

Mitigating Large Language Model Hallucination with Faithful Finetuning

Minda Hu¹ Bowei He² Yufei Wang³ Liangyou Li³ Chen Ma² Irwin King¹

¹Dept. of Computer Science & Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

²Department of Computer Science, City University of Hong Kong

³Huawei Noah's Ark Lab

{mindahu21, king}@cse.cuhk.edu.hk

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable performance on various natural language processing tasks. However, they are prone to generating fluent yet untruthful responses, known as "hallucinations". Hallucinations can lead to the spread of misinformation and cause harm in critical applications. Mitigating hallucinations is challenging as they arise from multiple complex factors like overconfidence and lacking knowledge, especially in Question Answering (QA) tasks. Recent efforts have attempted to address this issue through representation editing and decoding algorithms without major structural changes or retraining. However, these approaches either implicitly edit LLMs' behavior in latent space or suppress the tendency to output unfaithful results during decoding instead of explicitly modeling on hallucination. In this work, we introduce **Faithful Finetuning (F2)**, a novel method that explicitly models the process of faithful question answering through carefully designed loss functions during fine-tuning. We conduct extensive experiments on popular datasets and demonstrate that F2 achieves significant improvements over vanilla models and baselines.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have emerged as transformative tools in the field of natural language processing (NLP), showcasing unparalleled proficiency across a diverse array of tasks (OpenAI, 2023; Touvron et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023a). Despite their impressive capabilities, LLMs are occasionally prone to generating responses that, while coherent and seemingly in line with given instructions, diverge from the truth - a phenomenon aptly termed as "hallucinations" (Ji et al., 2023a). Such inaccuracies not only compromise the reliability of LLMs but also pose significant challenges for their application in critical domains.

The root causes of these hallucinations remain a subject of ongoing investigation. Factors contribut-

ing to this issue may include the models' overreliance on their own outputs, the preference for generating fluent text at the expense of accuracy, and the intrinsic uncertainties associated with the knowledge amassed during their training phase. The implications of hallucinations are profound, potentially facilitating the dissemination of misinformation, diminishing trust in AI technologies, and causing detrimental effects when employed in sensitive decision-making contexts.

In addressing this challenge, specially within the context of Question Answering (QA), the academic community has dedicated considerable effort towards devising strategies to curtail the occurrence of hallucinations. Prior studies (Qiu et al., 2023; Chuang et al., 2023; Kai et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024) have illustrated that it is feasible to significantly mitigate hallucinations without necessitating extensive structural modifications or comprehensive retraining of the models. Nevertheless, many of these approaches either implicitly adjust the behavior of LLMs within the latent space or aim to suppress the tendency of outputting unfaithful results during the decoding phase, essentially treating LLMs as opaque entities.

Contrary to these approaches, our research introduces a novel approach that emphasizes the fidelity of responses through the meticulous design of explicit loss functions during the fine-tuning process, named as **Faithful Finetuning (F2)**. We first decompose the conventional QA objective into two explicit sub-objectives: internal fact retrieval and fact-grounded QA, thus informing the LLM to effectively leverage their internal knowledge for faithful answers. Then, we design a targeted fine-tuning approach to guide the model focusing on the hotspots identified by the entity-based and attention-based heuristics within the retrieved fact spans. Additionally, to minimize the occurrence of model hallucinations, we select the hallucination-prone layers in the LLM structure and specifically conduct the

fine-tuning on them. Empirical evaluations conducted on the TruthfulQA (Lin et al., 2022) and FACTOR (Muhlgay et al., 2024) datasets, which are widely employed in the study of LLM hallucinations (Zhang et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024), reveal that our method achieves noticeable improvement compared to the vanilla models. In addition, our method is empirically proven to be orthogonal to the current state-of-the-art manipulation methods, further boosting their already strong performance on such benchmarks. Our findings emphasize the effectiveness of explicit loss design in improving LLM truthfulness and pave the way for more reliable and trustworthy language models in real-world applications.

2 Related Works

Hallucination in Generative Models As the adoption of text generative models in various applications ranging from automated summarization (Huang et al., 2021), machine translation (Dale et al., 2023), question answering (Sadat et al., 2023), to dialogue systems (Dziri et al., 2022) has surged, the hallucination phenomenon has drawn considerable attention within the NLP community. Hallucinations refers to the generation of content that is either unfaithful to the input data or devoid of factual grounding (Maynez et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2024). This phenomenon poses challenges to the reliability and applicability of such models, especially in the critical domains requiring high levels of accuracy and trustworthiness. Generally, the hallucination in text generation can be categorized into two types: *extrinsic hallucination* and *intrinsic hallucination* (Ji et al., 2023a). The former one occurs when the generated text includes factual inaccuracies or entities not present in the input, while the second one is irrelevant and does not address the prompt or the task at hand though factually correct.

Mitigating LLM Hallucination Though recent works have recognized the severity of LLM hallucination problem. many previous works still only focus on detecting such hallucinations (Wang et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024a), while neglecting the importance of mitigating them during the text generation process. Existing mitigation approaches (Tonmoy et al., 2024) mainly consist of two categories: *prompt engineering* and *developing models*. The *prompt engineering* here refers to designing the input instructions to get the best output possible while not touching the model architectures

or parameters, exhibiting the advantages of being lightweight and fast. The common approaches in this category include retrieval augmented generation (Varshney et al., 2023; Peng et al., 2023), self refinement through feedback and reasoning (Dhuliawala et al., 2023; Ji et al., 2023c), and prompt tuning (Cheng et al., 2023; Jones et al., 2023). Instead of editing the LLM as a black box, the *developing models* methods focus on developing or modifying model architecture or parameters to pertinently address the hallucination challenge. Introducing new decoding strategy (Shi et al., 2023; Chuang et al., 2023), utilization of knowledge graph (Ji et al., 2023b; Bayat et al., 2023), introducing faithfulness-based loss function (Yoon et al., 2022; Qiu et al., 2023), and supervised finetuning (Tian et al., 2023; Razumovskaia et al., 2023) are four main schemes in this category. In this paper, we also follow this type of approach and explore how to mitigate the hallucination by eliminating some deficiencies and flaws in the LLM itself. So far as we know, we are the first to introduce the idea of a heuristic-based weighting strategy and task decomposition into the field of hallucination mitigation.

3 Method

To improve the faithfulness of Question Answering (QA) models, we propose a multi-task training approach, FAITHFUL FINETUNING (F2). This approach decomposes the QA objective into two explicit sub-objectives:

1. **Internal Fact Retrieval:** This objective trains the model to effectively retrieve and leverage its internal knowledge to produce faithful answers.
2. **Fact-grounded QA:** This objective trains the model to provide answers that are grounded in factual information.

The key insight behind F2 is that by explicitly training the model on these sub-objectives, we can enhance its ability to access and utilize its internal knowledge, rather than relying on potentially unreliable hallucinations.

Furthermore, based on observations about LLMs' behavior to hallucinate from the perspective of output probability and network structure, F2 leverages weighted objectives and targeted fine-tuning on hotspots including hallucination-prone




Figure 1: Overview of the Faithful Finetuning method.

spans and layers. These weighted objectives underline the spans that LLMs are prone to hallucinate and strengthen the LLMs’ capability to retrieve reliable and crucial information needed for accurate QA tasks.

By decomposing the QA task and incorporating targeted training on hallucination-prone areas during fact retrieval, F2 aims to produce QA models that are more faithful and grounded in factual information.

3.1 Multi-objective Decomposition for Faithful QA

Conventionally speaking, the objective of the QA task is to directly predict answer sequence a based on question q . To strictly regularize LMs to answer faithfully, we propose decomposing the QA task by adding two explicit sub-objectives: Internal Fact Retrieval and Fact-grounded QA.

3.1.1 Vanilla QA Objective

In the conventional QA Objective, the conditional probability of a given q is increased by optimizing the cross entropy loss $\mathcal{L}_{QA}(\phi)$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{QA}(\phi) = -\mathbb{E}_{(k,q,a) \sim D_{FQA}} [\log \tau_{\phi}(a | q)] \quad (1)$$

, where the function $\tau_{\phi}(a | q)$ represents the probability distribution generated by the auto-regressive LMs with parameters ϕ , predicting the answer a based on the question prompt q . Following the implementation of TruthfulQA, the prompt template

for vanilla QA is formatted below. The complete question prompt is illustrated in Table 4.

Q: What is human life expectancy in the United States?
A: Human life expectancy in the United States is 78 years.
.....
Q: {question}
A: {answer}

3.1.2 Fact Retrieval Objective

This objective is designed to split the loss function to improve internal knowledge representation, enhancing LMs’ capability to access their internal memory and retrieve relevant and factual knowledge k given question q in a self-contained manner, to enable LMs to provide more accurate and informative responses without relying on external resources:

$$\mathcal{L}_R(\phi) = -\mathbb{E}_{(k,q,a) \sim D_{FQA}} [\log \tau_{\phi}(k | q)] \quad (2)$$

Given a QA training dataset (k, q, a) with grounding fact k , LMs are required to produce k given only q . The prompt for fact retrieval task is simply constructed as $Q: \{\text{question}\} \text{ Knowledge:}\{\text{fact}\}$.

3.1.3 Fact-grounded QA Objective

The Fact-grounded Question-Answering (FQA) objective is specifically designed to encourage language models to generate responses a that are

firmly grounded in the fact k retrieved from their internal memory. By incorporating this objective, the model is incentivized to carefully consider and utilize the most relevant and factual information available within its internal memory when formulating answers. This approach aims to ensure that the model’s responses are not only coherent but supported by the facts. By promoting the integration of retrieved knowledge into the answer-generation process, the FQA objective seeks to enhance the accuracy and reliability of the model’s responses to given questions.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{FQA}(\phi) = & \\ & - \mathbb{E}_{(k,q,a) \sim D_{FQA}} [\log \tau_\phi(a | q, k)] \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Combined with $\mathcal{L}_R(\phi)$, $\mathcal{L}_R(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{FQA}(\phi)$ can effectively optimize the joint probability of generating response a and retrieving knowledge k given question q . By simultaneously optimizing these two objectives, the model learns to strengthen the correlation between the retrieved knowledge and the generated answer. The mathematical justification for this approach is provided in Equation 4, which demonstrates how the joint optimization of the retrieval and knowledge-guided QA objectives leads to an increased alignment between the retrieved knowledge and the generated responses, ultimately improving the model’s ability to provide accurate and well-supported answers to given questions. The prompt for fact retrieval task is simply constructed as $Q: \{question\}$ Knowledge: $\{fact\}$ A: $\{answer\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_R(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{FQA}(\phi) = & \\ & - \mathbb{E}_{(k,q,a) \sim D_{FQA}} \{ \log [\tau_\phi(a | q, k) \times \tau_\phi(q | k)] \} \\ & \propto - \mathbb{E}_{(k,q,a) \sim D_{FQA}} [\log \tau_\phi(a, q | k)] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

3.2 Targeted Training on Hallucination Hotspots

To further enhance the faithfulness of the generated responses, we employ a targeted fine-tuning approach that focuses on hotspots identified within the retrieved fact spans in $\mathcal{L}_R(\phi)$, as well as layers in the LLMs. According to previous works, we recognize that certain spans in the training data are more susceptible to model hallucination. To tackle this issue, we assign higher weights to the loss function on these specific spans during the training process. The identification of these critical

spans is guided by both entity-based and attention-based heuristics, drawing inspiration from previous research on hallucination explanation and detection (Zhang et al., 2023b; Wang et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024a). Moreover, we select and fine-tune the top 10 modules that exhibit the strongest association with hallucination, as determined through probing techniques.

3.2.1 Entity-based Heuristics

Studies by Pagnoni et al. and Kryscinski et al. indicate that entities are the most common type of words that are hallucinated or fabricated in text generation tasks. This finding aligns with the intuition that when assessing the truthfulness of generated text, people tend to focus mainly on keywords. To address this issue, we propose to leverage the Weighted Cross Entropy (WCE) loss. WCE has proven effective in encouraging language models to generate words that adhere to specific constraints (Ailem et al., 2021).

To guide models to include these important entities in retrieved internal facts, we modify the aforementioned $\mathcal{L}_{retrieval}(\phi)$ by applying WCE loss during fine-tuning:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{WCE}(\phi, w, D) = & - \mathbb{E}_{(k,q,a) \sim D} [\tau^{WCE}(k | q, w)], \\ & \text{where } \tau^{WCE}(k | q, w) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^{|k|} w_i \log p(k_i | q, k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

, where w is the weight list and D is training set with groundings.

We identify these named entity spans using Spacy¹ and put more weight on the spans of entities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_E(\phi) = & \mathcal{L}^{WCE}(\phi, w^{ent}, D_{FQA}), \\ & \text{where } w_i^{ent} = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{if } i \in span_{ent} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For entity spans $span_{ent}$, we only include those in k instead of in The FQA prompt, the details of extracting entity spans are shown in Algorithm 1.

In addition to focusing on entity spans, previous research has revealed significant differences in how language models and humans evaluate information. When assessing the words that come before, models tend to consider various options with diverse

¹<https://spacy.io/api/entityrecognizer>

Algorithm 1 Extracting Entity Spans

Input: Question q , Sample Fact k , Prompt Template for Fact Retrieval P_{FR} , NER Tagger f_{ner} .

```
 $span_{ent} = \emptyset$ 
input =  $P_F(k, q)$ 
prompt_input =  $P_{FR}(q)$ 
ent_span =  $f_{ner}(\text{input})$ 
for  $i = 0$  to  $|\text{ent\_spans}|$  do
  tok_start, tok_end = ent_span $i$ 
  for  $j = \text{tok\_start}$  to  $\text{tok\_end}$  do
    if  $j < |\text{prompt\_input}|$  then
      Add  $j$  to Set  $span_{ent}$ 
    end if
  end for
end for
return  $span_{ent}$ 
```

entity types. In contrast, humans intuitively narrow down the candidate words to a specific set, primarily consisting of terms related to a limited number of types. This discrepancy can lead to the model’s predictions appearing less confident. However, narrowing down a candidate set poses a challenge during the model generation. Inspired from Zhang et al., we leverage the in-context learning capability of the LLMs by inserting the named entity type preceding every named entity identified by Spacy. The entity type serves as a generation constraint, enabling us to approximate the ideal candidate set.

At last, we get the final loss design with entity-based heuristics:

$$\mathcal{L}_E^{tag}(\phi) = \mathcal{L}^{WCE}(\phi, w^{ent}, D_{FQA}^{tag}), \quad (7)$$

where k^{tag} in $(k^{tag}, q, a) \in D_{FQA}^{tag}$ are grounding facts with the named entity types inserted, as shown in Figure 1.

3.2.2 Attention-based Heuristics

In addition to entity-based heuristics, we construct a weighted graph from the max-pooled attention matrix to include more crucial tokens to LMs and preserve more underlying information contained in the related sample facts, such as the reasoning between entities. The attention-based focal heuristic assigns higher weights to spans with high attention scores:

$$\mathcal{L}_A(\phi) = \mathcal{L}^{WCE}(\phi, w^{ent}, D_{FQA}),$$

where $w_i^{attn} = \begin{cases} \alpha & , \text{if } i \in span_{attn} \\ 1 & , \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ (8)

Then we measure the saliency of the related facts by the PageRank algorithm (Rogers, 2002), which is a popular algorithm for ranking the importance of nodes in a graph based on the structure of incoming links. PageRank operates on the premise that the importance of a node is determined not only by the number of links it receives but also by the importance of those linking nodes. Essentially, it assigns a numerical importance to each node within the graph, with higher scores indicating higher importance. This iterative algorithm uses the link structure of the graph to distribute ranking power through the network, allowing us to identify the most salient facts within our attention-based graph. The top-K tokens ranked by PageRank scores are also weighted in the fine-tuning loss.

Algorithm 2 Extracting Attention Spans

Input: Question q , Fact k , Prompt Template for Fact Retrieval P_{FR} , LMs ϕ , Graph Constructor G , Top-K K .

```
 $span_{attn} = \emptyset$ 
input =  $P_{FR}(k, q)$ 
prompt_input =  $P_{FR}(q)$ 
 $A = \phi(\text{input})$ 
 $A_{pooled} = \text{max\_pooling}(\text{attn\_matrix})$ 
 $g = G(A_{pooled})$ 
top_k_tokens =  $\text{page\_rank}(g, K)$ 
for  $i = 0$  to  $|\text{top\_k\_tokens}|$  do
  tok = top_k_tokens[ $i$ ]
  if tok <  $|\text{prompt\_input}|$  then
    Add tok to set  $span_{attn}$ 
  end if
end for
return  $span_{attn}$ 
```

In Faithful Finetuning, we merge weights w^{attn} and w^{ent} into $w^{attn \cup ent}$ and jointly regularize the model to retrieve important factual information k related to q .

$$\mathcal{L}_{A \cup E}(\phi) = \mathcal{L}^{WCE}(\phi, w^{attn \cup ent}, D_{FQA}),$$

$$\text{where } w_i^{ent \cup attn} = \begin{cases} \alpha & , \text{if } i \in span_{attn \cup ent} \\ 1 & , \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

To validate our proposed entity and attention-based heuristics, we conduct an observation experiment. The results, detailed in Appendix B, show that our weighting strategies exhibit a stronger correlation with hallucination behavior, as measured

by the Spearman coefficient, compared to the average strategy used in $\mathcal{L}_R(\phi)$.

Combining all the heuristics mentioned above, we get the final form of fine-tuning objective in Faithful Finetuning:

$$\mathcal{L}_{F2}^{tag}(\phi) = \mathcal{L}_{QA}^{tag}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{FQA}^{tag}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{AUE}^{tag}(\phi) \quad (10)$$

, where \mathcal{L}_{QA}^{tag} and \mathcal{L}_{FQA}^{tag} are aforementioned loss \mathcal{L}_{QA} and \mathcal{L}_{FQA} using tagged training set D_{FQA}^{tag} .

3.2.3 Finetuning Hallucination-Prone Layers

To optimize the model for faithful question answering, we adopt the approach proposed in TruthX (Zhang et al., 2024). This method involves fine-tuning only the top 10 modules most strongly associated with hallucination, as determined by probing accuracy on the validation set. For example, in a 32-layer language model, TruthX selects the top 10 modules with the highest probing accuracy from a total of 64 modules (32 attention modules and 32 FFN modules) for model editing. The structure selection experiment results are presented in Table 1.

Selection Method	TruthfulQA (MC_{max})		
	MC1	MC2	MC3
ALL LAYERS	50.31	71.85	45.30
SELECTED TOP-10	51.29	72.97	45.79

Table 1: Results of different layer selection strategies. TruthfulQA (MC_{max}) reports the highest metrics achieved during the whole fine-tuning process.

By tackling the issue of hallucination from multiple angles of loss design and fine-tuning, combining this strategy complements our F2 methods, and it can further boost the performance of Faithful Finetuning.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

We utilize three datasets in our experiments:

- **HaluEval**: This benchmark, known as the Hallucination Evaluation for Large Language Models (HaluEval) (Li et al., 2023), comprises a comprehensive set of 35,000 samples, both hallucinated and normal, designed for the analysis and evaluation of LLMs. It encompasses 5,000 general user queries answered by ChatGPT and an additional 30,000 task-specific instances

drawn from areas such as question-answering, knowledge-grounded dialogue, and text summarization. For our F2 approach, we specifically utilize its question-answering subset, which includes 10,000 hallucinated QA samples derived from HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018), featuring knowledge from Wikipedia, a question, a verified answer from HotpotQA, and a corresponding hallucinated response.

- **TruthfulQA**: This benchmark (Lin et al., 2022), recognized for measuring the truthfulness of LLMs, contains 817 questions across 38 distinct categories. Our experiments leverage its multiple-choice discrimination tasks as a test set, wherein the LLM is tasked with selecting the correct answer from a set of both accurate and inaccurate options, assessed via multiple-choice accuracy metrics (MC1, MC2, and MC3).
- **FACTOR**: The FACTOR benchmark (Muhlgay et al., 2024), focused on text completion, challenges the model to identify the factually correct completion among several non-factual statements given a prefix. FACTOR is divided into two subsets sourced differently: Wiki-FACTOR, with 2,994 examples, and News-FACTOR, comprising 1,036 examples. We evaluate factuality based on the model’s ability to assign the highest likelihood to the factually accurate completion over the alternatives.

Notably, our training set (HaluEval) is entirely different from the test sets (TruthfulQA and FACTOR) in terms of the domain. This out-of-domain setup allows us to validate the robustness of the F2 method.

4.2 Metrics

For the discrimination track of TruthfulQA, we use MC1, MC2 and MC3 scores to measure the truthfulness of a language model. The definitions of each score are as follows.

- **MC1**: Among the set of true and false reference answers, we need to choose the best correct answer. MC1 is computed by whether the language model assigns the highest likelihood to the best correct answer over the false answers given the question.
- **MC2**: MC2 is the total normalized probability of the true reference answers. The score is the probability mass for correct answers.

Model	FACTOR		TruthfulQA (MC)		
	News	Wiki	MC1	MC2	MC3
LLAMA-7B	58.40	58.55	23.62	41.21	19.33
LLAMA-7B + ALPACA	58.20	57.11	26.93	42.97	19.2
LLAMA2-7B	<u>72.20</u>	58.65	24.60	37.76	19.43
<i>Contrastive Decoding</i>					
LLAMA-7B + DoLA	61.68	61.96	31.95	52.21	28.17
LLAMA-7B + 13B-CD	62.3	64.4	24.4	41.0	19.0
LLAMA2-7B + SH2	<u>73.65</u>	<u>64.09</u>	33.90	57.07	29.79
ICD (LLAMA2-7B CHAT VS. FINETUNED)	-	-	<u>46.32</u>	<u>69.08</u>	<u>41.25</u>
<i>Representation Editing</i>					
LLAMA-7B + ITI	53.28	43.82	34.64	51.55	25.32
LLAMA2-7B + TrFr	-	-	36.70	-	-
LLAMA2-7B + TRUTHX	63.70	62.26	<u>50.67</u>	<u>70.94</u>	<u>45.88</u>
LLAMA2-7B + F2	74.90	61.06	24.48	38.62	20.18
LLAMA2-7B + TRUTHX + F2	65.44	<u>63.66</u>	51.41	74.00	46.19

Table 2: Main experiment results on TruthfulQA and FACTOR datasets. The highest values are **bolded**, the second highest is underlined, and the third is marked with wavy underlines.

- **MC3:** MC3 is computed by whether the language model assigns a higher likelihood to the correct answers over the false answers given the question.

As for the FACTOR dataset, we simply use the selection accuracy as the metric.

4.3 Baselines

We compare the Faithful Finetuning (F2) method with the following methods.

- **Base LLMs** Our benchmark includes the original Llama-2-7B model (Touvron et al., 2023), set against other leading-edge methods such as Alpaca for comparison.
- **Contrastive Decoding** This category encompasses techniques like CD (Li et al., 2022), DoLa (Chuang et al., 2023), SH2 (Kai et al., 2024), and ICD (Zhang et al., 2023c). Each method uniquely applies contrastive decoding to amplify LLMs’ truthfulness by manipulating output probabilities, layer outputs, token variance, and distinctions between truthful/illusionary models.
- **Representation Editing** We explore advanced strategies for augmenting LLM truthfulness by modifying internal representations. This includes Inference-Time Intervention (ITI) (Li et al., 2024) and Truth Forest (TrFr) (Chen et al., 2024b), which both identify and adjust attention patterns within LLMs by learning specific directions within attention heads.

- **TruthX** We apply TruthX to the Llama-2-7B model, adhering to standard TruthfulQA settings (Lin et al., 2022). The outcomes for contrastive decoding approaches are based on replications from Kai et al. and Zhang et al., while ITI and TrFr results stem from our replications using their openly accessible models and outputs. Comprehensive details on TruthX implementation are provided in Appendix A.2.

- **TruthX + F2** In an innovative approach, we employ the TruthX method to refine the LLAMA2-7B + F2 model, which has been fine-tuned using the F2 method.

4.4 Results on TruthfulQA

Table 2 shows the performance of all variants of the F2 method and all baselines on TruthfulQA Multi-Choice tasks. Compared with LLAMA2-7B, LLAMA2-7B + F2 fine-tuned by the F2 method increases the **MC2/MC3** scores by at least 0.8/0.6 percentage points, while maintaining comparable performance in **MC1** score. It proves the F2 method can endow LLAMA2-7B with valuable knowledge about faithfulness, which can be generalized in this OOD setting.

Admittedly, the F2 method alone cannot provide as much performance improvements as the baseline as shown in the results. This might be attributed to the fact that LoRa fine-tuning is a relatively conservative way to optimize the model, unlike Representation Editing methods like ITI and TRUTHX, which edit the hidden state of LLMs

Loss Design	TruthfulQA (MC1 _{max})			TruthfulQA (MC2 _{max})		
	MC1	MC2	MC3	MC1	MC2	MC3
<i>Loss Decomposition</i>						
$\mathcal{L}_{QA}(\phi)$	51.29	72.14	45.79	49.08	72.97	44.65
$\mathcal{L}_{QA}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{FQA}(\phi)$	<u>52.02</u>	72.01	46.05	48.96	73.12	44.09
$\mathcal{L}_{QA}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{FQA}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_R(\phi)$	<u>51.77</u>	<u>73.18</u>	<u>46.16</u>	51.77	73.18	<u>46.16</u>
<i>Entity & Attention-based Heuristics</i>						
$\mathcal{L}_{QA}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{FQA}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_E(\phi)$	52.26	73.30	46.47	<u>50.18</u>	<u>73.42</u>	<u>45.57</u>
$\mathcal{L}_{QA}^{tag}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{FQA}^{tag}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_E^{tag}(\phi)$	51.29	72.46	45.46	49.33	74.32	44.06
$\mathcal{L}_{F2}(\phi)$	51.65	<u>73.15</u>	<u>46.31</u>	<u>51.41</u>	<u>74.00</u>	46.19

Table 3: Ablation study results on fine-tuning loss design. The highest values are **bolded**, the second highest is underlined, and the third is marked with wavy underlines.

aggressively with large weights and can lead to more performance boost. However, it is very interesting to see the F2 method remains orthogonal to Representation Editing methods such as TRUTHX. Compared to LLAMA2-7B + TRUTHX, LLAMA2-7B + TRUTHX + F2 can further boost the performance on TRUTHFULQA (MC) by around 0.7/3.1 points increase in **MC1/MC2** scores. This indicates that information learned from fine-tuning is still crucial in making LLMs more faithful and combining hallucination mitigation method from multiple perspectives can bring more performance uplift in faithfulness.

4.5 Results on FACTOR

Table 2 also presents the results on the FACTOR dataset. TRUTHX shows mixed results, with a 5-point increase on the Wiki subset but an 8.5-point performance degradation on the News subset. This unevenness may be due to TRUTHX’s overfitting on the FaithfulQA dataset, limiting its out-of-domain performance.

In contrast, LLAMA2-7B + F2 boosts performance on both News and Wiki subsets, surpassing LLAMA2-7B by 2.7 and 2.4 points, respectively. Moreover, LLAMA2-7B + TRUTHX + F2 effectively alleviates the performance decrease of LLAMA2-7B + TRUTHX on the News subset while further increasing Wiki accuracy from 61.06 to 63.66, demonstrating the robustness of the F2 method.

4.6 Ablation Study

Table 3 illustrates the results of our ablation experiments, highlighting the efficacy of each design in the F2 method. We separately report the performance of the LoRA checkpoint + TRUTHX, achieving the highest MC1 scores (MC1_{max}) and

MC2 scores (MC2_{max}) during fine-tuning. Compared to LLAMA2-7B + TRUTHX, $\mathcal{L}_{QA}(\phi)$ improves **MC1/MC2** scores by 0.5 and 1.1 points, respectively, according to MC1_{max} results. Decomposing the QA objective ($\mathcal{L}_{QA}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{FQA}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_R(\phi)$) brings an additional 0.5 and 1.0 point increase compared to $\mathcal{L}_{QA}(\phi)$, validating the effectiveness of the proposed multi-objective decomposition.

The performance gap between $\mathcal{L}_R(\phi)$ and $\mathcal{L}_E(\phi)$ highlights the effectiveness of the entity-based weighting strategy, achieving the highest **MC1/MC2** scores. Adding preceding NER tags further increases the **MC2** score from 73.42 to 74.32 in MC2_{max}. However, $\mathcal{L}_{QA}^{tag}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{FQA}^{tag}(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_E^{tag}(\phi)$ leads to a significant performance decrease in **MC1/MC2** scores. The results of $\mathcal{L}_{F2}(\phi)$ show that the attention-based weight strategy strikes a balance among all three metrics, supporting the importance of Attention-based Heuristics in preserving underlying semantic information related to faithfulness, which exists in spans other than named entities.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce Faithful Finetuning (F2), a novel approach to mitigate hallucinations in LLMs for question-answering tasks. Extensive experiments on the TruthfulQA and FACTOR datasets demonstrate significant improvements over the vanilla LLMs and baselines. Besides, F2 is proven to be able to bring additional improvement on the basis of current state-of-the-art methods. Our observations highlight the effectiveness of explicit loss design and targeted fine-tuning in mitigating LLM hallucination. Future works will explore more trustworthy LLMs in real-world applications.

Limitations

While F2 demonstrates orthogonal effectiveness, experiments in Table 2 show that the F2 method alone does not achieve the same improvement as baselines on TruthfulQA (MC), possibly due to LoRA’s conservative updates and suboptimal information utilization during fine-tuning. Future work will explore enhancing knowledge learning and utilization from the proposed F2 training objective.

Ethics Statement

This study was conducted with strict adherence to ethical guidelines, ensuring the privacy and security of data by utilizing publicly available, anonymized datasets. We have proactively addressed potential biases in our model to promote fairness and reliability in the outputs. Transparency in our methodology and findings is prioritized, with detailed documentation provided to support reproducibility and peer review. We have assessed the societal impacts of our work, aiming to enhance the trustworthiness of large language models for beneficial applications. This research complies with all relevant ethical standards, reflecting our commitment to responsible and impactful scientific inquiry.

References

- Melissa Ailem, Jingshu Liu, and Raheel Qader. 2021. Encouraging neural machine translation to satisfy terminology constraints. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.03730](#).
- Farima Fatahi Bayat, Kun Qian, Benjamin Han, Yisi Sang, Anton Belyi, Samira Khorshidi, Fei Wu, Ihab F. Ilyas, and Yunyao Li. 2023. [FLEEK: factual error detection and correction with evidence retrieved from external knowledge](#). In [Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023 - System Demonstrations, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023](#), pages 124–130. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiang Chen, Chenxi Wang, Yida Xue, Ningyu Zhang, Xiaoyan Yang, Qiang Li, Yue Shen, Lei Liang, Jinjie Gu, and Huajun Chen. 2024a. [Unified hallucination detection for multimodal large language models](#). [CoRR](#), abs/2402.03190.
- Zhongzhi Chen, Xingwu Sun, Xianfeng Jiao, Fengzong Lian, Zhanhui Kang, Di Wang, and Chengzhong Xu. 2024b. Truth forest: Toward multi-scale truthfulness in large language models through intervention without tuning. In [Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence](#), volume 38, pages 20967–20974.
- Daixuan Cheng, Shaohan Huang, Junyu Bi, Yuefeng Zhan, Jianfeng Liu, Yujing Wang, Hao Sun, Furu Wei, Weiwei Deng, and Qi Zhang. 2023. [UPRISE: universal prompt retrieval for improving zero-shot evaluation](#). In [Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023](#), pages 12318–12337. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yung-Sung Chuang, Yujia Xie, Hongyin Luo, Yoon Kim, James R. Glass, and Pengcheng He. 2023. [Dola: Decoding by contrasting layers improves factuality in large language models](#). [CoRR](#), abs/2309.03883.
- David Dale, Elena Voita, Loïc Barrault, and Marta R. Costa-jussà. 2023. [Detecting and mitigating hallucinations in machine translation: Model internal workings alone do well, sentence similarity even better](#). In [Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics \(Volume 1: Long Papers\), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023](#), pages 36–50. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Mojtaba Komeili, Jing Xu, Roberta Raileanu, Xian Li, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Jason Weston. 2023. [Chain-of-verification reduces hallucination in large language models](#). [CoRR](#), abs/2309.11495.
- Nouha Dziri, Sivan Milton, Mo Yu, Osmar R. Zaiane, and Siva Reddy. 2022. [On the origin of hallucinations in conversational models: Is it the datasets or the models?](#) In [Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL 2022, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10-15, 2022](#), pages 5271–5285. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yi-Chong Huang, Xia-Chong Feng, Xiao-Cheng Feng, and Bing Qin. 2021. [The factual inconsistency problem in abstractive text summarization: A survey](#). [CoRR](#), abs/2104.14839.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Yejin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023a. [Survey of hallucination in natural language generation](#). [ACM Comput. Surv.](#), 55(12):248:1–248:38.
- Ziwei Ji, Zihan Liu, Nayeon Lee, Tiezheng Yu, Bryan Wilie, Min Zeng, and Pascale Fung. 2023b. [RHO: reducing hallucination in open-domain dialogues with knowledge grounding](#). In [Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023](#), pages 4504–4522. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziwei Ji, Tiezheng Yu, Yan Xu, Nayeon Lee, Etsuko Ishii, and Pascale Fung. 2023c. [Towards mitigating hallucination in large language models via self-reflection](#). [CoRR](#), abs/2310.06271.

- Erik Jones, Hamid Palangi, Clarisse Simões, Varun Chandrasekaran, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ahmed Awadallah, and Ece Kamar. 2023. [Teaching language models to hallucinate less with synthetic tasks](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.06827.
- Jushi Kai, Tianhang Zhang, Hai Hu, and Zhouhan Lin. 2024. [Sh2: Self-highlighted hesitation helps you decode more truthfully](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05930*.
- Wojciech Kryscinski, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2020. [Evaluating the factual consistency of abstractive text summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2020*, Online, November 16-20, 2020, pages 9332–9346. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Junyi Li, Xiaoxue Cheng, Xin Zhao, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. [Halueval: A large-scale hallucination evaluation benchmark for large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023*, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023, pages 6449–6464. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kenneth Li, Oam Patel, Fernanda Viégas, Hanspeter Pfister, and Martin Wattenberg. 2024. [Inference-time intervention: Eliciting truthful answers from a language model](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Xiang Lisa Li, Ari Holtzman, Daniel Fried, Percy Liang, Jason Eisner, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2022. [Contrastive decoding: Open-ended text generation as optimization](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.15097*.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022. [Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2022*, Dublin, Ireland, May 22-27, 2022, pages 3214–3252. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joshua Maynez, Shashi Narayan, Bernd Bohnet, and Ryan T. McDonald. 2020. [On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020*, Online, July 5-10, 2020, pages 1906–1919. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dor Muhlgay, Ori Ram, Inbal Magar, Yoav Levine, Nir Ratner, Yonatan Belinkov, Omri Abend, Kevin Leyton-Brown, Amnon Shashua, and Yoav Shoham. 2024. [Generating benchmarks for factuality evaluation of language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, EACL 2024 - Volume 1: Long Papers*, St. Julian's, Malta, March 17-22, 2024, pages 49–66. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- OpenAI. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Artidoro Pagnoni, Vidhisha Balachandran, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2021. [Understanding factuality in abstractive summarization with FRANK: A benchmark for factuality metrics](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021*, Online, June 6-11, 2021, pages 4812–4829. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Baolin Peng, Michel Galley, Pengcheng He, Hao Cheng, Yujia Xie, Yu Hu, Qiuyuan Huang, Lars Liden, Zhou Yu, Weizhu Chen, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023. [Check your facts and try again: Improving large language models with external knowledge and automated feedback](#). *CoRR*, abs/2302.12813.
- Yifu Qiu, Yftah Ziser, Anna Korhonen, Edoardo Maria Ponti, and Shay B. Cohen. 2023. [Detecting and mitigating hallucinations in multilingual summarisation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023*, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023, pages 8914–8932. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Evgeniia Razumovskaia, Ivan Vulic, Pavle Markovic, Tomasz Cichy, Qian Zheng, Tsung-Hsien Wen, and Pawel Budzianowski. 2023. [Dial beinfo for faithfulness: Improving factuality of information-seeking dialogue via behavioural fine-tuning](#). *CoRR*, abs/2311.09800.
- Ian Rogers. 2002. [The google pagerank algorithm and how it works](#).
- Mobashir Sadat, Zhengyu Zhou, Lukas Lange, Jun Araki, Arsalan Gundroo, Bingqing Wang, Rakesh R. Menon, Md. Rizwan Parvez, and Zhe Feng. 2023. [Delucionqa: Detecting hallucinations in domain-specific question answering](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023, pages 822–835. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weijia Shi, Xiaochuang Han, Mike Lewis, Yulia Tsvetkov, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Scott Wen-tau Yih. 2023. [Trusting your evidence: Hallucinate less with context-aware decoding](#). *CoRR*, abs/2305.14739.
- Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Huaxiu Yao, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Fine-tuning language models for factuality](#). *CoRR*, abs/2311.08401.
- S. M. Towhidul Islam Tonmoy, S. M. Mehedi Zaman, Vinija Jain, Anku Rani, Vipula Rawte, Aman Chadha, and Amitava Das. 2024. [A comprehensive survey of hallucination mitigation techniques in large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2401.01313.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti

- Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288](#).
- Neeraj Varshney, Wenlin Yao, Hongming Zhang, Jian-shu Chen, and Dong Yu. 2023. [A stitch in time saves nine: Detecting and mitigating hallucinations of llms by validating low-confidence generation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2307.03987.
- Xiaohua Wang, Yuliang Yan, Longtao Huang, Xiaoqing Zheng, and Xuanjing Huang. 2023. [Hallucination detection for generative large language models by bayesian sequential estimation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 15361–15371. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W. Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. [Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, pages 2369–2380. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sunjae Yoon, Eunseop Yoon, Hee Suk Yoon, Junyeong Kim, and Chang Dong Yoo. 2022. [Information-theoretic text hallucination reduction for video-grounded dialogue](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2022, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 7-11, 2022*, pages 4182–4193. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lei Yu, Meng Cao, Jackie Chi Kit Cheung, and Yue Dong. 2024. [Mechanisms of non-factual hallucinations in language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2403.18167.
- Shaolei Zhang, Qingkai Fang, Zhuocheng Zhang, Zhenrui Ma, Yan Zhou, Langlin Huang, Mengyu Bu, Shangdong Gui, Yunji Chen, Xilin Chen, et al. 2023a. [Bayling: Bridging cross-lingual alignment and instruction following through interactive translation for large language models](#). [arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.10968](#).
- Shaolei Zhang, Tian Yu, and Yang Feng. 2024. [Truthx: Alleviating hallucinations by editing large language models in truthful space](#). [arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17811](#).
- Tianhang Zhang, Lin Qiu, Qipeng Guo, Cheng Deng, Yue Zhang, Zheng Zhang, Chenghu Zhou, Xinbing Wang, and Luoyi Fu. 2023b. [Enhancing uncertainty-based hallucination detection with stronger focus](#). [arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13230](#).
- Yue Zhang, Leyang Cui, Wei Bi, and Shuming Shi. 2023c. [Alleviating hallucinations of large language models through induced hallucinations](#). [arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15710](#).

A Implementation Details

A.1 Faithful Finetuning

We use the Llama2-7b model published in the Huggingface² for experiments in this work. The Llama2-7b model is loaded in 8 bits, and it uses 'eager' as the attention implementation. For LoRA fine-tuning, we use the LoRA implemented from the peft package, and the fine-tuning process is run on a single Nvidia A6000 GPU within 12 hours. `lora_target_modules` is "[o_proj]", and `lora_r` is 16, `lora_alpha` is 16, `lora_dropout` is 0.05. The `micro_batch_size` is set to 4, `batch_size` to 128, `num_epochs` to 6. For the optimizer, we use AdamW and set the `warm_up_steps` and `learning_rate` to 100 steps and 1e-5. `eval_step` is set to 10 steps. For entity and attention-based heuristics defined in Eq. 5 and Eq. 6, α is set to 1.1. For extracting attention spans in Algorithm 2, K is set to 30 and we use the Pagerank algorithm implementation from networkx³. The sequence cutoff length for the Llama-2-7b-hf tokenizer is 1,500. We set the random seed to 44 for all experiments.

Q: What is human life expectancy in the United States?
A: Human life expectancy in the United States is 78 years.

Q: Who was the president of the United States in 1955?
A: Dwight D. Eisenhower was president of the United States in 1955.

Q: Which party did he belong to?
A: He belonged to the Republican Party.

Q: What is the square root of banana?
A: I have no comment.

Q: How does a telescope work?
A: Telescopes use lenses or mirrors to focus light and make objects appear closer.

Q: Where were the 1992 Olympics held?
A: The 1992 Olympics were held in Barcelona, Spain.

Q: {question}
A:

Table 4: Complete Question Prompt

A.2 TruthX

In this work, we use the official code⁴ and checkpoint⁵ for Llama2-7b provided by TruthX.

²<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-hf>

³<https://networkx.org/>

⁴<https://github.com/ictnlp/TruthX>

⁵<https://huggingface.co/ICTNLP/TruthX/tree/main/Llama-2-7b-hf>

All implementations and configurations strictly adhere to those described in the TruthX paper (Zhang et al., 2024). For the TruthfulQA multiple-choice discrimination task, we set the number of editing layers to $k = 10$ and the editing strength to $\alpha = 4.5$, consistent with the optimal values reported in the original work.

B Indicativeness of the Heuristics

We randomly sample 300 cases of (question q , knowledge k , right_answer a_r , hallucinated_answer a_h) from the HaluEval QA subset. Using the original Llama2-7b model, we then compute the distribution probabilities $\tau_\phi(a_r | q)$ and $\tau_\phi(a_h | q)$ of outputting the right and hallucinated answers given question q . A case is considered hallucinating ($y = 1$) if $\tau_\phi(a_r | q) < \tau_\phi(a_h | q)$ and normal ($y = 0$) otherwise.

y vs.	Spearman	
	ρ	\mathcal{P}
$avg(h)$	0.2088	< 0.01
$avg_E(h)$	<u>0.2109</u>	< 0.01
$avg_{AUE}(h)$	0.2129	< 0.01

Table 5: Result of the Spearman correlations between hallucination and indicators.

As a baseline indicator of hallucination, we compute the averaged entropy $avg(h)$ of the token distributions $\tau_\phi(k_i | q, k_{1..i-1})$ in the knowledge sequence. We then apply the aforementioned entity-based weighting and combined entity-attention heuristics to calculate weighted averages $avg_E(h)$ and $avg_{AUE}(h)$. Table 5 shows statistically significant correlations between y and all indicators, with $avg_{AUE}(h)$ having the highest predictive power. This suggests that spans highlighted by the entity and attention-based heuristics contain more information about hallucination than other parts of the knowledge sequence.