.5-7B backbone with role-specific low-rank adapters (LoRA (Hu et al., 2021)), adding <3% of the parameters of a 7B model while enabling independent fine-tuning.

We conducted a comprehensive evaluation on three representative competitive-programming suites—xCodeEval (Khan et al., 2024), APPS (Hendrycks et al., 2021), and CodeContests (Li et al., 2022)—and found that *MapCoder-Lite* leverages trajectory distillation, supervisor-guided cross-agent refinement, and rank-32 LoRA specialisation to boost xCodeEval accuracy from 13.2% to 28.3%, eliminates every XML-schema failure, and narrows the gap to a 32B MapCoder to within six points, all while cutting GPU memory and token generation time (time per output token) by 4×. These results demonstrate that careful agent-wise fine-tuning can unlock high-quality multi-agent code generation on small language models.

2 Background

2.1 LLMs for Competitive Programming

Large language models have already revolutionised *function-level* code generation: specialised vari-

ants such as Codex, Qwen-2.5-Coder, DeepSeek-Coder, and CodeLlama routinely achieve near-perfect scores on HumanEval, MBPP, and LiveCodeBench (Chen et al., 2021; Hui et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2024; Rozière et al., 2024; Jain et al., 2024). But recent community attention has shifted toward the far more demanding arena of *competitive programming*, where a model must translate a prose problem statement into a complete, time- and memory-efficient program that solves all hidden test cases. Datasets such as APPS (Hendrycks et al., 2021), CodeContests (Li et al., 2022), and xCodeEval (Khan et al., 2024) embody this shift: they assess full-program synthesis, algorithm selection, and constraint reasoning under the stringent standards of contest judging. Progress on these benchmarks now defines the “state of the art” for code-capable LLMs (OpenAI et al., 2025; DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025a), but their difficulty also exposes the limits of single-agent prompting, motivating the multi-agent systems discussed next.

2.2 Multi-Agent Code Generation

As competitive programming problems grow exceptionally in linguistic length and algorithmic subtlety, it is not uncommon for a single LLM prompt to miss hidden edge cases or violate the constraints of the competition. Recent work, therefore, turns to *multi-agent pipelines*, in which a set of specialised LLM agents collaborate under an explicit workflow (Huang et al., 2024; Pan et al., 2025). Among these systems, *MapCoder* (Islam et al., 2024) stands out with its attractive design that performs well in APPS and CodeContests. (Islam et al., 2024).

Fig. 1 illustrates MapCoder’s four-stage coding pipeline. A *retrieval* agent first queries a private corpus of textbook algorithms and returns a short, schema-constrained XML snippet that explains a candidate approach. Next, a *planning* agent expands this snippet into several step-wise execution plans, and a confidence score is generated for each

Model	Metric	Cost
Qwen32B	Number of problems	165
	Total runtime	27.53 hours
	Input tokens	5.08M tokens
	Output tokens	1.60M tokens
	Number of API calls	3,095 calls

Table 1: Resource cost of MapCoder using Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct on the CodeContests benchmark.

plan using XML format. Plans are sorted by confidence, and the top one is passed to a *coding* agent that writes full source code in the required language. Finally, a *debugging* agent compiles, executes, and patches the program until it clears all unit tests; if it fails, the loop backtracks to the next plan.

Role specialisation makes the pipeline *modular*: each agent faces a simpler, well-scoped sub-task, so errors can be isolated and corrected step-by-step, yielding higher overall accuracy than a monolithic prompt can achieve. The price of this modularity, however, is that the underlying LLM must possess enough *general* capability to perform four very different roles—retrieving algorithms, reasoning about plans, writing code, and fixing bugs—without losing coherence across stages.

2.3 Task-Specific Fine-Tuning

MapCoder relies on large-scale ($> 30B$), general-purpose LLMs at every stage, trading speed and memory for accuracy. Because each agent tackles a well-defined sub-task—retrieving algorithms, planning steps, writing code, or fixing bugs—a natural question is whether a single 7 B backbone can match MapCoder if it is fine-tuned *per role*. Fine-tuning smaller models has proved effective in other multi-agent settings (Zhao et al., 2025; Liang et al., 2025; Shen et al., 2024), and several studies have enhanced code-related abilities through supervised updates or parameter-efficient adapters (Fan et al., 2025; Tsai et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2024a). To our knowledge, however, no work has comprehensively studied how far role-aligned fine-tuning can push a small LLM inside a multi-agent pipeline for competitive programming.

2.4 Challenges

We identify key challenges in multi-agent code generation based on our implementation of MapCoder.

High Cost with Large Models. We evaluated MapCoder using the Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct model




Figure 2: Representative failure cases in 7B-scale models. (a) Format following error in the retrieval agent: the model fails to generate responses in the required XML structure, leading to format mismatches and processing errors. (b) Incomplete reasoning in the planning agent: a key step is omitted from the solution plan, resulting in failure to fully cover possible cases.

on the CodeContests benchmark, which comprises 165 competitive programming problems. As shown in Table 1, the system required 27.53 hours of runtime, processed approximately 5.08 million input tokens and 1.60 million output tokens, and made 3,095 API calls. This substantial resource usage stems from MapCoder’s multi-agent design involving four distinct agents and multiple iterations for planning and debugging. These results highlight the heavy runtime and memory burden of using large-scale language models (LMs) throughout the pipeline. We hypothesize that replacing each agent with a fine-tuned small LM can significantly reduce token-generation time and GPU memory usage, even with similar token and API call counts.

Failure Cases with Small Models. Fig. 2 illustrates typical failures when downsizing MapCoder’s model to a 7B scale.

- **Format Following Failures:** Multi-agent systems often rely on structured outputs in predefined formats. For instance, in MapCoder, the retrieval and planning agents must return XML-formatted responses with tags like `<root>`, `<algorithm>` and `<confidence>`. In Fig. 2(a), the 7B model inserts an extraneous `<description>` tag and omits the closing `</root>` tag, violating the expected format. Such structural errors disrupt downstream processing, as subsequent agents or parsers depend on well-formed inputs. These issues are

particularly critical in multi-agent pipelines, where format consistency ensures reliable coordination.

- **Low Role Performance:** Small models often struggle with role-specific tasks due to limited capacity. As shown in Fig. 2(b), the 32B model’s planning agent enumerates all relevant cases, demonstrating robust and comprehensive reasoning. In contrast, the 7B model omits a key sub-case involving the combination of multiple ticket types. Incomplete planning like this can yield incorrect solutions, even if individual steps seem plausible. Similar shortcomings appear in other roles: the coding agent may generate incorrect logic or indexing, while the debugging agent frequently fails to identify and correct bugs, leading to repeated failures across iterations.

To mitigate these issues, we propose task-specific fine-tuning to improve both format compliance and role execution, thereby enhancing overall code generation accuracy.

3 Methodology

To replace MapCoder’s 32B backbone with a memory-efficient 7B model while maintaining accuracy, we introduce a *role-aligned supervised fine-tuning (SFT)* pipeline that tailors one shared 7B backbone to four agents—retrieval, planning, coding, and debugging—via lightweight LoRA adapters. These changes present three specific challenges:

- **Role-specific data scarcity:** Public code-generation datasets provide ground-truth programs but lack datasets for retrieval queries, step-wise plans, and debug traces, hindering agent-wise supervision.
- **Cross-agent consistency:** Naïvely fine-tuning each agent in isolation overlooks inter-agent dependencies; a fix applied to one step can still fail downstream.
- **Parameter budget inflation:** Even if fine-tuning recovers agent-specific capability, storing four independent 7B checkpoints nullifies memory savings, approaching the original 32B footprint.

We address (i) by distilling high-quality *trajectories* from a strong LLM for retrieval & debugging,

tackle (ii) with a *supervisor* model that diagnoses end-to-end failures and regenerates only the faulty segment for planning & coding, and solve (iii) by sharing a single 7B backbone augmented with rank-32 *LoRAs*—adding $< 3\%$ parameters while preserving MapCoder’s modularity.

3.1 Strong LLM for Retrieval and Debugging

Observations. Two weaknesses repeatedly surface when the 32B backbone is replaced with a 7B model. First, the retrieval agent often violates the mandated XML schema or returns partial algorithm descriptions, so downstream agents cannot even parse its output. Second, the debugging agent fails to patch seemingly simple boundary-case bugs, leaving many programs one step short of success. Experiments with stronger LLMs such as Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct and DeepSeek-V3 show that these larger LLMs seldom make such mistakes, indicating that their trajectories can serve as high-quality supervision for smaller LLMs.

Challenges. Effective role-specific fine-tuning is hampered by two data gaps. (i) Public code-generation benchmarks provide only problem–solution pairs and contain no retrieval queries, step-wise plans, or debug traces; thus, no off-the-shelf corpus targets the intermediate process of the multi-agent coding pipeline. (ii) Even when synthetic trajectories are generated, many are noisy and fail the unit tests, so naïvely training on them would propagate errors rather than correct them.

Methods. Fig. 3 shows the proposed trajectory construction method. Our data pipeline begins by asking *strong LLMs*—Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct or DeepSeek-V3—to solve each coding task while explicitly printing the intermediate artefacts (i.e. *trajectories*) obtained from each MapCoder role. In one shot, the model emits an algorithm description for the retrieval agent, a step-wise plan for the planning agent, source code for the coding agent, and a patched version for the debugging agent. Because the same LLM generates the entire trajectory, the four outputs are mutually consistent and naturally aligned with their respective prompts.

To convert these raw trajectories into reliable supervision, we exploit the fact that MapCoder’s final objective—passing all the unit tests—is objectively verifiable. After executing the LLM-produced code, we keep the complete trajectory only if the program passes. This *pass-based filtering* eliminates noisy or partially correct traces without any manual inspection: a failure at test time almost




Figure 3: Illustration of trajectory construction for retrieval and debugging datasets. (a) When a strong LLM generates a complete solution that passes unit tests, the retrieval agent’s input-output pair is extracted as a training example. (b) To collect debugging data, a 7B model is used for planning and coding, and the strong LLM is used for debugging when the initial code fails. If the revised output passes, the debugging trajectory is added to the dataset.

Retrieval		Planning / Coding		xCodeEval
Dataset	Pass Filtering	Dataset	Pass Filtering	Accuracy (%)
-	-	-	-	11.32
Strong	-	-	-	16.04
Strong	✓	-	-	16.98
Strong	✓	Strong	✓	18.87
Strong	✓	Supervisor	✓	22.64

Table 2: Ablation study on data source and pass-based filtering for training retrieval, planning, and coding agents on xCodeEval. “Strong” refers to data generated by a large LM (e.g., Qwen2.5-32B, DeepSeek-V3), and “Supervisor” denotes data refined by a supervisor model after failure analysis.

always implies that at least one upstream artefact (faulty retrieval cue, flawed plan, or ineffective patch) is wrong, so discarding the whole sequence prevents error propagation during fine-tuning. The surviving set—about 2,200 retrieval examples and 4,200 debugging examples from APPS, xCodeEval, and CodeContests—forms a high-quality, role-aligned corpus that directly trains rank-32 LoRA on the shared 7B backbone. Empirically, models tuned on this filtered dataset regain XML-schema fidelity and bug-repair accuracy comparable to the original 32 B system while retaining the memory footprint advantages of a 7B model (see Table 2 for resulting accuracy enhancement).

3.2 Supervisor-Guided Planning and Coding

Observations. Even after the role-specific fine-tuning on strong LLM trajectories, the 7B planning agent still emits fragmentary execution flows, omitting edge cases, misordering steps, or drifting from the prescribed outline. Also, the coding agent continues to generate programs that compile yet collapse under the full unit-test suite. These *local*

errors propagate: an incomplete plan starves the coder of crucial hints, and a superficially correct program deceives the debugger until final evaluation. Table 2 confirms that this trajectory-only adaptation closes part of the gap but suffers from a noticeable accuracy loss. In contrast, Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct and DeepSeek-V3 produce structurally sound plans and largely correct first-pass implementations, indicating that stronger models possess global cues that the smaller model has not yet internalised.

Challenges. Despite the availability of agent-wise strong-model trajectories, two obstacles remain for high-quality fine-tuning. First, a locally tuned agent lacks *global awareness*: improving its own output does not guarantee end-to-end success unless that output is judged in context. Second, the *capacity gap* hinders direct imitation: a 7B model exposed to large-scale models’ plans and coding results may underfit or copy surface patterns without learning the deeper reasoning (phenomenon called capacity gap (Bansal et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2025)).

Methods. We propose a *supervisor-guided refinement pipeline* that supplies global feedback without enlarging the runtime model. As shown in Fig. 4, a 7B MapCoder first produces a complete retrieval→planning→coding trajectory. If the resulting program fails its unit tests, the entire trajectory is forwarded to a high-capacity *supervisor* LLM (DeepSeek-V3). The supervisor analyses the trace, pinpoints the agent primarily responsible for the failure, and issues concise, role-specific feedback, and only that agent regenerates its output. The revised trajectory is re-tested; once all tests pass, the final plan–code pair is added to the fine-tuning corpus.

Supervisor-guided refinement is applied selec-




Figure 4: Supervisor-aided data collection pipeline. When the final output fails, the supervisor inspects the full trajectory (including algorithm, plan, code, and test result), identifies the responsible agent, and provides targeted feedback to revise its output. If the revised result passes, the updated trajectory is added to the fine-tuning dataset.

FT Method	Trainable Parameters	Required Memory for Training (GB)	Accuracy (%)
FFT	7615.62M	45.69	18.87
LoRA	20.19M	15.35	22.64

Table 3: The number of trainable parameters, required memory for training, and xCodeEval accuracy of full fine-tuning (FFT) and LoRA methods with MapCoder-Lite 7B. Accuracy is measured only up to the coding stage, without debugging.

tively to trajectories where the strong LLM succeeds but the 7B model fails, minimizing generation overhead. The supervisor operates *only* during data generation, keeping inference lightweight. We store just the corrected agent input–output pairs, omitting the feedback itself, so the 7B model learns solely from information available at runtime. Crucially, every example in this corpus is produced and execution-validated by the 7B model, eliminating concerns about a capacity gap. Iterating over thousands of problems yields a dataset that aligns planners and coders with end-to-end success. Table 2 confirms that this strategy delivers a substantial accuracy boost.

3.3 Multi-Agent LoRA Fine-Tuning

To enable role-specific specialization in our multi-agent framework, we adopt an *agent-wise LoRA* approach. All four agents—retrieval, planning, coding, and debugging—share a frozen 7B base model, each paired with its own lightweight LoRA. These adapters are fine-tuned independently using pass-based-filtered and supervisor-guided trajectory distillation. This setup significantly reduces GPU memory usage during fine-tuning and supports modular training and deployment, allowing each agent to be updated without duplicating the full model. As shown in Table 3, LoRA significantly reduces the number of trainable parameters

and memory footprint, while achieving even higher accuracy than full fine-tuning. We attribute this accuracy gain in part to LoRA’s implicit regularization, which steers the model toward role-specific behaviors without overwriting core pretrained knowledge—a finding consistent with prior work (Hu et al., 2021; Houlsby et al., 2019).

4 Experimental Settings

Models. All agent-wise fine-tuning experiments use Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct as the base model. For comparison, we include larger models—Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct, serving as upper bounds to assess the effectiveness of our lightweight strategy.

Benchmarks. We evaluate models on three competitive programming benchmarks: xCodeEval (Khan et al., 2024), APPS (Hendrycks et al., 2021), and CodeContests (Li et al., 2022). For xCodeEval, we use the 106 problems from the compact program synthesis split. For CodeContests, we evaluate all 165 official test problems. We randomly select 150 test-set problems for APPS, following MapCoder (Islam et al., 2024). Each benchmark includes natural language problem descriptions with sample I/O and is evaluated using hidden unit tests. We also optionally report results on HumanEval and MBPP to assess generalization to function-level tasks.

Training Configuration. Each agent is fine-tuned using LoRA adapters with rank 32 applied to the linear modules for query, key, value, and output projection. Training is implemented with Hugging Face Transformers and PEFT libraries (HuggingFace), using a learning rate of $2e-5$, gradient accumulation of 16, and 3 training epochs. Hyperparameters were tuned individually per agent to ensure stable and consistent performance. All training experiments were conducted on a single

Method	xCodeEval (106)			APPS (150)			CodeContests (165)		
	Accuracy↑	Pass Count↑	Format Fails↓	Accuracy↑	Pass Count↑	Format Fails↓	Accuracy↑	Pass Count↑	Format Fails↓
Direct	18.87	20	–	4.00	6	–	1.21	2	–
CoT	5.66	6	–	4.67	7	–	3.64	6	–
Self-planning	9.43	10	–	1.33	2	–	3.03	5	–
Analogical	12.26	13	–	3.33	5	–	1.82	3	–
MapCoder	13.21	14	29	6.00	9	30	6.06	10	59
MapCoder-Lite	28.30	29	0	8.00	12	0	13.33	22	0

Table 4: Performance comparison of different methods using Qwen7B on xCodeEval, APPS, and CodeContests with Pass@1 accuracy (%). The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of problems in each benchmark.

NVIDIA A100 80GB GPU.

Evaluation Setting. We report pass@1 accuracy as the primary metric, reflecting whether the model’s top-1 output passes all test cases. All outputs are generated using greedy decoding for reproducibility and consistency with baseline evaluation.

5 Experimental Results

5.1 Effectiveness of Agent-wise Fine-Tuning

Table 4 compares the performance of a small LM (Qwen2.5-7B) across various single-agent prompt optimization methods—direct prompting, chain-of-thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2023), self-planning (Jiang et al., 2024b), and analogical prompting (Yasunaga et al., 2024)—as well as multi-agent approaches: MapCoder and our proposed MapCoder-Lite. Without fine-tuning, MapCoder shows only marginal gains over single-agent methods and even underperforms Direct prompting on xCodeEval (13.21% vs. 18.87%), despite using four specialized agents. This highlights the limitations of small LMs in multi-agent setups, where poor coordination and frequent format violations (as indicated by numerous format failures) prevent reliable end-to-end performance.

In contrast, MapCoder-Lite, with agent-wise fine-tuning, achieves substantial improvements across all benchmarks. On xCodeEval, accuracy more than doubles to 28.30%, outperforming all prompting baselines. Similar gains are seen on APPS (6.00% → 8.00%) and CodeContests (6.06% → 13.33%). Notably, fine-tuning eliminates all format failures, indicating that even small LMs can produce structurally consistent outputs when role-specialized. These results emphasize the critical role of agent-wise fine-tuning in realizing the full potential of small LMs in multi-agent frameworks.

5.2 Comparison with Larger Models

Table 5 compares MapCoder’s performance across backbone sizes from 7B to 32B (Qwen[7–32]B),

Model	xCodeEval	APPS	CodeContests	Memory	TPOT
Qwen7B	13.21	6.00	6.06	15.26	12.29
Qwen7B-FT	28.30	8.00	13.33	15.64	12.29
Qwen14B	28.30	10.00	15.76	29.58	23.36
Qwen32B	33.02	13.33	18.18	65.56	45.06

Table 5: Pass@1 accuracy (%) of MapCoder using Qwen models of different scales on xCodeEval, APPS, and CodeContests. Memory usage (GB) and Time Per Output Tokens (ms).

R	Agent			xCodeEval Accuracy (%)	Pass w/o Debug↑	Pass w/ Debug↑	Format Fail↓
	P	C	D				
-	-	-	-	13.21	11	3	29
✓	-	-	-	18.87	17	3	12
✓	✓	-	-	26.42	18	10	0
✓	✓	✓	-	24.53	24	2	0
✓	✓	-	✓	27.36	17	12	0
✓	✓	✓	✓	28.30	24	6	0

Table 6: Ablation study of per-agent fine-tuning contributions in MapCoder on xCodeEval. R, P, C, and D denote Retrieval, Planning, Coding, and Debugging agents, respectively.

alongside MapCoder-Lite—our fine-tuned 7B variant (Qwen7B-FT). Qwen7B-FT delivers a substantial accuracy boost over the untuned Qwen7B, matching the performance of Qwen14B and coming within six points of Qwen32B. This is particularly notable given that Qwen7B-FT requires only one-quarter of the GPU memory of Qwen32B, making it viable for deployment on memory-constrained edge devices (Karumbunathan, 2022). Moreover, the reduced model size yields a proportional speedup in token generation—LLM decoding being memory-bound—achieving a 4× reduction in time-per-output-token (TPOT), as measured using vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023). These results highlight that targeted fine-tuning enables small models to achieve competitive performance with dramatically lower cost.

5.3 Ablation Study

Contribution of Individual Agent Fine-Tuning.

Table 6 shows an ablation study evaluating the im-

Method	HumanEval (164 problems)				MBPP (397 problems)			
	Accuracy (%)	Pass w/o Debug \uparrow	Pass w/ Debug \uparrow	Format Fails \downarrow	Accuracy (%)	Pass w/o Debug \uparrow	Pass w/ Debug \uparrow	Format Fails \downarrow
MapCoder	70.73	105	11	14	67.51	244	24	68
MapCoder-Lite	82.93	120	16	1	84.63	305	31	0

Table 7: Evaluation of MapCoder and MapCoder-Lite on HumanEval and MBPP benchmarks.

pact of fine-tuning each agent in MapCoder on xCodeEval. Fine-tuning the retrieval agent alone improves accuracy from 13.21% to 18.87% and reduces format failures from 29 to 12, indicating better structural consistency. Adding the planning agent further boosts accuracy to 26.42% and eliminates format errors entirely, increasing both non-debug passes (17 \rightarrow 18) and debug-assisted completions (3 \rightarrow 10). Fine-tuning the coding agent (without debugging) raises non-debug passes to 24 but reduces debug-assisted passes to 2, since MapCoder only invokes the debugger when initial code fails sample I/O tests. Stronger code may bypass debugging entirely, leaving some errors uncaught. Conversely, fine-tuning the debugging agent (without coding) increases accuracy to 27.36%, with 12 debug-assisted completions—showing that an effective debugger can recover from weaker initial code. When all four agents are fine-tuned, overall accuracy peaks at 28.30%, with a strong balance between direct (24) and debug-assisted (6) completions. These results demonstrate that each agent addresses distinct failure modes and that coordinated fine-tuning is essential for maximizing end-to-end performance.

Evaluation on Simpler Coding Tasks. To evaluate generalization beyond competition-level programming, we compare MapCoder and MapCoder-Lite on two function-level benchmarks: HumanEval and MBPP. As shown in Table 7, MapCoder-Lite outperforms the baseline by significantly reducing format-related failures and achieving higher end-to-end accuracy. It improves both coding (increased passes without debugging) and debugging (even greater gains in passes with debugging), indicating enhanced reliability. These results suggest that MapCoder-Lite not only preserves generalization capability but also improves robustness on structurally simpler tasks.

Multi-Agent Tuning with Coder Model. We evaluate whether multi-agent code generation can be enhanced using a *code-specialized* language model (a.k.a. Coder model), such as Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct (Hui et al., 2024). As shown in Table 8, applying the multi-agent frame-

Model	Method	Accuracy (%)
Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct	MapCoder	5.66
	MapCoder-Lite	15.09
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	MapCoder	11.32
	MapCoder-Lite	22.64

Table 8: Comparison of MapCoder and MapCoder Lite using Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct. Accuracy is measured only up to the coding stage, without debugging.

work (MapCoder) and our fine-tuning strategy (MapCoder-Lite) to the Coder model does improve its performance, demonstrating that even domain-specialized models benefit from structured, role-specific tuning. However, despite these gains, the Coder-based pipeline still lags significantly behind our baseline model, Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct, both before and after fine-tuning. We attribute this gap to the Coder model’s limited general reasoning ability, which is critical for handling the diverse roles in multi-agent workflows, including retrieval, planning, and debugging, in addition to coding. In contrast, the general-purpose Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct model more effectively supports multi-agent coordination, and with our memory-efficient fine-tuning (MapCoder-Lite), achieves even higher end-to-end accuracy.

5.4 Case Study

To qualitatively assess the impact of agent-wise fine-tuning, we examine representative before-and-after examples for each agent. As illustrated in Appendix B, fine-tuning leads to notable improvements in algorithm retrieval, plan coverage, code correctness, and bug resolution. These examples highlight how each agent benefits from role-specific supervision, supporting the effectiveness of our fine-tuning strategy.

6 Conclusion

We introduced *MapCoder-Lite*, a multi-agent coding framework built on a 7B model with lightweight LoRA adapters. Through trajectory distillation, supervisor-guided refinement, and agent-wise specialization, it achieves competitive performance with lower cost. Our results show that small

models, when carefully fine-tuned, can match the reliability and accuracy of larger systems.

Limitations

Our framework relies on distilled trajectories from strong models like DeepSeek-V3 and Qwen2.5-32B, yet the fine-tuned 7B model does not fully replicate their performance. Rather than indicating a ceiling, this gap highlights opportunities to further enhance small models—potentially through architectural extensions, better training objectives, or reinforcement-based learning from distillation feedback.

In addition, the multi-agent structure introduces a wide design space for fine-tuning, as each agent has a distinct role and optimization goal. While we adopted a uniform tuning recipe across agents, this modularity also enables targeted specialization and co-training strategies in future work, suggesting that more adaptive tuning could unlock even greater performance.

References

- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, and Charles Sutton. 2021. [Program synthesis with large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2108.07732.
- Hritik Bansal, Arian Hosseini, Rishabh Agarwal, Vinh Q. Tran, and Mehran Kazemi. 2024. [Smaller, weaker, yet better: Training llm reasoners via compute-optimal sampling](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.16737.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, and 39 others. 2021. [Evaluating large language models trained on code](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2107.03374.
- DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, and 181 others. 2025a. [Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.12948.
- DeepSeek-AI, Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, and 181 others. 2025b. [Deepseek-v3 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.19437.
- Lishui Fan, Zhongxin Liu, Haoye Wang, Lingfeng Bao, Xin Xia, and Shanping Li. 2025. [Fait: Fault-aware fine-tuning for better code generation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2503.16913.
- Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y. Wu, Y. K. Li, Fuli Luo, Yingfei Xiong, and Wenfeng Liang. 2024. [Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming – the rise of code intelligence](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.14196.
- Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Saurav Kadavath, Mantas Mazeika, Akul Arora, Ethan Guo, Collin Burns, Samir Puranik, Horace He, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring coding challenge competence with apps](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2105.09938.
- Sirui Hong, Mingchen Zhuge, Jiaqi Chen, Xiawu Zheng, Yuheng Cheng, Ceyao Zhang, Jinlin Wang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, Chenyu Ran, Lingfeng Xiao, Chenglin Wu, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2024. [Metagpt: Meta programming for a multi-agent collaborative framework](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.00352.
- Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin de Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. 2019. [Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1902.00751.
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2106.09685.
- Dong Huang, Jie M. Zhang, Michael Luck, Qingwen Bu, Yuhao Qing, and Heming Cui. 2024. [Agentcoder: Multi-agent-based code generation with iterative testing and optimisation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.13010.
- HuggingFace. PEFT Library. <https://huggingface.co/docs/peft/index>. Website.
- Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Keming Lu, Kai Dang, Yang Fan, Yichang Zhang, An Yang, Rui Men, Fei Huang, Bo Zheng, Yibo Miao, Shuangruoran Quan, and 5 others. 2024. [Qwen2.5-coder technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2409.12186.
- Md. Ashraful Islam, Mohammed Eunus Ali, and Md Rizwan Parvez. 2024. [MapCoder: Multi-agent code generation for competitive problem solving](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4912–4944, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Md. Ashraful Islam, Mohammed Eunos Ali, and Md Rizwan Parvez. 2025. [Codesim: Multi-agent code generation and problem solving through simulation-driven planning and debugging](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.05664.
- Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. 2024. [Live-codebench: Holistic and contamination free evaluation of large language models for code](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.07974.
- Nan Jiang, Xiaopeng Li, Shiqi Wang, Qiang Zhou, Soneya Binta Hossain, Baishakhi Ray, Varun Kumar, Xiaofei Ma, and Anoop Deoras. 2024a. [Ledex: Training llms to better self-debug and explain code](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, pages 35517–35543. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Xue Jiang, Yihong Dong, Lecheng Wang, Zheng Fang, Qiwei Shang, Ge Li, Zhi Jin, and Wenpin Jiao. 2024b. [Self-planning code generation with large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.06689.
- Leela S. Karumbunathan. 2022. NVIDIA Jetson AGX Orin Series Technical Brief. Technical Report TB_10749-001_v1.2, NVIDIA Corporation. Version 1.2.
- Mohammad Abdullah Matin Khan, M Saiful Bari, Xuan Long Do, Weishi Wang, Md Rizwan Parvez, and Shafiq Joty. 2024. [XCodeEval: An execution-based large scale multilingual multitask benchmark for code understanding, generation, translation and retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6766–6805, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.06180.
- Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, Thomas Hubert, Peter Choy, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Igor Babuschkin, Xinyun Chen, Po-Sen Huang, Johannes Welbl, Sven Gowal, Alexey Cherepanov, and 7 others. 2022. [Competition-level code generation with alphacode](#). *Science*, 378(6624):1092–1097.
- Xuechen Liang, Yangfan He, Meiling Tao, Yinghui Xia, Jianhui Wang, Tianyu Shi, Jun Wang, and JingSong Yang. 2025. [Cmat: A multi-agent collaboration tuning framework for enhancing small language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.01663.
- OpenAI, :, Ahmed El-Kishky, Alexander Wei, Andre Saraiva, Borys Minaiev, Daniel Selsam, David Do-han, Francis Song, Hunter Lightman, Ignasi Clavera, Jakub Pachocki, Jerry Tworek, Lorenz Kuhn, Lukasz Kaiser, Mark Chen, Max Schwarzer, Mostafa Rohaninejad, Nat McAleese, and 7 others. 2025. [Competitive programming with large reasoning models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.06807.
- Ruwei Pan, Hongyu Zhang, and Chao Liu. 2025. [Codecor: An llm-based self-reflective multi-agent framework for code generation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.07811.
- Shanghaoran Quan, Jiayi Yang, Bowen Yu, Bo Zheng, Dayiheng Liu, An Yang, Xuancheng Ren, Bofei Gao, Yibo Miao, Yunlong Feng, Zekun Wang, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Yang Fan, Yichang Zhang, Binyuan Hui, and Junyang Lin. 2025. [Codeelo: Benchmarking competition-level code generation of llms with human-comparable elo ratings](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.01257.
- Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Ivan Evtimov, Joanna Bitton, Manish Bhatt, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Aaron Grattafiori, Wenhan Xiong, Alexandre Défossez, and 7 others. 2024. [Code llama: Open foundation models for code](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.12950.
- Weizhou Shen, Chenliang Li, Hongzhan Chen, Ming Yan, Xiaojun Quan, Hehong Chen, Ji Zhang, and Fei Huang. 2024. [Small LLMs are weak tool learners: A multi-LLM agent](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16658–16680, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yun-Da Tsai, Mingjie Liu, and Haoxing Ren. 2024. [Code less, align more: Efficient llm fine-tuning for code generation with data pruning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.05040.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2201.11903.
- Wenda Xu, Rujun Han, Zifeng Wang, Long T. Le, Dhruv Madeka, Lei Li, William Yang Wang, Rishabh Agarwal, Chen-Yu Lee, and Tomas Pfister. 2025. [Speculative knowledge distillation: Bridging the teacher-student gap through interleaved sampling](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.11325.
- Michihiro Yasunaga, Xinyun Chen, Yujia Li, Panupong Pasupat, Jure Leskovec, Percy Liang, Ed H. Chi, and Denny Zhou. 2024. [Large language models as analogical reasoners](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.01714.
- Yongda Yu, Guoping Rong, Haifeng Shen, He Zhang, Dong Shao, Min Wang, Zhao Wei, Yong Xu, and Juhong Wang. 2024. [Fine-tuning large language](#)

models to improve accuracy and comprehensibility of automated code review. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, 34(1).

Wanjia Zhao, Mert Yuksekgonul, Shirley Wu, and James Zou. 2025. Sirius: Self-improving multi-agent systems via bootstrapped reasoning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.04780.

A Details of Supervisor

Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 illustrate the operation of the supervisor used in our data curation pipeline. The supervisor receives the full execution trajectory of a problem, including the problem description, intermediate agent outputs (e.g., algorithm explanation, plan, code), and the result of test case execution.

As shown in Fig. 5, the input prompt explicitly instructs the supervisor to analyze the trajectory, determine which agent is responsible for the failure, and provide natural language feedback targeting that agent. The goal is to isolate the error at the correct stage (retrieval, planning, or coding), and produce actionable guidance that can be used to re-generate only the faulty component.

Fig. 6 shows a typical response from the supervisor. It correctly attributes the failure to the planning agent, explains why the plan is insufficient, and suggests how it should be modified. This output is then used to re-invoke the corresponding agent with additional guidance, creating high-quality training data without requiring human annotation.

B Improvements After Fine-Tuning

Fig. 7, 8, 9, and 10 illustrate representative improvements observed in the 7B model for the retrieval, planning, coding, and debugging agents, respectively.

In the retrieval example (Fig. 7), the pre-fine-tuned model incorrectly identifies the core algorithm as “Sliding Window” and includes unsupported tags like `<description>` within the `<algorithm>` block, failing to conform to the expected XML schema. After fine-tuning, the agent accurately identifies the algorithm (“Counting and Matching Pairs”) and outputs a well-structured XML response with all required tags properly closed.

In the planning example (Fig. 8), the original plan fails to capture key logical conditions (e.g., that the input must be both even and greater than 2). After fine-tuning, the agent successfully generates a plan that handles these conditions explicitly and correctly guides the coding agent.

In the coding example (Fig. 9), the unfine-tuned model incorrectly processes multiple input values on a single line, violating the problem’s input specification. Fine-tuning enables the agent to read inputs line by line, aligning its behavior with the expected input format and improving functional correctness.

Finally, the debugging example (Fig. 10) demonstrates how the unfine-tuned model fails to fix a bug caused by improper input parsing. The fine-tuned debugging agent correctly diagnoses the issue and proposes a revised plan and code that successfully passes all test cases.

These examples highlight the role-specific benefits of fine-tuning, improving not only task-level correctness but also structural and logical alignment across the entire pipeline.

You are an expert verifier in a multi-agent code generation system. The final code failed to pass the sample test cases. Your task is to carefully review the retrieved algorithm, plan, and code. Identify which part(s) were incorrect, and provide specific suggestions for improvement. Only include agents responsible for the mistake.

```

# Problem Description:
{verification_problem_desc}

# Retrieved Algorithm:
{verification_algorithm}

# Original Plan:
{planning}

# Generated Code:
\`
\`
{code}
\`
\`

# Test Log:
{test_log}

-----
Important:
- If a mistake in a later stage (e.g., Planning or Coding) was actually caused by a flawed output from an earlier stage (e.g., Retrieval or Planning), you MUST attribute the responsibility to the earlier one.
- For example: If the code fails because the plan was incorrect → Planning is responsible, not Coding.

- Your output MUST follow this strict XML format:
<root>
<responsible_agents>
<agent>Planning</agent> <!-- Or Retrieval / Coding / Multiple entries allowed -->
</responsible_agents>
<reasons>
<reason>Explain why this agent was responsible.</reason>
</reasons>
<suggestions>
<!-- Only include suggestions for the agents listed in <responsible_agents> -->
<suggestion target="\`Retrieval\`">Suggest improvement for Retrieval Agent.</suggestion>
<suggestion target="\`Planning\`">Suggest improvement for Planning Agent.</suggestion>
<suggestion target="\`Coding\`">Suggest improvement for Coding Agent.</suggestion>
</suggestions>
</root>

```

Figure 5: Prompt for the Supervisor.

```

<root>
  <responsible_agents>
    <agent><Planning></agent>
  </responsible_agents>
  <reasons>
    <reason><The planning agent incorrectly assumed that each team consists of 3 members (2 programmers and 1 mathematician or vice versa) and divided the minimum of a and b by 3. However, the problem requires each team to have exactly 4 members with at least one programmer and one mathematician. This flawed logic led to incorrect calculations for all test cases.></reason>
  </reasons>
  <suggestions>
    <suggestion target="Planning"><The planning agent should consider that each team must have exactly 4 members with at least one programmer and one mathematician. The correct approach is to calculate the maximum number of teams as the minimum of (a + b) // 4, a, and b. This ensures that the total number of students is sufficient for the teams, and there are enough programmers and mathematicians to meet the constraints.></suggestion>
  </suggestions>
</root>

```

Figure 6: Example response from the supervisor: identifies the flawed part of the plan and generates feedback.

Problem Description:

Ivan has a robot which is situated on an infinite grid. Initially the robot is standing in the starting cell (0, 0). The robot can process commands. There are four types of commands it can perform: U – move from the cell (x, y) to (x, y + 1); D – move from (x, y) to (x, y - 1); L – move from (x, y) to (x - 1, y); R – move from (x, y) to (x + 1, y). Ivan entered a sequence of n commands, and the robot processed it. After this sequence the robot ended up in the starting cell (0, 0), but Ivan doubts that the sequence is such that after performing it correctly the robot ends up in the same cell. He thinks that some commands were ignored by robot. To acknowledge whether the robot is severely bugged, he needs to calculate the maximum possible number of commands that were performed correctly. Help Ivan to do the calculations!



Retrieval (Qwen7B)

```
<root>
<problem>
...
</problem>
<algorithm>
The original problem can be solved using a combination of Sliding Window and Hash Map techniques.

The Sliding Window algorithm is a technique ...
</algorithm>
```

Wrong algorithm explanation, unclosed <root> tag



Retrieval (Qwen7B-FT)

```
<root>
<problem>
...
</problem>
<algorithm>
The algorithm used to solve the original problem involves checking the balance between the occurrences of certain pairs of commands ('U' and 'D', 'L' and 'R'). This requires counting the number of times each type of command appears and ensuring that they cancel out perfectly to allow the robot to return to its starting position.

Tutorial: Counting and Matching Pairs
...
</algorithm>
<root>
```

Correct algorithm tutorial and format

Figure 7: Improvement in algorithm tutorial and XML formatting by the retrieval agent after fine-tuning. The pre-trained model fails to identify the correct algorithm and generates an ill-formed XML response with an unclosed <root> tag. After fine-tuning, the retrieval agent provides a valid explanation based on matching command pairs and generates a well-structured XML block.

Problem Description:

One hot summer day Pete and his friend Billy decided to buy a watermelon. They chose the biggest and the ripest one, in their opinion. After that the watermelon was weighed, and the scales showed w kilos. They rushed home, dying of thirst, and decided to divide the berry, however they faced a hard problem. Pete and Billy are great fans of even numbers, that's why they want to divide the watermelon in such a way that each of the two parts weighs even number of kilos, at the same time it is not obligatory that the parts are equal. The boys are extremely tired and want to start their meal as soon as possible, that's why you should help them and find out, if they can divide the watermelon in the way they want. For sure, each of them should get a part of positive weight.



Planning (Qwen7B)

```
1. Check if the weight 'w' is even.
2. If 'w' is even, return "Yes".
3. Otherwise, return "No".
```

w must be even and greater than 2



Planning (Qwen7B-FT)

```
1. Read the input value 'w'.
2. Check if 'w' is greater than 2 and divisible by 2.
3. If true, print "Yes".
4. Otherwise, print "No".
```

Fine-tuned planning agent generates conditions correctly

Figure 8: Improvement in conditional logic by the planning agent after fine-tuning. The initial code fails to account for the edge case (w > 2) and only checks for evenness. After fine-tuning, the planning agent correctly generates the full condition required by the problem.

Problem Description:
 Nikolay has a lemons, b apples and c pears. He decided to cook a compote. According to the recipe the fruits should be in the ratio 1: 2: 4. It means that for each lemon in the compote should be exactly 2 apples and exactly 4 pears. You can't crumble up, break up or cut these fruits into pieces. These fruits – lemons, apples and pears – should be put in the compote as whole fruits. Your task is to determine the maximum total number of lemons, apples and pears from which Nikolay can cook the compote. It is possible that Nikolay can't use any fruits, in this case print 0.

Input Specification:
The first line contains the positive integer a ($1 \leq a \leq 1000$) – the number of lemons Nikolay has. The second line contains the positive integer b ($1 \leq b \leq 1000$) – the number of apples Nikolay has. The third line contains the positive integer c ($1 \leq c \leq 1000$) – the number of pears Nikolay has.

Output Specification:
 Print the maximum total number of lemons, apples and pears from which Nikolay can cook the compote.

↓
 Coding
 (Qwen7B)

```

python
def max_fruits():
  a, b, c = map(int, input().split())
  min_val = min(a, b // 2, c // 4)
  total_fruits = min_val * 7
  print(total_fruits)

max_fruits()
python
  
```

Input values
 should be read
 separately

↓
 Coding
 (Qwen7B-FT)

```

python
def max_fruits(a, b, c):
  # Calculate the minimum number of sets based on the limiting factor
  min_sets = min(a, b // 2, c // 4)

  # Calculate the total number of fruits used
  total_fruits = min_sets * (1 + 2 + 4)

  return total_fruits

# Reading input
a = int(input())
b = int(input())
c = int(input())

# Calling the function and printing the result
print(max_fruits(a, b, c))
python
  
```

Fine-tuned coding agent reads
 input values in the right way

Figure 9: Example of a coding error and its resolution after fine-tuning. The unfine-tuned agent incorrectly reads all input values from a single line, which violates the problem specification. After fine-tuning, the coding agent correctly processes line-separated inputs and computes the result accordingly.

```
# Problem:
Problem Description:
Nikolay has a lemons, b apples and c pears. He decided to cook a compote. According to the recipe the fruits should be in the ratio 1: 2: 4. It means that for each lemon in the compote should be exactly 2 apples and exactly 4 pears. You can't crumble up, break up or cut these fruits into pieces. These fruits – lemons, apples and pears – should be put in the compote as whole fruits. Your task is to determine the maximum total number of lemons, apples and pears from which Nikolay can cook the compote. It is possible that Nikolay can't use any fruits, in this case print 0.
Input Specification:
The first line contains the positive integer a (1 ≤ a ≤ 1000) – the number of lemons Nikolay has. The second line contains the positive integer b (1 ≤ b ≤ 1000) – the number of apples Nikolay has. The third line contains the positive integer c (1 ≤ c ≤ 1000) – the number of pears Nikolay has.
Output Specification:
Print the maximum total number of lemons, apples and pears from which Nikolay can cook the compote.
```



Retrieval,
Planning, Coding

```
python
def max_fruites():
    a, b, c = map(int, input().split())
    min_val = min(a, b // 2, c // 4)
    total_fruites = 7 * min_val
    print(total_fruites)

max_fruites()
```

Input values
should be read
separately

Debugging
(Qwen7B-FT)



Debugging
(Qwen7B)

```
## Modified Planning:
1. Read Input: Take three integers as input representing the number of lemons, apples, and pears.
2. Calculate Maximum Sets: Determine the maximum number of complete sets of 1 lemon, 2 apples, and 4 pears that can be formed. This is determined by the minimum value among `a // 1`, `b // 2`, and `c // 4`.
3. Compute Total Fruits: Calculate the total number of fruits used based on the maximum number of complete sets.
4. Output Result: Print the total number of fruits used.

## Code:
python
def max_fruites():
    # Read input values for lemons, apples, and pears
    a, b, c = map(int, input().split())

    # Calculate the maximum number of complete sets
    min_val = min(a, b // 2, c // 4)

    # Compute the total number of fruits used
    total_fruites = 7 * min_val

    # Output the total number of fruits used
    print(total_fruites)

# Call the function and take input
max_fruites()
```

Fail to identify the
problem

Modified Planning:

After analyzing the error message, it becomes clear that the issue arises because the input is not being read correctly. Each line of input needs to be processed separately, and the input should be read line by line rather than trying to parse everything at once. We need to read each line individually and process the values accordingly.

Here's the revised plan:

1. Read the first line containing the number of lemons.
2. Read the second line containing the number of apples.
3. Read the third line containing the number of pears.
4. For each set of inputs, calculate the minimum value among the quotients obtained by dividing the respective fruit counts by their required quantities in the ratio (i.e., lemons by 1, apples by 2, and pears by 4).
5. Compute the total number of fruits used based on the minimum value calculated.
6. Print the result for each set of inputs.

This approach ensures that the input is read correctly and processed line by line, avoiding the issues seen before.

Python3 Code:

```
python
def max_fruites():
    # Reading input values for lemons, apples, and pears
    a = int(input().strip()) # Number of lemons
    b = int(input().strip()) # Number of apples
    c = int(input().strip()) # Number of pears

    # Calculating the minimum value among the quotients
    min_val = min(a, b // 2, c // 4)

    # Computing the total number of fruits used
    total_fruites = 7 * min_val

    # Printing the result
    print(total_fruites)

# Calling the function to execute
max_fruites()
```

Debugging
success

Figure 10: Example of a debugging failure and recovery in the MapCoder pipeline. The initial plan and code fail to address the problem due to incorrect input parsing. After the debugging agent identifies the issue, the revised plan introduces line-by-line input reading, which successfully resolves the error.