

TREECODER: Systematic Exploration and Optimisation of Decoding and Constraints for LLM Code Generation

HENRIJS PRINCIS, University of Bristol, United Kingdom

ARINDAM SHARMA, University of Bristol, United Kingdom

CRISTINA DAVID, University of Bristol, United Kingdom

Large language models (LLMs) have shown remarkable ability to generate code, yet their outputs often violate syntactic or semantic constraints when guided only through natural language prompts. We introduce TREECODER, the most general and flexible framework to date for exploring decoding strategies, constraints, and hyperparameters in LLMs, and use it in code generation to enforce correctness and structure *during decoding* rather than relying on prompt engineering. TREECODER represents decoding as a tree search over candidate programs, where both decoding strategies and constraint functions—such as style, syntax, execution—are treated as first-class, optimisable components. This design enables systematic exploration and automatic tuning of decoding configurations using standard optimisation techniques. Experiments on the MBPP (Python) and SQL-Spider benchmarks show that TREECODER consistently improves accuracy across open-source models such as CodeLlama, Mistral and DeepSeek, often outperforming their unconstrained baselines by considerable margins.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → *Constraints*; • **Computing methodologies** → **Neural networks**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Constrained Decoding Framework, Code Generation, Large Language Models

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have become the de facto standard for a wide range of code-related tasks, including code completion, summarisation and translation [4, 5, 12]. However, their outputs are often inconsistent, violating hard constraints such as the syntax of the target programming language [38] or introducing logical errors that break compilation or execution.

A straightforward way to mitigate these issues is to improve the base model, scaling up its parameters, extending training, or curating higher-quality data. However, these approaches are computationally expensive, slow to iterate and do not provide any guarantees. A more efficient alternative is to enhance model behaviour at inference time, through methods that adjust or constrain the decoding process. Such techniques fall broadly into two categories: (1) *Decoding strategies*, which adjust how the model explores its probability distribution during generation; and (2) *Constrained decoding*, which restricts outputs to those that satisfy external rules such as grammatical, syntactic or logical constraints.

Decoding strategies. LLMs generate code token by token, a process known as *decoding*, by defining a conditional probability distribution $P_\theta(x_t \mid x_{<t})$ over the next token x_t given the preceding sequence $x_{<t}$.

A wide range of *decoding strategies* have been proposed to guide how language models (LMs) explore their predictive distribution during generation, each offering a different trade-off between efficiency, diversity, and correctness. The simplest approach, *sampling*, draws tokens stochastically from the model’s conditional distribution to produce diverse outputs [11, 24, 44]. More structured

alternatives such as *beam search* maintain the top- k most likely continuations at each step [20–22, 28, 29, 38]. Recent work has adapted more exploratory planning techniques, notably *Monte Carlo Tree Search* (MCTS) and *Sequential Monte Carlo* (SMC), from games and Bayesian inference, showing promising results on mathematical reasoning and code synthesis [25, 34]. Each strategy embodies a distinct bias-variance compromise: sampling promotes diversity but may produce invalid code, beam search prioritises likelihood at the cost of diversity, and population-based methods such as MCTS and SMC aim to balance exploration and exploitation under a fixed computational budget. No single method is uniformly optimal across all domains or decoding budgets.

While these decoding strategies determine *how* the model explores its distribution, they do not restrict *what* the model is allowed to produce. As a result, even high-likelihood sequences may violate the syntactic or semantic rules of the target language.

Constrained decoding. Contrary to this, *constrained decoding* [17, 25, 30, 32, 37, 38] modifies the decoding process by introducing a predicate $\Phi : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that specifies whether a partial sequence is admissible according to syntactic, semantic, or domain-specific rules. Formally, the constrained next-token distribution is $P_\theta^\Phi(x_t | x_{<t}) \propto P_\theta(x_t | x_{<t}) \cdot \Phi(x_{1:t})$. Only continuations satisfying $\Phi(x_{1:t}) = 1$ are considered during generation. As such, while decoding strategies control the search process itself, constraint-based approaches act orthogonally, enforcing external rules that restrict admissible outputs. For instance, *Adaptive Sampling with Approximate Expected Futures* (ASAp) used in Park et al. [30], is a *sampling* strategy that samples from a LM while ensuring outputs satisfy a *grammar constraint* and faithfully model the LM’s conditional distribution over syntactically valid strings.

These methods are particularly valuable in *code generation*, where correctness is discrete and non-negotiable: any syntactic or logical violation immediately results in compilation or runtime failure.

Main challenges for constrained decoding. Despite rapid progress in decoding algorithms and constraint mechanisms, research on code generation remains fragmented. Each decoding strategy—sampling, beam search, SMC, MCTS, ASAp, implements its own control loop, state representation and bookkeeping. Similarly, each constraint type tends to be integrated in an ad hoc manner, often coupled tightly to a specific decoding routine.

As decoding methods become increasingly specialised, researchers face two main challenges. First, **existing systems [1, 16, 17, 26, 31] hard-code particular combinations of search algorithms and constraint mechanisms**, making it difficult to isolate their individual contributions, compare their effects, or reuse and extend implementations. Second, **there is no principled way to systematically explore or optimise this growing space of alternatives**. Decoding strategies, constraints, and their hyperparameters interact in complex, non-linear ways, and small changes in the way they are chosen can dramatically alter performance. As a result, many observed improvements are discovered through trial and error rather than through a structured, data-driven search over the design space.

The most well-known framework for training and inferencing neural networks is Hugging Face [41]. While dominant for model training and inference, Hugging Face only supports beam search and sampling, as it does not track a decoding tree, limiting support for backtracking or population-based decoding methods. IterGen [39] addresses this partially by introducing a decoding tree and grammar-symbol navigation. However, it decodes a single hypothesis at a time and tightly couples constraints with decoding, making it difficult to flexibly combine or systematically compare alternative algorithms and constraint configurations.

This work: A unified, optimisable framework. We introduce TREECODER, *the most general and flexible framework to date for exploring decoding strategies, constraints and hyperparameters in LLMs*. Rather than fixing a specific algorithm, TREECODER parameterises the decoding stage itself: the decoding process and constraint mechanism are exposed as interchangeable modules, allowing users to compose and evaluate arbitrary configurations.

At its core lies a *decoding tree* that represents all hypotheses explored by the model. Nodes correspond to partial programs and edges denote token expansions, supporting operations such as *backtracking*, *branch pruning* and *parallel exploration*. A companion abstraction of *active nodes* captures the partial hypotheses currently eligible for expansion, unifying population-based strategies like sampling, beam search and SMC within the same framework. Unlike prior systems like IterGen [39], TREECODER supports parallel hypotheses tracking and constraint-aware decoding in a single, extensible design.

Contributions of TREECODER.

- **Extensible, lightweight, and efficient.** TREECODER exposes both decoding strategies and constraint mechanisms as first-class components, enabling new variants to be implemented in only a few dozen lines of code. Its modular design, together with built-in support for batching, caching, and backtracking, allows rapid prototyping while maintaining runtime and accuracy comparable to Hugging Face.
- **Systematic exploration and optimisation of the design space.** By treating code generation as a search over decoding, constraints, hyperparameters and even LLMs, TREECODER enables automated optimisation. Using standard tools such as Bayesian optimisation (Optuna [2]), the framework can automatically discover high-performing configurations.
- **Direct comparison of configurations.** A shared interface enables fair, head-to-head evaluation of decoding and constraint variants, isolating the effect of each design choice.

Use of TREECODER in code generation. Most current interactions with LLMs for coding rely on “vibe coding”, steering the model through carefully worded prompts rather than explicit control. Developers embed requirements such as “only output valid Python code” or “use this API” in natural language, but these instructions are interpreted heuristically and often ignored, especially when they conflict with the model’s learned biases or extend across multiple generation steps.

For users seeking more control, TREECODER replaces this trial-and-error process with a principled alternative: applying constraints *during decoding* rather than merely describing them in the prompt. In this paradigm, stylistic, syntactic and semantic rules become first-class, programmable components that dynamically steer the model’s generation process, an approach particularly well-suited to code generation, which must satisfy strict syntactic and semantic correctness. TREECODER offers a comprehensive library of such constraints and users can define new ones, making it easy to prototype, combine and experiment with new decoding behaviours.

Beyond constraints, TREECODER also allows users to interchange decoding strategies and, when datasets are available, to automatically optimise configurations of decoding strategies, constraints and hyperparameters, finding the best setting for a given coding task.

Experimental results. We evaluated the impact of TREECODER on improving code generation in relatively small open models—CODELLAMA-7B [36], MISTRAL-7B-INSTRUCT-v0.3 [23], and DEEPSEEK-CODER-7B-INSTRUCT-v1.5 [14]—using the MBPP [6] (Python) and SQL-Spider [43] benchmarks.

- Applying progressively stronger constraints at decoding steadily improves the accuracy of CODELLAMA-7B, rising from 32% with unconstrained decoding to 60% under combined syntactic and semantic constraints.

- Through automatic optimisation of decoding strategies, constraint sets and hyperparameters, TREECODER discovers task-specific configurations that markedly enhance performance. For MISTRAL-7B-INSTRUCT-v0.3 and DEEPSEEK-CODER-7B-INSTRUCT-v1.5, accuracy improves from near-zero compliance with basic output instructions to reliable code generation in 30% and 50% of cases, respectively; for CODELLAMA-7B, accuracy nearly doubles to over 60%.

2 Background

In this section, we introduce some background concepts and terminology used throughout the paper. For this purpose, Table 1 presents a taxonomy of decoding functions, classifying representative algorithms along five orthogonal dimensions that characterise most existing decoding strategies.

(i) **Determinism**—whether the search procedure is stochastic (e.g., sampling) or deterministic (e.g., beam search). (ii) **Concurrency**—whether multiple hypotheses are expanded in parallel (*population-based*) or a single trajectory is explored at a time (*trajectory-based*). (iii) **Backtracking**—whether the algorithm can revisit earlier states to explore unvisited branches. (iv) **Roll-outs**—whether candidate continuations are recursively expanded to full completions before being evaluated; in other words, a *roll-out* simulates entire trajectories from a partial hypothesis to assess its long-term promise. (v) **Optimisation goal**—whether the algorithm seeks a single most probable completion (*MAP-oriented*) or approximates the underlying model distribution (*distribution-oriented*).

MAP-oriented methods—such as beam search, best-first search, and MCTS—prioritise the most likely program under model and constraint scores. *Distribution-approximating methods*—such as sampling, SMC, and ASAp—aim to capture diverse plausible continuations, approximating the constrained posterior rather than a single mode. Roll-out-based algorithms like MCTS and ASAp both backtrack and expand candidates to completion, while methods like best-first search perform backtracking without full roll-outs.

Decoding Function	Determinism	Concurrency	Backtracking	Roll-outs	Goal Type
Beam Search	Deterministic	Population	No	No	MAP
SMC	Stochastic	Population	No	No	Distribution
Sampling	Stochastic	Population	No	No	Distribution
MCTS	Stochastic	Trajectory	Yes	Yes	MAP
ASAp	Stochastic	Trajectory	Yes	Yes	Distribution
Best-First Search*	Deterministic	Trajectory	Yes	No	MAP

Table 1. Categorisation of decoding functions by determinism, population/trajectory nature, backtracking, roll-out usage, and optimisation goal. * indicates algorithms not currently implemented within our framework.

Instantiation within our framework. To demonstrate the generality of our framework, we instantiate five representative decoding techniques: sampling, beam search, MCTS, SMC and ASAp. Each is implemented using shared modular components for search policy and constraint enforcement, showing that diverse decoding algorithms and constraint combinations can be expressed within a single tree search abstraction.

3 Framework for Constrained Decoding

At a high level, the framework treats constrained code generation as a form of tree search that is guided jointly by the LLM and user-specified constraints (Figure 1). Structural components, such as the decoding tree, its nodes, and their internal states, define the shared substrate over which all algorithms operate. Pluggable components such as the decoding function, termination condition, aggregation function, constraint modules and optimisation algorithm encapsulate the policy, stopping criteria, and external rules that govern traversal of the tree. By separating these

structural and pluggable elements, the framework allows users to compose and compare decoding strategies systematically, to optimise configurations automatically (e.g., via Bayesian optimisation), and to extend existing implementations with minimal code.

We next provide a high-level description of the framework’s components. We begin with the structural elements that underpin all decoding algorithms, followed by the pluggable components that control and constrain the generation process.




Fig. 1. High-level illustration of our framework. Structural components including the decoding tree, nodes, and node contents are on the left. Pluggable components including decoding function, termination condition, aggregation function and optimisation algorithm are on the right. The decoding function consists of a language model and an optional set of constraints.

Structural Components.

- A decoding **tree** is the *unifying abstraction* across our algorithms that minimises code duplication. Every algorithm makes use of the root node, which determines where the LM’s generation starts as well as methods for accessing active, inactive, terminal and complete nodes.
- To enable *systematic exploration of the solution space*, we require that every **node** contains links to parent and child nodes and that they contain a score s that indicates their quality. The score is usually equal to the node’s probability p_x , but more generally it’s calculated from the state of the tree. For example, for MCTS the score is based on number of times the node has been visited and lead to a solution that did not violate constraints.
- To enable *grammar symbol navigation* (i.e. the ability to track and reason about the current position within a program’s grammar as tokens are generated), upon every application of a constraint function such as an incremental parser, our framework automatically stores the constraint function’s state within our node’s state k . This state can then be used by the decoding function to make decisions such as how far to backtrack or to decide which branch of the search tree to investigate next.

We categorise each node as being either terminal, complete, active or inactive. We expand all active nodes concurrently which enables our framework to *simultaneously explore multiple hypotheses*. Furthermore, this categorisation serves as an interface between the decoding function and the termination condition.

- **Terminal nodes** have a score of zero and cannot be expanded. They represent a point where a constraint violation has been detected.
- **Complete nodes** contain the end-of-sequence token and have a score greater than zero. They also cannot be expanded.
- **Active nodes** are non-terminal nodes that will be expanded in the next iteration of the decoding function.
- **Inactive nodes** do not contain an end-of-sequence token and usually are not expanded by the subsequent application of the decoding function.

Pluggable Components. In our framework, the constraint functions, decoding functions, termination conditions, aggregation functions, LM and the optimisation algorithm denote modular components that can be plugged in. We provide a library of implementations for the first four, and users are free to experiment with custom versions as well as with different LMs and optimisation algorithms.

- An **optimisation algorithm** that searches over the rest of the pluggable components and optimises a user-provided objective function.
- A possibly empty set of **constraint functions** Φ that guide the LM towards generating good quality code by updating the prior probability of a token sequences.
- A **decoding function** δ that iteratively grows the tree by expanding the active nodes using the constraints and a LM until a terminal condition is reached.
- A **termination condition** ρ that checks whether the tree is complete.
- An **aggregation function** \otimes that aggregates nodes within the tree to produce the final output.
- An auto-regressive **LM** that given a sequence of tokens defines the probability distribution over a single token continuation.

The pseudocode for our approach is given in Algorithm 1 and defines the core loop of our framework, which treats decoding as a tree search guided by a LM and constraint functions. Starting from a root node, the framework repeatedly expands active nodes using a decoding function, δ , until a termination condition, $\rho(Tree)$, is met. The decoding function incorporates both model probabilities and constraint scores to guide generation. Once the tree is complete, an aggregation function, $\otimes(Tree)$, selects the best set of candidates.

Algorithm 1: TREECODER

Require: δ : Decoding function
Require: Φ : Optional set of constraint functions
Require: ρ : Terminal condition
Require: \otimes : Aggregation function
Require: LM: A trained language model

```

1:  $n \leftarrow \text{Node}(x = [], p_x = 1, \text{score} = 1)$    $\triangleright$  The starting node contains an empty sequence of tokens, probability of 1, and a score of 1
2:  $Tree \leftarrow \text{create\_tree}(n)$    $\triangleright$  Tree is created with root node
3: while  $\rho(Tree) \neq \text{true}$  do   $\triangleright$  While tree is incomplete
4:    $Tree \leftarrow \delta(Tree, LM, \Phi)$    $\triangleright$  Extend it by using the decoding function
5: end while
6: return  $\otimes(Tree)$    $\triangleright$  Once tree is complete, return the most promising sequences by aggregating the tree

```

In the rest of the section, we provide details about the individual components of the framework.

3.1 Optimisation Algorithm

TREECODER includes a higher-level optimisation module that treats decoding functions, constraint sets and hyperparameters as elements of a joint search space and applies standard optimisation methods such as grid search, random search, or Bayesian optimisation to identify effective configurations. By abstracting optimisation as an independent module, TREECODER cleanly separates search logic from decoding, enabling systematic and reusable tuning across tasks.

Algorithm 2 outlines our implementation. At each iteration, the optimiser proposes a new parameter configuration based on past evaluations, executes TREECODER with these parameters, and records the resulting performance. After a predefined number of iterations, the best-performing configuration is returned. This design cleanly separates optimisation logic from decoding and provides a minimal interface, enabling seamless integration with libraries such as Optuna [3].

Algorithm 2: Optimisation Algorithm

Require: θ : The ranges of hyper-parameters to optimise (e.g., decoding functions or population size range)
Require: *optimise*: A function that proposes new parameter instantiations based on past evaluations
Require: *max_iters*: The maximum number of optimisation iterations

```

1: past_accuracies  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: past_params  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3: while  $i < \text{max\_iters}$  do
4:   params  $\leftarrow \text{optimise}(\theta, \text{past\_accuracies}, \text{past\_params})$ 
5:   accuracy  $\leftarrow \text{TreeCoder}(\text{params})$ 
6:   past_accuracies  $\cup \{\text{accuracy}\}$ 
7:   past_params  $\cup \{\text{params}\}$ 
8:    $i++$ 
9: end while
10: return  $\arg \max_{p \in \text{past\_params}} \text{value}(p)$   $\triangleright$  Return the best instantiation of the parameters the optimisation algorithm was able to find

```

3.2 Decoding Function δ

The decoding function is a pluggable component that iteratively expands the decoding tree until a termination condition is met, as outlined in Table 1. Its implementation follows four core stages: *expand*, which grows active nodes using the LM’s probability distribution or performs roll-outs; *update*, which revises node scores based on the optimisation goal (MAP or distribution approximation); *prune*, which removes low-scoring branches and manages memory by clearing cached states; and *move*, which selects the next active nodes, determining whether the algorithm performs backtracking and whether it operates in a population- or trajectory-based manner. This unified structure allows diverse algorithms to share a common control loop (Algorithm 3) while varying in their specific implementations of these stages. We next explain each stage in more detail.

Algorithm 3: δ – General decoding function

Require: *Tree*: The current search tree
Require: LM: Language model
Require: Φ : Possibly empty set of constraints

```

1: children  $\leftarrow \text{Expand}(N, \text{LM}, \Phi)$  or  $\text{Rollout}(N, \text{LM}, \Phi, \delta)$   $\triangleright$  Expand step
2: children  $\leftarrow \text{LocalUpdate}(\text{children})$   $\triangleright$  Update children’s scores
3: Tree  $\leftarrow \text{GlobalUpdate}(\text{Tree})$   $\triangleright$  Update non-child node states
4: Tree  $\leftarrow \text{Prune}(\text{Tree})$   $\triangleright$  Prune non-active nodes
5: Tree  $\leftarrow \text{Move}(\text{Tree})$   $\triangleright$  Select new set of active nodes
6: return Tree

```

Expand. The expand step (line 1 in Algorithm 3) either expands the set of active nodes or performs a *roll-out* which is a recursive application of the general decoding function.

Let N be a set of nodes to be expanded and $n \in N$ denote a single node. The Expand operator applies the expansion procedure to each node in N and returns the union of their individual expansions (see Equation 1).

We denote the set of n ’s children as $\text{Expand}(n, \text{LM}, \Phi)$. Each child node is defined by a token sequence $\mathbf{x} = n_{\mathbf{x}} \circ t$, where \circ denotes concatenation and $t \in \mathcal{V}$ is a token from the LM’s vocabulary (see Equation 2).

The child’s probability is computed as $p_{\mathbf{x}} = p_{\text{parent}} \cdot p(t \mid n_{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot \Phi(n_{\mathbf{x}} \circ t)$ divided by a normalising constant that ensures the probabilities of all children sum to one. Here p_{parent} is the probability of the parent node that’s being expanded, $p(t \mid n_{\mathbf{x}})$ is the conditional probability of choosing token t and Φ is the aggregate score given by a set of constraint functions (see Equation 3).

Finally, to calculate the product of experts score given by the set of constraints Φ , we take their product (see Equation 4).

$$\text{Expand}(N, \text{LM}, \Phi) = \bigcup_{n \in N} \text{Expand}(n, \text{LM}, \Phi) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Expand}(n, \text{LM}, \Phi) = \{(x = n_x \circ t, p_x) \mid t \in \mathcal{V}\} \quad (2)$$

$$p_x = p_{\text{parent}} \cdot \frac{p(t \mid n_x) \cdot \Phi(n_x \circ t)}{\sum_{t' \in \mathcal{V}} p(t' \mid n_x) \cdot \Phi(n_x \circ t')} \quad (3)$$

$$\Phi(x \circ t) = \prod_{i=1}^n \phi_i(x \circ t) \quad (4)$$

Approximate Expand. While equations 1 to 4 provide a conceptually accurate description of node expansion, in practice modern LM vocabularies are so large (32k tokens for Llama 3.1) that it is impractical to evaluate a constraint function over all possible one token continuations. Furthermore, creating a large number of nodes on each expansion would quickly run into memory limitations.

To alleviate these issues, we adapt a procedure inspired by SMC [25] where a representative subset of particles approximates the true constrained distribution. In particular, we use the approximate expansion procedure below to approximate the true-weighted distribution:

- (1) Generate the LM’s distribution of single token continuations of the current node.
- (2) Draw j samples from this distribution.
- (3) Evaluate the constraint function on these samples.

The generated subset in most practical circumstances provides a good approximation to the set of all nodes given by Equation 2. This is because when j is the size of the LM’s vocabulary $|\mathcal{V}|$ and node’s are sampled without replacement, the approximate expansion procedure is equivalent to Equation 2.

This approximation becomes inaccurate in cases when the constraint functions are not correlated or inversely correlated to the conditional probabilities given by the language model. For example, when the user asks for Python code, but constrains the generation to Java code. It’s also inaccurate in cases where $j \ll |\mathcal{V}|$ so a large mass of true-weighted particle probabilities falls outside of the selected tokens.

To improve the quality of the approximation when j is small, we support two sampling modes in step 2: *greedy*, which selects the j most likely tokens according to the LM (i.e., top- k sampling), and *stochastic*, which samples j tokens from the LM’s original distribution. The greedy approximation is best suited for greedy decoding functions such as beam search and MCTS, whereas the stochastic approximation is better for sampling-based decoding functions such as constrained sampling or SMC.

Furthermore, we provide an optional token allow-list which ensures that certain tokens are always considered upon node expansion. This option is critical for highly constricted domains where the language model is badly aligned as we see in the experiment on badly aligned LMs in Section 7.1. Ultimately, the exact choice of j will depend on the problem setting, so we leave it as a parameter for user’s of our framework to explore.

Roll-outs. For algorithms without roll-outs, all active nodes are expanded once and the step is complete. For algorithms with roll-outs, active nodes are iteratively expanded until an end condition is met (e.g., generation of the EOS token). Conceptually, a roll-out can be viewed as a recursive invocation of the framework, where the inner call is restricted to a non-roll-out decoding function to prevent unbounded recursion. In our implementation, this recursion is unrolled into a loop for clarity.

Update. The update step updates node’s scores and states as shown in lines 2-3 in Algorithm 3. The score calculation determines the algorithm’s *goal*. Usually algorithms score nodes according to their probability. Sampling, Beam Search, and BFS all fall into this category. MCTS, ASAp and SMC all use more elaborate scoring schemes. For example, MCTS uses the PUCT score [9] which calculates the node’s score based on the probability, number of times a roll-out lead to a completion that satisfies constraints, and the number of times the node and its parent has been visited.

There are two types of updates *local updates* and *global updates*. Local updates update the state of newly extended nodes. Global updates update the state of all other nodes in the tree. For example, for MCTS the global update step updates the entire lineage of rolled-out nodes.

Prune. It’s purpose is memory management. For example, for beamsearch of width k , after the *Extend loop* we will have k^2 possible continuations. However, only the k highest scoring continuations are used, therefore we can prune the rest.

Similarly SMC, checks if the scores of the nodes fall below a certain threshold and then conditionally resamples them. Particles that were not chosen after resampling can be pruned.

Move. The move step of the algorithm selects which nodes will be expanded next. Population based algorithms always move to the newly extended nodes. However, trajectory based algorithms can backtrack to earlier state. For example, the ASAp algorithm never moves away from the start node. Best-first search always explores the most probable branch of the tree at any given time even if it includes backtracking.

3.3 Constraint Function Φ

While any function that imposes constraints on code generation could be implemented directly as a decoding function, we find it useful to draw a conceptual distinction between the decoding function that does the high-level decision making for which branch to explore next and the constraint function guiding the LM towards more promising solutions. This distinction makes our framework *modular* and allows swapping out constraint functions and decoding functions.

To handle both soft constraints (i.e. preferences that guide generation without strictly invalidating outputs) and hard constraints (i.e. rules that must always be satisfied), we follow the idea of potential functions in [25], such that our constraint function assigns a quality score to partial or complete token sequences. This design enables a unified mechanism for constraint enforcement: the update and prune stages of the decoding function can replicate hard masking behaviour (assigning zero score to invalid continuations) or soft masking (down-weighting unlikely continuations, as in [25]).

We further adopt the product of experts formulation which means that Φ can be decomposed into individual constraints ϕ such that $\Phi = \prod_{i=1}^n \phi_i$ where each ϕ_i takes as input the sequence of tokens \mathbf{x} and outputs a score indicating the quality of the sequence of tokens. For example, a score of 0 would indicate that the solution is invalid.

Product of experts formulation is desirable because it encourages breaking down the score assessment into individual modular components that can be applied individually or stacked. Such modularity helps allow for more explainable systems where the end-user can see which constraint has been violated. By using multiplication as the aggregation function any expert gets veto power over the sequence of tokens. This aligns well with the setting of constrained decoding for code generation where any syntax mistake, unit test failure, or security violation invalidates the solution.

Increased Expressive Power. Furthermore, we find that the product of experts formulation coupled with grammar constrained decoding increases expressivity of context free languages. It allows us to recognise strings that a single context-free grammar (CFG) could not. For example, consider the following two grammars over the alphabet $\{a, b, c\}$:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
G_1 : S_1 \rightarrow AB & G_2 : S_2 \rightarrow CD \\
A \rightarrow aA \mid \epsilon & C \rightarrow aCb \mid \epsilon \\
B \rightarrow bBc \mid \epsilon & D \rightarrow cD \mid \epsilon
\end{array}$$

Grammar G_1 and G_2 generate the language L_1 and L_2 respectively. L_1 consists of any number of a 's followed by an equal number of b 's and c 's. Similarly L_2 consists of an equal number of a 's and b 's followed by any number of c 's. Their intersection enforces both constraints simultaneously.

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1 &= \{ a^i b^n c^n \mid i, n \geq 0 \} \\
L_2 &= \{ a^n b^n c^j \mid n, j \geq 0 \} \\
L_1 \cap L_2 &= \{ a^n b^n c^n \mid n \geq 0 \}
\end{aligned}$$

This language, well known from formal language theory, is *not* context-free [8]. Hence, while both L_1 and L_2 are individually generated by CFGs, their intersection exceeds the expressive power of context-free grammars. Our approach, however, can represent this intersection naturally by adding two context-free grammars as decoding constraints to the `expand_node` function.

3.4 Termination Condition ρ

This function determines whether the tree is complete. If so, it returns all terminal nodes along with their associated scores. The condition is typically based on either the number of terminal nodes, length of the solution or a set time constraint. For example, for beam search of size k , the termination condition ρ is reached after k terminal nodes have been found. This can be expressed as $\rho: (\#\{n \mid n \text{ is terminal}\}) \geq k$.

3.5 Aggregation Function \otimes

The aggregation function combines all terminal nodes to produce an output. Two common aggregation functions are max based aggregation which chooses the top- k highest scoring nodes and *count* based aggregation which chooses the most common node.

4 Examples of Decoding Functions

A wide range of decoding techniques have been proposed for code generation. While enumerating all of them is impractical, our library implements two widely used algorithms—beam search and sampling—and three emerging approaches—MCTS, SMC, and ASAp—demonstrating the generality of our framework.

To illustrate our explanation of a decoding function, we compare the implementation of different decoding functions within our framework using the four steps of *expand*, *update*, *prune*, and *move*.

Expand. In Figure 2 we see the five implementations of the *expand*. On the left side, we show decoding functions without roll-outs. Functions without roll-outs differ only in the way they use the *Expand* function. In particular, beam search is a MAP oriented method and therefore uses greedy approximation whereas sampling and SMC are both distribution approximating methods therefore they both use the stochastic approximation.

Each decoding function draws a different number of children. SMC always draws a single child node and creates duplicates in the update step if the sampled node violates constraints. Sampling adjusts for lower population size by directly drawing $\left\lceil \frac{k}{|N|} \right\rceil$ children, and beamsearch always draws k children per node resulting in k^2 child nodes out of which only k will be kept.

On the right side there are two decoding functions that use rollouts. This means they go through all of the four stages of *expand*, *update*, *prune*, *move* within the *expand* stage.

Expand

Require: *Tree*, LM, Φ : Possibly empty set of constraints, *k*: Tree width constraint

<pre> 1: $N \leftarrow \text{get_active_nodes}(\text{Tree})$ 2: $\text{greedy} \leftarrow \text{True}$ 3: $j \leftarrow k$ 4: $M \leftarrow \text{Expand}(N, \text{LM}, \Phi, \text{greedy}, j)$ </pre> <p style="text-align: right;">▷ Greedy sampling ▷ <i>j</i> is samples per node</p> <p>(a) Beam Search</p> <pre> 1: $N \leftarrow \text{get_active_nodes}(\text{Tree})$ 2: $\text{greedy} \leftarrow \text{False}$ 3: $j \leftarrow \left\lceil \frac{k}{ N } \right\rceil$ 4: $M \leftarrow \text{Expand}(N, \text{LM}, \Phi, \text{greedy}, j)$ </pre> <p style="text-align: right;">▷ Stochastic Sampling</p> <p>(b) Sampling</p> <pre> 1: $N \leftarrow \text{get_active_nodes}(\text{Tree})$ 2: $\text{greedy} \leftarrow \text{False}$ 3: $j \leftarrow 1$ 4: $M \leftarrow \text{Expand}(N, \text{LM}, \Phi, \text{greedy}, j)$ </pre> <p style="text-align: right;">▷ Stochastic Sampling</p> <p>(c) SMC</p>	<pre> 1: $N \leftarrow \text{get_active_nodes}(\text{Tree})$ 2: $N \leftarrow \text{PUCT}(N)$ 3: $m \leftarrow \text{sample}(N, N.\text{scores})$ 4: while not $m.\text{is_complete}$ do 5: $m.\text{is_active} \leftarrow \text{False}$ 6: $M \leftarrow \text{Expand}(N, \text{LM}, \Phi, \text{True}, k)$ 7: $M \leftarrow \text{PUCT}(M)$ 8: $m \leftarrow \text{sample}(M, M.\text{scores})$ 9: $\text{tree.prune_kv_cache}()$ 10: $m.\text{is_active} \leftarrow \text{True}$ 11: end while </pre> <p>(d) MCTS</p> <pre> 1: $N \leftarrow \text{get_active_nodes}(\text{Tree})$ 2: $m \leftarrow N[0]$ 3: while not $m.\text{is_complete}$ do 4: $m.\text{is_active} \leftarrow \text{False}$ 5: $M \leftarrow \text{Expand}(m, \text{LM}, \Phi, \text{False}, k)$ 6: $M \leftarrow \text{EFG}(M)$ 7: $m \leftarrow \text{sample}(M, M.\text{scores})$ 8: $\text{tree.prune_kv_cache}()$ 9: $m.\text{is_active} \leftarrow \text{True}$ 10: end while </pre> <p style="text-align: right;">▷ Score with efg</p> <p>(e) ASAP</p>
---	---

Fig. 2. Expand without rollouts (left) and expand with rollouts (right). The *sample* function returns a node from the distribution defined by normalizing the node’s scores to sum to 1. The *PUCT* function calculates the *PUCT* score [35] and *EFG* calculates the node’s expected future grammaticality [30].

For MCTS this is done in the while loop (lines 4 to 11). I.e. line 6 is *expand*, line 7-8 is *update*, line 9 performs *pruning*, and line 10 corresponds to *move*. The only difference between ASAP and MCTS is in how they score nodes within the *expand*.

Another important consideration when implementing a rollout based decoding function is to choose the right termination condition within the while loop. Simply relying on sampling the EOS token is not sufficient because if a mistake has been made at the beginning of a Python program, then sampling the EOS token would lead to a probability of zero being assigned by the Expand function. This could then cause the terminal node to be never selected for expansion resulting in an infinite loop. That’s why a maximum length constraint is added for MCTS (line 4) and ASAP (line 3).

Update. The *update* part of the algorithm performs both *local* and *global* updates. It is responsible for scoring nodes and updating node specific state. In Figure 3, we see that the update step behaves differently for each of the decoding functions. For sampling and beamsearch, it scores nodes using their probability (lines 1-3). These would be considered local updates since the score calculation is only based on the newly extended nodes.

Similarly SMC only applies local updates. Node score is either 0 or 1 (line 2) depending on whether it satisfies all constraints. If the effective sample size (*s*) falls below a threshold (0.6), then nodes are resampled according to their scores to the population size (lines 5-8). This step ensures the population size remains consistent after an application of the decoding function.

MCTS and ASAP both employ *global updates*. They both use backpropagation (lines 2-7 and 1-8) respectively to update the entire lineage of node’s scores and state. For MCTS node’s state includes

Update

```

1: for  $m \in M$  do
2:    $m.score \leftarrow m.probability$ 
3: end for
4:  $M \leftarrow sorted(M, M.score)$ 

```

(a) Beam Search

```

1: for  $m \in M$  do
2:    $m.score \leftarrow m.probability$ 
3: end for
4:  $s \leftarrow effective\_sample\_size(Nodes)$ 
5: if  $s \leq 0.6$  then
6:    $M.scores \leftarrow \frac{\sum M.scores}{k}$ 
7:    $M \leftarrow reasample(M, M.scores, k)$ 
8: end if

```

(b) Sampling

(c) SMC

```

1:  $is\_win \leftarrow \lceil m.probability \rceil$ 
2: while  $m.parent$  do
3:    $m.playouts \leftarrow m.playouts + 1$ 
4:    $m.wins \leftarrow m.wins + is\_win$ 
5:    $m.score \leftarrow PUCT(m)$ 
6:    $m \leftarrow m.parent$ 
7: end while

```

(d) MCTS

```

1: while  $m.parent$  do
2:    $efg \leftarrow 0$ 
3:   for  $c \in m.children$  do
4:      $efg \leftarrow efg + c.probability \times c.efg$ 
5:   end for
6:    $m.efg \leftarrow efg$ 
7:    $m \leftarrow m.parent$ 
8: end while

```

(e) ASAP

Fig. 3. Update step of all five decoding functions

number of wins (i.e. number of times the node lead to a valid completion). For ASAP, node’s state includes expected future grammaticality (EFG). Note that upon node creation, we initialise playouts and wins to be equal to zero and EFG to be equal to 1.

Prune. In Figure 4 we see that that the prune step’s purpose is to manage memory. The memory footprint required for storing each node’s state is relatively small when using our approximation. However, KV cache takes up a lot of space (up to 0.5GB in this work, exact size varies based on model size, architecture, and sequence length) and thus needed to be cleared on every application of decoding function to avoid out-of-memory errors. Therefore, after each update step, we perform a call to *tree.prune_kv_cache()* which clears the KV cache of all inactive nodes. To maintain fast decoding, it keeps the cache of active nodes that will be expanded within the next iteration.

Move. The move step of the algorithm selects the next node to expand. We see that population based methods (Beam Search, Sampling and SMC) all move. I.e. they change which nodes are active after an application of the decoding function. MCTS and ASAP are both stationary meaning that they never move from the tree’s root node. Despite not moving, the rolled-out sequences are stored within the tree and used to calculate the end condition ρ and used within the aggregation function \otimes to allow the framework to terminate and return the most promising sequences.

5 Examples of Constraint Functions

In this section, we provide examples of the types of constraint functions for our framework. For illustration, Figure 6 provides several constraint functions that can be combined within our framework. Each constraint function takes in a sequence of tokens generated so far, a tokenizer, prefix length and optional state that contains additional information about the problem such as unit tests. Then, it evaluates the partially generated sequence and returns a scalar score indicating its validity. For instance, SYNTAX checks whether the decoded fragment can be compiled using Python’s codeop module, NO-COMMENTS suppresses inclusion of comments, NO-EXPLANATIONS

Prune & Move

```

1:  $M \leftarrow M[0:k]$ 
2: tree.prune_kv_cache()
3: return set_active(M)
    
```

(a) Beam Search

```

1:  $M \leftarrow \{m | m \in M \cap m.score \geq 0\}$ 
2: tree.prune_kv_cache()
3: return set_active(M)
    
```

(b) Sampling

```

1: tree.prune_kv_cache()
2: return set_active(M)
    
```

(c) SMC

```

1: tree.prune_kv_cache()
2: return set_active(tree.root_node)
    
```

(d) MCTS

```

1: tree.prune_kv_cache()
2: return set_active(tree.root_node)
    
```

(e) ASAP

Fig. 4. Prune and move steps of all five decoding functions

enforces that outputs start with `def` and contain no capital letters after the first line, nudging the model toward code-like continuations rather than natural language explanations, and `UNIT-TESTS` executes generated code against extracted assertions.

Beyond those in Figure 6, we define several additional constraint types that capture increasingly stricter properties of the generated programs (for brevity, these are not provided): (i) `CORRECT-SIGNATURE`—checks whether the function names match the specification and have the correct number of arguments. (ii) `TYPES-AND-SYNTAX`—applies the Pyright static analyser [13] to detect type and syntax errors. For this purpose, we require the model to generate explicit type annotations. (iii) `EXECUTES`—verifies whether the function executes without errors when provided the correct arguments as input. Besides static errors (e.g. syntax, types), this has the ability to catch runtime errors such as infinite loops or unhandled exceptions.

These constraints form a hierarchy of restrictiveness, with `UNIT-TESTS` being the strongest (while `No-COMMENTS` acts orthogonally):




Fig. 5. Partial order of constraints.

These constraints can act individually or jointly during decoding, guiding the search toward syntactically valid, well-structured, and semantically meaningful programs (more details on the constraints and their use are given in the experimental evaluation in Section 7). Formally, they are composed under the product-of-experts formulation introduced earlier, where the overall constraint score is the product of individual constraint outputs. This formulation naturally supports modular composition: each constraint functions as an “expert” that can independently veto invalid continuations, while their combination yields a single, unified quality signal used by the decoding

Require: *token_ids*: Model-generated token sequence
Require: *tokenizer*: Tokenizer for decoding token sequences
Require: *prefix_length*: Index marking end of user’s prompt
Require: *state*: Optional persistent constraint state that includes *unit tests*.

```

1: import codeop
2: def python_syntax(...):
3:   code ← tokenizer.decode(token_ids)
4:   code ← code[prefix_length:]
5:   code ← trim_last_line(code)
6:   valid ← codeop.compile(code)
7:   score ← 1 if valid else 0
8:   return ConstraintOutput(score=score)

```

(a) Python SYNTAX

```

1: def python_comments(...):
2:   code ← tokenizer.decode(token_ids)
3:   code ← code[prefix_length:]
4:   valid ← ("#" ∈ code) or ("'" ∈ code)
5:   score ← 1 if valid else 0
6:   return ConstraintOutput(score=score)

```

(b) No-COMMENTS

```

1: def no_explanations_constraint(...):
2:   code ← tokenizer.decode(token_ids)
3:   has_def ← code.startswith("def")
4:   lines ← code.split("\n", 1)
5:   no_upper ← ¬get_upper(lines[1])
6:   score ← 1 if has_def & no_upper else 0
7:   return ConstraintOutput(score=score)

```

(c) No-EXPLANATIONS

```

1: import eval,
2: def unit_test(...):
3:   if ¬sequence_finished(token_ids)
4:     return ConstraintOutput(score=1)
5:   end if
6:   code ← tokenizer.decode(token_ids[prefix_length :
7: ])
7:   tests ← state
8:   pass ← eval(code, tests)
9:   score ← 1 if valid else 0
10:  return ConstraintOutput(score=score)

```

(d) UNIT-TESTS

Fig. 6. Constraint function examples: SYNTAX (checks syntactic validity), No-COMMENTS (suppress comments), No-EXPLANATIONS (encourage code over natural language explanations), UNIT-TESTS (validate generated code via assertions).

function. As a result, TREECODER enables complex constraint behaviours—such as enforcing syntax, style, and functional correctness simultaneously—without altering the underlying decoding logic.

Expensive constraints still guide search. Certain constraints such as UNIT-TESTS and EXECUTES can only be applied once a sequence has been fully generated. For simple decoding strategies such as sampling, this information is completely dismissed and we are just as likely to re-produce the same erroneous solution on the next iteration. In contrast, more sophisticated strategies such as MCTS and ASAp retain this information within the search tree, reducing the likelihood of repeating previous mistakes. This means that the harder constraints make a bigger difference for more challenging problems that the model does not get right on the first try.

6 Experimental Setup

Infrastructure. All experiments were performed on AWS EC2 g6.2xlarge instances equipped with 8vCPUs, 32GB of RAM and an L4 GPU with 24GB of VRAM.

Datasets. For Python evaluation, we chose the Mostly Basic Programming Problems (MBPP) dataset [6] because it provides unit tests and problems of varying difficulty, allowing us to evaluate LMs with a wide spectrum of capabilities. Each problem consists of a problem description, unit tests and reference solution. We split the unit tests into *public unit tests* which we append to the problem description during generation and *private unit tests* which in combination with public unit tests we use to measure the true accuracy of the generated code. In subsequent optimisation experiments we also split the MBPP dataset into a smaller *validation* dataset used to search for optimal constraint combinations and *test* dataset.

For SQL evaluation we chose the **Spider** dataset [43]. The validation set contains 1034 natural language questions that can be answered by an SQL query. The dataset also contains a schema and a database which is used to verify the correctness of a query by executing it and comparing the result to the reference query.

Language Models. We evaluate our framework using CODELLAMA-7B [36] instruct, MISTRAL-7B-INSTRUCT-v0.3 [23] DEEPSEEK-CODER-7B-INSTRUCT-v1.5 [14] and Qwen [42] models for evaluation. We run models whose parameter count is above 4B in half precision (fp16) due to VRam constraints.

Framework parameters. We use the following **termination condition** ρ for all of our experiments: we finish generation when we find 5 complete nodes, or have reached 10k nodes, or have no more active nodes or when one of our nodes exceeds the length limit.

$$\begin{aligned} \rho: \quad & \#\{n \mid n \text{ is terminal} \ \& \ n\text{'s score} \geq 0\} \geq 5 && \text{or} \\ & \#n \geq 10\,000 && \text{or} \\ & \#\{n \mid n \text{ is active}\} = 0 && \text{or} \\ & \#\{n \mid \text{len}(n) \geq 256\} \geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

We use the following **aggregation function** for all of our experiments: we preferably choose nodes who are complete and have a score that's higher than 0, followed by complete nodes that contain syntax errors.

$$\begin{aligned} \otimes: \quad & \text{top}_5(\{n \mid n \text{ is terminal}\} \cup \\ & \{n \mid n \text{ is active} \ \& \ \text{not terminal}\} \cup \\ & \{n \mid n \text{ is not active} \ \& \ \text{not terminal}\}) \end{aligned}$$

Metrics. We report the accuracy which signifies the proportion of problems where the solution passes all public and private testcases. Conversely, the unit test constraint only uses the *public* tests to guide generation.

For later comparisons with other frameworks, we expand on this metric by using the pass@k metric, which checks whether any of the k generated solutions satisfy all unit tests. We report the total number of node expansions as a measure of how efficient our implementation is. In the context of comparing algorithms, we use the number of node expansions as an upper bound to performance. This score directly measures how many times an LLM call was made multiplied by the batchsize to produce the probability distribution over the next token.

7 Experimental Evaluation

7.1 Using TREECODER for Constraint Enforcement during Decoding

Most current interactions with LLMs for programming rely on prompt engineering to steer model behaviour and describe desired properties such as correctness or style. However, these textual constraints are interpreted heuristically and are often ignored during generation. Conversely, TREECODER enables easy experimentation with constraints directly during decoding.

To illustrate this, we evaluate CODELLAMA-7B under a range of constraint configurations (described in Section 5), all capturing information already described in the prompt. As rows 1-7 in Table 2 show, each constraint type progressively increases the precision of the generated code. In particular, unit tests yield the largest gains, while syntactic constraints alone provide marginal benefits. Lightweight constraints such as comment suppression reduce node expansions by 6.5% compared to no constraints, without degrading accuracy.

For comparison purposes, Table 3 further analyses which constraints are most frequently violated when they only appear in the prompt, particularly those related to program execution and types. Higher values correspond to stricter or more frequently violated constraints. This evaluation reveals that many natural language constraints are disregarded by the LLM, confirming the need for decoding-time enforcement rather than relying on prompt-level guidance.

Model	Width	Decoding	Constraints	Accuracy (%)	Expansions
CODELLAMA-7B	5	Sampling	-	32.3	274
CODELLAMA-7B	5	Sampling	No-COMMENTS	32.8	256
CODELLAMA-7B	5	Sampling	SYNTAX	34.0	270
CODELLAMA-7B	5	Sampling	CORRECT-SIGNATURE	36.1	254
CODELLAMA-7B	5	Sampling	TYPES-AND-SYNTAX	47.5	610
CODELLAMA-7B	5	Sampling	EXECUTES	47.1	359
CODELLAMA-7B	5	Sampling	UNIT-TESTS	60.0	417
CODELLAMA-7B	5	Sampling	All	60.7	316
CODELLAMA-7B	5	SMC	All	61.4	332
CODELLAMA-7B	5	Beam Search	All	63.0	706
CODELLAMA-7B	5	MCTS	All	65.3	1099
CODELLAMA-7B	5	ASAP	All	68.9	1158

Table 2. Performance under different decoding strategies and constraint combinations on MBPP. “All” combines SYNTAX, UNIT-TESTS and No-COMMENTS constraints. For TYPES-AND-SYNTAX checking we use the playwright library and instruct the LM to generate type annotations (which slightly increases the length of generated program, which in turn increases the node expansions).

Constraint Type	Filtered (%)
UNIT-TESTS	55.6
EXECUTES	39.6
TYPES-AND-SYNTAX	25.9
No-EXPLANATIONS	12.9
No-COMMENTS	4.1
SYNTAX	2.4
CORRECT-SIGNATURE	1.9

Table 3. Percentage of generations filtered out by each constraint type for the CODELLAMA-7B model using sampling with a population size of 5 and without any constraints. A higher value indicates a stricter or more frequently violated constraint. Out of the five generated solutions we only evaluate the highest scoring sequence for each problem.

Mis-aligned models. The previous experiments evaluated constraint-guided coding on well-aligned models that generally followed code-only instructions. However, many open-source models such as MISTRAL-7B and DEEPSEEK-7B exhibit persistent misalignment: they tend to ignore prompts and interleave natural-language commentary with code, producing *explanation-code-explanation* patterns *even when explicitly asked to output only code*. This behaviour illustrates the limitations of prompt-level control and motivates decoding-time constraint enforcement.

To address this, we employ the lightweight No-EXPLANATIONS constraint (Section 5), which enforces that outputs start with `def` and contain no capital letters after the first line. This nudges the model toward code-like continuations from the outset. Because the initial `def` token often has low model confidence, we include it in the always-considered token list and slightly increase the expansion parameter ($j=25$ rather than $j=5$) to preserve plausible continuations.

As shown in Table 4, these minimal decoding-time interventions substantially improve code validity. For both MISTRAL-7B and DEEPSEEK-7B, enforcing No-EXPLANATIONS improves performance

Model	Decoding Function	Constraints	Accuracy (%)	Expansions
MISTRAL-7B	Beam Search	-	-	205
MISTRAL-7B	Beam Search	SYNTAX	-	603
MISTRAL-7B	Beam Search	No-EXPLANATIONS	33.7	252
MISTRAL-7B	Beam Search	SYNTAX +No-EXPLANATIONS	33.2	607
DEEPSEEK-7B	Beam Search	-	-	448
DEEPSEEK-7B	Beam Search	SYNTAX	-	492
DEEPSEEK-7B	Beam Search	No-EXPLANATIONS	61.8	557
DEEPSEEK-7B	Beam Search	SYNTAX +No-EXPLANATIONS	61.3	543

Table 4. Population size was set to 5, and the expansion approximation parameter j was set to 25. We use MISTRAL-7B-INSTRUCT-v0.3 and DEEPSEEK-CODER-7B-INSTRUCT-v1.5 models for comparison.

from near-zero compliance with basic output instructions (denoted as - in the table) to reliable code generation in over 30% and 60% of cases, respectively. In this case, simple syntactic checks are insufficient. They typically trigger only after invalid prefixes denoting explanations have already been generated, making recovery difficult.

This experiment reinforces the idea that even lightweight constraints, applied during decoding rather than expressed in the prompt, can realign misbehaving models toward syntactically valid and executable code.

7.2 Using TREECODER to Compare Decoding Strategies

Beyond constraints, TREECODER enables users to vary the underlying decoding strategy itself, revealing how different search behaviours trade off accuracy and efficiency. Among the methods tested, ASAP achieves the highest accuracy, closely followed by MCTS (rows 8–12 in Table 2). Both rely on rollouts and backtracking to refine partial hypotheses, which improves solution quality but increases computational cost as suggested by the higher number of expansions. In contrast, beam search expands more nodes than sampling or SMC, as it maintains distinct beams rather than merging similar candidates. These results highlight how TREECODER facilitates systematic exploration of decoding dynamics—allowing practitioners to switch search strategies within a single unified framework.

7.3 Using TREECODER for Systematic Exploration of the Design Space

Beyond enabling users to manually select constraints and decoding strategies, TREECODER also supports *automatic exploration* of this design space. In particular, it integrates the optimisation algorithm described in Section 3.1 to systematically search for configurations that maximise task performance.

Finding the best configuration for CODELLAMA-7B. To illustrate this capability, we investigate the following question: *What is the the optimal decoding function, constraints, and population size that optimises the accuracy given a soft time limit of 10 seconds per sample?* We address this through a two-stage experiment that automatically identifies effective decoding configurations and then evaluates their generalisation to unseen test cases.

Stage 1 – Searching for the optimal configuration. We employ the Optuna library [2], which implements Gaussian-process-based Bayesian optimisation, to explore five decoding functions (beam search, sampling, MCTS, ASAP, and SMC), population sizes from 1 to 5, and combinations of constraints including Python SYNTAX, UNIT-TESTS and No-COMMENTS. In total, the search space

comprises 200 unique configurations, and the optimisation uses log Expected Improvement as the acquisition function to balance exploration and exploitation.

Each configuration is evaluated on the 50 validation problems of MBPP, with a soft time limit of 10 seconds per query checked after each decoding step. Table 5 reports the best configuration found for each decoding function showing the accuracy and sample time on the test problems.

The search identifies SMC with UNIT-TESTS and NO-COMMENTS constraints as the most effective strategy, achieving 68 % accuracy, while remaining within the runtime budget (Table 5). Across decoding methods, unit tests emerge as the most influential constraint, and larger population sizes consistently improve accuracy, highlighting the benefits of maintaining multiple concurrent hypotheses.

Decoding Function	Constraint Config.	Pop. Size	Validation Acc.(%)	Validation Time(s)	Test Acc.(%)	Test Time(s)
Sequential Monte Carlo	UNIT-TESTS +NO-COMMENTS	5	68.0	1.7	59.2	3.2
Beam Search	UNIT-TESTS	4	64.0	6.7	58.1	7.2
Sampling	UNIT-TESTS	5	62.0	2.8	58.4	3.5
ASAp	UNIT-TESTS	4	52.0	12.1	49.9	13.9
Monte Carlo Tree Search	UNIT-TESTS +SYNTAX	5	54.0	10.8	45.4	12.1
Baseline CODELLAMA-7B (Sampling)	No Constraints	1	-	-	36.1	1.7

Table 5. Performance of each decoding function on validation (tuning) and test splits of the MBPP dataset. For MCTS and ASAp, population size corresponds to the expansion parameter j .

Stage 2 – Evaluate on the Test Set. We then test the best configurations on the test dataset split of the MBPP to assess whether the optimised settings generalise to unseen programs. Table 5 also presents the corresponding results on the validation split. While overall accuracies decrease slightly, reflecting the higher difficulty of the test set, the same qualitative trends persist: *configurations that incorporate unit-test constraints and use larger populations consistently outperform the unconstrained baseline*, i.e. the default implementation for CODELLAMA-7B provided by Hugging Face which uses sampling and generates a single sequence without any constraints.

Finding the best LM configuration. Next, we run an optimisation experiment to choose the optimal LM configuration among CODELLAMA-7B, DEEPSEEK-7B and MISTRAL-7B for accuracy and a soft time limit of 10 seconds, using the test/validation split of MBPP. This experiment also includes the NO-EXPLANATIONS constraint, which suppresses the generation of natural-language explanations.

Results are reported in Table 6, where the best emerging configuration is for CODELLAMA-7B. We also show the best configuration for each model. In summary, on MBPP, the best CODELLAMA-7B configuration outperforms DEEPSEEK-7B by 14% and MISTRAL-7B-INSTRUCT-v0.3 by 24% indicating the importance of choosing the right LM for a given task. Notably, the best configuration is not the same for all models, for instance, CODELLAMA-7B does not require the NO-EXPLANATIONS constraint. In comparison to Table 5, the best decoding strategy for CODELLAMA-7B remains the same; however, the constraint configuration slightly differs because of the larger space and the inherent non-determinism of sampling based algorithms.

7.4 Comparison of TREECODER to Existing Frameworks

To assess runtime efficiency and accuracy fidelity, we compare TREECODER with Hugging Face Transformers [41] and IterGen [39].

Language Model	Decoding Function	Constraint Config.	Pop. Size	Validation Acc.(%)	Validation Time(s)	Test Acc.(%)	Test Time(s)
CODELLAMA-7B	Sequential Monte Carlo	SYNTAX +UNIT-TESTS	5	66.00	2.67	61.27	3.29
DEEPSEEK-7B	Beam Search	NO-EXPLANATIONS +UNIT-TESTS	5	52.00	9.47	50.66	9.24
MISTRAL-7B	Beam Search	NO-EXPLANATIONS +UNIT-TESTS	5	38.00	9.87	32.89	9.91
Baseline CODELLAMA-7B	Sampling	No Constraints	1	-	-	36.1	1.72

Table 6. Performance of each LM on validation (tuning) and test splits of the MBPP dataset.

Comparison to Hugging Face. We compare TREECODER against the Hugging Face transformers library on the MBPP benchmark using identical decoding settings. Despite its general-purpose abstractions, TREECODER achieves virtually identical accuracy—matching pass@5 and pass@1 scores across both beam search and sampling—while maintaining near-equivalent runtime. In particular, TREECODER’s beam search is only about 25% slower (2.8 s vs. 2.1 s) and its sampling slightly faster (2.7 s vs. 2.8 s). These results show that the framework’s modularity and flexibility introduce negligible overhead compared to specialised implementations, while supporting far richer combinations of decoding strategies and constraints. Full runtime and accuracy details are provided in the Supplementary Material.

Comparison to IterGen. We also compare TREECODER against IterGen, which supports grammar-based backtracking but only explores a single decoding trajectory at a time. For this purpose, we re-implement IterGen’s SQL decoding algorithm within our framework and reproduce its outputs on the Spider dataset with an average of 87.6% identical queries and nearly identical accuracy (see Table 7).

Name	Model	Constraints	Accuracy	Identical Queries (%)
IterGen	Qwen2.5-Coder-1.5B	SYNTAX + ALIAS	47.4	93.2
IterGen (TREECODER)	Qwen2.5-Coder-1.5B	SYNTAX + ALIAS	47.9	93.2
IterGen	Llama3-8B	SYNTAX + ALIAS	36.4	90.4
IterGen (TREECODER)	Llama3-8B	SYNTAX + ALIAS	36.2	90.4
IterGen	Llama3.2-3B	SYNTAX + ALIAS	23.3	79.1
IterGen (TREECODER)	Llama3.2-3B	SYNTAX + ALIAS	23.7	79.1

Table 7. Comparison between IterGen’s SQL decoding algorithm re-implemented in TREECODER and original. The SYNTAX constraint enforces valid SQL syntax while the ALIAS constraint ensures that an alias refers to a valid SQL table.

8 Related Work

Decoding determines how an LLM explores its output space when generating text or code. While numerous studies have introduced constrained decoding methods that incorporate lexical, syntactic, or semantic rules [7, 21, 28, 33, 38], most of these approaches build on a small set of core search paradigms, as mentioned in the previous section: sampling [11, 24, 44], beam search [20–22, 28, 29, 38], SMC [10, 15, 25] and MCTS [19, 27, 34].

Various works have sought to extend these base algorithms by introducing additional constraints during generation. Such constraints are especially valuable in code generation, where syntactic or semantic violations immediately lead to compilation or execution errors. Constraint-aware beam search [7, 21, 28] integrates lexical, logical, or grammatical restrictions directly into the beam

expansion step, while systems such as Synchromesh [33] adapt sampling to enforce semantic or structural validity. Despite their diversity, these approaches all instantiate specific combinations of search policy and constraint enforcement—precisely the coupling that our framework aims to decouple and generalise.

Next, we focus on grammar-constrained and grammar-aligned decoding, two major paradigms for ensuring structural and semantic validity during generation.

Grammar-Constrained Decoding. Grammar-constrained decoding (GCD) aims to generate sentences that conform to a formal grammar, making it applicable to tasks such as entity disambiguation, closed information extraction, constituency parsing, conflict resolution, and code generation [17, 37]. GCD methods typically use a parser to mask tokens that would lead to invalid completions [17, 32, 37], thereby ensuring syntactic well-formedness of the generated text.

Grammar-Aligned Decoding. While GCD enforces syntactic validity, it does not ensure semantic alignment with the underlying grammar. It may assign high probability to prefixes whose valid continuations are semantically implausible, distorting the overall output distribution [30]. To address this, grammar-aligned decoding (GAD) methods refine the decoding process using grammar feedback. ASAP [30] sequentially samples under grammar constraints and adjusts token probabilities; SMC [25] maintains a population of constrained hypotheses that are periodically resampled; and MCMC [18] iteratively refines full completions via prefix-based edits. All three approaches converge to the true constrained distribution but differ in their trade-offs: MCMC can converge quickly on structured tasks, SMC benefits from GPU-friendly parallelisation at the cost of higher memory use, and ASAP and MCMC provide adaptive runtime budgets through sequential refinement.

Constrained Decoding Frameworks. The most closely related frameworks are SynCode [40] and IterGen [39]. SynCode first introduced grammar-constrained decoding via incremental parsing, while IterGen extended it to allow traversal of the search space using grammatical units. However, IterGen remains fundamentally a *single-sequence* decoding framework: it supports grammar-constrained sampling with backtracking but lacks native support for *population-based* search methods such as beam search, SMC, or MCTS.

Our framework generalises beyond these approaches in three key ways. First, it supports *concurrent decoding of multiple partial sequences*, enabling population-based strategies and efficient exploration of the search space. Second, it *extends beyond grammars* by modelling decoding as constrained tree search parameterised by arbitrary decoding functions and constraint modules. Third, it *enables systematic exploration and optimisation of the design space* spanning decoding strategies, constraints, and hyperparameters.

9 Conclusions

We introduced TREECODER, a modular framework for LLM constraint decoding that unifies diverse decoding strategies and constraint types within a single tree-based abstraction. Its flexible design enables automatic optimisation over decoding strategies, constraints and hyperparameters, allowing users to systematically explore and compare configurations through a shared interface. Experiments on the MBPP and Spider benchmarks show that enforcing constraints during decoding and jointly optimising decoding configurations with TREECODER significantly improves code-generation accuracy across models such as CodeLlama, Mistral and DeepSeek.

References

- [1] Kareem Ahmed, Kai-Wei Chang, and Guy Van den Broeck. 2024. Controllable Generation via Locally Constrained Resampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13111* (2024).
- [2] Takuya Akiba, Shotaro Sano, Toshihiko Yanase, Takeru Ohta, and Masanori Koyama. 2019. Optuna: A Next-generation Hyperparameter Optimization Framework. *arXiv:1907.10902* [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.10902>
- [3] Takuya Akiba, Shotaro Sano, Toshihiko Yanase, Takeru Ohta, and Masanori Koyama. 2019. Optuna: A Next-Generation Hyperparameter Optimization Framework. In *The 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 2623–2631.
- [4] Zhamri Che Ani, Zauridah Abdul Hamid, and Nur Nazifa Zhamri. 2024. The Recent Trends of Research on GitHub Copilot: A Systematic Review. In *Computing and Informatics*, Nur Haryani Zakaria, Nur Suhaili Mansor, Husniza Husni, and Fathey Mohammed (Eds.). Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore, 355–366.
- [5] Zhamri Che Ani, Zauridah Abdul Hamid, and Nur Nazifa Zhamri. 2024. The Recent Trends of Research on GitHub Copilot: A Systematic Review. In *Computing and Informatics*, Nur Haryani Zakaria, Nur Suhaili Mansor, Husniza Husni, and Fathey Mohammed (Eds.). Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore, 355–366.
- [6] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell I. Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie J. Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc V. Le, and Charles Sutton. 2021. Program Synthesis with Large Language Models. *CoRR* abs/2108.07732 (2021). *arXiv:2108.07732* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07732>
- [7] Debangshu Banerjee, Tarun Suresh, Shubham Ugare, Sasa Misailovic, and Gagandeep Singh. 2025. CRANE: Reasoning with constrained LLM generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.09061* (2025).
- [8] Yehoshua Bar-Hillel, Micha Perles, and Eli Shamir. 1961. On formal properties of simple phrase structure grammars. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 14 (1961), 143–172.
- [9] Cameron B. Browne, Edward Powley, Daniel Whitehouse, Simon M. Lucas, Peter I. Cowling, Philipp Rohlfshagen, Stephen Tavener, Diego Perez, Spyridon Samothrakis, and Simon Colton. 2012. A Survey of Monte Carlo Tree Search Methods. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in Games* 4, 1 (2012), 1–43. [doi:10.1109/TCIAIG.2012.2186810](https://doi.org/10.1109/TCIAIG.2012.2186810)
- [10] Olivier Cappe, Simon J. Godsill, and Eric Moulines. 2007. An Overview of Existing Methods and Recent Advances in Sequential Monte Carlo. *Proc. IEEE* 95, 5 (2007), 899–924. [doi:10.1109/JPROC.2007.893250](https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2007.893250)
- [11] 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, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *arXiv:2107.03374* [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374>
- [12] Xiang Chen, Jiacheng Xue, Xiaofei Xie, Caokai Liang, and Xiaolin Ju. 2025. A Systematic Literature Review on Neural Code Translation. *arXiv:2505.07425* [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.07425>
- [13] Microsoft Corporation. 2025. Pyright: Static Type Checker for Python. <https://github.com/microsoft/pyright>. Accessed: 2025-11-13.
- [14] 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, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Haowei Zhang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Li, Hui Qu, J. L. Cai, Jian Liang, Jianzhong Guo, Jiaqi Ni, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jin Chen, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, Junxiao Song, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peiyi Wang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qihao Zhu, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Ruyi Chen, S. S. Li, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Shengfeng Ye, Shirong Ma, Shiyu Wang, Shuang Zhou, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, T. Wang, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, W. L. Xiao, Wangding Zeng, Wanbiao Zhao, Wei An, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xianzu Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaokang Zhang, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xingkai Yu, Xinnan Song, Xinxia Shan, Xinyi Zhou, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Y. X. Zhu, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Li, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yi Zheng, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Ying Tang, Yishi Piao, Yisong

- Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yu Wu, Yuan Ou, Yuchen Zhu, Yudian Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yukun Zha, Yunfan Xiong, Yunxian Ma, Yuting Yan, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Z. F. Wu, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhen Huang, Zhen Zhang, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhibin Gou, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhihong Shao, Zhipeng Xu, Zhiyu Wu, Zhongyu Zhang, Zhuoshu Li, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Ziyi Gao, and Zizheng Pan. 2025. DeepSeek-V3 Technical Report. arXiv:2412.19437 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.19437>
- [15] Arnaud Doucet, Nando de Freitas, and Neil Gordon. 2001. *An Introduction to Sequential Monte Carlo Methods*. Springer New York, New York, NY, 3–14. doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-3437-9_1
- [16] Saibo Geng, Berkay Döner, Chris Wendler, Martin Josifoski, and Robert West. 2024. Sketch-guided constrained decoding for boosting blackbox large language models without logit access. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09967* (2024).
- [17] Saibo Geng, Martin Josifoski, Maxime Peyrard, and Robert West. 2024. Grammar-Constrained Decoding for Structured NLP Tasks without Finetuning. arXiv:2305.13971 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.13971>
- [18] Emmanuel Anaya Gonzalez, Sairam Vaidya, Kanghee Park, Ruyi Ji, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Loris D’Antoni. 2025. Constrained Sampling for Language Models Should Be Easy: An MCMC Perspective. arXiv:2506.05754 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.05754>
- [19] Xinyu Guan, Li Lyna Zhang, Yifei Liu, Ning Shang, Youran Sun, Yi Zhu, Fan Yang, and Mao Yang. 2025. rStar-Math: Small LLMs Can Master Math Reasoning with Self-Evolved Deep Thinking. arXiv:2501.04519 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.04519>
- [20] Jianfei He, Shichao Sun, Xiaohua Jia, and Wenjie Li. 2023. Empirical Analysis of Beam Search Curse and Search Errors with Model Errors in Neural Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, Mary Nurminen, Judith Brenner, Maarit Koponen, Sirkku Latomaa, Mikhail Mikhailov, Frederike Schierl, Tharindu Ranasinghe, Eva Vanmassenhove, Sergi Alvarez Vidal, Nora Aranberri, Mara Nunziatini, Carla Parra Escartin, Mikel Forcada, Maja Popovic, Carolina Scarton, and Helena Moniz (Eds.). European Association for Machine Translation, Tampere, Finland, 91–101. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.eamt-1.10/>
- [21] Corentin Hokamp and Qun Liu. 2017. Lexically Constrained Decoding for Neural Machine Translation via Grid Beam Search. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*. 1535–1546.
- [22] Liang Huang, Kai Zhao, and Mingbo Ma. 2018. When to Finish? Optimal Beam Search for Neural Text Generation (modulo beam size). arXiv:1809.00069 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.00069>
- [23] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. Mistral 7B. arXiv:2310.06825 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06825>
- [24] Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustín Dal Lago, Thomas Hubert, Peter Choy, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Igor Babuschkin, Xinyun Chen, Po-Sen Huang, Johannes Welbl, Sven Gowal, Alexey Cherepanov, James Molloy, Daniel J. Mankowitz, Esme Sutherland Robson, Pushmeet Kohli, Nando de Freitas, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Oriol Vinyals. 2022. Competition-level code generation with AlphaCode. *Science* 378, 6624 (2022), 1092–1097. doi:10.1126/science.abq1158 arXiv:<https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.abq1158>
- [25] João Loula, Benjamin LeBrun, Li Du, Ben Lipkin, Clemente Pasti, Gabriel Grand, Tianyu Liu, Yahya Emara, Marjorie Freedman, Jason Eisner, Ryan Cotterell, Vikash Mansinghka, Alexander K. Lew, Tim Vieira, and Timothy J. O’Donnell. 2025. Syntactic and Semantic Control of Large Language Models via Sequential Monte Carlo. arXiv:2504.13139 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.13139>
- [26] João Loula, Benjamin LeBrun, Li Du, Ben Lipkin, Clemente Pasti, Gabriel Grand, Tianyu Liu, Yahya Emara, Marjorie Freedman, Jason Eisner, Ryan Cotterell, Vikash Mansinghka, Alexander K. Lew, Tim Vieira, and Timothy J. O’Donnell. 2025. Syntactic and Semantic Control of Large Language Models via Sequential Monte Carlo. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- [27] Tingwei Lu, Yangning Li, Liyuan Wang, Binghuai Lin, Jiwei Tang, Qingsong Lv, Wanshi Xu, Hai-Tao Zheng, Yinghui Li, Xin Su, and Zifei Shan. 2025. LSR-MCTS: Alleviating Long Range Dependency in Code Generation. arXiv:2504.07433 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.07433>
- [28] Ximing Lu, Peter West, Rowan Zellers, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. NeuroLogic Decoding: (Un)supervised Neural Text Generation with Predicate Logic Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 4288–4299. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.339
- [29] Clara Meister, Tim Vieira, and Ryan Cotterell. 2021. If beam search is the answer, what was the question? arXiv:2010.02650 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.02650>

- [30] Kanghee Park, Jiayu Wang, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, Nadia Polikarpova, and Loris D’Antoni. 2024. Grammar-Aligned Decoding. [arXiv:2405.21047](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.21047) [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.21047>
- [31] Kanghee Park, Jiayu Wang, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, Nadia Polikarpova, and Loris D’Antoni. 2025. Grammar-aligned decoding. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (NIPS ’24). Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 774, 22 pages.
- [32] Gabriel Poesia, Oleksandr Polozov, Vu Le, Ashish Tiwari, Gustavo Soares, Christopher Meek, and Sumit Gulwani. 2022. Synchromesh: Reliable code generation from pre-trained language models. [arXiv:2201.11227](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11227) [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11227>
- [33] Gabriel Poesia, Oleksandr Polozov, Vu Le, Ashish Tiwari, Gustavo Soares, Christopher Meek, and Sumit Gulwani. 2022. Synchromesh: Reliable Code Generation from Pre-Trained Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02805* (2022).
- [34] Isha Puri, Shivchander Sudalairaj, Guangxuan Xu, Kai Xu, and Akash Srivastava. 2025. Rollout Roulette: A Probabilistic Inference Approach to Inference-Time Scaling of LLMs using Particle-Based Monte Carlo Methods. [arXiv:2502.01618](https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.01618) [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.01618>
- [35] Christopher D. Rosin. 2011. Multi-armed bandits with episode context. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* 61, 3 (2011), 203–230. doi:10.1007/s10472-011-9258-6
- [36] 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, Jade Copet, Faisal Azhar, Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Nicolas Usunier, Thomas Scialom, and Gabriel Synnaeve. 2024. Code Llama: Open Foundation Models for Code. [arXiv:2308.12950](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.12950) [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.12950>
- [37] Torsten Scholak, Nathan Schucher, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. 2021. PICARD: Parsing Incrementally for Constrained Auto-Regressive Decoding from Language Models. [arXiv:2109.05093](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.05093) [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.05093>
- [38] Torsten Scholak, Nathan Schücher, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. 2021. PICARD: Parsing Incrementally for Constrained Autoregressive Decoding from Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 7517–7535.
- [39] Shubham Ugare, Rohan Gumaste, Tarun Suresh, Gagandeep Singh, and Sasa Misailovic. 2025. IterGen: Iterative Semantic-aware Structured LLM Generation with Backtracking. [arXiv:2410.07295](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.07295) [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.07295>
- [40] Shubham Ugare, Tarun Suresh, Hangoo Kang, Sasa Misailovic, and Gagandeep Singh. 2024. Improving LLM Code Generation with Grammar Augmentation. *CoRR* abs/2403.01632 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.01632>
- [41] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. 2020. HuggingFace’s Transformers: State-of-the-art Natural Language Processing. [arXiv:1910.03771](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03771) [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03771>
- [42] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, Chujie Zheng, Dayiheng Liu, Fan Zhou, Fei Huang, Feng Hu, Hao Ge, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiaxi Yang, Jing Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Lianghao Deng, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Mingze Li, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Shixuan Liu, Shuang Luo, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Wenbiao Yin, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Wang, Xinyu Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yinger Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zekun Wang, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhipeng Zhou, and Zihan Qiu. 2025. Qwen3 Technical Report. [arXiv:2505.09388](https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09388) [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09388>
- [43] Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, Zilin Zhang, and Dragomir Radev. 2019. Spider: A Large-Scale Human-Labeled Dataset for Complex and Cross-Domain Semantic Parsing and Text-to-SQL Task. [arXiv:1809.08887](https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.08887) [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.08887>
- [44] Yuqi Zhu, Jia Li, Ge Li, Yunfei Zhao, Jia Li, Zhi Jin, and Hong Mei. 2023. Hot or Cold? Adaptive Temperature Sampling for Code Generation with Large Language Models. [arXiv:2309.02772](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.02772) [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.02772>