

PREPAIR: Pointwise Reasoning Enhance Pairwise Evaluating for Robust Instruction-Following Assessments

Hawon Jeong^{*1} ChaeHun Park^{*1} Jimin Hong^{1,2} Jaegul Choo¹

¹ KAIST AI ² KRAFTON

{hawon,ddehun,jimmyh,jchoo}@kaist.ac.kr

Abstract

Pairwise evaluation using large language models (LLMs) is widely used for evaluating natural language generation (NLG) tasks. However, the reliability of LLMs is often compromised by biases, such as favoring verbosity and authoritative tone. In the study, we focus on the comparison of two LLM-based evaluation approaches, pointwise and pairwise. Our findings demonstrate that pointwise evaluators exhibit more robustness against undesirable preferences. Further analysis reveals that pairwise evaluators can accurately identify the shortcomings of low-quality outputs even when their judgment is incorrect. These results indicate that LLMs are more severely influenced by their bias in a pairwise evaluation setup. To mitigate this, we propose a hybrid method that integrates pointwise reasoning into pairwise evaluation. Experimental results show that our method enhances the robustness of pairwise evaluators against adversarial samples while preserving accuracy on normal samples.

1 Introduction

Building an automated evaluation for natural language generation (NLG) tasks is crucial due to its scalability, and cost-effectiveness compared to human evaluation. Recent research has benchmarked LLMs' evaluation capabilities using pairwise comparisons. In this approach, LLMs determine the preferable output between two options, with human preferences serving as the ground truth (Chiang and Lee, 2023; Liu et al., 2023). Additionally, the approach aligns closely with human preferences, achieving levels of agreement comparable to those among human annotators (Qin et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2024), and stands out for its wide applicability across a diverse range of tasks.

However, LLMs tend to exhibit undesirable preferences such as verbosity, egocentric, and authoritative tone (Wang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023;




Figure 1: A motivating example of PREPAIR. Pairwise reasoning helps the evaluator to favor a response that seems friendly but fails to follow instructions. Pointwise reasoning, however, enables the evaluator to select the response that follows the given instructions.

Koo et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024). To better understand and address this issue, Zeng et al. (2024) introduced the LLMBAR meta-evaluation dataset. The dataset evaluates whether LLMs can judge text based on adherence to instructions rather than inherent biases. It includes pairs of model outputs: one that follows the instructions correctly and another that is adversarially designed to appear favorable but fails to follow instructions. Their analysis reveals that LLM evaluators often perform worse than random guessing on these adversarial sets.

Despite the known limitation of LLM evaluators in their spurious preferences, we argue that LLMs do not entirely fail to judge adherence to instructions. Instead, their biases may be amplified in pairwise evaluation setups. To investigate this, we compare two evaluation setups: *pairwise* and *pointwise*. In the pairwise approach, the evaluator model compares two outputs simultaneously, while in the pointwise approach, each output is

* Equal contribution

assessed independently. Our results indicate that while the pairwise evaluator performs better than the pointwise evaluator on normal sets, it performs significantly worse on adversarial sets. Additionally, we examine the reasoning process of the pairwise evaluator by prompting the model to describe both the strengths and weaknesses of two outputs before making a decision. Our analysis reveals that although LLMs may show a preference for biased texts when evaluating adversarial examples, they accurately identify the shortcomings of low-quality outputs that fail to follow instructions.

Motivated by our aforementioned findings, we propose a simple yet effective prompting strategy, namely PREPAIR. This strategy incorporates **P**ointwise **R**easoning within a **P**AIRwise evaluation framework, performing well on both normal and adversarial datasets. As illustrated in Fig. 1, our key idea is to extract unbiased and objective insights for each output using the pointwise reasoner and integrate these explanations of both outputs into the evaluation process. This approach alleviates the biases of pairwise evaluators while maintaining their performance on normal sets. Experimental results demonstrate that our strategy improves the robustness of pairwise evaluators against biases while maintaining accuracy on normal datasets. Specifically, our method increased the accuracy of the GPT-3.5-turbo by 18.18 and the Claude-3 model by 12.85.

The contributions of our research are as follows:

- We present our insights about how LLM evaluators are influenced by pairwise evaluation setups on adversarial samples.
- We propose a simple yet effective prompting strategy that incorporates pointwise reasoning into pairwise evaluation for LLM-based evaluation.
- Experimental results on multiple meta-evaluation datasets confirm the effectiveness and validity of our method.

2 Related Work

Recent studies have increasingly used LLMs as evaluation metrics due to their advanced instruction-following and generalization capabilities in various tasks (Kocmi and Federmann, 2023; Min et al., 2023; Chan et al., 2023; Lin and Chen, 2023). However, LLM evaluators have exhibited

biases, such as favoring longer, more verbose responses (Li et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2024) and a *self-preference* bias, where they rate their own generated text higher (Li et al., 2023; Koo et al., 2023). Zeng et al. (2024) reported that including general evaluation guidelines in prompts can enhance the discerning ability of LLM evaluators to some extent. Our work rigorously analyzes the impact of different evaluation approaches on adversarial samples and proposes a robust prompting strategy to enhance LLM evaluation reliability.

3 Analyzing LLM Evaluators on Adversarial Evaluation Samples

We now analyze LLM-based evaluators using different datasets and prompting strategies. We introduce meta-evaluation datasets with different characteristics and then compare two representative evaluation approaches (i.e., *pointwise* and *pairwise*) on these datasets. Finally, we examine the impacts of intrinsic biases presented in LLM evaluators by inspecting their reasoning process.

3.1 Preliminary

Meta-Evaluation Datasets In this work, we use two pairwise meta-evaluation datasets widely used to assess evaluation metrics - MT-BENCH (Zheng et al., 2024) and LLMBAR (Zeng et al., 2024). Each evaluation sample in both datasets consists of (1) input instruction, (2) a pair of two model generations, and (3) a human preference label over the generations. MT-Bench contains 80 instructions and paired generations from six generative models. The human judgments are about which generation is better or a tie. LLMBAR aims to assess the evaluators’ discerning ability for instruction-following outputs. Specifically, we use LLMBAR-Adversarial set, which contains adversarial model outputs with favorable superficial patterns but deviates from the original instruction. The evaluation samples used in our experiments are 1131 for MT-Bench and 319 for LLMBAR-Adversarial. In this work, we denote MT-Bench and LLMBAR-Adversarial as normal and adversarial evaluation benchmarks for LLM evaluators, respectively. More dataset details are in A.1.

Pointwise and Pairwise Approaches There have been two popular approaches for pairwise text evaluation: *pairwise* and *pointwise*. In the pairwise approach, an LLM receives an instruction and two model-generated outputs and then chooses a higher-




Figure 2: Results of pointwise and pairwise approaches in normal (MT-Bench) and adversarial (LLMBBar-Adversarial) meta-evaluation datasets.

quality (or equal-quality) output. In the pointwise approach, an LLM assigns a single score on a Likert scale to each generated output independently. It regards the output with a higher score as higher quality. The simplest way to elicit a pointwise score is using the generated scalar value. To obtain more fine-grained and continuous score, Liu et al. (2023) propose using a weighted summation between each score and its predicted probability as a final score.

3.2 Analysis

Setup We use a gpt-3.5-turbo as an evaluator and compare the approaches above (i.e., pointwise and pairwise) on MT-Bench and LLMBBar datasets. We utilize the original prompts released by each dataset for prompting. For LLMBBar, we also include general rules, such as prioritizing outputs that honestly follow instructions, into the prompts since these guidelines generally contribute to enhancing evaluation quality (Zeng et al., 2024). The performance of the evaluator is obtained by comparing its judgments to human judgments in the datasets. In MT-Bench, as a tie option is allowed, the pairwise evaluator is prompted to choose one of three options (e.g., "Output A (or B) is better" or "tie"), and the scalar value generated from the pointwise evaluator on the Likert-scale is directly used as an evaluation. The human judgments in the LLMBBar dataset contain only two options ("Output A (or B) is better"). Following Liu et al. (2023), we use a weighted summation with token probability for the pointwise evaluator to obtain the evaluation score. Detailed experimental setups are in Appendix A.3.

Results Fig. 2 shows the meta-evaluation results on the two datasets. The pairwise evaluator performs better on MT-Bench, while the pointwise evaluator significantly outperforms it on LLMBBar (52.35 vs. 36.05). These contrasting results likely stem from the structural differences in the evaluation approaches. The pairwise method, which evaluates two outputs simultaneously, excels with

Evaluation Sample

Instruction: Create a new headline that is witty and summarizes the article. A new study has found that eating spinach can increase intelligence.

Output A: Spinach: The New Brain Food, or Just Another Leafy Green? (*Human-preferred*)

Output B: Spinach It To Win: Eating Spinach Can Boost Your Brain Power!

Explanations from LLM Evaluator

Strengths of Output A: Clever play on words with "Brain Food" and "Leafy Green." / Succinctly summarizes the article topic.

Weaknesses of Output A: Lacks a direct mention of the study findings. / Could be perceived as slightly less engaging compared to Output B.

Strengths of Output B: Engaging and catchy with the phrase "Spinach It To Win." / Clearly states the benefit of eating spinach for brain power.

Weaknesses of Output B: The use of "Win" might be seen as slightly exaggerated or sensationalized. / Could be considered a bit informal for certain audiences.

Final Judgement of LLM Evaluator

Therefore, Output B is better.

Table 1: Explanations and judgment of pairwise evaluators from an evaluation sample. The correct and incorrect model explanations are manually highlighted.

normal samples like those in MT-Bench. However, with adversarially designed samples in LLMBBar, the pairwise evaluator is more severely affected by the LLM’s intrinsic biases—tendencies in the model that skew its judgments based on the superficial clues of evaluation samples. On the other hand, the pointwise approach, evaluating each output independently, avoids these biases, leading to better performance on adversarial samples. Inspired by these results, our next experiments aim to further explore how intrinsic biases impact the pairwise approach in adversarial evaluations.

Correct Reasoning behind Incorrect Predictions of Pairwise Evaluators

To understand why pairwise evaluators struggle with adversarial samples in LLMBBar, we prompted the LLM to explain its reasoning process before making predictions. Specifically, we encouraged the LLM to explain the strengths and weaknesses of each output to see if it can accurately recognize issues in low-quality outputs. Note that this variant of conventional reasoning strategy (Kojima et al., 2022) improves the pairwise evaluator’s performance on LLMBBar from 36.05 to 40.12, though it remained lower than the pointwise approach (52.35). We then manually examine the explanation provided by LLM for 100 wrongly predicted samples. Our analysis reveals that, despite incorrect final decisions, the pairwise

Methods	GPT-3.5-T	GPT-4	Claude-3
Pointwise	<u>52.35</u>	82.76	-
Pairwise	36.05	77.74	40.75
w/ CoT	31.66	77.12	41.07
w/ PREPAIR [^]	37.62	78.37	<u>43.26</u>
w/ PREPAIR	54.23	<u>80.88</u>	53.60

Table 2: Accuracies on adversarial datasets in LLMBAR. The highest and the second-highest scores in each column are highlighted in bold and underlined, respectively. *GPT-3.5-T* denotes *gpt-3.5-turbo*. PREPAIR[^] adopts pairwise reasoning but follows the reasoning format of PREPAIR.

evaluator’s explanations for identifying flaws in low-quality outputs were often rational. We find that 64 out of 100 explanations accurately describe weaknesses that align with our manual annotations. For example, as shown in Table 1, the pairwise evaluator correctly identifies problems in a flawed output but ultimately makes the wrong judgment. This indicates that while the LLM evaluator with the pairwise approach has the potential to perform better, it is hindered by intrinsic issues within the pairwise setup. Therefore, addressing these issues is essential for reliable pairwise evaluation.

4 PREPAIR: Pointwise Reasoning for Pairwise Evaluation

Approach Our analysis demonstrated that (1) pointwise evaluators, despite lower accuracy on normal samples, show increased robustness against adversarial samples, and (2) LLMs struggle to make accurate predictions on adversarial samples, even when they are aware of issues in low-quality outputs. To address these challenges, we propose a hybrid evaluation method, called PREPAIR, which is designed to incorporate the robustness of pointwise reasoning on adversarial samples into pairwise evaluation. Our method operates within a pairwise setup, given a single instruction and two model outputs. Each generation is independently analyzed in a pointwise manner, generating reasoning about its quality without reference to the other generation. These reasonings, along with the original instruction and both model generations, are then provided to the pairwise evaluator. The pairwise evaluator uses this information to determine which generation is superior. By integrating these approaches, we aim to develop a more effective and reliable evaluation framework that benefits from independent analysis as well as comparative assessment.

Methods	Labeler Type		
	Expert	Author	Total
Pointwise	51.64	51.22	51.55
Pairwise	<u>62.49</u>	54.07	60.65
w/ CoT	63.16	<u>55.69</u>	61.54
w/ PREPAIR [^]	62.94	53.25	60.83
w/ PREPAIR	62.37	57.72	<u>61.36</u>

Table 3: Accuracies with GPT-3.5-turbo on MT-Bench. *Labeler Type* denotes different human annotator groups in MT-Bench. The indicators are the same as Table 2.

Setup We conduct experiments on the following propriety LLMs: *gpt-3.5-turbo*, *Claude-3-Haiku*, and *gpt-4*. The temperature is set to 0 across all models. We compare our hybrid method for the pairwise approach against the following baselines. *w/ CoT* generates an explanation before making a prediction. PREPAIR performs a pointwise explanation for each sample and then passes them to a pairwise evaluator to make final judgments. PREPAIR[^] is an ablated version of our method that prompts pairwise evaluators to generate explanations about two outputs individually, in the same format as PREPAIR. This baseline is to confirm the validity of the pointwise reasoning process. We also report the scores of pointwise approaches for better interpretation. More experimental details are in Appendix A.

Results Our method increases the accuracy of the pairwise evaluator on the LLMBAR dataset across all LLMs. The improvements are most significant in GPT-3.5-Turbo and Claude-3. On the MT-Bench dataset, pairwise evaluators with different methods show similar performances. These results indicate that PREPAIR enhances pairwise evaluators on adversarial scenarios while maintaining its performance on normal evaluation samples.

5 Conclusion

In this study, we analyze the robustness of LLM evaluators using two assessment strategies: evaluating responses individually (pointwise) and comparing responses simultaneously (pairwise). We empirically show that pointwise evaluators are more robust, while pairwise evaluators are more susceptible to superficial cues due to inherent biases in LLMs. To address this, we propose a hybrid approach called PREPAIR that independently analyzes each output to prepare the final judgment for

the pairwise evaluation. This method enhances the robustness of pairwise evaluators against adversarial samples while maintaining accuracy on normal samples.

Limitations

Despite of its efficacy, PREPAIR may not be a fundamental solution for LLM-based evaluations. The ultimate goal should be to enable LLMs to discern response quality based on human preference hierarchies, even when presented with adversarial samples simultaneously. Nevertheless, reaching this goal is challenging, as even powerful proprietary models have yet to achieve this. Therefore, our work is important for advancing the development of LLM evaluators that better align with human judgment. Besides, our method required additional forward passes of LLMs to obtain pointwise reasoning results of different models individually. This computational issue can be alleviated to some extent by caching the generated reasoning when a repetitive evaluation for a model response is needed.

References

- Chi-Min Chan, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Jianxuan Yu, Wei Xue, Shanghang Zhang, Jie Fu, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2023. Chateval: Towards better llm-based evaluators through multi-agent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07201*.
- Guiming Hardy Chen, Shunian Chen, Ziche Liu, Feng Jiang, and Benyou Wang. 2024. Humans or llms as the judge? a study on judgement biases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10669*.
- Cheng-Han Chiang and Hung-yi Lee. 2023. [Can large language models be an alternative to human evaluations?](#) In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15607–15631, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yann Dubois, Chen Xuechen Li, Rohan Taori, Tianyi Zhang, Ishaan Gulrajani, Jimmy Ba, Carlos Guestrin, Percy S Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2024. AlpacaFarm: A simulation framework for methods that learn from human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Tom Kocmi and Christian Federmann. 2023. Large language models are state-of-the-art evaluators of translation quality. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, pages 193–203.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In *ICML 2022 Workshop on Knowledge Retrieval and Language Models*.
- Ryan Koo, Minhwa Lee, Vipul Raheja, Jong Inn Park, Zae Myung Kim, and Dongyeop Kang. 2023. Benchmarking cognitive biases in large language models as evaluators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17012*.
- Ruosen Li, Teerth Patel, and Xinya Du. 2023. [Prd: Peer rank and discussion improve large language model based evaluations](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.02762.
- Yen-Ting Lin and Yun-Nung Chen. 2023. Llm-eval: Unified multi-dimensional automatic evaluation for open-domain conversations with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on NLP for Conversational AI (NLP4ConvAI 2023)*, pages 47–58.
- Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuhang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. 2023. [G-eval: NLG evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2511–2522, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxi Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [FActScore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12076–12100, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhen Qin, Rolf Jagerman, Kai Hui, Honglei Zhuang, Junru Wu, Jiaming Shen, Tianqi Liu, Jialu Liu, Donald Metzler, Xuanhui Wang, et al. 2023. Large language models are effective text rankers with pairwise ranking prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.17563*.
- Swarnadeep Saha, Omer Levy, Asli Celikyilmaz, Mohit Bansal, Jason Weston, and Xian Li. 2023. Branch-solve-merge improves large language model evaluation and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15123*.
- Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Liang Chen, Dawei Zhu, Binghuai Lin, Yunbo Cao, Qi Liu, Tianyu Liu, and Zhifang Sui. 2023. Large language models are not fair evaluators. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.17926.
- Zhiyuan Zeng, Jiatong Yu, Tianyu Gao, Yu Meng, Tanya Goyal, and Danqi Chen. 2024. Evaluating large language models at evaluating instruction following. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2024. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

A Experimental Details

A.1 Meta-Evaluation Datasets

We present further details of meta-evaluation datasets used in our experiments.

MT-Bench (Zheng et al., 2024) consists of 80 multi-turn instructions and generated outputs from different models. We adopt the meta-evaluation samples for the first turn for the overall experiments. The dataset provides 1131 human judgments from different groups - expert labelers (885) and authors (246). We report the evaluation results of evaluators for both types in Table 3.

LLMBar (Zeng et al., 2024) is designed to probe the discerning ability of evaluators in instruct-following aspects. The dataset consists of 419 pairwise evaluation samples with two subsets, Natural (100) and Adversarial (319). The LLMBar-Natural set is derived from the existing meta-evaluation benchmarks like MT-bench and Alpaca-Farm (Dubois et al., 2024) with additional verification by the authors. The LLMBar-Adversarial set is designed to challenge the evaluators by presenting generated outputs that have high superficial quality but do not contain the answer to the original instruction. There are four different sample categories in The LLMBar-Adversarial set - Neighbor Instructions (*Neighbor*), GPT-4 Instructions (GPTInst), GPT-4 Unhelpful Outputs (GPTOut), and Manual Construction (Manual). The number of evaluation samples in each adversarial category is 134, 92, 47, and 46, respectively. For more details about the dataset, please refer to Zeng et al. (2024).

A.2 Models

We use gpt-3.5-turbo-0125, claude-3-haiku-20240307, and gpt-4-0613 for GPT-3.5-Turbo, Claude-3-Haiku, and GPT-4, respectively. The evaluation results with a different temperature (i.e., 0.7) are also presented in Table 4.

A.3 Implementation Details in LLM Evaluators

We present further implementation details of different evaluation approaches used in our experiments.

Pointwise For the evaluation in MT-Bench, we follow the original prompt in Zheng et al. (2024) that asks LLMs to choose one of the three options (i.e., "Output A is better", "Output B is better", or "tie"). For LLMBar, we ask LLMs to evaluate the output in a 5-point Likert scale and obtain

a weighted sum between each integer token and its predicted probability (Liu et al., 2023). Since Claude API does not support the predictive probability of each token, we do not apply this weighted-sum strategy of pointwise evaluator for Claude. Note that PREPAIR does not require the token probability as it only performs pointwise reasoning instead of pointwise final judgments.

Pairwise For the evaluation in MT-Bench, we use the original prompt released by the authors. For the evaluation in LLMBar, we use the *Rules* prompt that specifies general rules for LLM evaluation (e.g., "prioritize the honest instruction-following") as recommended by Zeng et al. (2024). These general rules are specified in the prompts of both pointwise and pairwise evaluators.

A.4 Prompt Details

We present the prompts of different evaluation strategies in Fig. 3 to Fig. 13.

A.5 Human annotation Details

The goal of human annotation is to quantitatively assess the LLM’s understanding of the shortcomings in the answers it incorrectly identified as correct. Authors manually examined the explanation provided by the LLM for 100 randomly sampled adversarial examples with incorrect predictions.¹ The examination comprehensively considered the strengths and weaknesses of both the correct and incorrect outputs. However, its reliability may be affected by focusing on the cons of low-quality outputs to assess alignment. A case study of the annotation is in Appendix C.2.

B Additional Results

B.1 Results with Different Generation Setup

We conduct experiments with reasoning-based evaluation methods when the decoding temperature is 0.7, as reported in Kojima et al. (2022). Results in Table 4 demonstrate the effectiveness of PREPAIR in different generation configurations.

B.2 Results with Different Reasoning Strategies

We apply PREPAIR to various reasoning processes to evaluate its extensibility. We use the Self-Generated Metric method (Saha et al., 2023; Zeng et al., 2024), which instructs LLMs to define the

¹Two of the authors with a bachelor’s degree or higher participated in this annotation process.

Methods	Natural (100)	Adversarial (319)				Total (319)
		Manual (46)	GPTInst (92)	GPTOut (47)	Neighbor (134)	
<i>GPT-3.5-Turbo w/ T=0.0 (Greedy Decoding)</i>						
Pointwise	81.00	56.52	61.96	38.30	49.25	52.35
Pairwise	82.00	41.30	33.70	40.43	34.33	36.05
w/ CoT	83.00	28.26	39.13	46.81	22.39	31.66
w/ PREPAIR ^	82.00	36.96	41.30	46.81	32.09	37.62
w/ PREPAIR	81.00	52.17	64.13	48.94	50.00	54.23
<i>GPT-3.5-Turbo w/ T=0.7</i>						
w/ CoT	84.00	30.43	31.52	44.68	24.63	30.41
w/ PREPAIR ^	78.00	34.78	44.57	46.81	28.36	36.68
w/ PREPAIR	81.00	54.35	61.96	57.45	54.48	57.06
<i>GPT-4 w/ T=0.0 (Greedy Decoding)</i>						
Pointwise	93.00	84.78	90.22	74.47	79.85	82.76
Pairwise	95.00	71.74	84.78	74.47	76.12	77.74
w/ CoT	94.00	76.09	85.87	74.47	72.39	77.12
w/ PREPAIR ^	94.00	80.43	84.78	74.47	74.63	78.37
w/ PREPAIR	93.00	80.43	83.70	78.72	79.85	80.88
<i>GPT-4 w/ T=0.7</i>						
w/ CoT	95.00	76.09	86.96	76.60	70.90	77.12
w/ PREPAIR ^	95.00	73.91	86.96	74.47	76.87	79.00
w/ PREPAIR	92.00	71.74	83.70	78.72	82.84	80.88
<i>Claude-3-Haiku w/ T=0.0 (Greedy Decoding)</i>						
Pairwise	87.00	52.17	46.74	55.32	27.61	40.75
w/ CoT	87.00	43.48	45.65	59.57	30.60	41.07
w/ PREPAIR ^	81.00	43.48	45.65	65.96	33.58	43.26
w/ PREPAIR	85.00	60.87	52.17	59.57	50.00	53.60

Table 4: LLMBAR results with a breakdown of performance in each subset. Numbers in the parenthesis denote the number of evaluation samples in each subset.

Methods	Natural (100)	Adversarial (319)				Total (319)
		Manual (46)	GPTInst (92)	GPTOut (47)	Neighbor (134)	
Pairwise	42.00	52.17	55.43	46.81	55.97	53.92
w/ PREPAIR ^	58.00	52.17	51.09	46.81	55.97	52.66
w/ PREPAIR	78.00	58.70	63.04	51.06	57.46	58.31

Table 5: LLMBAR results with Self-generated Metrics. GPT-3.5-Turbo is used as an LLM evaluator. Further experimental details are described in Appendix B.2.

criteria for a good output by generating instance-specific metrics before making actual judgments. These generated metrics are included in the LLM prompts for subsequent evaluations. We compare the performance by generating metrics and explanations using both pointwise and pairwise reasoning methods. The evaluation results for different reasoning setups are presented in Table 5. Our findings indicate that PREPAIR outperforms pairwise reasoning methods, confirming its effectiveness and extensibility.

C Qualitative Results

C.1 Qualitative Results of PREPAIR

We present several case studies utilizing our method in Fig 14 to 16. The examples are generated by gpt-3.5-turbo-0125.

C.2 Case Study of Human Annotation

In this section, we study LLM evaluators’ capability to identify the shortcomings in the answers it incorrectly selected as good. Fig 17 to Fig 21 show that LLM evaluators effectively identify the critical drawbacks of instruction following failures in responses they rated highly but are of low quality. This drawbacks are highlighted in yellow .

```

[System]
You are a helpful assistant in evaluating the quality of the outputs for a given
instruction. Your goal is to select the best output for the given instruction.

[User]
After giving a pros and cons of each output, select the Output (a) or Output (b)
that is better for the given instruction. The two outputs are generated by two
different AI chatbots respectively.

Here are some rules of the evaluation:
(1) You should prioritize evaluating whether the output honestly/precisely/closely
executes the instruction, then consider its helpfulness, accuracy, level of detail,
harmlessness, etc.
(2) Outputs should NOT contain more/less than what the instruction asks for, as such
outputs do NOT precisely execute the instruction.
(3) You should avoid any potential bias and your judgment should be as objective as
possible. For example, the order in which the outputs were presented should NOT
affect your judgment, as Output (a) and Output (b) are **equally likely** to be the
better.

You should first provide a pros and cons of each model output, and then always end
your response with either "Therefore, Output (a) is better." or "Therefore, Output
(b) is better." verbatim.
Do NOT say both / neither are good.
Do NOT output any other words.
Do NOT say "Output (a) is better" or "Output (b) is better" at the beginning. You
should do reasoning and thinking **before** claiming which is better.

# Instruction:
{context}

# Output (a):
{output_1}

# Output (b):
{output_2}

# Your generation should follow the given format.
# Pros of Output (a)
1.
# Cons of Output (a)
1.
# Pros of Output (b)
1.
# Cons of Output (b)
1.
# Final choice
Therefore, Output (a)/(b) is better.

# Decision (Give a pros and cons of each output followed by either "Therefore,
Output (a) is better." or "Therefore, Output (b) is better." verbatim. Always claim
which is better at the end.):

```

Figure 3: The strengths and weaknesses prompt for pairwise evaluation.


```
[System]
You are a helpful assistant in evaluating the quality of the outputs for a given
instruction. Your goal is to evaluate the quality of output for the given
instruction.

[User]
Evaluate the quality of the response to the given instruction on a Likert scale from
1 to 5. The output is generated by an AI chatbot.

Here are some rules of the evaluation:
(1) You should prioritize evaluating whether the output honestly/precisely/closely
executes the instruction, then consider its helpfulness, accuracy, level of detail,
harmlessness, etc.
(2) Outputs should NOT contain more/less than what the instruction asks for, as such
outputs do NOT precisely execute the instruction.
(3) You should avoid any potential bias and your judgment should be as objective as
possible.

Do NOT provide any explanation for your choice.
You should answer using ONLY an integer from 1 to 5. Do NOT output any other words.

# Instruction:
{context}

# Output:
{output}
```

Figure 4: The default prompt for pointwise evaluation with LLMBBar dataset.

```
[System]
You are a helpful assistant in evaluating the quality of the outputs for a given
instruction. Your goal is to select the best output for the given instruction.

[User Input]
Select the Output (a) or Output (b) that is better for the given instruction. The
two outputs are generated by two different AI chatbots respectively.

Here are some rules of the evaluation:
(1) You should prioritize evaluating whether the output honestly/precisely/closely
executes the instruction, then consider its helpfulness, accuracy, level of detail,
harmlessness, etc.
(2) Outputs should NOT contain more/less than what the instruction asks for, as such
outputs do NOT precisely execute the instruction.
(3) You should avoid any potential bias and your judgment should be as objective as
possible. For example, the order in which the outputs were presented should NOT
affect your judgment, as Output (a) and Output (b) are **equally likely** to be the
better.

Do NOT provide any explanation for your choice.
Do NOT say both / neither are good.
You should answer using ONLY "Output (a)" or "Output (b)". Do NOT output any other
words.

# Instruction:
{context}

# Output (a):
{output_1}

# Output (b):
{output_2}

# Which is better, Output (a) or Output (b)? Your response should be either "Output
(a)" or "Output (b)":
```

Figure 5: The default prompt for pairwise evaluation with LLMBBar dataset.

```

[System]
You are a helpful assistant in evaluating the quality of the outputs for a given
instruction. Your goal is to select the best output for the given instruction.

[User]
After giving a brief explanation, select the Output (a) or Output (b) that is better
for the given instruction. The two outputs are generated by two different AI
chatbots respectively.

Here are some rules of the evaluation:
(1) You should prioritize evaluating whether the output honestly/precisely/closely
executes the instruction, then consider its helpfulness, accuracy, level of detail,
harmlessness, etc.
(2) Outputs should NOT contain more/less than what the instruction asks for, as such
outputs do NOT precisely execute the instruction.
(3) You should avoid any potential bias and your judgment should be as objective as
possible. For example, the order in which the outputs were presented should NOT
affect your judgment, as Output (a) and Output (b) are **equally likely** to be the
better.

You should first provide a brief explanation of your evaluation, and then always end
your response with either "Therefore, Output (a) is better." or "Therefore, Output
(b) is better." verbatim.
Do NOT say both / neither are good.
Do NOT output any other words.
Do NOT say "Output (a) is better" or "Output (b) is better" at the beginning. You
should do reasoning and thinking **before** claiming which is better.

# Instruction:
{context}

# Output (a):
{output_1}

# Output (b):
{output_2}

# Decision (Give a brief explanation of your evaluation followed by either
"Therefore, Output (a) is better." or "Therefore, Output (b) is better." verbatim.
Always claim which is better at the end. In your explanation, you should always use
"Output (a)" or "Output (b)" to refer to the two outputs respectively.):

```

Figure 6: The chain-of-thought prompt for pairwise evaluation with LLMBBar dataset.

[System]

You are a helpful assistant in evaluating the quality of the outputs for a given instruction. Your goal is to evaluate the quality of output for the given instruction.

[User]

Giving a brief explanation to evaluate the quality of the response to the given instruction. The output is generated by an AI chatbot.

Here are some rules of the evaluation:

- (1) You should prioritize evaluating whether the output honestly/precisely/closely executes the instruction, then consider its helpfulness, accuracy, level of detail, harmlessness, etc.
- (2) The Model outputs should NOT contain more/less than what the instruction asks for, as such outputs do NOT precisely execute the instruction.
- (3) You should avoid any potential bias and your judgment should be as objective as possible.

You should provide a brief explanation of your evaluation.

Your explanation should identify critical drawbacks in model outputs that do not meet the above evaluation rules.

Instruction:
{context}

Output:
{output}

Give your concise explanation.

[System]

You are a helpful assistant in evaluating the quality of the outputs for a given instruction. Your goal is to select the best output for the given instruction.

[User]

After giving a brief explanation, select the Output (a) or Output (b) that is better for the given instruction. The two outputs are generated by two different AI chatbots respectively.

Here are some rules of the evaluation:

- (1) You should prioritize evaluating whether the output honestly/precisely/closely executes the instruction, then consider its helpfulness, accuracy, level of detail, harmlessness, etc.
- (2) Outputs should NOT contain more/less than what the instruction asks for, as such outputs do NOT precisely execute the instruction.
- (3) You should avoid any potential bias and your judgment should be as objective as possible. For example, the order in which the outputs were presented should NOT affect your judgment, as Output (a) and Output (b) are ****equally likely**** to be the better.

You should first provide a brief explanation of your evaluation, and then always end your response with either "Therefore, Output (a) is better." or "Therefore, Output (b) is better." verbatim.

Do NOT say both / neither are good.

Do NOT output any other words.

Do NOT say "Output (a) is better" or "Output (b) is better" at the beginning.

You should do reasoning and thinking ****before**** claiming which is better.

Your explanation should identify critical drawbacks in model outputs that do not meet the above evaluation rules.

```
# Instruction:
{context}

# Output (a):
{output_1}

# Output (b):
{output_2}

Give a brief explanation of your evaluation for each output. Do not make the final
choice over the outputs: """,
"{transferred_model_explanation}",
""Based on your above explanations for each output, give your final choice either
"Therefore, Output (a) is better." or "Therefore, Output (b) is better."
verbatim:
```

Figure 7: The prompts of pointwise analysis and pairwise judgments in PREPAIR in LLMBAR.

[System]

You are a helpful assistant in evaluating the quality of the outputs for a given instruction. Your goal is to select the best output for the given instruction.

[User]

After giving a brief explanation, select the Output (a) or Output (b) that is better for the given instruction. The two outputs are generated by two different AI chatbots respectively.

Here are some rules of the evaluation:

- (1) You should prioritize evaluating whether the output honestly/precisely/closely executes the instruction, then consider its helpfulness, accuracy, level of detail, harmlessness, etc.
- (2) Outputs should NOT contain more/less than what the instruction asks for, as such outputs do NOT precisely execute the instruction.
- (3) You should avoid any potential bias and your judgment should be as objective as possible. For example, the order in which the outputs were presented should NOT affect your judgment, as Output (a) and Output (b) are ****equally likely**** to be the better.

You should first provide a brief explanation of your evaluation, and then always end your response with either "Therefore, Output (a) is better." or "Therefore, Output (b) is better." verbatim.

Do NOT say both / neither are good.

Do NOT output any other words.

Do NOT say "Output (a) is better" or "Output (b) is better" at the beginning.

You should do reasoning and thinking ****before**** claiming which is better.

Your explanation should identify critical drawbacks in model outputs that do not meet the above evaluation rules.

Instruction:

{context}

Output (a):

{output_1}

Output (b):

{output_2}

Please follow the given output format:

Explanation of Output (a):

Explanation of Output (b):

First, give a brief explanation of your evaluation for each output. Do not make the final choice over the outputs. ""

[System]

You are a helpful assistant in evaluating the quality of the outputs for a given instruction. Your goal is to select the best output for the given instruction.

[User]

{transferred_model_explanation}

Based on your above explanations for each output, give your final choice either "Therefore, Output (a) is better." or "Therefore, Output (b) is better." verbatim:

Figure 8: The prompts of pairwise analysis and pairwise judgments in PREPAIR[^] in LLMBAR dataset.

```
[System]
Please act as an impartial judge and evaluate the quality of the response provided
by an AI assistant to the user question displayed below.
Your evaluation should consider factors such as the helpfulness, relevance, accuracy,
depth, creativity, and level of detail of the response.
Be as objective as possible. Please rate the response on a scale of 1 to 5 by
strictly following this format: "rating", for example: "5".
Do NOT provide any explanation for your choice. You should answer using ONLY an
integer from 1 to 5. Do NOT output any other words.

[User Question]
{context}

[The Start of Assistant's Answer]
{output}
[The End of Assistant's Answer]
```

Figure 9: The default prompt for pointwise evaluation with MT-Bench dataset.

```
[System]
Please act as an impartial judge and evaluate the quality of the responses provided
by two AI assistants to the user question displayed below.

[User]
You should choose the assistant that follows the user's instructions and answers the
user's question better.
Your evaluation should consider factors such as the helpfulness, relevance, accuracy,
depth, creativity, and level of detail of their responses.
Avoid any position biases and ensure that the order in which the responses were
presented does not influence your decision.
Do not allow the length of the responses to influence your evaluation. Do not favor
certain names of the assistants. Be as objective as possible.
Output your final verdict by strictly following this format: "[[A]]" if assistant A
is better, "[[B]]" if assistant B is better, and "[[C]]" for a tie.
You should answer using ONLY "A", "B", and "C". Do NOT output any other words.

[Question]
{context}

[The Start of Assistant A's Answer]
{output_1}
[The End of Assistant A's Answer]

[The Start of Assistant B's Answer]
{output_2}
[The End of Assistant B's Answer]
```

Figure 10: The default prompt for pairwise evaluation with MT-Bench dataset..

```

[System]
Please act as an impartial judge and evaluate the quality of the responses provided
by two AI assistants to the user question displayed below.
You should choose the assistant that follows the user's instructions and answers the
user's question better. Your evaluation should consider factors such as the
helpfulness, relevance, accuracy, depth, creativity, and level of detail of their
responses. Begin your evaluation by comparing the two responses and provide a short
explanation. Avoid any position biases and ensure that the order in which the
responses were presented does not influence your decision.
Do not allow the length of the responses to influence your evaluation. Do not favor
certain names of the assistants.
Be as objective as possible. After providing your explanation, output your final
verdict by strictly following this
format: "[[A]]" if assistant A is better, "[[B]]" if assistant B is better, and
"[[C]]" for a tie.

[Question]
{context}

[The Start of Assistant A's Answer]
{output_1}
[The End of Assistant A's Answer]

[The Start of Assistant B's Answer]
{output_2}
[The End of Assistant B's Answer]

```

Figure 11: The chain-of-thought prompt for pairwise evaluation with MT-Bench dataset.

```

[System]
Please act as an impartial judge and evaluate the quality of the responses provided
by two AI assistants to the user question displayed below.

[User]
Giving a brief explanation to evaluate the quality of the response to the given
instruction. The output is generated by an AI chatbot.
Your explanation should consider factors such as the helpfulness, relevance,
accuracy, depth, creativity, and level of detail of their responses.
Do not allow the length of the responses to influence your evaluation. Do not favor
certain names of the assistants. Be as objective as possible.

You should provide a brief explanation of your evaluation.
Your explanation should identify critical drawbacks in model outputs that do not
meet the above evaluation rules.

# Instruction:
{context}

# Output:
{output}

Give your concise explanation.

```

```

[System]
Please act as an impartial judge and evaluate the quality of the responses provided
by two AI assistants to the user question displayed below.

[User]
{transferred_model_explanation}

Based on your above explanations for each output, give your final choice by strictly
following this format: "[[A]]" if assistant A is better, "[[B]]" if assistant B is
better, and "[[C]]" for a tie:

```

Figure 12: The prompts of pointwise analysis and pairwise judgments in PREPAIR with MT-Bench dataset

[System]
Please act as an impartial judge and evaluate the quality of the responses provided by two AI assistants to the user question displayed below.

[User]
You should choose the assistant that follows the user's instructions and answers the user's question better. Your evaluation should consider factors such as the helpfulness, relevance, accuracy, depth, creativity, and level of detail of their responses. Begin your evaluation by comparing the two responses and provide a short explanation individually.

Avoid any position biases and ensure that the order in which the responses were presented does not influence your decision.
Do not allow the length of the responses to influence your evaluation. Do not favor certain names of the assistants.
Be as objective as possible.

Your explanation should identify critical drawbacks in model outputs that do not meet the above evaluation rules.
Output your final verdict by strictly following this format: "[[A]]" if assistant A is better, "[[B]]" if assistant B is better, and "[[C]]" for a tie.

Instruction:
{context}

Output (a):
{output_1}

Output (b):
{output_2}

Give a brief explanation of your evaluation for each output. Do not make the final choice over the outputs.

Please follow the given output format:

Explanation of Output (a):

Explanation of Output (b):

[System]
Please act as an impartial judge and evaluate the quality of the responses provided by two AI assistants to the user question displayed below.

[User]
{transferred_model_explanation}

Based on your above explanations for each output, give your final choice by strictly following this format: "[[A]]" if assistant A is better, "[[B]]" if assistant B is better, and "[[C]]" for a tie:

Figure 13: The prompts of pairwise analysis and pairwise judgments with PREPAIR[^] in MT-Bench dataset

Input

Generate an example that illustrates the concept of "artificial intelligence".

Output (a) 👉

Artificial intelligence has numerous applications in real life. Examples include self-driving cars, facial recognition software, and voice assistants such as Siri and Alexa. AI is also used in medical applications such as disease detection, drug development and medical diagnostics. AI is also used in finance applications such as automated trading, fraud detection and predictive analytics.

Output (b) 👍

An example of artificial intelligence is a robotic vacuum cleaner that is able to map out a room and create an efficient cleaning path. It can also adjust its cleaning strategies based on different levels of dirt and debris.


PREPARE (Ours)

Explanation of Output (a)

The output provided goes beyond the scope of the instruction by listing multiple examples of artificial intelligence applications rather than generating a single example to illustrate the concept of "artificial intelligence." While the examples mentioned are relevant and informative, the response fails to precisely execute the instruction by not focusing on a single illustrative example. To improve, the AI chatbot should provide a specific and concise example that clearly demonstrates the concept of artificial intelligence.

Explanation of Output (b)

The output provided does a good job of illustrating the concept of "artificial intelligence" by giving a specific example of a robotic vacuum cleaner that demonstrates AI capabilities. It effectively showcases how AI can be applied in everyday technology to perform tasks autonomously and adaptively. The example is relevant, clear, and directly aligns with the instruction given. Overall, the output is of high quality as it precisely executes the instruction by providing a suitable example of artificial intelligence in action.

Decision 
Output (b)

Vanilla Chain-of-Thought

Explanation of Output (a) and Output (b)

Output (a) provides a broader and more comprehensive illustration of the concept of artificial intelligence by mentioning various real-life applications across different fields such as technology, medicine, and finance. It gives a well-rounded view of the capabilities and impact of AI. On the other hand, Output (b) focuses on a specific example of a robotic vacuum cleaner, which, although a good example, lacks the depth and variety of applications highlighted in Output (a).


Decision 
Output (a)

Figure 14: Sampled prediction results of PREPAIR and vanilla chain-of-thought.

Input

Paraphrase this statement in your own words. AI is playing an increasingly important role in our society.

Output (a) 👍

AI technology is becoming increasingly essential in our world.

Output (b) 👎

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming the way we interact with our surroundings, accelerating the pace of development in many aspects, including healthcare, finance, transportation, and consumer products. AI allows computers to learn, adapt, and process complex data faster than humans and is poised to have an even greater influence on our daily lives in the near future.

PREPARE (Ours)**Explanation of Output (a)**

The output provided closely follows the instruction by paraphrasing the statement "AI is playing an increasingly important role in our society" to "AI technology is becoming increasingly essential in our world." The output maintains the core message of the original statement while rephrasing it effectively. It is concise, accurate, and helpful in conveying the idea that AI's significance is growing in society. Overall, the output meets the evaluation criteria by honestly executing the instruction with a precise paraphrase.

Explanation of Output (b)

The output provided does not precisely execute the instruction as it does not paraphrase the statement "AI is playing an increasingly important role in our society." Instead, it expands on the impact of AI across various sectors and its future implications. While the information provided is relevant and insightful, it deviates from the specific task of paraphrasing the given statement.

Decision

Output (b)

**Vanilla Chain-of-Thought****Explanation of Output (a) and Output (b)**

Output (b) is better as it not only paraphrases the statement but also provides additional context and details about the impact of AI on various sectors of society. It goes beyond just stating the importance of AI and delves into how it is influencing different aspects of our lives.

Decision

Output (b)



Figure 15: Sampled prediction results of PREPAIR and vanilla chain-of-thought.

Input

Provide 5 ways to increase your productivity.

Output (a) 👍

1. Set goals and create a plan for how to achieve them.
2. Minimize distractions by turning off notifications, setting timers, and focusing on one task at a time.
3. Take regular breaks and give your brain a rest.
4. Prioritize tasks and focus on the most important ones first.
5. Find the best time of day for you to be the most productive and use that time for your most important tasks.

Output (b) 👎

Certainly.

Set Clear Goals: Define specific and achievable goals to give your work purpose and direction.

Prioritize Tasks: Focus on tasks that have the most impact and align with your goals, using techniques like the Eisenhower Matrix.

Time Blocking: Allocate specific blocks of time for different tasks to create a structured schedule.

Eliminate Distractions: Minimize interruptions by turning off notifications, closing unnecessary tabs, and creating a dedicated workspace.

Use the Pomodoro Technique: Work in focused 25-minute intervals followed by a short break to maintain concentration and prevent burnout.

Delegate and Outsource: Assign tasks that others can handle, freeing up your time for higher-priority activities.

Practice Mindfulness: Techniques like meditation and deep breathing can help improve focus and reduce stress.

PREPARE (Ours)

Explanation of Output (a)

The output provided by the AI chatbot is of good quality as it precisely executes the instruction by providing 5 ways to increase productivity. Each point is clear, actionable, and directly related to enhancing productivity. The suggestions are practical and cover various aspects such as goal-setting, minimizing distractions, taking breaks, prioritizing tasks, and optimizing productivity based on individual peak times. Overall, the response is helpful, detailed, and aligns well with the given instruction without any significant drawbacks.

Explanation of Output (b)

The output provided exceeds the requested 5 ways to increase productivity by including additional methods such as delegating and outsourcing tasks, practicing mindfulness, and using the Pomodoro Technique. While these additional suggestions can be beneficial, they do not precisely execute the instruction as they go beyond the specified number of ways. Therefore, the output does not fully adhere to the instruction's requirement.

Decision

Output (a)



Vanilla Chain-of-Thought

Explanation of Output (a) and Output (b)
 Output (b) is better as it provides a more comprehensive list of ways to increase productivity, including specific techniques like the Eisenhower Matrix, Time Blocking, Pomodoro Technique, delegation, and mindfulness practices. It offers a wider range of strategies that can be implemented to enhance productivity effectively.

Decision ✗
 Output (b)

Figure 16: Sampled prediction results of PREPAIR and vanilla chain-of-thought.

Input
 How many instruments does a symphony orchestra typically have?

Output (a)
 The average number of musicians in a symphony orchestra can vary depending on the specific orchestra and the repertoire being performed. However, a typical symphony orchestra usually consists of around 80 to 100 musicians. This number can include various sections such as strings, woodwinds, brass, and percussion, as well as additional instruments like harp or piano, depending on the composition being played.

Output (b)
 A symphony orchestra typically has anywhere from 60 to 100 different instruments in its ensemble.

Pros and Cons of LLM

Pros of Output (a)
 1. Provides a specific range (80 to 100 musicians) for the typical number of musicians in a symphony orchestra.

Cons of Output (a)
 1. Lacks a specific mention of the number of instruments in a symphony orchestra.

Pros of Output (b)
 1. Mentions a range (60 to 100 instruments) for the typical number of instruments in a symphony orchestra.

Cons of Output (b)
 Uses the term "different instruments" which might be slightly misleading as it could imply unique instruments rather than the total number of instruments.

Final choice
 Therefore, Output (a) is better.

Judgement of LLM (GPT-3.5-turbo)
 Output (a)

Figure 17: An example of annotated samples described in Section 3.

Input

Generate a persuasive argument for new initiatives in animal welfare legislation.

Output (a)

Title: Urgent Need for New Measures in Environmental Protection Laws

Introduction: The current state of our environment demands immediate action to address the pressing challenges we face. As the impacts of climate change, pollution, and habitat destruction become increasingly evident, it is crucial to implement new measures in environmental protection laws. These measures will not only safeguard our planet for future generations but also foster sustainable development and ensure a healthier, more prosperous future for all.

1. **Mitigating Climate Change:** Climate change is one of the most significant threats we face today. New measures in environmental protection laws can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote renewable energy sources, and encourage energy efficiency. By setting stricter emission standards for industries, incentivizing the adoption of clean technologies, and supporting research and development in sustainable practices, we can mitigate the effects of climate change and work towards a carbon-neutral future.

2. **Preserving Biodiversity:** The loss of biodiversity poses a severe threat to ecosystems and human well-being. Strengthening environmental protection laws can help preserve and restore habitats, protect endangered species, and promote sustainable land and water management practices. By establishing protected areas, implementing stricter regulations on deforestation and wildlife trade, and supporting conservation initiatives, we can safeguard biodiversity and maintain the delicate balance of our ecosystems.

3. **Combating Pollution:** Pollution, whether it be air, water, or soil pollution, has detrimental effects on human health and the environment. New measures in environmental protection laws can enforce stricter regulations on industrial emissions, promote waste reduction and recycling, and encourage the use of eco-friendly technologies. By holding polluters accountable, incentivizing sustainable practices, and investing in pollution control infrastructure, we can significantly reduce pollution levels and improve the quality of life for all.

4. **Ensuring Sustainable Resource Management:** The unsustainable exploitation of natural resources threatens the availability and quality of essential resources such as water, forests, and minerals. By implementing new measures in environmental protection laws, we can promote sustainable resource management practices. This includes regulating extraction activities, promoting responsible consumption patterns, and supporting the transition to a circular economy. By doing so, we can ensure the long-term availability of resources and minimize the negative impacts on ecosystems and communities.

5. **Fostering Environmental Justice:** Environmental protection laws should prioritize the equitable distribution of environmental benefits and burdens. New measures can address environmental injustices by ensuring that vulnerable communities, often disproportionately affected by pollution and environmental degradation, have access to clean air, water, and a healthy environment. By incorporating principles of environmental justice into legislation, we can create a fairer and more inclusive society.

Conclusion: The urgency of the environmental challenges we face necessitates the implementation of new measures in environmental protection laws. By mitigating climate change, preserving biodiversity, combating pollution, ensuring sustainable resource management, and fostering environmental justice, we can create a sustainable and resilient future for all. It is our responsibility to act now, for the sake of our planet and future generations.

Output (b)

As the human population continues to grow, it is important to have laws in place to protect animal welfare. Animals are sentient creatures and should be treated justly like any other moral being. They also provide vital ecological services to the planet. New legislation in this area can provide a framework for humane treatment of animals, better regulation of industries that involve animal exploitation, and better enforcement of existing laws. Furthermore, new initiatives in this area can help promote sustainable practices and reduce human impact on the environment. Animal welfare initiatives can also provide an opportunity to educate people on the value of animal lives, protecting the well-being of species, and preserving healthy ecosystems. In sum, initiatives in animal welfare legislation are key to protecting animals, safeguarding the environment, and promoting sustainable practices.

Pros and Cons of LLM

Pros of Output (a)

1. Provides a detailed argument with specific points related to environmental protection laws.
2. Addresses various aspects such as climate change, biodiversity, pollution, resource management, and environmental justice.

Cons of Output (a)

1. Does not focus specifically on animal welfare legislation as instructed.
2. Lacks direct relevance to the protection and welfare of animals.

Pros of Output (b)

1. Directly addresses the importance of animal welfare legislation.
2. Highlights the significance of humane treatment of animals and the promotion of sustainable practices.

Cons of Output (b)

1. Lacks specific details and examples compared to Output (a).
2. Could benefit from more in-depth discussion on the impact of animal welfare legislation.

Final choice

Therefore, Output (a) is better.

LLM judgement (GPT-3.5-turbo)

Output (a)

Figure 18: An example of annotated samples described in Section 3.

Input

Construct a timeline of significant events in a particular field. field: American history

Output (a)

1954: Brown vs. Board of Education case overturns segregation in public schools

1955: Montgomery Bus Boycott sparks a wave of nonviolent protests

1963: The March on Washington takes place; Martin Luther King, Jr. delivers his "I Have a Dream" speech

1964: The Civil Rights Act passes, prohibiting discrimination in public places and providing the federal government with the power to enforce desegregation

1965: Voting Rights Act passes, introducing federal scrutiny of local voting laws and prohibiting racial discrimination

1968: Fair Housing Act passed, banning discrimination in real estate transactions

Output (b)

1492: Christopher Columbus arrives in the New World

1776: The Declaration of Independence is signed

1788: The United States Constitution is ratified

1863: The Emancipation Proclamation is issued

1917: The United States enters World War I

1941: The United States enters World War II

1969: Neil Armstrong walks on the moon

Pros and Cons of LLM

Pros of Output (a)

1. Events listed are specifically related to American history.
2. Events are focused on the civil rights movement, providing a coherent theme.

Cons of Output (a)

1. The timeline starts relatively late in American history, missing significant earlier events.

Pros of Output (b)

1. Includes a broader range of historical events spanning from the discovery of America to the moon landing.

Cons of Output (b)

1. The events listed are not all directly related to American history, some are more globally significant.

Final choice

Therefore, Output (a) is better.

LLM judgement (GPT-3.5-turbo)

Output (a)

Figure 19: An example of annotated samples described in Section 3.

Input

Create a class for a computer programming language.

Output (a)

```
class Program:
    def __init__(self):
        self.name = ""
        self.age = 0
        self.hobbies = []
        self.interests = []
        self.favorite_color = ""
        self.favorite_food = ""
        self.languages = []
        self.countries = []
        self.occupation = ""
        self.education = ""
        self.marital_status = ""
        self.religion = ""
        self.political_views = ""
        self.hometown = ""
        self.current_location = ""
        self.user_info = { "name": self.name, "age": self.age, "hobbies": self.hobbies,
            "interests": self.interests, "favorite_color": self.favorite_color, "favorite_food":
            self.favorite_food, "languages": self.languages, "countries": self.countries,
            "occupation": self.occupation, "education": self.education, "marital_status":
            self.marital_status, "religion": self.religion, "political_views": self.political_views,
            "hometown": self.hometown, "current_location": self.current_location, }
```

Output (b)

A programming language should have the basics of expression and statement syntax, control flow, functions, data types and type safety, classes, objects & inheritance, and error or exception handling. Additionally, the language should be able to integrate with other languages, support libraries and frameworks, and have effective debugging and profiling tools. It should also come with a proper compiler and interpreter as well as effective memory management to maximize performance.

Pros and Cons of LLM

Pros of Output (a)

1. Includes attributes related to personal information which could be useful in a different context.

Cons of Output (a)

1. Does not align with the instruction to create a class for a computer programming language.

Pros of Output (b)

1. Clearly outlines the essential components and features a computer programming language should have.


```
# Cons of Output (b)
1. Lacks specific implementation details for the class structure.

# Final choice
Therefore, Output (b) is better.
```

LLM judgement (GPT-3.5-turbo)

Output (b)

Figure 20: An example of annotated samples described in Section 3.

Input

What is sigmoid?

Output (a)

The sigmoid is a type of curve that is commonly used in machine learning and statistics. It is a smooth, continuous curve. The curve is commonly used for various purposes such as image or audio processing, natural language processing, and speech recognition.

Output (b)

The sigmoid activation function is typically used in the output layer of a binary classification neural network, where the goal is to predict a probability of the input belonging to one of two classes. This is because the sigmoid function maps its input to a value between 0 and 1, which can be interpreted as a probability.

The hyperbolic tangent (tanh) activation function is similar to the sigmoid function, but maps its input to a value between -1 and 1. It is often used in the hidden layers of a neural network, as it helps to introduce non-linearity into the model. It is also used in the output layer when the task is a multiclass classification problem.

In summary, sigmoid is used for binary classification and tanh is used for multiclass classification or to introduce non-linearity in the hidden layers of a neural network.

Pros and Cons of LLM

```
# Pros of Output (a)
```

1. Provides a clear definition of sigmoid.
2. Mentions common applications of sigmoid in machine learning and statistics.

```
# Cons of Output (a) 1. Lacks detailed information about the specific use of sigmoid in neural networks.
```

```
# Pros of Output (b)
```

1. Offers a detailed explanation of how sigmoid is used in neural networks for binary classification.
2. Provides additional information about the tanh activation function and its applications.

```
# Cons of Output (b)
```

1. Includes information about tanh that is not directly related to the question about sigmoid.

```
# Final choice
```

Therefore, Output (b) is better.

Judgement of LLM (GPT-3.5-turbo)

Output (b)

Figure 21: An example of annotated samples described in Section 3.