

Latent Distance Guided Alignment Training for Large Language Models

Haotian Luo
Sichuan University

Abstract

Ensuring alignment with human preferences is a crucial characteristic of large language models (LLMs). Presently, the primary alignment methods, RLHF and DPO, require extensive human annotation, which is expensive despite their efficacy. The significant expenses associated with current alignment techniques motivate researchers to investigate the development of annotation-free alignment training methods. In pursuit of improved alignment without relying on external annotation, we introduce Latent Distance Guided Alignment Training (LD-Align). This approach seeks to align the model with a high-quality supervised fine-tune dataset using guidance from a latent space. The latent space is generated through sample reconstruction, akin to auto-encoding. Consequently, we utilize the distance between sample pairs in the latent space to guide DPO-based alignment training. Extensive experimentation and evaluation show the efficacy of our proposed method in achieving notable alignment.¹

1 Introduction

Over the past two years, LLMs have demonstrated strong performance. LLMs have shown remarkable performance in various fields of NLP, such as mathematical problem solving, summarization generation, reading comprehension, and open-ended question answering, achieving notable results. In order to align the behavior of LLMs with human expectations, such as adhering to facts and avoiding biases, and to better elicit their capabilities, such as mathematical reasoning, researchers have proposed alignment training methods, which typically involve a process requiring extensive manual annotation of data. Alignment training is typically employed after Supervised Fine-tune(SFT), with

the most commonly used mainstream methods being Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF) and Direct Preference Optimization (DPO)(Rafailov et al., 2023).

Since mainstream alignment training methods typically require extensive manual annotation, which is expensive to obtain, the pursuit of an alignment method that does not necessitate human annotation is becoming increasingly popular. To solve this challenging problem, there are currently some efforts aimed at avoiding manual annotation in alignment tasks. RLAIF(Lee et al., 2023) utilizes large language models to generate preference labels instead of human annotators and explores the direct utilization of language models to generate reward scores. SPIN(Chen et al., 2024) iteratively train a LLM to align on the SFT datasets through a self-play mechanism which shares a similar motivation with GAN(Goodfellow et al., 2020). Also, (Yuan et al., 2024) have studied Self-Rewarding Language Models, where the language model itself is used via LLM-as-a-Judge prompting to provide its own rewards during training.

In the present study, we introduce a DPO-based novel approach termed LD-Align (Latent Distance Guided Alignment Training), aimed at iteratively aligning a fine-tuned LLM with a given high-quality SFT dataset without any additional human annotation or reliance on a more powerful LLM for support. Within this framework, we consider samples sourced from the SFT dataset as golden labels, contrasting with those generated by the model, which we categorize as dispreferred samples. By quantifying the disparity between the latent feature vectors of these two sets within a latent space established through sample reconstruction, we ascertain the alignment status of each instance, effectively gauging the degree of suboptimality. Subsequent to this assessment, employing iterative training facilitated by DPO, we assign higher update weights to samples exhibiting lower alignment lev-

¹The V1 unfinished version of the submission has never been reviewed and approved by Huaxiu Yao. We will release a finalized version soon.

els, thus stimulating exploration for potential better alignment, while conversely allotting smaller update weights to those with higher alignment levels, thereby mitigating the risk of overfitting. Our contributions can be succinctly summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel DPO-based align method (LD-Align), which is guided in instance-level in the training process.
- Through comprehensive experiments, the proposed method achieves the best performances among selected competing methods.

2 Related Work

2.1 Aligning LLM with human preference

With advancements in AI systems, the accompanying rise in risks becomes more pronounced. Undesirable behaviors exhibited by LLMs, such as providing untruthful responses, displaying sycophancy, and engaging in deception, become exacerbated as the scale of the models increases. This phenomenon raises concerns regarding the management of advanced AI systems, which are increasingly challenging to regulate. The predominant alignment approach commonly employed involves learning from feedback. A conventional strategy is reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF). Here, human assessors furnish feedback by comparing various responses generated by the chat model, and this feedback is subsequently utilized through Reinforcement Learning (RL) in conjunction with a pre-trained reward model, which is often trained with PPO. Due to the complexity of the process and the instability encountered during training, researchers have introduced Direct Performance Optimization. This has been demonstrated by the community to be an effective approach.

3 Preliminaries

We consider a Large Language Model (LLM) parameterized by θ and denoted as p_θ , which accepts a sequence $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \dots, x_n]$, commonly termed as the prompt, and then generate a corresponding response $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, \dots, y_m]$. Hence, the response \mathbf{y} is construed as a sample drawn from the conditional probability distribution $p_\theta(\cdot|\mathbf{x})$. The conditional probability distribution $p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^m p_\theta(y_j|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<j}), \quad (1)$$

Subsequently, we review supervised fine-tuning (SFT), which is the primary training methodologies to adapt a pre-trained LLM for downstream tasks, utilizing a relatively smaller dataset of labeled examples compared to the data used in pre-training stage. In this paper, we focus on the task of instruction-tuning where the prompt-answer pairs denoted as (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) , are drawn from a specified SFT dataset \mathcal{D} . Thus the training objective of SFT under the instruction tuning setting can be formulated as:

$$\max_{p_\theta} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \right]$$

4 Method

In this section, we introduce our new fine-tuning method (Self-Aligning in Latent Space) for boosting LLMs given a high-quality supervised fine-tuning (SFT) dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\}_N$ containing N samples, without relying on additional external annotations. In summary, given a LLM p_θ fine-tuned on \mathcal{D} , we train a guiding model through auto-encoding to assess the distance between generated samples and real samples within the latent space of this model. Subsequently, we employ this distance as a signal to guide the model aligning with the real data distribution via direct preference optimization (DPO).

4.1 Guiding model

Considering an auto-encoding structure $\mathcal{T} = (\phi, \psi)$ with conditions, which consists of an encoder ϕ and a decoder ψ . Both encoder and decoder are based on pre-trained transformers, which are set to be GPT-2(Radford et al., 2019) in our experiment. The encoder ϕ takes prompt \mathbf{x} and response \mathbf{y} as input, and output a multi-dimension latent vector $\mathbf{h} = \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Meanwhile, decoder ψ takes prompt \mathbf{x} and latent variable \mathbf{h} as input and try to reconstruct the real response \mathbf{y} . The training data for the model is sourced from two components: the SFT dataset \mathcal{D} and generated samples $\{(x, y')\}_{i=1}^n$ produced by the initial fine-tuned model p_θ . The training objective of guiding model \mathcal{T} can be formulated as:

To minimize \mathcal{L}_{guide} , encoder ϕ needs to extract some attributes in the form of a latent vector while decoder ψ needs to utilize this latent vector $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ or $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')$ to successfully reconstruct \mathbf{y} or \mathbf{y}' given the same \mathbf{x} .

$$\mathcal{L}_{guide}(\psi, \phi) = -\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{y}' \sim p_{\theta}(\cdot | x)} \left[\log p_{\psi}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) + \log p_{\psi}(\mathbf{y}' | \mathbf{x}, \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')) \right] \quad (2)$$

$$\max_{p_{\theta}} \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}, y' \sim p_{\theta}(\cdot | x)} \left[\frac{\mathbf{s}_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')}{\mathbf{S}_{\phi}(\mathcal{D}, p_{\theta})} \log p^*(\mathbf{y} \succ \mathbf{y}' | x) \right] \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{Align}(p_{\theta}; p_{ref}) = & \\ & - \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}, y' \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot | x)} \left[\frac{\mathbf{s}_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')}{\mathbf{S}_{\phi}(\mathcal{D}, p_{ref})} \log \sigma \left(\beta \log \frac{p_{\theta}(y | x)}{p_{ref}(y | x)} - \beta \log \frac{p_{\theta}(y' | x)}{p_{ref}(y' | x)} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{Align}(p_{\theta}; p_{ref}) = & \\ & - \beta \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}, y' \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot | x)} \left[\frac{\mathbf{s}_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')}{\mathbf{S}_{\phi}(\mathcal{D}, p_{ref})} \sigma(z) \left[\underbrace{\nabla_{\theta} \log p(y | x)}_{\text{increase likelihood of } y} - \underbrace{\nabla_{\theta} \log p(y' | x)}_{\text{decrease likelihood of } y'} \right] \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

4.2 Self-Aligning in Latent Space

4.2.1 Overview

This subsection describes our main method deliberately. We regard \mathbf{y} as the winner sample and \mathbf{y}' as the loser sample, and employ a DPO-based approach to train iteratively for alignment using the distance in the latent space as guidance. In each iteration, for samples with larger distances in the latent space, we assign greater update weights, while conversely, for samples with smaller distances in the latent space, indicating proximity to real samples, we assign smaller update weights.

4.2.2 Details

As \mathcal{D} is a high-quality dataset, each $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{D}$ can be seen as a golden label. In other words, we will have a preference over a tuple $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')$ when given an \mathbf{x} , where \mathbf{y} denotes a real response from SFT dataset while \mathbf{y}' denotes a response generated by p_{θ} . This preference can be denoted as $\mathbf{y} \succ \mathbf{y}' | \mathbf{x}$. For each tuple $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')$ with a given \mathbf{x} , considering the setting of a Bradley-Terry model, we have:

$$p^*(\mathbf{y} \succ \mathbf{y}' | x) = \frac{\exp(r^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))}{\exp(r^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) + \exp(r^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}'))}$$

In this formula, r^* is a ground-truth reward model that cannot be accessed. With the guiding model $\mathcal{T} = (\phi, \psi)$ mentioned above, we can deriving the per-instance distance between two responses for a

given prompt in latent space via:

$$\mathbf{s}_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}') = \|\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - \phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')\|_2$$

A large \mathbf{s}_{ϕ} indicates that the generated response is relatively far from the real response. Meanwhile, a smaller \mathbf{s}_{ϕ} means the generated response is already good enough as it is close to the real response in latent space. Now we can declare that, our goal is to align the language model p_{θ} to the SFT dataset \mathcal{D} with the guidance of normalized per-instance distances in latent space. Thus we can formulate an optimization problem. where $\mathbf{S}_{\phi}(\mathcal{D}, p_{\theta})$ is the expectation of distance on the SFT dataset \mathcal{D} calculated by:

$$\mathbf{S}_{\phi}(\mathcal{D}, p_{\theta}) = \frac{\mathbf{s}_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')}{\mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}, y' \sim p_{\theta}(\cdot | x)} \left[\mathbf{s}_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}') \right]}$$

This optimization objective can be regarded as a weighted Bradley-Terry model, according to DPO, we can solve this optimization problem using the following approach:

4.2.3 Evaluation

For the optimization objective mentioned above, the gradient with respect to the parameters θ can be written as: where $\sigma(z) = \beta \log \frac{p_{\theta}(y | x)}{p_{ref}(y | x)} - \beta \log \frac{p_{\theta}(y' | x)}{p_{ref}(y' | x)}$. From this formulation, we can see that, for a pair of y and y' , we assign higher update weight when y' is far from y in the latent space,

Algorithm 1 LD-Align Pseudo Code

Require: SFT Dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$, Guide model $\mathcal{T} = (\phi, \psi)$, LLM with parameter θ_0

- 1: **for** $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ **do**
- 2: Generate responses $\mathbf{y}_i \sim p_{\theta_0}(\cdot | \mathbf{x}_i)$.
- 3: **end for**
- 4: Update $(\phi, \psi) = \arg \max_{(\phi, \psi)} \sum_{i \in [N]} \log p_{\psi}(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \phi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)) + \log p_{\psi}(\mathbf{y}'_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \phi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}'_i))$
- 5: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ **do**
- 6: **for** $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ **do**
- 7: Generate responses $\mathbf{y}_i \sim p_{\theta_{T-1}}(\cdot | \mathbf{x}_i)$.
- 8: Calculate distance $\mathbf{s}_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}'_i) = \|\phi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) - \phi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}'_i)\|_2$
- 9: **end for**
- 10: Calculate distance expectation $\mathbf{S}_{\phi}(\mathcal{D}, p_{\theta_{T-1}}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \mathbf{s}_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}'_i)$
- 11: Update $\theta_T = \arg \max_{\theta} \sum_{i \in [N]} \frac{\mathbf{s}_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}'_i)}{\mathbf{S}_{\phi}(\mathcal{D}, p_{\theta_{T-1}})} \log \sigma \left(\beta \log \frac{p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{x}_i)}{p_{\theta_{T-1}}(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{x}_i)} - \beta \log \frac{p_{\theta}(\mathbf{y}'_i | \mathbf{x}_i)}{p_{\theta_{T-1}}(\mathbf{y}'_i | \mathbf{x}_i)} \right)$
- 12: **end for**

which is denoted by the magnitude of normalized distance $\frac{\mathbf{s}_{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')}{\mathbf{S}_{\phi}(\mathcal{D}, p_{ref})}$. This re-weighting term is efficient because of that, in a standard preference optimization problem, we only ranked samples instead of golden labels while when given a golden dataset (for example, high-quality SFT dataset \mathcal{D}), we can measure how well is the LLM aligned with golden samples. The re-weighting term derived from reconstruction can allocate more attention to the samples that are not good enough and allocate less attention to those are already excellent to avoid over-fitting during the training procedure.

5 Experiment

5.1 Experiment setup

5.1.1 Dataset

The SFT dataset we use is Ultrachat200k(Ding et al., 2023) by HuggingFace, which consists of about 200k high-quality multi-round dialogues generated by ChatGPT that span a wide range of topics. For supervised fine-tune, the full dataset is used as training data while for SPIN and LD-Align, only a subset containing 50k samples is used.

5.1.2 Model

The model we used for our experiments, Mistral-7B(Jiang et al., 2023), is a widely used pre-trained LLM engineered for superior performance and efficiency. Mistral 7B outperforms Llama 2 13B across all evaluated benchmarks, and Llama 1 34B in reasoning, mathematics, and code generation. It should be noticed that, Huggingface has provided zephyr-7b-sft-full, which is fine-tuned on Ultrachat200k with Mistral-7B. We choose zephyr-7b-

sft-full as our fine-tuned baseline and experiments conducted with selected competing methods were all based on this fine-tuned model.

5.1.3 Evaluation metric

We evaluate the performances of different methods using several benchmarks and reward scores. For benchmark evaluation, we widely select datasets and benchmarks for evaluating the performance of models:

- **Truthfulness.** TruthfulQA(Lin et al., 2021)
- **Commonsense Reasoning.** PIQA(Bisk et al., 2020), Hellaswag(Zellers et al., 2019), ARC(Clark et al., 2018), OpenbookQA(Mihaylov et al., 2018)
- **CoT Reasoning.** GSM8k(CoT)(Cobbe et al., 2021)
- **Multi-round Dialogue.** Mutual(Cui et al., 2020)

For reward evaluation, our goal is to assess how well the model’s response aligns with human preferences. We choose a widely used reward model based on DeBERTa(He et al., 2020) (reward-model-deberta-v3-large-v2) as the reward model. Given an instruction \mathbf{x} and a response \mathbf{y} , we leverage a reward model RM to compute the reward score $\mathbf{r} = \text{RM}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, which reflects how well the response \mathbf{y} aligns with human preference with given instruction \mathbf{x} .

5.1.4 Competing Methods

To show the efficiency of proposed LD-Align, we will compare LD-Align with several methods. We

| Model | TruthfulQA | PIQA | HellaSwag | ARC | OpenbookQA | GSM8k | MuTual | AVG |
|------------|------------|------|-----------|------|------------|-------|--------|-------|
| Zephyr-sft | 43.7 | 82.1 | 62.1 | 55.7 | 30.8 | 44.4 | 63.5 | - |
| SPIN | 48.7 | 81.7 | 65.1 | 60.4 | 33.6 | 45.4 | 61.2 | 4.56% |
| LD-Align 0 | 49.5 | 82.2 | 65.0 | 59.1 | 33.2 | 44.3 | 63.3 | 4.49% |
| LD-Align 1 | 50.7 | 82.4 | 66.1 | 59.7 | 33.6 | 44.9 | 63.5 | 5.70% |
| LD-Align 2 | 50.3 | 82.5 | 66.2 | 60.7 | 33.2 | 45.9 | 63.3 | 6.00% |

describe several most competing models as follows.

Continual SFT We continually train the model in a SFT fashion on Ultrachat-200k dataset. We set the lr to be 1e-5 and train for 2 epochs with a global batch size of 64 on multiple GPUs.

SPIN SPIN is also a annotation-free alignment training method which try to convert a weak model to a strong one through the lens of self-play, where the model is enhanced by playing against itself without requiring any direct supervision. We report the results of SPIN reproduced in our machine with the codes provided in their repository and we keep all the hyperparameters the same with the setting mentioned in SPIN’s paper.

DPO DPO requires annotated preference data for training, we utilize UltraFeedback Binarized, which comprises both chosen and rejected chat completions evaluated by GPT-4. We train the zephyr-7b-sft-full with DPO We set the lr to be 2e-7 and beta to be 0.1. We train the model for 2 epochs (which is already near to convergence) with a global batch size of 64 on multiple GPUs.

5.2 Results

It can be observed that following three iterations of LD-Align training, the model exhibited a notable improvement across multiple benchmarks. In the final iteration, the overall average enhancement reached 6.00%, surpassing the performance of SPIN.

To validate the quality of the latent space characterized by the guiding model, we conducted the following analyses: (1) Analyzing the distribution of latent distances between sample pairs; (2) For a given input x , we sampled and generated two responses y'_a, y'_b and calculate their distances to real response y . The response with the greater distance was considered lower in quality. Additionally, both responses were evaluated by GPT4 to judge which one is more aligned with real response, and we recorded the number of instances where their judgments are consistent.

5.3 Conclusion

We propose LD-Align, which can align model on the high-quality SFT datasets by leveraging the distances of samples in latent space without any additional manual annotations. Our approach yields significant improvements across multiple benchmarks, effectively enhancing the overall competence of the model

References

- Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, et al. 2020. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439.
- Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, and Quanquan Gu. 2024. Self-play fine-tuning converts weak language models to strong language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01335*.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Leyang Cui, Yu Wu, Shujie Liu, Yue Zhang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. Mutual: A dataset for multi-turn dialogue reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04494*.
- Ning Ding, Yulin Chen, Bokai Xu, Yujia Qin, Zhi Zheng, Shengding Hu, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Bowen Zhou. 2023. Enhancing chat language models by scaling high-quality instructional conversations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14233*.
- Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2020. Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11):139–144.
- Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2020. Deberta: Decoding-enhanced

bert with disentangled attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03654*.

Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.

Harrison Lee, Samrat Phatale, Hassan Mansoor, Kellie Lu, Thomas Mesnard, Colton Bishop, Victor Carbone, and Abhinav Rastogi. 2023. Rlaif: Scaling reinforcement learning from human feedback with ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00267*.

Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2021. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07958*.

Todor Mihaylov, Peter Clark, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2018. Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02789*.

Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.

Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 53728–53741. Curran Associates, Inc.

Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. 2024. Self-rewarding language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10020*.

Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07830*.