

TReB: A Comprehensive Benchmark for Evaluating Table Reasoning Capabilities of Large Language Models

Ce Li
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
lice@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Xiaofan Liu
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
liuxiaofan@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Zhiyan Song
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
songzhiyan@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Ce Chi
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
chice@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Boshen Shi
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
shiboshen@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Chen Zhao
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
zhaochen@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Guanguang Chang
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
changguanguang@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Zhendong Wang
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
wangzhendong@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Kexin Yang
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
yangkexin@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Xing Wang*
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
wangxing@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Chao Deng
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
dengchao@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Junlan Feng*
JIUTIAN Research
Beijing, China
fengjunlan@cmjt.chinamobile.com

Abstract

The majority of data in businesses and industries is stored in tables, databases, and data warehouses. Reasoning with table-structured data poses significant challenges for large language models (LLMs) due to its hidden semantics, inherent complexity, and structured nature. One of these challenges is lacking an effective evaluation benchmark fairly reflecting the performances of LLMs on broad table reasoning abilities. In this paper, we fill in this gap by presenting a comprehensive table reasoning benchmark, TReB. Firstly, we propose a taxonomy to systematically measure both shallow table understanding abilities and deep table reasoning abilities, covering a total of 26 sub-tasks. We then construct a high quality dataset through a dedicated data processing and synthesis procedure. Based on these well-constructed samples, we design an evaluation framework to robustly measure table reasoning capabilities with three distinct inference modes. Experimental results with our data and framework reveal that existing LLMs still have significant room for improvement in addressing the complex and real world table related tasks. Both the dataset and evaluation framework are publicly available, with the dataset hosted on huggingface.co/datasets/JT-LM/JIUTIAN-TReB, and the framework on github.com/JT-LM/jiutian-treb.

*Corresponding Author

CCS Concepts

• Information systems → Data mining.

Keywords

Table Reasoning; Benchmark; LLM Evaluation

ACM Reference Format:

Ce Li, Xiaofan Liu, Zhiyan Song, Ce Chi, Boshen Shi, Chen Zhao, Guanguang Chang, Zhendong Wang, Kexin Yang, Xing Wang, Chao Deng, and Junlan Feng. 2026. TReB: A Comprehensive Benchmark for Evaluating Table Reasoning Capabilities of Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 49th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '26)*, July 20–24, 2026, Melbourne, VIC, Australia. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3805712.3808617>

1 Introduction

Table reasoning refers to the core capability of a model to interpret, manipulate, and deduce insights from tabular data through logical operations [43]. It is prominent in the field of natural language processing [24], and has huge potentials in real-world applications such as Business Intelligence and Healthcare [7]. Traditional approaches mostly focus on encoding the semantics of tables through structure embeddings and attention mechanisms, enabling pretrained models to better understand the content of tabular data [20, 28, 45]. In recent years, the advent of large language models (LLMs), like GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 [1, 2], has redefined the paradigm of table reasoning methodology. Instead of relying solely on table semantic embeddings, LLMs leverage prompt engineering, external tools such as SQL and Python [4, 30], and complex reasoning techniques such as chain-of-thought (CoT) [34] to understand and analyze the tabular



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. *SIGIR '26, Melbourne, VIC, Australia*
© 2026 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-2599-9/2026/07
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3805712.3808617>

data. These developments have demonstrated the remarkable reasoning capability of LLMs to perform table-related data analysis, even without task-specific modifications.

Owing to the growing potential of LLMs in analyzing tabular data, several benchmarks, such as TableBench [35] and RealTableBench [28], have been developed to evaluate their reasoning capabilities. These benchmarks evaluate LLMs across multiple dimensions, including information retrieval, structural understanding, and numerical computation. Despite recent advancements, comprehensively evaluating the table-reasoning capabilities of LLMs is still challenging due to three critical reasons:

First, existing benchmarks lack a systematic taxonomy that integrates the complete workflow of a human data analyst. While prior works incorporate some basic task categorization, they fall short in modeling professional analysis skills — spanning from foundational structural understanding and precise table operations to advanced complex multi-step analysis. This deficiency limits both comprehensive capability assessment and clear error attribution.

Second, existing datasets often lack sufficient quality and real-world complexity. We assess dataset quality via label accuracy, structural integrity, and semantic consistency. Existing benchmarks contain 15%-30% noisy samples due to insufficient cleaning. For real-world complexity, we measure via table scale, reasoning steps, and domain authenticity. Existing data uses small tables (<50 rows, <5 columns) with single-step reasoning, failing to match enterprise-level tabular data analysis scenarios. Consequently, these datasets fail to challenge models with the deep, multi-step analysis typical of real-world applications.

Third, existing evaluation frameworks mainly rely on textual inference, where tables are provided in Markdown and models produce answers in free-form text. However, traditional textual inference can not match the rigorous demands of tabular data analysis, leading to frequent hallucinations. It is inherently error-prone for structured data analysis requiring heavy computation and mathematical modeling. In practice, it is typically instantiated as textual Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [34], while executable paradigms—such as Program-of-Thought (PoT) [5] and tool-integrated iterative reasoning—remain underexplored, even though they can improve precision by grounding results in code execution rather than probabilistic text generation. Consequently, existing evaluation frameworks cannot fully assess an LLM’s ability to function as a reliable, tool-using agent in authentic analytical workflows.

To address these challenges, we introduce **TReB**, a comprehensive benchmark designed to standardize the assessment of table reasoning. Our core contributions are threefold:

(1) **Hierarchical Taxonomy for Systematic Assessment:**

We propose a fine-grained taxonomy that structures table reasoning into 6 core skills and 26 subtasks, mapping the complete analytical workflow from fundamental *Natural Language Understanding* to tabular *Advanced Data Analysis*. Unlike monolithic evaluations, this hierarchical design mirrors the workflow of professional data analysts, enabling precise error attribution and diagnostic insights into an LLM’s specific capabilities.

(2) **Full-Spectrum Data Construction:** To ensure comprehensive coverage of our taxonomy, we construct a high-quality

dataset of 7,790 instances through a hybrid strategy. This includes the rigorous cleaning of multi-source open data (filtering for structure and semantics) and the targeted generation of synthetic data via Rule-based and LLM-based pipelines to fill coverage gaps. This approach guarantees diversity in both task complexity and reasoning paradigms.

(3) **Scalable & Robust Evaluation Framework:** We establish a configuration-driven framework that streamlines large-scale assessment via batch inference. Crucially, it integrates diverse inference paradigms to match task requirements: Textual Chain-of-Thought (TCoT), Program-of-Thought (PoT), and Interleaved CoT (ICoT) — a ReAct-style [41] approach that dynamically alternates between textual analysis and code execution to solve complex, multi-step problems. For judging predictions, it employs a robust LLM-as-a-Judge mechanism, which utilizes a granular 0–10 scale to objectively evaluate the correctness of answers, overcoming the limitations of rigid string-matching metrics.

In summary, this work systematizes table reasoning by proposing a fine-grained capability taxonomy. Based on this foundation, we introduce a holistic open-source suite comprising a high-quality dataset¹ and an extensible evaluation framework². Furthermore, to facilitate fair competition, we maintain a blind test leaderboard³ where ground truth is withheld. These contributions aim to standardize benchmarks and accelerate the development of generalizable table reasoning models.

2 Dataset

In this section, we first propose a hierarchical taxonomy of table reasoning capabilities. Building upon the above taxonomy, we describe our data construction pipeline, which integrates (i) curated high-quality instances obtained via systematic filtering and cleansing of open-source datasets, and (ii) synthesized examples designed to improve both the quantity and quality of the data.

2.1 Table Reasoning Taxonomy

Existing evaluations for table reasoning predominantly rely on single-task datasets or limited multi-task benchmarks, failing to capture the full breadth of LLM capabilities [7, 24, 43]. Furthermore, real-world tabular tasks require a progression from atomic operations to composite logic. By structuring the evaluation from *Basic Understanding* to *Operational Execution* and finally to *Insight Generation*, our taxonomy mirrors the human cognitive workflow of data analysis. Motivated by this process, we propose a fine-grained hierarchical taxonomy that structures table reasoning into a comprehensive capability spectrum. As detailed in Table 1, this taxonomy ranges from fundamental language understanding to advanced data analysis, encompassing 6 core skills and 26 distinct subtasks.

- **Natural Language Understanding (NLU):** Evaluates foundational language skills required for tabular reasoning, including instruction following, robustness to perturbations, coding, math, etc.

¹<https://huggingface.co/datasets/JT-LM/JIUTIAN-TReB>

²<https://github.com/JT-LM/jiutian-treb>

³<https://jt-lm.github.io/jiutian-treb>

Table 1: Taxonomy

Core Skill	Subtask	Task Description	Number of Data
NLU	Understanding	Evaluates LLMs’ semantic comprehension capabilities	500
	Instruction Following	Assesses LLMs’ ability to follow instructions	90
	Hallucination Evaluation	Measures LLMs’ tendency to generate false information	500
	Robustness Evaluation	Tests LLMs’ stability under varied inputs	500
	Code Generation	Evaluates LLMs’ ability to generate functional code	500
	Mathematical Reasoning	Assesses numerical reasoning capabilities	500
TU	Table Retrieval	Tests information retrieval from tabular data with/without prompts	500
	Table Summary	Evaluates generation of descriptive text from tables	500
	Table Column Naming	Assesses ability to infer column names from data	500
	Table Title Naming	Evaluates generation of concise table titles	500
	Table Fact Checking	Tests table comprehension and logical reasoning	500
	Table Plausibility Verification	Assesses table content validity using prior knowledge	15
TBO	Table Query	Evaluates precise and fuzzy query capabilities on tabular data	500
	Table Selection	Tests table reasoning filtering (exact and semantic-based)	500
TCO	Table General Operations	Assesses basic statistical computations on tables	500
	Table Domain-Specific Operations	Evaluates domain-specific formula applications	239
DA	Table Outlier Detection	Tests identification of anomalous data points	43
	Table Correlation Analysis	Evaluates inter-column relationship analysis	63
	Table Hypothesis Testing	Assesses statistical testing capabilities	42
	Table Distribution Testing	Evaluates probability distribution analysis	500
ADA	Multi-step Retrieval	Tests multi-step computation and information retrieval	49
	Multi-step Fact Checking	Evaluates multi-step fact verification	61
	Multi-step Operations	Assesses complex table-based calculations	61
	Multi-step Correlation Analysis	Tests advanced correlation analysis	49
	Multi-step Hypothesis Testing	Evaluates complex hypothesis testing	61
	Multi-step Conditional Calculation	Assesses conditional computations based on derived tables	17

- **Table Understanding (TU):** Assesses structural grasp of tabular data, focusing on schema inference (e.g., column naming), content summarization, and factual verification of table entries.
- **Table-Based Operations (TBO):** Tests the ability to perform precise information retrieval and filtering (row/column selection) based on both exact and fuzzy query constraints.
- **Table Calculation Operations (TCO):** Examines numerical reasoning skills, ranging from fundamental statistical computations to the application of domain-specific formulas.
- **Data Analysis (DA):** Focuses on deriving analytical insights from data distributions, including outlier detection, correlation analysis, and statistical hypothesis testing.
- **Advanced Data Analysis (ADA):** Challenges the model with complex, multi-step reasoning tasks that require logical planning to execute composite operations (e.g., multi-step retrieval and conditional calculations).

In summary, this hierarchical taxonomy moves beyond flat metrics to disentangle atomic capabilities. It transforms evaluation from a black-box assessment into a structured inquiry.

2.2 Open-source Data Collection

To rigorously evaluate models under our taxonomy, we first collect public datasets from multiple sources. This ensures the coverage across most of the capability spectrum, from atomic semantic understanding to tabular reasoning. In particular, we design a construction pipeline including capability-aligned acquisition followed by a rigorous cleaning protocol.

Firstly, to assess the fundamental natural language understanding layer of the taxonomy, we curated 59,901 instances from ten representative datasets [9, 15, 18, 21–23, 26, 31, 33, 46]. Post-processing included deduplication, format normalization, and English-Chinese bilingual translation to ensure linguistic diversity.

Then, to further support the tabular reasoning, we harvested over 2 million raw samples via a hybrid strategy of keyword retrieval and manual curation spanning two decades of literature (e.g., Web of Science, Google Scholar). We targeted keywords such as “table structure recognition”, “cell-level QA”, and “table fact checking”. After filtering for representativeness and format compatibility (Markdown/HTML/CSV), we integrated 29 canonical benchmarks (e.g., AIT-QA [19], ToTTo [25], HybridQA [6], and TableBench [35]) sourced from Wikipedia, financial reports, and academic publications.

To guarantee evaluation reliability, we implemented a rigorous multi-stage cleaning pipeline addressing both structural and semantic dimensions. On the structural level, we enforce strict constraints by capping the context at 32K characters, consistent with the context window limit of most open-source LLMs. We remove empty or overly sparse tables, and simplify nested headers to improve efficiency and readability. On the semantic level, we deployed a **Consensus-Based Quality Control Framework** where a judge model evaluates inferences from three candidate LLMs against ground truth, supplemented by a human-in-the-loop review for ambiguous cases. This rigorous filtration process distinguished high-quality data from noise, ultimately yielding **0.75 million verified instances** that serve as a robust foundation for systematic table reasoning assessment.

Finally, to map each sample to the defined taxonomy, we clearly define the evaluation criteria and task boundaries, and leverage LLMs to automatically classify such samples into the corresponding subtasks, ensuring precise alignment and avoiding overlaps across subtasks.

2.3 Data Synthesis

To bridge the coverage gap where open-source datasets fail to encompass the full spectrum of our 26-subtask taxonomy, we implemented a hybrid data synthesis pipeline.

First, for 10 structured sub-tasks requiring consistent formats (e.g., Table Retrieval, Query, Selection), we employ *Rule-based generation*. This involves selecting numeric tables with computable properties and applying logic-driven templates to synthesize QA pairs for deterministic operations such as filtering, sorting, and statistical computation.

Then, for 4 sub-tasks demanding semantic flexibility (e.g., *Table Summary*, *Plausibility*, *Domain-specific Operations*), we utilize *LLM-based generation*. This strategy operates in two modes: generating QA pairs from existing tables, or co-synthesizing table-QA pairs when necessary. All LLM-generated outputs undergo a rigorous dual-discriminator verification process; only samples achieving unanimous consensus on accuracy, relevance, and coverage are retained.

In particular, to simulate the sequential complexity of real-world data analysis, we developed a pipeline that synthesizes multi-turn QA pairs requiring chained reasoning. Covering 6 advanced sub-tasks (e.g., Multi-step Retrieval, Conditional Calculation), this method constructs 'harder' samples that compel models to perform iterative verification and calculation, mirroring the workflow of a human expert. Such pipeline includes four parts: 1) **Collect complex tables**. We define a 'complex table' as one that exhibits high dimensionality (> 100 rows, > 10 columns) and analytical richness. Specifically, eligible tables must possess semantically clear headers, at least two categorical columns for filtering, and four numeric columns with non-zero variance for computation. Furthermore, we enforce strict quality controls, excluding tables with > 80% missing values or significant textual noise. 2) **Model complex reasoning logic**. We model analytical reasoning as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG), where nodes represent atomic operators and edges define data dependencies. To structure the workflow, we categorize these operators into three hierarchical tiers: *Selection & Filtering* (defining analytical scope), *Aggregation & Transformation* (synthesizing metrics), and *Logical Derivation* (computing final insights). Consequently, a specific analyst workflow is formalized as a random walk over this operator graph. 3) **Generate multi-turn reverse questions**. Based on the sampled workflow, we prompt two LLMs in an adversarial manner: one for question generation and another as a discriminator, which evaluates semantic plausibility, logical consistency, and answerability. For questions that pass the discriminator's criteria, we further refine the questions from the perspective of real users to enhance their authenticity. 4) **Generate answers**. For each table and its associated question pair, multiple candidate answers are generated using LLM. These candidates then undergo human review to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the final accepted answers.

Finally, we sample the verified high-quality data and release a taxonomy-aligned subset (as shown in Table 1) as the benchmark for evaluating large language models. We have fully open-sourced the benchmark dataset, which comprises 7,790 instances covering 6 core skills and 26 subtasks, with an average of 64 rows and 8 columns per table, covering domains such as finance, education, healthcare, and enterprise. The complete dataset are provided in our open repository.

3 Evaluation Framework

The evaluation framework is designed to systematically assess the performance of LLMs in table reasoning. In particular, the system operates on a configuration-driven basis, enabling rapid switching between models and task sets via simple config modifications. To handle the computational load, the framework employs batch inference for high throughput. Furthermore, to maximize GPU utilization, it features a decoupled two-stage architecture: inference and judgement are executed sequentially. In the following part we detail the framework's workflow from the Inference phase and the judge Phase.

As shown in Figure 1, the framework begins with loading batch of samples from the dataset built above. Each sample is a four-element tuple containing (Table, Question, Groundtruth, Extra-Info). Then, the framework incorporates three distinct inference modes: Textual Chain-of-Thought (TCoT), Programmatic Chain-of-Thought (PoT), and Interleaved Chain-of-Thought (ICoT). For TCoT, a table is organized as a markdown or html string which inserted into user question. Then the model operates on textual reasoning, generating answers in plain text. For PoT, we inject the basic schema information into user question and then the model produces executable code, which is further executed in the sandbox to derive the final answer. The ICoT mode enables models to perform multi-step reasoning by combining textual explanations and programmatic outputs in an iterative process, encouraging the model to engage in planning, iterative step-by-step reasoning, and self-reflection. The table storage path is provided, forcing model to read data by python code. Specifically, the textual reasoning content is wrapped within '`<think></think>`' tags, the python code is wrapped with '````python````', and the executed result is wrapped with '````CodeExecuteResult````'.

Following the inference phase, the framework evaluates model outputs using an *LLM-as-a-Judge* paradigm [8, 11, 13, 44]. We adopt this approach to overcome the limitations of rigid string-matching metrics (e.g., Exact Match, ROUGE), which often fail to capture the semantic validity of open-ended table reasoning tasks. These traditional metrics risk penalizing stylistically distinct but factually correct responses. To address this, the judge acts as a robust surrogate for human reviewers, assigning an integer score on a scale of 0 to 10. A score of 0 denotes a completely incorrect answer, while 10 indicates a perfect match with the ground truth. Crucially, this granular scale accommodates *partial correctness*: for queries requiring multiple answers, models that retrieve incomplete but valid subsets are awarded intermediate scores, ensuring a more objective assessment of reasoning capabilities.




Figure 1: Evaluation Framework Overview.

4 Experiments

In this section, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation of over 20 state-of-the-art LLMs on our benchmark, providing an in-depth analysis of their performance across various table reasoning tasks.

4.1 Experiment Setup

4.1.1 LLMs. We evaluate a total of 26 LLMs, covering a diverse range of models designed for different purposes. These include general LLMs, code-optimized LLMs, deep thinking LLMs, math and structured data analysis optimized LLMs, and LLMs specifically fine-tuned for table reasoning tasks. The evaluated models range from 7B to 72B parameters. All models reported in this paper are open-source, as their model sizes and architectural details are publicly available and thus facilitate fair and transparent comparisons. Evaluation results for closed-source models are provided in our GitHub repository for reference.

4.1.2 Inference Mode. We evaluate models using three inference modes: TCoT, PoT, and ICoT. For NLU core skills (non-tabular structural tasks), only TCoT is used as these tasks focus on language understanding rather than code-based table manipulation. In TCoT, models receive table content in Markdown/HTML formats and directly generate answers. PoT and ICoT modes do not provide the model with plaintext table content. Instead, the models have to write codes to read the table, extract the required information, and finally answer the questions.

4.1.3 Evaluation Metrics. In the following experiments, we primarily use LLM-as-a-judge [44] to evaluate model performance across tasks. LLM-as-a-judge evaluates semantic similarity and answer accuracy. For LLM-as-a-judge, we utilize the Qwen2-72B-Instruct [37] model (a distinct variant from the evaluated Qwen2.5 series with independent parameter initialization and training objectives) which has been fully trained with RLHF to align with human preferences, to evaluate semantic similarity and answer accuracy. This model is excluded from the evaluated model set and uses a separate inference pipeline to minimize family-related evaluation bias. Notably, since PoT produces code as its output, we use the result of code execution as the model answer. This means that if the code fails to execute, the test sample is automatically assigned a score of zero.

4.2 Experimental Results

4.2.1 Overall Performance Analysis. We summarize the average performance of all models across all tasks, with scores normalized to a 0–100 range (as shown in Table 2). We conduct human evaluation on 5% randomly sampled instances and the correlation between human scores and LLM-as-a-judge scores is above 0.85, demonstrating consistent judgment.


Two trends can be observed from the results: (1) Models scoring higher on Natural Language Understanding (NLU) and Table Understanding (TU) generally perform better on other tasks, as these two skills underpin question comprehension and table content retrieval. Both of them serve as foundational skills for more advanced capabilities. (2) The datasets of Advanced Data Analysis (ADA) are more challenging versions of Table Basic (TBO), Computational Operations (TCO), and Data Analysis (DA). Therefore, the scores of ADA are generally lower than other tasks due to the complexity of both the tables and the questions. Through error analysis, we observe that even the top-performing models still face significant challenges in multi-step conditional calculation. In particular, several complex tasks under ADA are universally difficult for all evaluated models. This result indicates that current LLMs still have substantial room to improve on complex, multi-step table reasoning.

We also compared the performance of the five types of LLMs. Generally, within the same model series, larger models outperform their smaller counterparts. For example, the Llama-3.1-70B model achieves better results than the Llama-3.1-8B, and the Qwen2.5-72B model outperforms the Qwen2.5-7B. These trends are also broadly consistent with the scaling laws observed for LLMs. The results also show that Deep Thinking LLMs achieve the highest overall performance. Their advanced reasoning capabilities for complex problems and self-reflection abilities enable them to consistently achieve top scores across the table reasoning tasks. By the way, in practice, performance depends on not only model type but multiple factors, including model size, training strategy, and inference configuration. Nevertheless, our evaluation still reveals the specific tabular reasoning capabilities of different types of LLMs.

4.2.2 Performance Analysis by Inference Mode. We analyze model performance across the three inference modes: TCoT, PoT, and ICoT. As shown in Figure 2, the left panel provides an overall overview, where the results are averaged across all sub-tasks under each table

Table 2: Overall Experimental Results with LLM-as-a-judge

Model Name	NLU	TU			TBO			TCO			DA			ADA			Overall
	TCoT	TCoT	PoT	ICoT	TCoT	PoT	ICoT	TCoT	PoT	ICoT	TCoT	PoT	ICoT	TCoT	PoT	ICoT	
General LLMs																	
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct [12]	61.46	49.53	45.04	47.06	39.22	50.11	55.76	41.51	55.12	50.20	39.68	51.97	50.89	31.36	24.01	13.62	44.16
Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct [12]	70.75	64.38	66.47	57.93	57.74	72.20	48.04	65.75	77.69	61.46	48.58	61.80	51.91	40.29	42.48	27.50	57.18
Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct [39]	64.66	58.79	57.98	68.26	41.46	56.99	61.23	51.61	62.71	73.63	44.88	52.17	61.84	37.13	28.08	44.63	54.13
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct [39]	75.87	72.39	64.46	87.07	66.56	71.05	72.06	73.18	80.93	85.25	54.05	59.69	70.97	42.14	46.49	61.25	67.71
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3 [17]	47.47	40.22	37.33	25.14	32.57	50.09	37.18	35.28	45.46	35.61	37.20	23.96	27.09	18.89	15.14	16.05	32.79
Code Optimized LLMs																	
Qwen2.5-Coder-7B-Instruct [16]	61.87	55.51	57.92	64.30	44.36	61.03	66.86	47.59	65.17	69.26	39.99	57.73	62.99	35.99	33.97	45.50	54.38
Deepseek-Coder-7B-Instruct-v1.5 [14]	16.63	21.82	19.36	12.38	26.83	36.69	24.33	19.93	30.11	19.26	14.65	13.46	14.28	13.27	3.62	13.77	18.77
Deepseek-Coder-33B-Instruct [14]	26.59	35.09	49.06	24.39	39.40	57.01	54.72	29.16	42.74	30.91	24.77	53.87	33.54	10.94	26.96	19.60	34.92
Seed-Coder-8B-Instruct [3]	45.18	50.65	57.21	59.61	44.06	66.58	66.33	42.66	67.57	68.67	38.68	62.94	65.62	32.59	38.05	42.27	53.04
Yi-Coder-9B-Chat [42]	43.64	32.76	50.61	39.70	30.59	56.24	51.56	32.49	58.34	54.58	23.07	48.17	51.50	21.41	28.72	20.62	40.25
Deep Thinking LLMs																	
Deepseek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B [10]	51.28	49.28	33.86	54.58	56.33	48.24	52.49	62.01	43.28	56.50	49.19	41.19	57.34	22.86	18.02	36.89	45.83
Deepseek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B [10]	61.78	62.29	66.71	81.18	73.07	65.02	68.66	67.10	51.27	79.11	53.87	46.51	61.98	34.81	31.34	51.26	59.75
Deepseek-R1-Distill-Qwen-32B [10]	63.04	69.19	65.33	86.18	78.23	71.92	70.51	68.34	62.82	69.76	56.36	67.90	61.33	32.14	43.22	52.51	63.67
Deepseek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B [10]	53.17	56.13	34.86	54.48	55.23	39.07	49.60	57.29	36.86	52.17	49.24	13.14	40.90	20.32	6.40	25.19	40.25
Deepseek-R1-Distill-Llama-70B [10]	65.21	67.88	67.51	86.98	74.65	69.16	69.23	80.07	76.14	86.08	59.35	66.64	73.03	37.27	44.68	54.04	67.37
QwQ-32B [29]	71.39	71.51	72.62	91.02	80.57	78.23	74.00	74.47	73.31	75.36	51.79	72.54	60.68	45.06	54.79	64.88	69.51
Qwen3-8B [36]	62.60	67.27	70.68	82.93	80.87	69.06	70.51	71.25	66.31	71.58	58.16	55.51	61.14	52.76	44.34	57.41	65.15
Qwen3-14B [36]	68.07	68.80	64.08	87.33	79.26	76.16	77.51	73.03	69.27	73.63	58.00	66.49	66.18	48.28	50.55	56.90	67.72
Qwen3-32B [36]	67.72	67.84	71.16	90.89	81.19	75.83	77.56	73.32	70.91	75.07	62.23	68.63	67.55	49.63	57.34	62.70	69.97
Math Optimized LLMs																	
Kimina-Prover-Preview-Distill-7B [32]	22.69	11.53	0.15	9.85	19.50	0.40	16.58	24.94	0.70	16.31	12.67	0.05	11.43	8.04	0.00	8.66	10.22
Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct [38]	40.17	22.35	13.48	41.38	34.68	26.22	38.29	37.61	31.01	51.51	18.68	20.04	39.08	12.09	2.25	19.57	28.03
Qwen2.5-Math-72B-Instruct [38]	56.98	53.56	46.57	76.98	58.35	48.73	59.40	61.20	58.62	79.27	35.23	35.51	58.50	17.74	23.70	39.31	50.60
Deepseek-Math-7B-Instruct [27]	28.85	21.02	7.77	28.98	15.91	4.25	8.41	20.61	10.91	11.45	20.34	9.50	18.02	12.63	1.30	11.02	14.43
Table Reasoning Optimized LLMs																	
TableGPT2-7B [28]	60.83	58.97	64.61	73.82	48.38	59.79	65.43	57.05	71.94	75.58	44.14	51.24	66.80	32.06	33.21	50.68	57.16
Table-R1-SFT-7B [40]	71.58	62.04	53.52	25.10	68.21	54.49	15.70	71.25	59.87	13.57	37.08	41.26	33.75	35.64	25.95	19.95	43.06
Table-R1-Zero-7B [40]	66.18	64.36	48.99	77.99	54.56	36.01	58.57	62.06	50.28	76.16	50.32	48.95	63.79	28.21	32.32	45.36	54.01

**Figure 2: Comparison of table reasoning capability under different reasoning modes.**

reasoning skill and grouped by the three inference modes. Overall, models under the ICoT mode achieve better performance, particularly in DA and ADA tasks, outperforming the traditional TCoT approach. This demonstrates the potential of the ICoT paradigm in handling table reasoning tasks. In fact, the TCoT and ICoT modes differ fundamentally in how they handle table content: TCoT directly inputs the table in Markdown or HTML format, while ICoT enables the model to actively explore the table content through iterative interactions. This distinction becomes critical when dealing with large tables. Due to the context window limitations, TCoT struggles to process the entire table content, whereas ICoT, being independent of context size, is unaffected by table size and can dynamically query the table to retrieve relevant information.

The right panel of Figure 2 focuses on performance evaluations for tasks requiring precise calculations. A notable trend emerges: TCoT underperforms in calculation-intensive tasks. This is because TCoT fundamentally relies on token-based predictions and lacks the capability to perform precise computations. In contrast, PoT

and ICoT excel in such tasks by generating and execute code in a sandbox environment. Notably, the ICoT mode enables iterative code generation, allowing the model to self-reflect and correct errors. This iterative coding and execution mechanism enables ICoT to excel in handling complex numerical calculation table reasoning tasks.

4.2.3 Case Study. Figure 3 illustrates a multi-step table reasoning example, alongside the inference processes of the QwQ-32B model across three modes. In PoT, the model generates erroneous code due to an incorrectly defined threshold and output a wrong answer. In TCoT, the mode attempts to solve the problem through a step-by-step textual reasoning process. However, TCoT may be inappropriate for computation-intensive tasks. First, the limited token budget restricts the size of the table that can be processed, rendering TCoT ineffective for large-scale tabular data. Second, complex operations on tables tend to result in reasoning errors of arithmetic operations, further limiting the applicability of TCoT to such tasks. Contrastly, the ICoT method demonstrates robustness




Figure 3: A representative case that demonstrates the differences among three inference modes.

through its iterative refinement capability. Although the model initially produces incorrect code, with receiving feedback of the incorrect code, which enables the model to revise its initial code, fix the error, and ultimately produce the correct answer.

The comparative analysis of this case demonstrates that the ICoT offers greater tolerance for intermediate errors and provides the model with opportunities for self-reflection and self-correction.

5 Limitations and Future Work

5.1 Limitations

One limitation of our framework is its reliance on LLM-as-a-judge, which may inadvertently introduce biases. These biases stem from the inherent tendencies of LLMs to favor certain reasoning styles or answer formats over others. We have taken multiple steps to mitigate these biases by carefully designing and refining system prompts to ensure neutrality and consistency in scoring. Despite this, extensive experimental analyses show that in the vast majority of cases, LLM-as-a-judge achieves more objective results compared to other evaluation methods.

Furthermore, since a considerable portion of our dataset is collected from public web sources, we cannot verify whether the evaluated LLMs have been trained on these exact or highly similar data points, which may lead to unintentional data leakage and overestimated performance.

5.2 Future Work

Several promising directions for future work can further enhance the scope and utility of this benchmark:

Complex Excel Tables and Multi-Table Scenarios: Another important direction is the incorporation of more sophisticated

datasets, including complex Excel tables and multi-table reasoning tasks. These additions would enable the evaluation of models' abilities to handle inter-table relationships, perform advanced operations across multiple datasets, and answer questions of higher complexity. By simulating real-world challenges, this extension would allow for a more comprehensive assessment of model capabilities in practical table mining applications.

Enhanced Tool Integration: Future work could also focus on extending the framework to evaluate models' ability to integrate with external tools, such as databases, APIs, or advanced computational systems. This would enable the benchmark to assess how effectively models can utilize external resources to solve highly complex or domain-specific tasks that go beyond the limits of standalone reasoning.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we presented a comprehensive benchmark TReB designed to standardize the evaluation of table reasoning. Guided by a fine-grained capability taxonomy, we introduced a high-quality dataset and a practical evaluation framework to support diverse inference strategies. Our extensive experiments yield critical insights into the current landscape of LLMs: (1) the Advanced Data Analysis tasks serve as a rigorous touchstone, effectively probing models' intrinsic problem-solving abilities; (2) Deep Thinking LLMs demonstrate superior overall performance by leveraging self-reflection to handle complex reasoning; and (3) ICoT-based approaches exhibit a distinct competitive edge in computation-intensive scenarios. By open-sourcing these resources and establishing a held-out leaderboard, we aim to facilitate fair comparison and accelerate the development of more robust, generalizable tabular models.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [2] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [3] ByteDance Seed, Yuyu Zhang, Jing Su, Yifan Sun, Chenguang Xi, Xia Xiao, Shen Zheng, Anxiang Zhang, Kaibo Liu, Daoguang Zan, Tao Sun, Jinhua Zhu, Shulin Xin, Dong Huang, Yetao Bai, Lixin Dong, Chao Li, Jianchong Chen, Hanzhi Zhou, Yifan Huang, Guanghan Ning, Xierui Song, Jiaye Chen, Siyao Liu, Kai Shen, Liang Xiang, and Yonghui Wu. 2025. Seed-Coder: Let the Code Model Curate Data for Itself. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03524* (2025).
- [4] Linzheng Chai, Shukai Liu, Jian Yang, Yuwei Yin, Ke Jin, Jiaheng Liu, Tao Sun, Ge Zhang, Changyu Ren, Hongcheng Guo, et al. 2024. Mceval: Massively multilingual code evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07436* (2024).
- [5] Wenhui Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W Cohen. 2022. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12588* (2022).
- [6] Wenhui Chen, Hanwen Zha, Xierui Song, Wenhan Xiong, Hong Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2020. HybridQA: A Dataset of Multi-Hop Question Answering over Tabular and Textual Data. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*. 1026–1036.
- [7] Mingyue Cheng, Qingyang Mao, Qi Liu, Yitong Zhou, Yupeng Li, Jiahao Wang, Jiaying Lin, Jiawei Cao, and Enhong Chen. 2025. A survey on table mining with large language models: Challenges, advancements and prospects. *Authoria Preprints* (2025).
- [8] Cheng-Han Chiang and Hung-Yi Lee. 2023. Can Large Language Models Be an Alternative to Human Evaluations?. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 15607–15631.
- [9] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168* (2021).
- [10] DeepSeek-AI. 2025. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948* (2025).
- [11] Yann Dubois, Chen Xuechen Li, Rohan Taori, Tianyi Zhang, Ishaan Gulrajani, Jimmy Ba, Carlos Guestrin, Percy S Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023. AlpacaFarm: A simulation framework for methods that learn from human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 30039–30069.
- [12] Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
- [13] Jiawei Gu, Xuhui Jiang, Zhichao Shi, Hexiang Tan, Xuehao Zhai, Chengjin Xu, Wei Li, Yinghan Shen, Shengjie Ma, Honghao Liu, et al. 2024. A survey on llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15594* (2024).
- [14] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196* (2024).
- [15] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874* (2021).
- [16] Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiaxi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Kai Dang, et al. 2024. Qwen2.5-Coder Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12186* (2024).
- [17] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, et al. 2023. Mistral 7B. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825* (2023).
- [18] Yimin Jing, Renren Jin, Jiahao Hu, Huihui Qiu, Xiaohua Wang, Peng Wang, and Deyi Xiong. 2023. Followeval: A multi-dimensional benchmark for assessing the instruction-following capability of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09829* (2023).
- [19] Yannis Katsis, Saneem Chemmengath, Vishwajeet Kumar, Samarth Bharadwaj, Mustafa Canim, Michael Glass, Alfio Gliozzo, Feifei Pan, Jaydeep Sen, Karthik Sankaranarayanan, et al. 2022. AIT-QA: Question Answering Dataset over Complex Tables in the Airline Industry. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies: Industry Track*. 305–314.
- [20] Myung Jun Kim, Félix Lefebvre, Gaëtan Brison, Alexandre Perez-Lebel, and Gaël Varoquaux. 2025. Table Foundation Models: on knowledge pre-training for tabular learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14415* (2025).
- [21] Yuhang Lai, Chengxi Li, Yiming Wang, Tianyi Zhang, Ruiqi Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, Wen-tau Yih, Daniel Fried, Sida Wang, and Tao Yu. 2023. DS-1000: A natural and reliable benchmark for data science code generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 18319–18345.
- [22] Xun Liang, Shichao Song, Simin Niu, Zhiyu Li, Feiyu Xiong, Bo Tang, Yezhaohui Wang, Dawei He, Peng Cheng, Zhonghao Wang, et al. 2023. Uhgeval: Benchmarking the hallucination of chinese large language models via unconstrained generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15296* (2023).
- [23] Hongwei Liu, Zilong Zheng, Yuxuan Qiao, Haodong Duan, Zhiwei Fei, Fengzhe Zhou, Wenwei Zhang, Songyang Zhang, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. 2024. Math-bench: Evaluating the theory and application proficiency of llms with a hierarchical mathematics benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12209* (2024).
- [24] Weizheng Lu, Jing Zhang, Ju Fan, Zihao Fu, Yueguo Chen, and Xiaoyong Du. 2025. Large language model for table processing: A survey. *Frontiers of Computer Science* 19, 2 (2025), 192350.
- [25] Ankur Parikh, Xuezhi Wang, Sebastian Gehrmann, Manaal Faruqui, Bhuwan Dhingra, Diyi Yang, and Dipanjan Das. 2020. ToTTo: A Controlled Table-To-Text Generation Dataset. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 1173–1186.
- [26] Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Commun. ACM* 64, 9 (2021), 99–106.
- [27] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Y Wu, et al. 2024. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300* (2024).
- [28] Aofeng Su, Aowen Wang, Chao Ye, Chen Zhou, Ga Zhang, Gang Chen, Guangcheng Zhu, Haobo Wang, Haokai Xu, Hao Chen, et al. 2024. Tablegpt2: A large multimodal model with tabular data integration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.02059* (2024).
- [29] Qwen Team. 2025. Qwq-32b: Embracing the power of reinforcement learning. URL: <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwq-32b> (2025).
- [30] Bing Wang, Changyu Ren, Jian Yang, Xinnian Liang, Jiaqi Bai, Linzheng Chai, Zhao Yan, Qian-Wen Zhang, Di Yin, Xing Sun, et al. 2023. Mac-sql: A multi-agent collaborative framework for text-to-sql. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11242* (2023).
- [31] Boxin Wang, Chejian Xu, Shuohang Wang, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, Jianfeng Gao, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, and Bo Li. 2021. Adversarial glue: A multi-task benchmark for robustness evaluation of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02840* (2021).
- [32] Haiming Wang, Mert Unsal, Xiaohan Lin, Mantas Baksys, Junqi Liu, Marco Dos Santos, Flood Sung, Marina Vinyes, Zhenzhe Ying, Zekai Zhu, et al. 2025. Kiminaprover preview: Towards large formal reasoning models with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.11354* (2025).
- [33] Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhramil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyang Jiang, et al. 2024. Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- [34] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 24824–24837.
- [35] Xianjie Wu, Jian Yang, Linzheng Chai, Ge Zhang, Jiaheng Liu, Xeron Du, Di Liang, Daixin Shu, Xianfu Cheng, Tianzhen Sun, et al. 2025. Tablebench: A comprehensive and complex benchmark for table question answering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 39. 25497–25506.
- [36] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, et al. 2025. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388* (2025).
- [37] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, et al. 2024. Qwen2 Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671* (2024).
- [38] An Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bofei Gao, Bowen Yu, Chengpeng Li, Dayiheng Liu, Jianhong Tu, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Keming Lu, Mingfeng Xue, Runji Lin, Tianyu Liu, Xingzhang Ren, and Zhenru Zhang. 2024. Qwen2.5-Math Technical Report: Toward Mathematical Expert Model via Self-Improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12122* (2024).
- [39] Qwen: An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiaxi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Pei Zhang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Runji Lin, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Tingyu Xia, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zihan Qiu. 2024. Qwen2.5 Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115* (2024).
- [40] Zheyuan Yang, Lyuhao Chen, Arman Cohan, and Yilun Zhao. 2025. Table-r1: Inference-time scaling for table reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23621* (2025).
- [41] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

- [42] Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Guoyin Wang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, et al. 2024. Yi: Open foundation models by 01. ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04652* (2024).
- [43] Xuanliang Zhang, Dingzirui Wang, Longxu Dou, Qingfu Zhu, and Wanxiang Che. 2025. A survey of table reasoning with large language models. *Frontiers of Computer Science* 19, 9 (2025), 199348.
- [44] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2023. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 46595–46623.
- [45] Bingzhao Zhu, Xingjian Shi, Nick Erickson, Mu Li, George Karypis, and Mahsa Shoaran. 2023. XTab: Cross-table Pretraining for Tabular Transformers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 43181–43204.
- [46] Terry Yue Zhuo, Minh Chien Vu, Jenny Chim, Han Hu, Wenhao Yu, Ratnadira Widayarsi, Imam Nur Bani Yusuf, Haolan Zhan, Junda He, Indraneil Paul, et al. 2024. Bigcodebench: Benchmarking code generation with diverse function calls and complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15877* (2024).