

Evaluating LLMs with Multiple Problems at once: A New Paradigm for Probing LLM Capabilities

Zhengxiang Wang and Jordan Kodner and Owen Rambow

Department of Linguistics & Institute for Advanced Computational Science

Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, USA

{first.last}@stonybrook.edu

Abstract

Current LLM evaluation predominantly performs evaluation with prompts comprising single problems. We propose *multi-problem evaluation* as an additional approach to study the multiple problem handling capabilities of LLMs. We present a systematic study in this regard by comprehensively examining 7 LLMs on 4 related types of tasks constructed from 6 classification benchmarks. The 4 task types include traditional single-problem tasks, homogeneous multi-problem tasks, and two index selection tasks that embed the multi-problem tasks. We find that LLMs are competent multi-problem solvers: they generally perform (nearly) as well on multi-problem tasks as on single-problem tasks. Furthermore, contrary to common expectation, they often do not suffer from a positional bias with long inputs. This makes *multi-problem prompting* a simple and cost-efficient prompting method of practical significance. However, our results also strongly indicate that LLMs lack true understanding: they perform significantly worse in the two index selection tasks than in the multi-problem task under various evaluation settings, although they can indeed do index selection in general.

1 Introduction

In recent years, large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable natural language understanding and reasoning capabilities by achieving often superhuman performance on a wide range of NLP benchmarks and human exams (OpenAI, 2023; Beltagy et al., 2020; Gemini-Team, 2023; Anthropic, 2024). With the advances in both GPU hardware and algorithms (Dai et al., 2019; Beltagy et al., 2020; Dao et al., 2022; Ding et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024, *inter alia*), LLMs are being developed with larger and larger context windows (e.g., 8K, 128K, and even 2M) to support diverse real-world use cases, such as in retrieval augmented generation (Lewis et al., 2020; Borgeaud et al.,




Figure 1: Standard single-problem evaluation versus multi-problem evaluation.

2022). Correspondingly, there is a growing body of research that evaluates LLMs when presented with tasks in long inputs (e.g., Shaham et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024a; Levy et al., 2024).

While these efforts investigate what is possible with larger context windows, they still focus on a single problem per prompt. Little is known how well LLMs can handle prompts comprising multiple problems simultaneously. This is an important question because in order to solve multiple problems presented in a single input that can be sufficiently long, LLMs need to locate each problem in the input when generating answers to these problems in a correct order. This helps us better understand how well LLMs can use information from the inputs with varying numbers of problems.

To this end, we present the first study that systematically and comprehensively examines the multiple problem handling capabilities of 7 LLMs on 4 related types of tasks constructed from 6 classification benchmarks. The task types in our experiments include traditional single-problem tasks (i.e., the standard use of these benchmarks), homogeneous multi-problem tasks of varying sizes, and two index selection tasks that embed the multi-problem tasks with additional selection steps. These task types are designed to be minimally different from one another and we test the LLMs under zero-shot, few-shot, and few-shot-CoT (chain of thought, Wei et al., 2023) settings. We find that:

LLMs can handle multiple problems of the same type at once with comparable or even superior performance to traditional single-problem presentation. This is often the case with even 100 problems per prompt. This indicates that LLMs do not necessarily always show declining performance in response to longer inputs, as may be commonly expected. Furthermore, they also do not necessarily show the primacy and recency biases that have been observed in other contexts (Liu et al., 2024a).

This multi-problem prompting substantially reduces costs. For example, prompting many homogeneous problems with shared task instructions can reduce the actual cost of accessing GPT-4 to perform inference by up to 82% per problem when performing multiple classifications per prompt rather than separately, based on our experiments.

Nevertheless, LLMs still display a lack of true understanding, as they do not solve multiple problems equally well when presented in a different form. More concretely, they perform significantly worse in selecting indices of text falling into each label, either independently or altogether, than in making multiple classifications at once directly, although these are conceptually equivalent. The issue, as we show, is not the index selection task, but the combination of the actual classification task (which is hard) and the index selection task (which is easy). Furthermore, we find that selecting indices of text that belong to each label one at a time is significantly more challenging than generating the indices for all labels at once under all evaluation settings. In the former scenario, LLMs consistently make more contradiction errors and non-excluded middle errors, compared to the latter scenario, because they select indices for each label independently rather than sequentially. This again highlights the probabilistic aspect of the LLM answer generation, as opposed to true understanding.

Our paper proceeds as follows. We first review related work in Section 2. We then motivate and propose multi-problem evaluation in Section 3, followed by an introduction to the experimental setups in Section 4. We report and discuss our main results in Section 5 and follow-up results in Section 6. Section 7 concludes. We release our code, data, and results at <https://github.com/jaack-wang/multi-problem-eval-llm>.

2 Related Work

While there have been several surveys dedicated to the evaluation of specific topics, e.g., hallucination (Huang et al., 2023; Rawte et al., 2023), bias and fairness (Gallegos et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024b), and alignment (Wang et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024b), we note that current LLM evaluation has predominantly focused on LLM’s performance on prompts consisting of single problems. Each of such prompts presents a single problem and expects one specific answer to that problem.

To the best of our knowledge, Laskar et al. (2023) is the only study that analyzes the ability of GPT-series models to solve 5 short questions sampled from two open-domain QA benchmarks (Min et al., 2021; Berant et al., 2013) at once. They observe that only instruction fine-tuned GPT models can handle such multi-problem prompts, but with varying performance drops. However, since evaluating LLMs with multiple problems presented together is not the focus of Laskar et al. (2023), the authors do not provide any fine-grained analysis nor conduct their experiments under different conditions, e.g., different numbers of problems in each prompt, non-GPT LLMs, and prompting strategies other than zero-shot prompting. It remains unknown how well LLMs in general can do multiple problems at once.

Another line of research is the evaluation of LLMs presented with tasks requiring long inputs. These long-input tasks include long text understanding and reasoning (Shaham et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024a), many-label classification with long task description (Li et al., 2024a), and short question answering extended with irrelevant distractor information (Levy et al., 2024). It is generally found that long-input tasks overall remain a challenge, with the most capable proprietary LLMs such as GPT-4 often achieving the best absolute performance. These studies also identify positional biases of LLMs over long inputs, such as primacy bias (Liu et al., 2024a) and recency bias (Liu et al., 2024a; Levy et al., 2024).

3 Multi-Problem Evaluation

3.1 Single- vs. Multi-Problem Evaluation

As illustrated in Fig 1, the difference between a *single-problem evaluation* and a *multi-problem evaluation* lies in the number of problems placed under a task instruction (extending general prompt design from (Brown et al., 2020)). Multi-problem

Input Format	Benchmark	# Samples	Objective
Single-text	SST-2	1,821	Sentiment analysis
	CoLA	1,043	Grammatical acceptability
	AGNews	1,000	Topic classification
Text-pair	MRPC	1,725	Paraphrase detection
	SNLI	1,000	Natural language inference
	WiC	1,400	Word sense disambiguation

Table 1: Classification benchmarks used in the study. We use the test splits wherever possible, except for CoLA, for which we use the dev split, since the test split is not publicly available. For AGNews and SNLI, we randomly sample 1,000 examples from the test splits.




Figure 2: An example prompt for a 5-problem classification task constructed from CoLA, divided into shared instructions and a series of problems.

evaluation places several parallel problems in prompts and expects an answer to each problem in sequence, whereas single-problem evaluation only provides one problem per prompt. A simple example of a multi-problem task would bundle multiple classification or QA problems together and ask LLMs to solve them sequentially.

Evaluation in a multi-problem setting has several advantages over typical single-problem evaluation. First, it is less likely for LLMs to encounter exact long multi-problem prompts during pre-training because of the combinatorial nature of constructing prompts from multiple problems. This helps to mitigate a growing data contamination concern in modern large-scale pre-training (Jacovi et al., 2023; Sainz et al., 2023). Second, since we can manipulate what kind of problems and how many problems to include, we know exactly which problem a LLM gets wrong or right across positions in the prompts. This enables us to construct a well controlled and easily interpretable evaluation. Third, our study demonstrates that leveraging the rich existing benchmarks to create a new multi-problem task is *cheap, easy to implement, and highly adaptable*. The most laborious component is the prompt design, which, once done, can easily be applied to a set of benchmarks with minimal adaptation.

3.2 Benchmarks

To facilitate comparison, we construct homogeneous multi-problem tasks from existing single-problem benchmarks. We consider the following 6 classification benchmarks, as described in Table 1: SST-2 (Socher et al., 2013), CoLA (Warstadt et al., 2019), AGNews (Gulli, 2004), MRPC (Dolan and Brockett, 2005), SNLI (Bowman et al., 2015), and WiC (Pilehvar and Camacho-Collados, 2019). These benchmarks are commonly used for NLP evaluation, with SST-2, CoLA, and MRPC appearing in GLUE (Wang et al., 2019) and WiC in SuperGLUE (Sarlin et al., 2020). They cover two classification paradigms: single-text classification and text-pair classification. The objective of each benchmark is also different. A detailed description of these benchmarks is provided in Appendix A.

3.3 Evaluation Tasks and Prompt Design

We conduct our multi-problem evaluation on 4 related types of tasks, conceptualized in Fig 3, using the 6 classification benchmarks introduced above. We employ the “task instruction + problem” structure illustrated in Fig 1 to design the prompts and to maximize the prompt similarity across tasks.¹

Single Classification (SingleClf) We start with Single Classification, which is the standard way of evaluating LLM’s classification capabilities. The prompt indicates the task objective and the possible label choices in the task instruction, followed by one target classification problem. For example, we use the following task instruction for CoLA: “Indicate the grammatical acceptability for the following line of text. The acceptability shall be either ‘Acceptable’ or ‘Unacceptable.’”

Batch Classification (BatchClf) This is the multi-problem version of SingleClf. The BatchClf prompt consists of a shared task instruction with multiple target classification problems following. Fig 2 provides an example of a 5-problem classification task based on CoLA. The task instructions for a SingleClf prompt and for the corresponding BatchClf prompt are nearly identical to maximize comparability.

Index Selection One Category (SelectOne) We additionally introduce two index selection tasks that conceptually embed BatchClf. SelectOne differs from BatchClf by having an additional reasoning step, namely index selection. More concretely,

¹The prompt templates used are presented in Appendix A.




Figure 3: The 4 types of evaluation tasks designed for classification benchmarks illustrated in the form of a <task, input, output> triplet. We use the darker colors to indicate the *anticipated* increasing task complexity.

for each label *one at a time*, SelectOne prompts LLMs to select *all* indices of text that should be classified as label *separately*. The expected output for SelectOne is “None,” “All,” or a list of applicable indices.

Index Selection All Categories (SelectAll) SelectAll prompts a system to do SelectOne for each possible label *all at once*. The expected output for a single prompt consists of, for every possible label, the label followed by the SelectOne output for that label. For both SelectOne and SelectAll, we ask LLMs to produce the output in JSON format.²

We design the two selection tasks to test LLM’s understanding of the classifications performed under BatchClf. Since selection tasks of size n may have anywhere from 0 to n correct indices per class, spurious correlations are less likely during our evaluation, given the combinatorial answer space.

4 Experimental Setup

Summary of terminology We refer to prompting an LLM under one experimental configuration (e.g., benchmark, model) as a **task**. We have 4 task types: SingleClf, BatchClf, SelectOne, and SelectAll (Section 3). Each task contains one or more **problems** for the LLM to respond to. The problems are the examples from the existing 6 benchmarks listed in Table 1. Three of these benchmarks are **single-text** problems (classification of properties of a single text), and 3 are **text-pair inputs** (classification of the relationship between two texts).

LLMs and evaluation settings We evaluate 7 LLMs: Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023), Mistral 7B (Jiang et al., 2023), Mixtral 8x7B (Jiang et al.,

²This is for ease of parsing SelectAll outputs and for comparability, but we found in our early experiments that having free-form responses for SelectOne led to similar results.

2024), Llama-3 8B and 70B,³ GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023). We conduct the main experiments under the zero-shot setting with greedy decoding. We selectively experiment with other prompting strategies in the follow-up experiments in Section 6. Details about these models, such as model versions and context windows, are in Appendix B.

LLM output parsing code We develop an extensive set of regular expressions to parse the LLM outputs for the 4 task types in Fig 3, taking into account such factors as the task type, the benchmark, and the LLM model, among others. The parsing code is capable of handling cases where LLMs do not generate outputs in a format as intended, e.g., an undefined label, or an answer with un-requested explanations. Details can be found in Appendix B.

Task size We refer to the number of classification problems contained in a prompt as the **task size**. The task size for a single-problem prompt (SingleClf) is 1. In our experiments, we use 5 different task sizes for all benchmarks: 1, 5, 10, 20, and 50. We also test task size 3 for text-pair benchmarks, and task size 100 for single-text benchmarks. We use all problems from each benchmark for SingleClf.

For each benchmark, we randomly sample 100 distinct sets of 100 problems, then select the first n for task size n , so that larger task sizes only differ from smaller task sizes by having additional problems. For SelectOne, we re-use each set of multiple problems m times to construct m prompts targeting each of the m possible labels for those problems. This results in m times more prompts for SelectOne than BatchClf and SelectAll under the same conditions. However, the problems are identical across the three task types.

³<https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>

	> 90% SCAcc	> 80% SCAcc	> 75% SCAcc
Vicuna 13B	79.3	93.1	93.1
Mistral 7B	76.7	83.3	100.0
Mixtral 8x7B	63.3	83.3	86.7
Llama-3 8B	73.3	90.0	100.0
Llama-3 70B	80.0	100.0	100.0
GPT-3.5	56.7	83.3	90.0
GPT-4	100.0	100.0	100.0
Overall	75.6	90.4	95.7

Table 2: Percent of time that BatchClf performance surpasses a threshold percent of SingleClf accuracy (SCAcc) across benchmarks.

Performance metric We measure the average per-problem accuracy to unify the evaluation across the four task types in Fig 3. Per-problem accuracy (PPA) is the average accuracy of classifying n problems in a single prompt or, in the case of SelectOne, in a set of directly related prompts targeting different labels. It is defined in Equation 1:

$$\text{PPA} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta(I(\mathcal{P}_i), \mathcal{A}_i) \quad (1)$$

$I(\mathcal{P}_i)$ is the inferred LLM-generated answer to the i th problem in the input prompt, \mathcal{A}_i is the ground truth, and δ is the Kronecker delta function such that $\delta(i, j) = 1$ iff $i = j$ and 0 otherwise. For the two index selection tasks, $I(\mathcal{P}_i)$ is determined by considering the LLM’s assignments of indices to all possible labels. LLMs may produce contradictory index assignments across different labels, or not select certain indices at all. In other words, $I(\mathcal{P}_i)$ may be mapped to a list of labels or an empty list, instead of a single label. In both cases, $I(\mathcal{P}_i) \neq \mathcal{A}_i$ and therefore $\delta(I(\mathcal{P}_i), \mathcal{A}_i) = 0$.

To measure an LLM’s performance on a task type under some conditions (benchmark and task size), we average PPA on all the related prompts for that task. Since we are mainly interested in comparing the LLM’s performance across task types, accuracy alone suffices for our purpose.

5 Main Results

5.1 LLMs are Multi-Problem Solvers

We aggregate the zero-shot results across the 7 LLMs on the 4 task types for each benchmark in Fig 4 with the related full results for each LLM provided in Appendix C. We exclude the results of Vicuna on AGNews when task size is 100 because the prompts exceed the model’s context length. We focus on the general patterns across LLMs and benchmarks, since model-level or benchmark-level vari-

ations are not the focus of the study. To compare performance difference, we use Mann-Whitney U tests for significant testing and Cohen’s d (Cohen, 1969) for measuring effect size.

LLMs can handle multiple classifications at once with minimal performance loss. Although the BatchClf accuracy generally declines as the task size increases (Fig 4), all 7 LLMs achieve accuracy of at least 90% that of SingleClf across the benchmarks most of the time. Table 2 indicates the proportion of BatchClf tasks for which each LLM surpasses a threshold percent of corresponding SingleClf performance. Interestingly, for SNLI almost all LLMs perform better in BatchClf than in SingleClf across all the task sizes (3-50) and GPT-4 consistently achieves a BatchClf accuracy near or better than the SingleClf accuracy under all conditions (see Appendix C). Overall, the SingleClf accuracy for the 7 LLMs on the 6 benchmarks is 75.5% and the BatchClf counterpart is 72.3%, a minor 3.2% absolute drop from the former.

Multi-problem prompting is cost-efficient. Single-problem prompting can waste input tokens by redundantly repeating a shared task instruction. Multi-problem prompting reduces this redundancy, and this saving is larger the more problems are combined in a single prompt. Because performance tends to decline slowly as the number of tasks increases, this yields a favorable cost-accuracy ratio as the number of tasks increases (Fig 5). We only encountered two outliers, Vicuna on MRPC with task size 50 where the average input is 3,645 tokens and the context window is 4,096 tokens, and Mixtral 8x7B at ≥ 50 on AGNews. While it is of course up to downstream users to determine what cost-accuracy is right for them, this is likely beneficial for many use cases where similar prompts are repeated frequently.

To further illustrate, we estimate the potential cost saving rate for BatchClf based on our experiments. Fig 6 shows the cost saving rate for each model/task combination at the largest BatchClf task size that achieves at least 95% SingleClf accuracy for that pair. We observe that the cost saving rate is substantial for all LLMs run on all the 6 benchmarks, ranging from from 30.7% to 82.0%. The average cost saving rate for each LLM on the 6 benchmark is at least 44.7% (GPT-3.5) and up to 68.5% (Mixtral 8x7B). We provide more fine-grained analysis in Appendix C.




Figure 4: Aggregated average accuracy of the 7 LLMs on the 4 types of tasks across various task sizes for each benchmark. See Appendix C for the full results for each LLM.




Figure 5: Cost/Accuracy Ratio (lower is better) for the 7 LLMs on the 6 benchmarks for SingleClf (task size=1) and BatchClf (otherwise). We use the average (input + output) token count per classification as the proxy for the actual inference costs, calculated on the basis of the input and output tokens. The plot for MRPC is log-scale for the y-axis.




Figure 6: Cost saving rate (%) per classification based on our experiments. The cost is estimated by both the input and output token counts (using the respective tokenizers), weighted according to the pricing policy from OpenAI and TogetherAI (for non-GPT LLMs) websites.

LLMs make errors evenly across positions under multiple problems. Fig 7 shows that LLMs do not have clear positional bias, also known as the serial position effect in psychology (Murdock, 1962), when solving multiple problems of the same type at once (i.e., BatchClf). While some positional bias may surface for some LLMs on some benchmarks, such biases are very mild or non-existent most of times (see breakdown in Appendix C). This is in contrast to the previous single-problem evaluation results, where LLMs are found to be better at using information from the beginning (primacy bias) or the end (recency bias) of the prompt (Liu et al., 2024a; Levy et al., 2024). The lack of a positional bias supports the claim that LLMs can use

	BatchClf vs SelectOne	BatchClf vs SelectAll	SelectOne vs SelectAll
Mean Acc Dif	32.0	12.1	-19.9
Std Dev	16.9	15.3	12.0
Cohen's d	1.8	0.8	-1.0

Table 3: Pairwise accuracy difference (x vs $y = x - y$). All the differences are statistically significant and with a large effect size ($|Cohen's d| \geq 0.8$).

information equally well across different positions under multiple homogeneous problems.

5.2 LLMs Lack True Understanding

While there is no consensus about what constitutes “understanding” in LLMs, it is typically assumed that *true understanding* of a problem involves the ability to solve the problem under various forms, e.g., question answering, fill-in-the-blank, and multiple choice questions. We adopt this *invariance assumption* for the purposes of our analysis. In this sense, our results show that LLMs lack true understanding.

LLMs perform significantly worse on the selection tasks. In our experiments, LLMs nearly always perform much better in BatchClf than in SelectOne and SelectAll under the same conditions with a consistent and stable margin, even when the task size is just 3 or 5 (Fig 4). The overall discrepancy in accuracy between BatchClf and the two tasks is large and statistically significant (32% for




Figure 7: Cumulative error density across positions averaging results from the benchmarks. Task size 3/100: the 3 text-pair/single-text benchmarks; otherwise: all the 6 classification benchmarks. See Appendix C for full results.




Figure 8: Pairwise comparisons of SelectOne and SelectAll for each LLM across different task sizes averaging over results from the 6 benchmarks.

SelectOne and 10% for SelectAll), as shown in Table 3. Moreover, the selection tasks have a sharper downward performance curve (Fig 4) as the task size increases, compared to that of BatchClf.

Although it is expected that the selection tasks are harder because BatchClf is embedded by them, the sharp drop in accuracy even with a rather small task size suggests that LLMs do not really “understand” many of the texts they can otherwise classify correctly under BatchClf.

LLMs lack internalized planning and consistently select inconsistently. Surprisingly, such a consistent and rather stable performance gap also exists between SelectOne and SelectAll in favor of the latter, largely independently of the task size (Fig 4). On average, the SelectOne accuracy is 19.9% lower than the SelectAll accuracy, also with a large and significant effect size (Table 3).

We investigate the reasons in Fig 8, which shows that when asked to select text indices for one label at a time independently, LLMs almost always assign more indices to more than one label (i.e., contradiction) and leave more indices unselected (i.e., non-excluded middles). This showcases a lack of internalized planning with modern LLMs with zero-shot prompting, although different LLMs may make these two types of errors in different proportions. In contrast, when LLMs have to select indices for all labels at once, they are less likely to generate directly illogical answers in a single out-

put because what they answer to the i_{th} label puts a condition on their answer to the $(i + 1)_{th}$ label. This highlights the probabilistic aspect of LLM answer generation, which may deviate from what is considered true and invariant understanding.

LLMs can do index selection. While we argue that the LLMs’ weaker performance on SelectOne and SelectAll is due to a weakness in combining classification with index selection, an alternative explanation would be that they just generally struggle at index selection. To exclude this possibility, we simplify the two index selection tasks by directly replacing each line of text with its gold standard label in the prompts for AGNews, which has most labels. We then ask the LLMs to select the indices of lines containing each label with minimal modifications to the original task instructions.

Fig 9 shows that LLMs can perform in the simplified selection tasks much better than the original ones, with Llama-3 70B, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 even achieving (nearly) 100% accuracy across task sizes. The 7 LLMs’ overall performance in the simplified selection tasks is even slightly higher than their overall BatchClf accuracy. The previously observed performance gap between SelectOne and SelectAll also disappears for almost all LLMs (see Appendix D for full results). In general, LLMs can indeed do index selection.

In conclusion, it appears that the tested LLMs perform less well on SelectOne and SelectAll as




Figure 9: Average accuracy of the 7 LLMs on the two simplified index selection tasks based on AGNews. We provide the original results from BatchClf, SelectOne, and SelectAll for easy comparisons.

compared to BatchClf because they cannot adequately combine the index selection task and the classification tasks in response to a zero-shot prompt. Put differently, the LLMs lack true understanding of the problems presented in different forms, even when the number of problems is quite small (e.g., 3 or 5), which may not be human-like.

6 Follow-up Experiments

6.1 CoT Helps the Index Selection Tasks Slightly but the Gap Remains

We use 1-shot-CoT to prompt LLMs to do BatchClf first and then perform the two index selection tasks on the 6 benchmarks with a fixed task size 10. Table 4 shows that while overall LLMs benefit from CoT for both SelectOne and SelectAll, the benefits are generally larger for SelectOne than SelectAll (3.1% versus 1.0% improvement) and not consistent across models with Mistral 8x7B performing even worse with CoT. The full results provided in Appendix D also show mixed effects across benchmarks. Interestingly, however, the task complexity hierarchy among BatchClf, SelectOne, and SelectAll remains in virtually all cases. We leave to future studies the investigation of how CoT may further help with the two selection tasks.

6.2 Few-Shot Prompting Does Not Help

To test the generality of the main findings, we first re-run all experiments for CoLA providing 2 exemplars in the prompts and with a fixed task size 5 for tasks other than SingleClf. We find that few-shot prompting is mostly detrimental across LLMs, particularly so for SelectOne and BatchClf. As a result, SelectAll shows an overall better performance than BatchClf and the performance gap between SelectOne and SelectAll becomes much larger. Never-

Task Model	SelectOne	+ CoT	SelectAll	+ CoT	BatchClf
Vicuna	23.0	25.8	53.2	57.6	68.7
Mistral 7B	38.3	47.5	56.8	60.5	71.2
Mistral 8x7B	47.4	38.7	65.1	58.4	73.4
Llama-3 8B	39.0	41.8	62.4	59.0	73.3
Llama-3 70B	59.4	67.1	72.9	79.2	79.4
GPT-3.5	45.5	47.5	66.7	66.3	71.9
GPT-4	66.3	71.8	78.8	81.8	81.9
Overall	45.5	48.6	65.1	66.1	74.3

Table 4: Aggregate average accuracy of SelectOne and SelectAll with and without 1-shot-CoT for each LLM. BatchClf performance is also provided for comparisons.

theless, our main findings still hold most of times for the 7 LLMs. Full results are provided in Appendix D for space reasons.

6.3 Testing on a Novel Benchmark

We generate a novel benchmark with 1,000 distinct and label-balanced text pairs sampled from SST-2. The task objective is to determine if each text pair shares the same sentiment, which we believe is unlikely to appear in the training data of LLMs. We run experiments on this benchmark using the same experimental setup described in Section 4 for the text-pair benchmarks. Possibly due to the novel use of SST-2, Mistral 7B only achieves 29.6% accuracy in SingleClf, well below the 50.0% random baseline and close to the SelectOne performance. Other than that, the results (see Appendix D) are consistent with our main results.

7 Conclusion

We propose multi-problem evaluation and present the first systematic and comprehensive study in this regard. Our results provide new insights into the multiple problem handling capabilities of LLMs: LLMs are competent multi-problem solvers for multiple homogeneous problems, but they lack true understanding of the problems because they perform significantly worse when the problems are presented in different forms. Our study showcases the potential of multi-problem evaluation as a new paradigm for probing LLM capabilities.

There are several directions worth future explorations. For example, to better understand how well how LLMs can handle multiple problems in general, it is important to test LLMs with other types of problems (e.g., reasoning problems) and with multiple heterogeneous problems (e.g., mixing different benchmarks/tasks). It is also important to understand what causes LLMs to perform worse

or better when prompted with multiple problems, such as benchmark, task size, and model’s context length. In particular, model-level ablation studies are needed if we want to know how LLMs obtain the ability to handle multiple problems at once and how to improve their understanding capabilities.

Acknowledgement

We thank the Institute for Advanced Computational Science (IACS) at Stony Brook University for providing us free access to the GPT models used in our experiments. Zhengxiang Wang and Owen Rambow were supported in part by funding from the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) under Contracts No. HR01121C0186, No. HR001120C0037, and PR No. HR0011154158. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of DARPA.

Limitations

While we have done our best to make our experiments as comprehensive as possible, there is always more work that can be done in a large comparison study, including the addition of even more benchmarks and language models. We were limited by cost, time, and space and have attempted to select an informative and representative sample of experiments. Since we used pre-existing benchmarking data sets, we inherit any labeling errors that they main contain. Finally, despite our efforts to compare different prompts, as is the case with all prompt-based LLM studies, we cannot guarantee that slight differences in the prompts would not meaningfully alter the results.

Ethical Concerns

To the best of our knowledge, all results published in this paper are accurate. All data sources are free, publicly available, and cited in the article. No sensitive data was used which could violate individuals’ privacy or confidentiality.

References

Anthropic. 2024. The Claude 3 model family: Opus, Sonnet, Haiku.

Iz Beltagy, Matthew E. Peters, and Arman Cohan. 2020. [Longformer: The long-document transformer](#).

Jonathan Berant, Andrew Chou, Roy Frostig, and Percy Liang. 2013. [Semantic parsing on Freebase from question-answer pairs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1533–1544, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Katie Millican, George Bm Van Den Driessche, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Bogdan Damoc, Aidan Clark, Diego De Las Casas, Aurelia Guy, Jacob Menick, Roman Ring, Tom Hennigan, Saffron Huang, Loren Maggiore, Chris Jones, Albin Cassirer, Andy Brock, Michela Paganini, Geoffrey Irving, Oriol Vinyals, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Jack Rae, Erich Elsen, and Laurent Sifre. 2022. [Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens](#). In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2206–2240. PMLR.

Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. [A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 632–642, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#).

Yukang Chen, Shengju Qian, Haotian Tang, Xin Lai, Zhijian Liu, Song Han, and Jiaya Jia. 2024. [Longlora: Efficient fine-tuning of long-context large language models](#).

Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing GPT-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality](#).

Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. 2017. [Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.

J. Cohen. 1969. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Academic Press.

- Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Quoc Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. [Transformer-XL: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2978–2988, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tri Dao, Dan Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. 2022. [Flashattention: Fast and memory-efficient exact attention with io-awareness](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 16344–16359. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Yiran Ding, Li Lyna Zhang, Chengruidong Zhang, Yuanyuan Xu, Ning Shang, Jiahang Xu, Fan Yang, and Mao Yang. 2024. [Longrope: Extending llm context window beyond 2 million tokens](#).
- William B. Dolan and Chris Brockett. 2005. [Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases](#). In *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Paraphrasing (IWP2005)*.
- Isabel O. Gallegos, Ryan A. Rossi, Joe Barrow, Md Mehrab Tanjim, Sungchul Kim, Franck Dernoncourt, Tong Yu, Ruiyi Zhang, and Nesreen K. Ahmed. 2024. [Bias and fairness in large language models: A survey](#).
- Gemini-Team. 2023. [Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models](#).
- Antonio Gulli. 2004. [AG’s corpus of news articles](#).
- Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2023. [A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions](#).
- Alon Jacovi, Avi Caciularu, Omer Goldman, and Yoav Goldberg. 2023. [Stop uploading test data in plain text: Practical strategies for mitigating data contamination by evaluation benchmarks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5075–5084, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#).
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th  ophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. [Mistral of experts](#).
- Md Tahmid Rahman Laskar, M Saiful Bari, Mizanur Rahman, Md Amran Hossen Bhuiyan, Shafiq Joty, and Jimmy Huang. 2023. [A systematic study and comprehensive evaluation of ChatGPT on benchmark datasets](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 431–469, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mosh Levy, Alon Jacoby, and Yoav Goldberg. 2024. [Same task, more tokens: the impact of input length on the reasoning performance of large language models](#).
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich K  ttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rock-t  schel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. [Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9459–9474. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Jiaqi Li, Mengmeng Wang, Zilong Zheng, and Muhan Zhang. 2023. [Loogle: Can long-context language models understand long contexts?](#)
- Tianle Li, Ge Zhang, Quy Duc Do, Xiang Yue, and Wenhu Chen. 2024a. [Long-context LLMs struggle with long in-context learning](#).
- Yingji Li, Mengnan Du, Rui Song, Xin Wang, and Ying Wang. 2024b. [A survey on fairness in large language models](#).
- Nelson F. Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. 2024a. [Lost in the Middle: How Language Models Use Long Contexts](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173.
- Yang Liu, Yuanshun Yao, Jean-Francois Ton, Xiaoying Zhang, Ruocheng Guo, Hao Cheng, Yegor Klochkov, Muhammad Faaiz Taufiq, and Hang Li. 2024b. [Trustworthy LLMs: a survey and guideline for evaluating large language models’ alignment](#).
- Sewon Min, Jordan Boyd-Graber, Chris Alberti, Danqi Chen, Eunsol Choi, Michael Collins, Kelvin Guu, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Kenton Lee, Jennimaria Palomaki, Colin Raffel, Adam Roberts, Tom Kwiatkowski, Patrick Lewis, Yuxiang Wu, Heinrich K  ttler, Linqing Liu, Pasquale Minervini, Pontus Stenetorp, Sebastian Riedel, Sohee Yang, Minjoon Seo, Gautier Izacard, Fabio Petroni, Lucas Hosseini, Nicola De Cao, Edouard Grave, Ikuya Yamada, Sonse Shimaoka, Masatoshi Suzuki, Shumpei Miyawaki, Shun Sato, Ryo Takahashi, Jun Suzuki, Martin Fajcik, Martin Docekal, Karel Ondrej, Pavel Smrz, Hao Cheng, Yelong Shen, Xiaodong Liu, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, Jianfeng Gao, Barlas Oguz, Xilun Chen, Vladimir Karpukhin, Stan

- Peshterliev, Dmytro Okhonko, Michael Schlichtkrull, Sonal Gupta, Yashar Mehdad, and Wen-tau Yih. 2021. [NeurIPS 2020 efficientqa competition: Systems, analyses and lessons learned](#). In *Proceedings of the NeurIPS 2020 Competition and Demonstration Track*, volume 133 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 86–111. PMLR.
- Bennet B. Murdock. 1962. [The serial position effect of free recall](#). *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 64(5):482–488.
- OpenAI. 2023. [GPT-4 technical report](#).
- Mohammad Taher Pilehvar and Jose Camacho-Collados. 2019. [WiC: the word-in-context dataset for evaluating context-sensitive meaning representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 1267–1273, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vipula Rawte, Amit Sheth, and Amitava Das. 2023. [A survey of hallucination in large foundation models](#).
- Oscar Sainz, Jon Campos, Iker García-Ferrero, Julen Etxaniz, Oier Lopez de Lacalle, and Eneko Agirre. 2023. [NLP evaluation in trouble: On the need to measure LLM data contamination for each benchmark](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 10776–10787, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Paul-Edouard Sarlin, Daniel DeTone, Tomasz Malisiewicz, and Andrew Rabinovich. 2020. [SuperGlue: Learning feature matching with graph neural networks](#).
- Uri Shaham, Maor Ivgi, Avia Efrat, Jonathan Berant, and Omer Levy. 2023. [ZeroSCROLLS: A zero-shot benchmark for long text understanding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 7977–7989, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D. Manning, Andrew Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. [Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1631–1642, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. [GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding](#).
- Yufei Wang, Wanjuan Zhong, Liangyou Li, Fei Mi, Xingshan Zeng, Wenyong Huang, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, and Qun Liu. 2023. [Aligning large language models with human: A survey](#).
- Alex Warstadt, Amanpreet Singh, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. [Neural network acceptability judgments](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:625–641.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#).

A Data

A.1 Benchmarks

- SST-2 (Socher et al., 2013) or Stanford Sentiment Treebank is a binary sentiment benchmark created from movie reviews. The sentiment is either positive or negative. License unspecified.
- CoLA (Warstadt et al., 2019) or Corpus of Linguistic Acceptability is a binary grammaticality judgement benchmark created by aggregating grammaticality examples used in previous linguistics literature. The grammaticality is either acceptable or unacceptable. MIT License.
- AGNews (Gulli, 2004) is a corpus of news articles collected by Antonio Gulli, covering four general news categories: “Business,” “Sports,” “World,” and “Sci/Tech.” License unspecified.
- MRPC (Dolan and Brockett, 2005) or Microsoft Research Paraphrase Corpus is a binary paraphrase detection benchmark comprising sentence pairs collected from news articles, either paraphrases or non-paraphrases. License unspecified.
- SNLI (Bowman et al., 2015) or Stanford Natural Language Inference is a three-way textual inference benchmark containing human-written sentence pairs for image captions. The inference relation is either entailment, neutral, or contradiction. Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.
- WiC (Pilehvar and Camacho-Collados, 2019) or Word-in-Context is a binary word sense disambiguation benchmark where a target word is used either with same meaning or with different meanings in two provided contexts for each example. Examples are taken from lexical resources like WordNet and Wiktionary. Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License.

Task	Prompt template
Single Classification	<p>Indicate the sentiment for the following line of text. The sentiment shall be either 'Positive' or 'Negative.'</p> <p>Text: \$text Sentiment:</p>
Batch Classification	<p>Indicate the sentiment for each of the \$num following lines of text. The sentiment shall be either 'Positive' or 'Negative.'</p> <p>Texts, one per line:</p> <p>\$texts</p> <p>The sentiments for each of the \$num lines of text, one per line:</p>
Index Selection One Category	<p>Go over the \$num lines of text below and list the index numbers of the lines with \$polarity sentiment according to the following instructions: If none of the texts show \$polarity sentiment, write 'None.' If all the texts show \$polarity sentiment, write 'All.' Otherwise, provide the index numbers for each text with \$polarity sentiment.</p> <p>Output your responses in JSON format with the key '\$polarity'. A formatted example output is provided below. { '\$polarity': [None/All or index numbers for the texts with \$polarity sentiment] }</p> <p>Texts, one per line:</p> <p>\$texts</p> <p>JSON output:</p>
Index Selection All Categories	<p>Go over the \$num lines of text below. First, list the index numbers of the lines with positive sentiment. Then, list the index numbers of the lines with negative sentiment. If none of the texts show a particular sentiment, write 'None.' If all the texts show a particular sentiment, write 'All.' Otherwise, provide the index numbers of the texts that fit a particular category.</p> <p>Output your responses in JSON format with two keys: 'positive' and 'negative.' A formatted example output is provided below. { 'positive': [None/All or index numbers of positive sentences], 'negative': [None/All or index numbers of negative sentences] }</p> <p>Texts, one per line:</p> <p>\$texts</p> <p>JSON output:</p>

Table 5: Prompt templates for SST-2. Words immediately preceded by the dollar sign \$ are placeholders.

A.2 Prompt Templates

Table 5 provides the prompt templates for the 4 task types constructed from SST-2. The prompt templates for the other 5 benchmarks follow the same “task instruction + problem” structure, with the task instruction tailored for the task objective of each benchmark. Check <https://github.com/jaaack-wang/multi-problem-eval-llm> for full prompt templates and all prompts created in this study.

Throughout our research project, we have also tried prompts with different wordings and structures until we finally unified the prompt designs presented in Table 5. For example, we initially asked LLMs to directly generate indices line by line instead of a JSON output for SelectOne and we did not provide any formatted example for SelectAll. We also put the output format instruction in the end of each prompt for SelectAll, instead of in the beginning. Although we observed certain task-level performance variations, which are

expected, the overall complexity among the 4 task types (SelectOne > SelectAll > BatchClf > SingleClf) remains unchanged, despite the variations in the prompts. This indicates the overall limited effects of rewording and restructuring prompts.

A.3 Average Prompt Length

Table 6 details the average prompt token count for each task across different task sizes and benchmarks based on the GPT-3.5 tokenizer. Using other LLMs’ tokenizers yields mostly similar counts.

B Experimental details

B.1 LLM Details

Table 7 describes the specific versions for the 7 LLMs we use in the paper and highlights their differences in terms of open weights, training with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback or RLHF (Christiano et al., 2017), architecture, number of parameters, and context window size. We

Task size	SST-2	CoLA	AGNews	MRPC	SNLI	WiC
1	59	54	77	106	94	95
3	-	-	-	240 / 318 / 345	184 / 244 / 305	184 / 250 / 304
5	183 / 246 / 275	127 / 182 / 218	236 / 338 / 406	356 / 434 / 461	253 / 312 / 374	254 / 320 / 374
10	305 / 368 / 397	184 / 239 / 275	403 / 504 / 573	646 / 724 / 751	421 / 480 / 542	423 / 489 / 543
20	547 / 610 / 639	300 / 355 / 391	736 / 838 / 906	1221 / 1298 / 1326	757 / 816 / 878	761 / 827 / 881
50	1290 / 1353 / 1382	647 / 702 / 738	1741 / 1842 / 1911	2948 / 3025 / 3053	1763 / 1822 / 1884	1772 / 1838 / 1892
100	2515 / 2578 / 2607	1223 / 1278 / 1314	3421 / 3523 / 3591	-	-	-

Table 6: Average prompt token count for the main experiments under zero-shot scenario. For simplicity, the counts here are calculated based on GPT-3.5 tokenizer, but using other tokenizers from other LLMs used in this study yields mostly similar counts. For task size greater than 1, we report the token counts for BatchClf, SelectOne, and SelectAll in sequence separated by ‘/’.

Model	Version	Open Weights	With RLHF	MoE	# Parameter	Context Window Size
Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023)	v1.5	✓	✗	✗	13B	4,096
Mistral 7B (Jiang et al., 2023)	Instruct-v0.2	✓	✗	✗	7B	8,192
Mixtral 8x7B (Jiang et al., 2024)	Instruct-v0.1	✓	✗	✓	47B	8,192
Llama-3 8B	Instruct	✓	✓	✗	8B	8,192
Llama-3 70B	Instruct	✓	✓	✗	70B	8,192
GPT-3.5	turbo-0125	✗	✓	✗	-	16,385
GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023)	turbo-2024-04-09	✗	✓	✗	-	128,000

Table 7: The 7 LLMs we use, all instruction finetuned. For the two GPT LLMs, it is commonly assumed that both are larger than GPT-3 (a 175B LLM) with GPT-4 being the largest. For Mixtral 8x7B, a Mixture of Experts (MoE) LLM, although each token has access to 47B parameters, but only uses 13B active parameters during inference.

use OpenAI API⁴ and TogetherAI API⁵ to call GPT LLMs and non-GPT LLMs, respectively.

B.2 LLM Output Parsing Code

The LLM output parsing code contains over 200 lines of regular expressions to parse LLM outputs. The code takes into accounts the following five variables during parsing: task type, benchmark, model, task size, and target label (for SelectOne). This is to ensure our code can handle cases when LLMs generate undefined labels, un-instructed explanations, or even wrong answer format (e.g., a non-JSON output for SelectOne and SelectAll).

Overall, our code achieves about 99.9% overall parsing rate. The unparsable cases mostly come from SingleClf outputs where LLMs output undefined labels, such as “Mixed” or “Netual” for SST-2. For BatchClf outputs, we implement a series of rules to extract both defined and undefined labels, because of the order of the extracted labels affects the final evaluation. For SelectOne and SelectAll, our code extracts JSON object, fixes cases where the JSON object has formatting issues, or extracts a series of text indices when there is no JSON object identified in the output.

Check <https://github.com/jaaack-wang/>

⁴<https://platform.openai.com/docs/overview>

⁵<https://www.together.ai/>

[multi-problem-eval-llm](#) for details.

C Main Experiments

C.1 Full Results

The full results obtained from the main experiments are visualized in Fig 10. We exclude the results of Vicuna on AGNews when task size is 100 because the prompts exceed the model’s context length.

C.2 Task Complexity Hierarchy

In Table 3 from Section 5, we demonstrate the overall task complexity hierarchy among BatchClf, SelectOne, and SelectAll. It is found that SelectOne > SelectAll > BatchClf, where “>” denotes a “more complex than” relationship.

Similar to Fig 4, which describes the aggregate average accuracy across benchmarks, Fig 11 describes the aggregate average accuracy across LLMs. Although there are few cases shown in Fig 10 where the overall complexity hierarchy among BatchClf, SelectOne, and SelectAll does not hold (e.g., Vicuna on MRPC for task size 50), these cases are exceptional and likely due to the interactions of multiple factors in play, such as model, benchmark, input length, and context windows. Nevertheless, the overall task complexity hierarchy is clear both in Fig 4 (benchmark-level) and in Fig 11 (model-level).




Figure 10: Full average accuracy of the 7 LLMs on the 4 tasks across the 6 benchmarks.




Figure 11: Aggregate average accuracy on the 4 tasks averaging over results from the 6 benchmarks for each LLM. “Overall” presents the average results across all LLMs for each one of the 4 task.




Figure 12: Cost/Accuracy Ratio (lower is better) for the 7 LLMs on the 6 benchmarks for SingleClf (task size=1) and BatchClf (otherwise). The upper MRPC plot (input-wise) is log-scale for the y-axis. Note that the scale of y-axis tends to be smaller in the output-wise plots than the input-wise plots because the outputs are usually much shorter than the inputs for zero-shot classification problems.

C.3 Cost/Accuracy Ratio: Input-wise and Output-wise

In Fig 5 from Section 5, we calculate the cost/accuracy ratio based on both the input and output tokens, because this is how the actual cost is billed. We use token counts as the proxy for the actual costs to avoid the huge discrepancies in the inference costs among LLMs (e.g., GPT-4-Turbo is 20 times more expensive than GPT-3.5-Turbo) and for a better visualization.

To further investigate the sources of saving for multi-problem prompting, we also visualize the input-wise and output-wise cost/accuracy ratio in Fig 12, considering only input length and output length as proxies for costs, respectively. As expected, the input-wise cost/accuracy ratio goes down more dramatically and consistently than the output-wise one as the task size increases. This is because multi-problem prompting is meant to reduce redundancy of repeating a shared task instruction in the input rather than in the output and the average input token count is smaller the more classifications are performed at once.

Interestingly, we also observe an overall lower output-wise cost/accuracy ratio across benchmarks, mostly from non-GPT models. For example, on WiC, the output-wise cost/accuracy ratio for Llama-3 8B shows a smooth downward curve. We note that this is possible because non-GPT models tend to generate lengthy reasoning and explanations when not instructed to, but multi-problem prompting somehow suppresses such a tendency.

C.4 Positional Errors under BatchClf

Fig 13 shows the full results regarding the positional errors the 7 LLMs make across benchmarks and task sizes. We note that (1) distribution of the positional errors becomes more random (or even) as the task size increases for all LLMs; (2) in most cases, the positional errors distribute nearly randomly, showing no evidence of obvious positional biases, if any; (3) some LLMs may display more severe positional biases on some benchmarks with a certain task size, such as GPT-3.5 on SST-2 with task size 50, but overall this is rare.

D Follow-up Experiments

D.1 Simplified Index Selection Tasks

Fig 14 shows the full results for the two simplified index selection tasks, along with results for the two original selection tasks and BatchClf, based on AGNews. Clearly, (1) all LLMs perform much better in the simplified tasks than the original ones; (2) Mixtral 8X7B, Llama-3 70B, GPT-3.5, and GPT-4 can do these simplified selection tasks even better than their BatchClf performance consistently, with the latter three achieving nearly 100% accuracy in most cases; (3) the task complexity hierarchy between SelectOne and SelectAll nearly disappears for all LLMs except Vicua, implying that it may be challenging for Vicuna to perform index selection tasks in general.

D.2 1-shot-CoT Results

Table 8 presents the full 1-shot-CoT results across benchmarks and LLMs with a fixed task size 10.

As demonstrated in Section 6, CoT improves the LLMs’ performance in SelectOne and SelectAll with an overall larger positive effect on the former, but the improvement is not consistent both across benchmarks and across LLMs. For examples, LLMs tend to benefit from CoT for both selection tasks constructed from SST-2, CoLA, and SNLI (see the “Overall” results in Table 8).

D.3 Few-shot Results

Table 9 shows the full 2-shot results on CoLA for each LLM, which shows a general negative effect of few-shot prompting. According to these results, LLMs performs much worse in SelectOne with an overall accuracy going down to 25.2% from 58.1%. Similarly, the negative effect is larger on BatchClf than on SelectAll, making the overall BatchClf accuracy lower than SelectAll, although the former is still often higher than the latter under the same test conditions.

D.4 Full Results on the Novel Benchmark

Fig 15 shows the full results on the novel benchmark created on top of SST-2.




Figure 13: Cumulative error density across positions for all benchmarks and LLMs across different task sizes. The task size “M/N” on the left side of the plots denotes the task size for the 3 text-pair benchmarks (i.e., MRPC, SNLI, and WiC) and for the 3 single-text benchmarks (i.e., SST-2, CoLA, AGNews), respectively.




Figure 14: Full results for the two simplified index selection tasks versus the original tasks based on AGNews.

Model	Benchmark Task	SST-2	CoLA	AGNews	MRPC	SNLI	WiC
Vicuna	SelectOne	38.5	22.2	16.8	15.8	9.9	34.5
	+ CoT	52.6	53.9	12.1	12.1	11.5	12.5
	SelectAll	66.7	65.7	42.2	67.4	28.2	48.8
	+ CoT	81.7	69.2	40.9	63.9	40.9	48.9
	BatchClf	89.1	73.2	70.4	66.7	59.3	53.4
Mistral 7B	SelectOne	53.3	52.8	41.5	36.6	23.3	22.2
	+ CoT	66.5	55.1	44.8	59.4	29.5	29.5
	SelectAll	68.3	63.6	48.2	58.4	54.7	47.9
	+ CoT	74.4	68.2	57.0	68.5	47.6	47.3
	BatchClf	79.6	76.8	78.1	74.0	69.1	49.6
Mixtral 8x7B	SelectOne	76.5	61.0	46.2	45.2	23.8	32.0
	+ CoT	41.5	67.3	12.9	48.4	25.1	37.2
	SelectAll	85.3	68.4	62.9	65.9	56.2	52.0
	+ CoT	49.0	67.4	57.8	66.5	58.9	51.1
	BatchClf	80.2	80.9	71.6	70.8	73.3	63.7
Llama-3 8B	SelectOne	67.8	50.8	55.1	21.7	21.4	17.3
	+ CoT	85.0	48.9	22.1	50.7	22.3	22.0
	SelectAll	85.0	62.9	59.6	64.8	50.1	52.2
	+ CoT	85.8	66.5	45.3	64.5	39.8	52.3
	BatchClf	92.0	76.8	79.5	62.8	69.2	59.5
Llama-3 70B	SelectOne	83.6	72.7	67.4	61.0	32.3	39.3
	+ CoT	94.7	79.7	75.2	67.9	69.4	15.8
	SelectAll	87.3	79.6	76.2	71.7	68.6	53.9
	+ CoT	96.1	83.7	85.5	73.9	77.3	58.4
	BatchClf	96.4	82.8	86.8	73.5	75.2	61.7
GPT-3.5	SelectOne	71.9	65.8	47.6	25.2	28.4	33.8
	+ CoT	80.2	71.7	57.9	26.8	26.5	22.1
	SelectAll	83.1	79.7	68.3	61.5	55.8	51.6
	+ CoT	89.5	77.5	58.8	70.2	50.5	51.2
	BatchClf	95.0	81.8	86.4	52.7	57.4	58.0
GPT-4	SelectOne	88.6	80.8	66.4	58.1	53.8	50.0
	+ CoT	84.5	81.9	67.8	60.1	77.0	59.6
	SelectAll	92.4	84.0	79.2	73.5	80.8	62.8
	+ CoT	91.3	83.7	85.4	76.2	83.3	71.0
	BatchClf	96.0	84.0	86.7	72.6	83.8	68.4
Overall	SelectOne	68.6	58.0	48.7	37.7	27.6	32.7
	+ CoT	72.1	65.5	41.8	46.5	37.3	28.4
	SelectAll	81.2	72.0	62.4	66.2	56.3	52.7
	+ CoT	81.1	73.7	61.5	69.1	56.9	54.3
	BatchClf	89.8	79.5	79.9	67.6	69.6	59.2

Table 8: Full 1-shot-CoT results for all benchmarks and LLMs. The task size is fixed at 10.

Model	Task Benchmark	SingleClf	BatchClf	SelectOne	SelectAll
Vicuna	CoLA	78.8	71.0	48.6	59.6
	+ 2-shot	69.0	50.4	14.8	64.0
Mistral 7B	CoLA	81.5	74.4	47.4	59.4
	+ 2-shot	80.2	65.0	25.0	60.4
Mixtral 8x7B	CoLA	84.4	81.2	65.0	70.6
	+ 2-shot	81.8	73.2	19.8	72.4
Llama-3 8B	CoLA	80.2	79.4	33.4	61.2
	+ 2-shot	74.3	46.6	0.6	63.8
Llama-3 70B	CoLA	82.8	83.4	71.2	79.6
	+ 2-shot	81.8	82.0	29.2	80.8
GPT-3.5	CoLA	84.2	79.6	63.4	76.2
	+ 2-shot	79.5	76.8	38.2	72.8
GPT-4	CoLA	85.1	83.8	77.8	83.6
	+ 2-shot	85.7	80.8	48.6	81.0
Overall	CoLA	82.4	79.0	58.1	70.0
	+ 2-shot	78.9	67.8	25.2	70.7

Table 9: Full 2-shot results on CoLA. We use a fixed task size 5 for tasks other than SingleClf, whose task size is 1 by default. We provide the related zero-shot results for easy comparisons.




Figure 15: Full results on the novel benchmark created on top of SST-2 where the task objective is to decide if a text pair shares the same sentiment.