

---

# Improving Weak-to-Strong Generalization with Scalable Oversight and Ensemble Learning

---

Jitao Sang<sup>\*†</sup>, Yuhang Wang<sup>\*</sup>, Jing Zhang, Yanxu Zhu, Chao Kong,  
Junhong Ye, Shuyu Wei and Jinlin Xiao  
Department of Computer Science  
Beijing Jiaotong University  
Beijing, China 100044

## Abstract

This paper presents a follow-up study to OpenAI’s recent superalignment work on Weak-to-Strong Generalization (W2SG). Superalignment focuses on ensuring that high-level AI systems remain consistent with human values and intentions when dealing with complex, high-risk tasks. The W2SG framework has opened new possibilities for empirical research in this evolving field.

Our study simulates two phases of superalignment under the W2SG framework: the development of general superhuman models and the progression towards superintelligence. In the first phase, based on human supervision, the quality of weak supervision is enhanced through a combination of scalable oversight and ensemble learning, reducing the capability gap between weak teachers and strong students. In the second phase, an automatic alignment evaluator is employed as the weak supervisor. By recursively updating this auto aligner, the capabilities of the weak teacher models are synchronously enhanced, achieving weak-to-strong supervision over stronger student models.

We also provide an initial validation of the proposed approach for the first phase. Using the SciQ task as example, we explore ensemble learning for weak teacher models through bagging and boosting. Scalable oversight is explored through two auxiliary settings: human-AI interaction and AI-AI debate. Additionally, the paper discusses the impact of improved weak supervision on enhancing weak-to-strong generalization based on in-context learning. Experiment code and dataset will be released at <https://github.com/ADaM-BJTU/W2SG>.

## 1 Introduction


Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) is the pivotal solution today in aligning powerful AI models with human intentions and values. It has demonstrated considerable success in aligning advanced language models such as GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and Llama2. RLHF is underpinned by the principle of rewarding behaviors highly regarded by humans while penalizing those deemed inferior, as outlined in seminal works [3, 7]. Therefore, its efficacy hinges on the availability of high-quality feedback from human evaluators. As depicted in Figure 1(a)<sup>1</sup>, the continual enhancement of AI capabilities presents a conspicuous dichotomy: while AI capabilities are on an upward trajectory, human evaluative capacity remains relatively unchanged. Consequently, we will reach an inflection point where models transcending human-level performance begin to manifest complex behaviors

---


<sup>\*</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work.

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author: [jtsang@bjtu.edu.cn](mailto:jtsang@bjtu.edu.cn)

<sup>1</sup>Copied from a slide in Jan Leike’s talk “Language and Human Alignment” (Jan.17, 2023).



(a) Evaluated by RLHF.



(b) Evaluated by SO, W2SG and mW2SG+SO.

Figure 1: Task difficulty: AI can do vs. overseer can evaluate .

beyond human comprehension. At this juncture, the human ability to provide effective feedback diminishes, and thus RLHF will fail in aligning these superhuman AI models.

One approach to address the above *Superalignment*<sup>2</sup> challenge is *Scalable Oversight* (SO), which seeks to augment the human supervision with carefully designed AI assistants [1]. The core idea is to create a composite overseer, that surpasses the capabilities of the AI models being monitored (illustrated by the purple dash line in Figure 1(b)). However, this approach encounters a major problem stemming from its overly optimistic assumption: as the AI models grow stronger and more complex, it becomes increasingly challenging to ensure that this augmented human supervision can consistently outpace the AI’s advancements.

OpenAI’s Superalignment team has recently introduced its first study named *Weak-to-Strong Generalization* (W2SG [2]). Instead of enhancing the supervisory quality, W2SG leverages weaker models as proxies for human supervisors and aims to ensure that stronger models can generalize from the imperfect supervisory signals of the weaker models. This idea is illustrated by the white arrow in Figure 1(b)). W2SG offers a novel perspective to address superalignment challenges and makes empirical research in this area feasible through the analogy between human evaluator and weaker models. It provides a promising avenue by leveraging the nuanced understanding that even less sophisticated AI models can contribute meaningfully to guiding and shaping more advanced models.

From the experimental results in the W2SG paper [2], it is easy to find that enhancing the capabilities of the weak teacher models plays a crucial role in improving generalization performance. On the

<sup>2</sup><https://openai.com/blog/introducing-superalignment/>

other hand, merely increasing the capabilities of the strong student models, while keeping the weak teacher models unchanged, yields trivial improvements in generalization. This can be intuitively understood: enhancing the weak teacher models’ capabilities provides more effective supervisory signals. In contrast, simply boosting the strong student models amplifies the capability gap between the two, thereby escalating the challenges in weak-to-strong generalization.

Therefore, this study is motivated to enhance the performance of weak-to-strong generalization by improving the accuracy of the supervisory signals from the weak teacher models. Specifically, we employ a combination of ensemble learning and scalable oversight approaches: ensemble learning integrates multiple weak teacher models in both serial and parallel schemes to enhance the quality of supervision (multiple Weak-to-Strong Generalization, abbreviated as mW2SG and detailed in Section 3), and scalable oversight allows the strong models to assist the weak teacher models in evaluation (abbreviated as SO, detailed in Section 4). These two approaches can reduce the capability gap between the weak teacher and the strong student (illustrated by the blue dash line in Figure 1(b)), thereby more effectively facilitating weak-to-strong generalization in harnessing the potential of weak supervision to elicit stronger models.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce a two-phase superalignment roadmap based on the weak-to-strong generalization framework. The first phase is grounded in human supervision, while the second phase pivots to an automated aligned evaluator. Targeting the first phase, Section 3 and Section 4 elaborate two respective methods of ensemble learning and scalable oversight to improve weak-to-strong generalization. Experiments and results are also reported. In Section 5, we discuss the alternative weak-to-strong generalization setup under in-context learning. The role of scalable oversight in improving weak supervision and contextual example selection is examined.

## 2 The Roadmap to Aligned Super Intelligence via Weak-to-Strong Generalization

According to the conceptual framework of OpenAI, the realization of superintelligence is envisaged to unfold in two phases: the general superhuman model and superintelligence. Addressing these two pivotal phases, this section will outline the superalignment roadmap under the weak-to-strong generalization setting.


### 2.1 Phase 1: Towards General Superhuman Model

This initial phase is characterized by the development of AI models that outperform human capabilities in a broad range of tasks. Since the capability gap between the model to be aligned and humans for this phase is not vast, human evaluators can serve as weak supervisors. The approaches proposed in this work, combining ensemble learning and scalable oversight, are specifically targeted at this phase. They aim to enhance the supervisory quality of human evaluators over complex tasks, by integrating multiple weak supervisions and employing assistive AI models.


### 2.2 Phase 2: Towards Superintelligence

In this advanced phase, the AI models evolve to a level of computational and cognitive capability several orders of magnitude beyond the human level. As the complexity of tasks that AI can handle substantially exceeds human understanding, the supervisory role of human evaluators, even with the assistance of strong auxiliary models, diminishes progressively. As illustrated in Figure 2(a), the effectiveness of human supervision reduces to insignificance once student models’ capability reaches a certain threshold (e.g., general superhuman), and the evaluative capacity for alignment supervision (represented by the blue dashed line) will remain largely constant.

At this juncture, we propose to replace human evaluators with the strongest aligned student model to serve as the automated alignment evaluator, a new form of weak teacher model, to continue supervising even stronger student models. Notably, unlike the fixed supervisory capacity of human evaluators, the automated alignment evaluator can undergo recursive updates: use the aligned strong student models to update the automated alignment evaluator and facilitate the next generation of weak-to-strong generalization. We call this method *Recursive Weak-to-Strong Generalization* (R-W2SG). As depicted in Figure 2(b), the capability of the weak teacher model will increase in sync



(a) Human supervision reduces to insignificance.



(b) Continuously enhancing weak supervision by mW2SG+SO and R-W2SG.

Figure 2: The roadmap of superalignment via weak-to-strong generalization.

with the enhancements of the strong student model, ensuring only a capability gap of one generation between the weak teacher and strong student model. This recursive approach ensures a continuous and dynamic alignment process, adapting to the evolving capabilities of AI models.

Note that in simulating the above recursive process, it is necessary to incrementally increase the complexity of the alignment tasks in sync with the enhancing capabilities of the models. Ideally, the chosen tasks should represent the most complex challenges that the current strongest model can tackle. This strategy ensures that the aligned models are capable of safely and reliably executing the most challenging tasks.

Figure 3 summarizes the basic idea of realizing weak-to-strong generalization in the above two phases. This roadmap to aligned superintelligence delineates a strategic and phased solution to developing AI systems that are not only powerful but also remain aligned with human ethics and values. The weak-to-strong generalization framework serves as a foundational basis during this alignment process, ensuring a gradual and controlled evolution toward superintelligence. In the rest of this paper, we focus on Phase 1 to elaborate on the proposed solutions and initial experimental findings.

### 3 Improving Weak-to-Strong Generalization with Ensemble Learning

As an exploratory study, we use the science exam question dataset SciQ [12] as the example task throughout this paper. Originally, the SciQ dataset is structured as a multi-choice format. Strictly




Figure 3: Illustration of the proposed W2SG-based superalignment roadmap.

following the setup used in OpenAI’s paper, we have also converted it into a binary classification problem.

In terms of model selection, considering the extensive training required for ensemble learning, we opted for the GPT2 series [8] in this section. Unless otherwise specified, GPT2-small is fixed as the weak teacher model, and larger-size GPT2-medium, GPT2-large, and GPT2-XL are examined as progressively stronger student models. In the following, we will introduce the methods and experimental results of combining multiple weak teacher models through bagging and boosting, respectively.

### 3.1 Bagging-enhanced Weak-to-Strong Generalization

#### Method

Bagging is a classic ensemble learning method for enhancing weak model performance by combining multiple weak teacher models in parallel. The key is ensuring the diversity among different weak models. We achieve this by sampling from the training data set and the feature sets. Regarding feature sampling, we can either randomly sample different output feature dimensions, or select different hidden layers as the distinct weak teacher models.

For training set sampling, we employ both random sampling and bootstrap sampling. Random sampling randomly picks data to create a new training set, leaving the rest for validation. Bootstrap sampling, on the other hand, involves repeated selection from the training set, including potential duplicates, with unselected data comprising the validation set.

For feature sampling, one method is selecting a certain proportion of feature dimensions from the output of the model’s hidden layers. These features are fed into a binary classifier for training. By fixing the sampling proportion and randomly sampling different feature dimensions, different weak teacher models are obtained.

Another method for feature sampling is to choose outputs from different hidden layers of the model. Since each hidden layer processes information differently and captures distinct aspects of the data, it is possible to tap into varying levels of abstraction and complexity in the data representation by choosing outputs from different layers.

After obtaining multiple different weak teacher models through the above three methods, we have tried both hard voting and soft voting to combine the weak models. In hard voting, the final prediction is the result chosen by the majority of models. In soft voting, models output probabilities for each category as a measure of confidence. The confidence scores are summed and averaged, and the category with the highest average probability is selected as the final prediction.

#### Experimental Settings

**Dataset.** Initially, we sample  $10k$  data points from the training set of SciQ and divide them evenly into two parts. Additionally, we extract  $1k$  samples from both the validation and test sets of the original SciQ dataset. These samples are designated as our validation and test sets, respectively. Furthermore, we convert this dataset into binary classification problems. Assuming each data point consists of one question and  $k$  candidate answers, we transform each data point into  $k$  new data points in the form of  $(Q, A)$ , where the label for incorrect answer  $A$  is 0 and the label for correct answer  $A$  is 1. Throughout this process, we ensure an equal number of correct and incorrect labels for each question, resulting in two  $(Q, A)$  pairs per question. Finally, our constructed “train” and “train2” each contain  $10k$  samples, while the test set and validation set each contain  $2k$  samples.

**Models.** For training set sampling, GPT2-small and GPT2-medium are employed as the weak teacher model, and larger-size models are employed as the strong student models (i.e., weak model of GPT-2 small with strong model of GPT2-medium, GPT2-large and GPT2-XL). For feature sampling, due to the fewer hidden layers of the GPT2-small and the smaller dimensions of the output layer features, we only use GPT2-medium as the weak model and GPT2-large and GPT2-XL as the strong model.

**Weak labels.** We train weak models on “train1” and use them to predict samples on “train2” and validation. The outputs of the models are fed into a binary classifier to obtain the probabilities of “incorrect” and “correct”, serving as weak labels.

**Hyperparameters.** We set the batch size for training weak models to 32. For the method involving sampled training samples, the models are trained for 5 epochs. For the other two methods, they are trained for 4 epochs each. Model performance is monitored on the validation set, and training is halted when there is no further improvement in performance on the validation set.

**Sampling details.** Training set sampling strategy involves selecting 4000, 5000, 6000, 7000, 8000, and 10000 (bootstrap) data. The unselected training samples constitute the validation set. Among them, positive and negative samples each account for 50%. Feature layer sampling involved randomly sampling 10%, 30%, 50%, and 70% of features from the GPT2-medium output layer and then using these sampled features to train weak models on “train1”. Feature dimension sampling involved using outputs from the 10th to 24th hidden layers of the GPT2-medium model to train weak models on “train1”.

## Experimental Results

We present the results of training set sampling in Figure 4(a) and Figure 4(b). As the number of ensembled models increases, there is a clear and linear enhancement in accuracy. The bagging performance when exceeding 5 ensembled models generally surpasses the baseline. However, beyond 10 ensembled models, the increase in accuracy begins to plateau. Regarding the different sizes of the training set, as randomly sampled training set increases from 4000 to 7000 samples, the ensemble performance consistently improves. However, when the training data further increases beyond 7000, this upward trend diminishes, and performance may even slightly decline. This can be attributed to a decrease in data diversity, which in turn diminishes the effectiveness of the ensemble. Comparatively, bootstrap-based ensembles demonstrate the best performance, by sampling as much data as possible while ensuring diversity.

Figure 5(a) and Figure 5(b) display the results of sampling different output-layer feature dimensions. Notably, when the feature sampling proportion is set to 0.1, there’s a significant impact on the performance of ensembling. With higher feature sampling proportions, the variance in performance among weak models is marginal.

The results of combining different hidden layers are shown in Figure 6. We observe a linear increase with the rising number of ensembled models, peaking at the ensemble of 13 models (i.e., ensembling 10th to 22nd feature layers). This trend is likely due to the substantial differences among the hidden layers of the weak models, which leads to a high degree of diversity in the trained models. Consequently, augmenting the number of models in the ensemble within a certain limit can further enhance the performance.

We also report weak-to-strong performance based on the above ensembled models. It can be observed that bootstrap and feature layer sampling have respectively achieved better improvements in training data sampling and feature sampling. Consequently, we integrate 17 GPT2-small and 7 GPT2-medium




Figure 4: Weak models with different training set sampling.




Figure 5: Weak models with different feature set sampling.




Figure 6: Weak models with different feature layer combination.

models, each trained on 10000 bootstrapped samples, for data-based bagging. For feature-based bagging, we integrate outputs from the 10th to the 22nd hidden layers of GPT2-medium models.

The experimental results are shown in Table 1. We find two primary observations: (1) Horizontally, as the size of the strong model escalates, the influence of enhanced weak performance on weak-to-strong generalization gradually diminishes. This may stem from the excessively wide gap between weak and strong models, hindering the weak model’s effective supervision over the strong model. This underpins our emphasis in Phase 2 *R-W2SG* on maintaining a manageable capability gap between the weak and strong models within one generation. (2) Vertically, although integrating different hidden layers yields a higher boost in weak performance compared to bootstrap sampling (0.719 vs. 0.714), it does not contribute as significantly to weak-to-strong performance (0.721 vs. 0.727 for GPT2-large and 0.731 vs. 0.738 for GPT2-XL). This may be attributed to bootstrap sampling preserving a more robust diversity among weak models. These two findings indicate that in future

	Weak performance	Weak-to-Strong performance		
		medium	large	XL
before bagging	0.661 (small)	0.659	0.676	0.682
	0.694 (medium)	–	0.717	0.730
after bagging (bootstrap sample)	0.689 (small)	0.678	0.688	0.682
	0.714 (medium)	–	<b>0.727</b>	<b>0.738</b>
after bagging (layer combine)	<b>0.719</b> (medium)	–	0.721	0.731

Table 1: Improving W2SG via bagging-based supervision enhancement.




Figure 7: Weak models with different boosting methods.

studies on weak-to-strong generalization, attention should extend beyond merely enhancing weak supervision, to encompass the influences of other pivotal factors.

### 3.2 Boosting-enhanced Weak-to-Strong Generalization

#### Method

Boosting serially trains multiple weak models, where each subsequent model is designed to address and rectify the deficiencies of its predecessors. We implement both AdaBoost and Gradient Boost to combine with Weak-to-Strong generalization.

The core of the Adaboost method is that when the current weak classifier is difficult to learn from some samples, the weight of these difficult samples is increased when the next weak classifier is trained. So the latter weak model can make up for the shortcomings of the previous model and be more comprehensive after integration.

Gradient Boost, on the other hand, guides the update of the current weak classifier in the direction opposite to the gradient of the cumulative previous models. This method effectively performs gradient descent relative to the loss function of the target, making the ensemble model exhibit reduced loss on the training set. The processes of calculating sample weight is listed in Alg. 3 and Alg. 4 in Appendix.

#### Experimental Results

We replicate the experimental setup from the previous subsection for bagging. Ensemble accuracy results for weak models using AdaBoost and Gradient Boost are depicted in Figure 7. Notably, comparable outcomes are only achieved when training with the full dataset. While Gradient Boost shows a slight improvement with 2-3 model integrations, further combinations lead to a decline. Table 3 details the performance of the initial few weak models. It’s observed that the first model performs best, with a rapid decrease from the third model onwards, nearing random guess levels. This may be attributed to the limitations of standard ensemble methods in generative problems and integrating large-sized models.

To evaluate the contribution of AdaBoost and Gradient Boost on weak-to-strong generalization, each method underwent three rounds of training on a weighted set before the ensemble. Results are shown in Table 2. It is shown that the boosting methods marginally enhance weak performance, but fail to

	Weak performance	Weak-to-Strong performance		
		medium	large	XL
before boosting	0.685 (small)	<b>0.672</b>	0.680	<b>0.685</b>
after boosting (Adaboost)	0.686 (small)	0.671	0.675	0.676
after boosting (Gradient Boost)	<b>0.695</b> (small)	<b>0.672</b>	<b>0.688</b>	0.679

Table 2: Improving W2SG via boosting-based supervision enhancement.

Ensemble method	1st model	2nd model	3rd model	4th model	5th model
Adaboost	<b>0.685</b>	0.638	0.52	-	-
Gradient Boost	<b>0.692</b>	0.689	0.668	0.620	0.542

Table 3: Single weak models’ performance in boosting which are trained with 10000 samples. From the third round onwards, the performance of single Adaboost weak model is close to 0.5.

contribute to W2SG performance, which in some cases, even deteriorated. Investigating the cause, we focus on the training process of the first three models in AdaBoost, as exemplified in Figure 8. Beyond the initial model, subsequent models struggle to reduce loss, concentrating on challenging samples due to reweighted training, and failing to capture accurate dataset characteristics. Thus, the weak performance gain is attributed to a minority of difficult samples, which yet deviate from the overall distribution and do not benefit the complex tasks like knowledge-based Q&A in W2SG. This reaffirms the observations from Section 3.1: in addition to enhancing weak supervision, future efforts should explore more factors to effectively contribute to W2SG.

## 4 Improving Weak-to-Strong Generalization with Scalable Oversight

Scalable oversight leverages auxiliary models to enhance the supervision quality. In this section, we utilize un-tuned strong models as auxiliary models and explore their potential in scalable oversight settings. Two types of auxiliary settings are examined: human-AI interaction and AI-AI debate.

The task remains focused on the SciQ dataset. When selecting models, considering the need for auxiliary models to interact with humans and provide context for the weak models, it’s essential that these models possess a certain level of instruction-following and context-understanding capabilities. Taking into account performance on the SciQ task, we chose the Qwen series: qwen-1.8b-chat as the weak teacher model and qwen-7b-base as both the strong student model and the auxiliary model.

There are two points to clarify: (1) Unlike previous section where ensemble learning leveraged small-sized *base* models trained with task-specific data to serve as weak teachers, in this section we directly employ the small-sized *chat* models as the weak teacher. Since the aim is to verify whether scalable oversight contributes to enhancing annotation quality and subsequently improves weak-to-strong generalization, we do not further train the chat model with task-specific data and directly compare the annotation quality before and after applying scalable oversight. (2) In typical scalable oversight, it is necessary to tune an auxiliary model according to the assistant task. However, for simplicity in this exploratory study, we don’t tune the strong base model to better interact between humans or models. Instead, we utilize in-context learning to ensure a certain level of instruction following, which is also one of the notable limitations of our current approach, awaiting future refinement to fully realize the potential of scalable oversight.

### 4.1 Interaction-enhanced Weak-to-Strong Generalization

#### Method

The effectiveness of using an auxiliary model in scalable oversight largely hinges on the specific characteristics of the task. Considering the SciQ dataset, which includes questions covering a broad spectrum of knowledge across various disciplines such as physics, biology, and earth science, a notable challenge arises for the weak teacher model due to its restricted ability to offer effective annotations. Therefore, we treat the auxiliary model as a supportive agent to provide essential background knowledge relevant to the questions in the SciQ dataset. Leveraging this augmented




Figure 8: The training loss of three models serially trained on 10,000 samples using Adaboost.

---

**Algorithm 1** Interaction-enhanced Scalable Oversight.

---

- 1: **Input:** Unlabeled question-answer dataset  $D = \{(q_i, a_i)\}$ , size of context example set  $m$ , number of context examples used per iteration by weak model  $n$ .
  - 2: **Output:** Labeled dataset  $D_{so}$  through interaction-enhanced scalable oversight.
  - 3: Initialize auxiliary model  $M_{aux}$  and weak model  $M_{weak}$ .
  - 4: Initialize dataset  $D_{so} \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
  - 5: Initialize context example set  $E \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
    - ▷ Step 1: In-context example generation for interacting.
  - 6: **for**  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $m$  **do**
  - 7:   Randomly select a question  $q_i$  from  $D$ .
  - 8:   Use  $M_{weak}$  to generate contextual information  $k_i^w$  for  $q_i$ .
  - 9:   Add  $(q_i, k_i^w)$  to the context example set  $E$ .
  - 10: **end for**
    - ▷ Step 2: Scalable oversight for labeling.
  - 11: **for** each pair  $(q_i, a_i)$  in  $D$  **do**
  - 12:   Generate augmented background knowledge  $k_i^a$  using  $M_{aux}$  and  $n$  context examples randomly selected from  $E$ .
  - 13:   Determine the correctness of  $a_i$  for  $q_i$  as  $\hat{y}_i$ , based on  $k_i^a$ .
  - 14:   Add the triplet  $(q_i, a_i, \hat{y}_i)$  to  $D_{so}$ .
  - 15: **end for**
- 

knowledge, the weak teacher model is expected to extend its supervision capability and produce annotations more accurately.

Our method’s algorithm is detailed in Alg. 1 which comprises two primary steps. Since the auxiliary model is the *base* version, we generate examples in the first step and exploit in-context learning to elicit its instruction following capability. Note that the basic idea here is to use in-context examples to convey the assistant task’s objective and standardize the output format. It is thus less important to guarantee the quality of the generated knowledge responses. Hence, the weak teacher model is sufficient for generating these in-context examples. In the second step, the auxiliary model initially generates background knowledge related to the posed question. This process involves using  $n$  random in-context examples from set  $E$ . Following this, the weak model judges the correctness of the answers in relation to the question, utilizing the background information provided. The corresponding prompt template for the above in-context example generation, knowledge extraction and data annotation are presented in Table 11 in Appendix.

### Experimental Settings

**Models.** Our experimental setup consists of three models. Firstly, we choose qwen-1.8b-chat as the weak teacher model, which has not been trained on datasets related to the specific task. For the strong student model, we employ qwen-7b-base, with a key modification: the unembedding layer of the model is replaced by a linear classification head, configured to produce two outputs. The auxiliary

	Weak performance (qwen-1.8b-chat)	Weak-to-Strong performance (qwen-7b-base )
before SO	0.676	0.826
after SO	<b>0.749</b>	<b>0.848</b>

Table 4: Improving W2SG via interaction-enhanced scalable oversight.




Figure 9: The performance of weak models across different subjects.

model in our study is also based on the qwen-7b-base architecture; however, it is utilized without any training or structural adjustments.

**Weak labels.** We employ the interaction-enhanced method to generate responses on the “train2” set. Weak labels are derived from text responses using a rule-based process. For example, if the model outputs “Yes”, it is assigned a label of 1. Conversely, a response of “No” is tagged with a label of 0. To maintain a balanced distribution of weak labels in our training dataset, we randomly sample 2500 instances from each class to form a training set of 5000 samples for training the strong model. Similarly, for the validation set, we randomly select 600 instances from each class, resulting in a total of 1200 samples.

**Training hyperparameters.** The finetuning of the strong models is conducted over 2 epochs, utilizing a batch size of 32. We adopt an early stopping strategy, which is based on monitoring the accuracy of the model against weak labels on a separate validation set.

**Evaluation.** We report accuracy on the test set which is also balanced to have an equal number of samples in each class. In particular, random guess performance corresponds to 50% accuracy.

## Experimental Results

We present the experimental results in Table 4. Firstly, it’s evident that implementing interaction-enhanced scalable oversight substantially enhances the efficacy of weak models, leading to an accuracy increase exceeding 7%. Moreover, as demonstrated in Figure 9, we compare the accuracy across various topics featured in the questions of the test set.<sup>3</sup> It shows significant performance improvements in four out of five subjects, with chemistry seeing particularly notable gains. Such results underscore the crucial role of the auxiliary model’s knowledge in tackling the SciQ task, echoing the importance of selecting appropriate assistant tasks.

Additionally, the result of the weak-to-strong performance, presented in the last column of Table 4, clearly shows that the proposed method effectively improves weak-to-strong performance. This finding further demonstrates that enhancing the weak model’s supervisory capabilities through scalable oversight can contribute to the performance of the strong student model.

## 4.2 Debate-enhanced Weak-to-Strong Generalization

### Method

<sup>3</sup>Note that since the original dataset do not provide topic information, we categorize the questions using ChatGPT-4.

The standard debate paradigm involves at least two agents presenting answers and statements to assist human judges in decision-making. In the context of weak-to-strong generalization, auxiliary models engage in the debate, and the weak model replaces humans as the judge. This weak model uses the auxiliary models’ arguments for annotating data, which then serves to train the strong student model.

Specifically, our approach consists of three steps, as outlined in Alg. 2. Initially, we deploy two auxiliary models with opposing stances on each question-answer pair from the SciQ dataset. One model affirms the answer’s accuracy, while the other challenges it, both providing justifications for their positions. Following the settings in Section 4.1, we utilize qwen-7b-base as our auxiliary models and apply in-context learning to standardize the output formats.

After generating initial explanations, we conduct several rounds of debate between the two auxiliary agents. The explanation from one agent serves as context for the other, prompting both models to refine their explanations in light of the opposing perspective. We iteratively repeat this multi-agent debate process until a set number of rounds are completed.

Finally, the explanations generated by both agents in the final round of debate are presented concurrently to the weak teacher model. This weak model utilizes these final explanations to assess the answer’s validity. The corresponding prompt templates for debate-based scalable oversight are presented in Table 12 in Appendix.

---

**Algorithm 2** Debate-enhanced Scalable Oversight.

---

- 1: **Input:** Unlabeled question-answer dataset  $D = \{(q_i, a_i)\}$ , rounds of debate  $N$ .
  - 2: **Output:** Labeled dataset  $D_{so}$  through debate-enhanced scalable oversight.
  - 3: Initialize two auxiliary models  $M_{aux_A}, M_{aux_B}$  and weak model  $M_{weak}$ .
  - 4: Initialize dataset  $D_{so} \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
    - ▷ Step 1: Initial explanations generation.
  - 5: Initialize dataset  $D_1 \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
  - 6: **for** each pair  $(q_i, a_i)$  in  $D$  **do**
  - 7:      $M_{aux_A}, M_{aux_B}$  generate explanations  $E_i^{A1}, E_i^{B1}$  from opposing sides.
  - 8:     Add  $(q_i, a_i, E_i^{A1}, E_i^{B1})$  to set  $D_1$ .
  - 9: **end for**
    - ▷ Step 2: Multi-agent debate.
  - 10: **for**  $n \leftarrow 2$  to  $N$  **do**
  - 11:     Initialize dataset  $D_n \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
  - 12:     **for** each pair  $(q_i, a_i, E_i^{An-1}, E_i^{Bn-1})$  in  $D_{n-1}$  **do**
  - 13:         Input  $E_i^{Bn-1}$  to  $M_{aux_A}$  to generate  $E_i^{An}$ .
  - 14:         Input  $E_i^{An-1}$  to  $M_{aux_B}$  to generate  $E_i^{Bn}$ .
  - 15:         Add  $(q_i, a_i, E_i^{An}, E_i^{Bn})$  to set  $D_n$ .
  - 16:     **end for**
  - 17: **end for**
    - ▷ Step 3: Weak model judgement.
  - 18: **for** each pair  $(q_i, a_i, E_i^{AN}, E_i^{BN})$  in  $D_N$  **do**
  - 19:      $M_{weak}$  determine the correctness of  $a_i$  for  $q_i$  as  $\hat{y}_i$ , based on  $E_i^{AN}, E_i^{BN}$ .
  - 20:     Add the triplet  $(q_i, a_i, \hat{y}_i)$  to  $D_{so}$ .
  - 21: **end for**
- 

**Experimental Settings**

The number of debate rounds is set to three. During the first round, both auxiliary models present initial explanations without interaction. In the second and third rounds, the two auxiliary models interact and update their explanations based on each other’s statements. After each round, the weak teacher model annotates the dataset based on the arguments presented by both sides. Subsequently, we train the strong student model using the dataset annotated by the weak teacher model. The other settings in this section are identical in Section 4.1.

**Experimental Results**

	Weak performance	Weak-to-Strong performance
before SO	<b>0.676</b>	<b>0.826</b>
after round 1 debate	0.642	0.819
after round 2 debate	0.662	0.822
after round 3 debate	0.667	0.822

Table 5: The performance of debate-enhanced scalable oversight.

Debate Prompt	Question-Answer Prompt
<p>Please read the context first and then determine if the following question’s answer is correct. If it is correct, reply with solely “Yes”. If it is incorrect, reply with solely “No”.</p> <p><b>Context:</b> <i>One person think it is correct for the reason that the structure of hydrogen is H, and it is an element that is not always counted as organic, but it is the most abundant element in living organisms. Another person think it is incorrect for the reason that organic chemistry is the branch of chemistry that studies the properties and reactions of organic compounds, which are compounds that contain carbon.</i></p> <p><b>Question:</b> Organic chemistry is the study of the chemistry of what?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b>hydrogen</p> <p><b>Output:</b>Yes.</p>	<p>Please determine if the following question’s answer is correct.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> Organic chemistry is the study of the chemistry of what?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b>hydrogen</p> <p><b>Output:</b>The answer “hydrogen” is <i>incorrect</i>. Organic chemistry is the study of the chemistry of organic compounds, which are molecules composed of carbon atoms bonded to other <i>non-hydrogen atoms</i> through chemical bonds such as covalent or ionic bonds. Therefore, the correct answer would be “organic compounds”.</p>

Table 6: Example of failure cases in debate-enhanced weak-to-strong generalization.

The experimental results are shown in Table 5. Despite an observed improvement in weak performance across debate rounds, it does not exceed the results obtained without scalable oversight. This may be attributed to two factors: Firstly, the auxiliary models we use are base models with limited instruction-following abilities, making it difficult to fully comprehend the debate instructions. Although in-context learning is employed to standardize the output format, the increased length of context proves too challenging, especially for models of 1.8b size. Table 6 showcases some failure cases. It is observed that qwen-1.8b-chat tends to produce incorrect answers when responding to the *Weak Model Judgement* prompt, yet correctly answers under standard question-answer prompt. This suggests that the extended context and intricate logical dynamics inherent in debate configurations may disrupt the model’s ability for accurate evaluation. Secondly, SciQ is a task based on scientific knowledge, where answers are objective and definite. While debate aims at subjective reasoning and may not suit tasks with objective answers, potentially diminishing its utility in this context.

However, it is important to acknowledge the improved weak performance as the number of debate rounds increases, which is consistent with the findings from work [5] on multi-agent debate. More rounds of debate lead to more concise and focused conclusions, thus reducing the evaluative burden on the weak teacher model. Future strategies involving tuning the auxiliary models according to the debate settings and utilizing a more capable weak teacher model are expected to positively contribute to weak-to-strong generalization.

### 4.3 Combining Scalable Oversight and Ensemble Learning

#### Method

Previous experimental observations suggest that scalable oversight and ensemble learning both contribute to enhancing the supervision of weaker models. It is natural to integrate these approaches. Specifically, we combine interaction-based scalable oversight with bagging techniques. Note that since interaction-based scalable oversight requires instruction-following capability, we employ qwen-

qwen-1.8b-chat layer	Weak performance
last	<b>0.749</b>
second-to-last	0.683
third-to-last	0.690
Bagging (hard voting)	0.717

Table 7: The performance of interaction-based SO combined with different layers.

	Weak performance	Weak-to-Strong performance
before SO	0.676	0.826
After SO	0.749	0.848
After SO + Bagging (# run = 11)	<b>0.768</b>	<b>0.851</b>

Table 8: W2SG performance combining scalable oversight and ensemble learning.

1.8b-chat as the weak model similar to Section 4.1 and implement two bagging approaches that do not require additional training.

The first bagging approach is akin to the layer-based bagging method introduced in Section 3. However, in this particular instance, we use the models’ original unembedding layer rather than using an additional linear classifier. The second bagging approach conducts multiple runs of scalable oversight and then amalgamates their outcomes. This process is executed without making any modifications to the model itself. Due to the top- $p$  sampling strategy employed during the generation of responses, different runs exhibit a certain degree of variability which aligns with the conditions for ensemble learning.

### Experimental Results

In Table 7, we showcase the results of interaction-based SO combining features derived from different layers. Note that due to the necessity for interaction, the preceding layers are insufficient for generating coherent natural language responses. The experimental results indicate that the performance of the second-to-last and third-to-last layers is significantly inferior compared to the last layer. Layers preceding these are even incapable of completing the task effectively. This limitation has a consequential impact on the overall performance of bagging, leading to outcomes that are not as optimal as anticipated.

The results of integrating multiple runs of interaction-based SO are depicted in Figure 10. Notably, as we increment the count of runs contributing to the collective inference, the model’s effectiveness enhances, reaching a peak performance near 0.77. This method is further explored in the weak-to-strong experiment, involving the aggregation of results from 11 different model runs. The results, as detailed in Table 8, demonstrate that the integration of scalable oversight and ensemble learning contributes to a further improvement in weak-to-strong performance.

It is noteworthy that as the number of runs increases, the improvement in the weak model’s performance tends to stabilize, leading to only marginal enhancements in the weak-to-strong approach. This phenomenon could be attributed to the limited variability introduced by different runs. In future attempts to combine scalable oversight and ensemble learning, it is crucial to not only select an appropriate assistant task but also to strike a balance between ensuring adequate and comparable accuracy and maintaining diversity among the weak models. One possible approach to achieve this involves utilizing models of comparable size but with varying architectures. Such a strategy would potentially maximize the benefits of both scalable oversight and the diversity intrinsic to ensemble learning.

## 5 Discussion: the Contribution of Scalable Oversight to In-Context Learning-based Weak-to-Strong Generalization

In-context learning (ICL) is another configuration of weak-to-strong generalization, where the supervisory signals for contextual examples originate from the weak teacher model. In this section, we explore the applications of scalable oversight in improving weak supervision and selecting similar contextual examples.




Figure 10: The performance of interaction-based SO combining multiple runs.

### 5.1 Improving Weak Supervision for ICL-based Weak-to-Strong Generalization

#### Method

OpenAI’s W2SG paper [2] claims that enhanced weak supervision is also beneficial for the ICL configuration. Given previous findings confirming that interaction-enhanced scalable oversight effectively boosts weak models’ supervisory capabilities, we are motivated to explore whether scalable oversight can similarly improve ICL-based weak-to-strong generalization.

To this end, we design two categories of weak-to-strong prompts: the basic prompt and the confidence-inclusive prompt, as outlined in Table 13. The basic prompt consists of a sequence of question-answer pair examples with pseudo-labels annotated by the weak teacher model. The confidence-inclusive prompt expands on the basic format by incorporating the confidence score associated with these pseudo-labels. Specifically, for the SciQ task, this involves indicating the likelihood (probability of 0 or 1) for the first token in the responses from the strong student model.

We implement a 5-shot ICL setup and, to ensure statistical reliability in our results, choose the label with the maximum numerical value among the soft labels generated by the strong student model for accuracy calculation.

#### Experimental Settings

**Models.** The configuration for scalable oversight aligns precisely with the setup described in Section 4.1: we employ qwen-1.8b-chat as the weak teacher model, qwen-7b-base as the strong student model, and use the same setup for the auxiliary model.

**Sampling Strategy.** Prior research suggests that ICL prediction accuracy is influenced by the proportion of labels among contextual examples [14]. To mitigate this effect, we implement label balancing in the sample selection process. Specifically, for a total sample count denoted by  $k$ , the quantity of label classes allocated to  $m$  will not surpass  $k \div m$  for even  $k$ , or  $k \div (m + 1)$  for odd  $k$ . For every test, iterative sampling is conducted from the dataset. During each sampling cycle, we assess if the number of examples within the category matching the current soft label adheres to the predetermined threshold.

#### Experimental Results

The results of integrating ICL-based weak-to-strong generalization with scalable oversight are shown in Table 9. The first finding indicates a notable performance enhancement following this integration. This underscores scalable oversight can enhance generalization performance by improving the accuracy of labels in weak supervision, which aligns with W2SG’s findings [2]. Secondly, regardless of the presence of scalable oversight, the addition of confidence enhances the performance of weak-to-strong generalization by about 0.02. This shows the pivotal role of confidence in refining accuracy by conveying more comprehensive information. Moreover, compared to the base prompt,

	Weak performance	Weak-to-Strong performance	
		w/o confidence	w/ confidence
before SO	0.676	0.819	0.836
after SO	<b>0.749</b>	<b>0.821</b>	<b>0.843</b>

Table 9: Improving ICL-based W2SG via interaction-based scalable oversight.

	Random	VoteK	BM25	Top-K
Weak-to-Strong performance	0.819	0.813	0.822	<b>0.827</b>

Table 10: The performance of ICL-based W2SG under different context retriever.

the inclusion of confidence yields a more substantial impact of weak supervision improvement on weak-to-strong generalization (evidenced by a 0.002 and 0.007 boost for prompts w/o and w/ confidence, respectively). This suggests that scalable oversight not only improves weak supervision accuracy but may also positively influence the refinement of confidence information.

## 5.2 Selecting Similar Examples for ICL-based Weak-to-Strong Generalization

Contextual example selection is another critical factor in ICL, as highlighted in recent studies [4]. Some works [6, 10] report that selecting similar contextual examples aids ICL effectiveness. To investigate this, we implement various sample selection algorithms for ICL-based weak-to-strong generalization in this subsection.

Specifically, we employ three context retriever algorithms from OpenICL [13]: BM25 [9], Top-K [6], and VoteK [11]. BM25 and Top-K are similarity-based, whereas VoteK enhances sample diversity. The results, shown in Table 10, indicate significant performance improvements with similarity-based methods, particularly Top-K, which achieve a 0.008 enhancement. This underscores the further benefits of selecting similar contextual examples beyond enhancing weak label accuracy for W2SG.

It is crucial to note that while off-the-shelf example selection approaches are used here, determining sample similarity becomes non-trivial for increasingly complex tasks. For instance, gauging similarity in large-scale coding projects is more challenging than evaluation, akin to generation tasks in difficulty. Therefore, a more adaptable and universal approach is to incorporate scalable oversight, utilizing strong auxiliary models for similarity computation and similar contextual example selection. These findings and their implications will be further elaborated in the next paper version.

## 6 Conclusions

The introduction of the weak-to-strong generalization framework has made empirical research in superalignment feasible. However, there remains numerous unresolved conceptual and technical challenges. This study has delineated two phases of superalignment solution under the weak-to-strong generalization framework. In the first phase, we explore two approaches to enhance weak supervision quality. For scalable oversight, the key takeaway is the importance of careful selection of the assistant task and the necessary allocation of the auxiliary model to better fulfill its supporting role. There is also potential in exploring and combining more scalable oversight methods. For ensemble learning, the future focus is on adapting to generative problems and large models, while integrating with other classic machine learning techniques such as weak supervision learning. Moreover, the observed benefits of improved weak supervision for both fine-tuning and in-context learning suggest a combined solution in future weak-to-strong generalization research. In the second phase, preliminary feasibility experiments based on a recursive setup are necessary, along with considering issues of alignment verification and calibration to prevent value drift in the auto alignment evaluator.

Additionally, it’s important to recognize the limitations of weak-to-strong generalization in realistically simulating superalignment scenarios. For instance, in the first phase, the weak teacher models act as proxies for human evaluators. When aligning with superhuman models, the practicality of transitioning these weak models back to human supervisors needs careful consideration. In terms of scalable oversight, methods based on interaction and debate, initially applied to AI models, could be easily adapted for human evaluators. Regarding ensemble learning, there are potential challenges to address: Bagging requires effectively merging diverse viewpoints from evaluators with different

backgrounds, while boosting involves coordinating individuals to tackle sequential sub-tasks. Such considerations are crucial for advancing superalignment practices and ensuring their relevance and applicability in future AI development.

## References

- [1] Samuel R. Bowman, Jeeyoon Hyun, Ethan Perez, Edwin Chen, Craig Pettit, Scott Heiner, Kamilė Lukošiuėtė, Amanda Askell, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Cameron McKinnon, Christopher Olah, Daniela Amodei, Dario Amodei, Dawn Drain, Dustin Li, Eli Tran-Johnson, Jackson Kernion, Jamie Kerr, Jared Mueller, Jeffrey Ladish, Joshua Landau, Kamal Ndousse, Liane Lovitt, Nelson Elhage, Nicholas Schiefer, Nicholas Joseph, Noemí Mercado, Nova DasSarma, Robin Larson, Sam McCandlish, Sandipan Kundu, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Sheer El Showk, Stanislav Fort, Timothy Telleen-Lawton, Tom Brown, Tom Henighan, Tristan Hume, Yuntao Bai, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Ben Mann, and Jared Kaplan. Measuring progress on scalable oversight for large language models, 2022.
- [2] Collin Burns, Pavel Izmailov, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Bowen Baker, Leo Gao, Leopold Aschenbrenner, Yining Chen, Adrien Ecoffet, Manas Joglekar, Jan Leike, Ilya Sutskever, and Jeff Wu. Weak-to-strong generalization: Eliciting strong capabilities with weak supervision, 2023.
- [3] Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [4] Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, and Zhifang Sui. A survey for in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*, 2022.
- [5] Yilun Du, Shuang Li, Antonio Torralba, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Igor Mordatch. Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multiagent debate, 2023.
- [6] Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. What makes good in-context examples for gpt-3? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.06804*, 2021.
- [7] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- [8] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI Blog*, 1(8), 2019.
- [9] Stephen Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, et al. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 3(4):333–389, 2009.
- [10] Ohad Rubin, Jonathan Herzig, and Jonathan Berant. Learning to retrieve prompts for in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.08633*, 2021.
- [11] Hongjin Su, Jungo Kasai, Chen Henry Wu, Weijia Shi, Tianlu Wang, Jiayi Xin, Rui Zhang, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A Smith, et al. Selective annotation makes language models better few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.01975*, 2022.
- [12] Johannes Welbl, Nelson F. Liu, and Matt Gardner. Crowdsourcing multiple choice science questions, 2017.
- [13] Zhenyu Wu, YaoXiang Wang, Jiacheng Ye, Jiangtao Feng, Jingjing Xu, Yu Qiao, and Zhiyong Wu. Openicl: An open-source framework for in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02913*, 2023.
- [14] Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12697–12706. PMLR, 2021.

## 7 Appendix

### 7.1 The procedures of Adaboost and Gradient Boost

---

**Algorithm 3** Adaboost

---

- 1: **Input:** training data  $D = \{(x_i, y_i)\}$ , size of training data  $n$
- 2: **Output:** ensemble model  $f(x)$
- 3: Initialize weak model  $H_0$
- 4: Initialize each sample weight  $W_0(i) = 1, i = 1, \dots, n$
- 5: **for**  $t \leftarrow 0$  to  $T$  **do**
- 6:     Train current weak model  $H_t$  with training dataset  $D$  and corresponding sample weight  $W_t$ .
- 7:     Calculate the error rate  $e_t$  of  $H_t$  on  $D$ .
- 8:     Calculate the  $H_t$ 's weight  $\alpha_t \leftarrow \frac{1}{2} \ln\left(\frac{1-e_t}{e_t}\right)$ .
- 9:      $Z_t \leftarrow 2\sqrt{e_t(1-e_t)}$ .
- 10:    **for**  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  **do**
- 11:       $W_{t+1}(i) = \frac{W_t(i) \exp(-\alpha_t y_i H_t(x_i))}{Z_t}$
- 12:    **end for**
- 13: **end for**
- 14:  $f(x) \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^T \alpha_t H_t(x)$

---

---

**Algorithm 4** Gradient Boost

---

- 1: **Input:** training data  $D = \{(x_i, y_i)\}$ , size of training data  $n$
- 2: **Output:** ensemble model  $f(x)$
- 3: Initialize weak model  $H_1$ , cumulative model  $F_1 = H_1$ .
- 4: Initialize sample gradient  $g_1^i = y_i$
- 5: **for**  $t \leftarrow 1$  to  $T$  **do**
- 6:      $Loss_t(g_t, F_t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (g_t^i - F_t(x(i)))^2$
- 7:      $H_t = \operatorname{argmin}_{H_t} Loss_t(g_t, F_t)$
- 8:     **for**  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  **do**
- 9:        $g_t^i = \frac{\partial Loss_t(y_i, F_t(x_i))}{\partial F_t(x_i)}$
- 10:    **end for**
- 11:     $F_t = F_{t-1} + v H_t(x)$
- 12: **end for**

---

### 7.2 Prompt Templates

Table 11, Table 12, and Table 13 respectively show the prompts used in interaction-enhanced W2SG (section 4.1), debate-enhanced W2SG (section 4.2) and ICL-based W2SG (section 5).

	<b>Prompt Template</b>
<b>In-context Examples Generation</b>	Please provide the background knowledge to answer the following question. Limit your reply to 30 words. Input: ["question"] Output:
<b>ICL-based Knowledge Extraction</b>	Question:["question demo 1"] Knowledge: ["knowledge demo 1"] Question:["question demo 2"] Knowledge: ["knowledge demo 2"] ... Question:["question"] Knowledge:
<b>Knowledge-Based Data Annotation</b>	Please determine if the following question's answer is correct based on the context. If it is correct, output "Yes". If it is incorrect, output "No". Context: ["knowledge"] Input: question:["question"] answer:["answer"] Output:

Table 11: The prompt templates used in the interaction-enhanced weak-to-strong generalization.

	<b>Prompt Template</b>
<b>Initial Explanation Generation</b>	<p>There is a question followed by an answer. Assuming the answer is correct(incorrect), please give your explanation.Examples are given below.</p> <p>Input:question:[“question demo 1”] answer:[“answer demo 1”]  Output:[“explanation demo 1”]  Input:question:[“question demo 2”] answer:[“answer demo 2”]  Output:[“explanation demo 2”]  Input:question:[“question”] answer:[“answer”]  Output:</p>
<b>Multi-agent Debate</b>	<p>There is a question followed by an answer. Another agent think the answer is incorrect(correct), and its explanation is given below. Please use its explanation as additional information to update your explanation.Examples are given below.</p> <p>Input:question:[“question demo 1”] answer:[“answer demo 1”]  explanation from another agent:[“another_explanation demo 1”]  Output:[“new_explanation demo 1”]  Input:question:[“question demo 2”] answer:[“answer demo 2”]  explanation from another agent:[“another_explanation demo 2”]  Output:[“new_explanation demo 2”]  Input:question:[“question”] answer:[“answer”]  explanation from another agent:[“another_explanation”]  Output:</p>
<b>Weak Model Judgement</b>	<p>Please read the context first and then determine if the following question’s answer is correct. If it is correct, reply with solely “Yes”. If it is incorrect, reply with solely “No”.</p> <p>Context:One person think it is correct for the reason [“correct_explanation”]  Another person think it is incorrect for the reason [“incorrect_explanation”]  Input: question:[“question”] answer:[“answer” ]  Output:</p>

Table 12: The prompt templates used in the debate-enhanced weak-to-strong generalization.

	<b>Prompt Template</b>
<b>Basic Prompt</b>	<p>There is a science knowledge question, followed by an answer. Respond with 1 if the answer is correct, and with 0 otherwise.</p> <p>Q:["question demo 1"] A:["answer demo 1"] ["label demo 1"]</p> <p>Q:["question demo 2"] A:["answer demo 2"] ["label demo 2"]</p> <p>...</p> <p>Q:["question"] A:["answer"]</p>
<b>Confidence-Inclusive Prompt</b>	<p>There is a science knowledge question, followed by an answer. Respond with 1 if the answer is correct, and with 0 otherwise. Note that there may be errors in the answers to the contextual examples.</p> <p>Q:["question demo 1"] A:["answer demo 1"] ["label demo 1"]. (Confidence: ["confidence demo 1"])</p> <p>Q:["question demo 2"] A:["answer demo 2"] ["label demo 2"]. (Confidence: ["confidence demo 2"])</p> <p>...</p> <p>Q:["question"] A:["answer"]</p>

Table 13: The prompt templates used in the ICL-based weak-to-strong generalization.