

# Merge, Ensemble, and Cooperate! A Survey on Collaborative Strategies in the Era of Large Language Models

Jinliang Lu<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Ziliang Pang<sup>1\*</sup>, Min Xiao<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Yaochen Zhu<sup>3\*</sup>, Rui Xia<sup>3</sup>, Jiajun Zhang<sup>1,2,4†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

<sup>2</sup>School of Artificial Intelligence, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

<sup>3</sup>Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing, China

<sup>4</sup>Wuhan AI Research, Wuhan, China

{lujinliang2019, ziliang.pang}@ia.ac.cn,

{yczhu, rxia}@njjust.edu.cn, {jjzhang, min.xiao}@nlpr.ia.ac.cn

## Abstract

The remarkable success of Large Language Models (LLMs) has ushered natural language processing (NLP) research into a new era. Despite their diverse capabilities, LLMs trained on different corpora exhibit varying strengths and weaknesses, leading to challenges in maximizing their overall efficiency and versatility. To address these challenges, recent studies have explored collaborative strategies for LLMs. This paper provides a comprehensive overview of this emerging research area, highlighting the motivation behind such collaborations. Specifically, we categorize collaborative strategies into three primary approaches: *Merging*, *Ensemble*, and *Cooperation*. *Merging* involves integrating multiple LLMs in the parameter space. *Ensemble* combines the outputs of various LLMs. *Cooperation* leverages different LLMs to allow full play to their diverse capabilities for specific tasks. We provide in-depth introductions to these methods from different perspectives and discuss their potential applications. Additionally, we outline future research directions, hoping this work will catalyze further studies on LLM collaborations and paving the way for advanced NLP applications.

## 1 Introduction

"Many hands make light work."

— John Heywood

Human beings have long understood the power of collaboration. When individuals pool their diverse skills and efforts, they can achieve far more than they could alone. This principle of collective effort has found new relevance in the realm of machine learning (Dietterich, 2000; Panait and Luke, 2005; Sagi and Rokach, 2018), significantly boosting the development of artificial intelligence.

In recent years, large language models (LLMs) (Brown et al., 2020; Chowdhery et al., 2023) have

\*Equal Contribution

†Corresponding author



Figure 1: Recently, numerous large language models have been released, each with its own unique strengths. This diversity has fueled research into collaboration between these models.

emerged as one of the most rapidly developing and promising directions in artificial intelligence. These models have significantly transformed the paradigm of natural language processing (NLP) (Min et al., 2023a; Chang et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2023) and influenced other areas (Wu et al., 2023a; Zhang et al., 2024a). This impressive revolution has inspired numerous universities, institutes, and companies to pre-train and release their own LLMs. Currently, over 74,000 pre-trained models are available on the HuggingFace model hub<sup>1</sup>. As shown in Figure 1, these models, trained with diverse data, architectures, and methodologies, possess unique capabilities: some are proficient in multilingual tasks (Le Scao et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2022), others specialize in domains like medicine (Yang et al., 2024b) or finance (Wu et al., 2023b), some are adept at processing long-context windows (Chen et al., 2023e,f), while others are fine-tuned for better alignment with human interaction (Ouyang et al., 2022). However, no single model consistently outperforms all others across tasks (Jiang

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/models>

et al., 2023a). This variability motivates research into the collaboration between various LLMs to unlock their combined potential, akin to creating a *Hexagon Warrior*.

Despite progress in LLM collaboration research, the relationships and context among the proposed methods remain unclear. This survey aims to fill that gap by categorizing collaboration techniques into three main approaches: **Merging**, **Ensemble**, and **Cooperation**. Specifically, **Merging** and **Ensemble** methods for LLMs are derived from traditional fusion techniques commonly explored in machine learning (Li et al., 2023a). These methods are tailored to be more suitable for LLMs, effectively leveraging the collaborative advantages of diverse LLMs. **Merging** involves integrating the parameters of multiple LLMs into a single, unified model, requiring that the parameters are compatible within a linear space. In contrast, **Ensemble** focuses on combining the outputs generated by various LLMs to produce coherent results, with less emphasis on the parameters of the individual models. **Cooperation** extends beyond *merging* and *ensemble*. This survey concentrates on cooperative methods that harness the diverse strengths of LLMs to achieve specific objectives. In general, these techniques expand the methodologies for model collaboration, holding significant research importance for LLMs.

The structure of this work is organized as follows. We begin by providing the background of LLMs and defining collaboration techniques for LLMs in Section 2. Next, we introduce three key categories: **Merging** in Section 3, **Ensemble** in Section 4, and **Cooperation** in Section 5. Each category of methods is thoroughly classified and described in detail, offering a clear understanding of their respective frameworks and applications. Finally, we offer a comprehensive discussion in Section 6, highlighting challenges and future directions for research.

In summary, this study aims to comprehensively explore the strategies and methodologies for collaborative efforts among LLMs. We aspire for this survey to enrich understanding of LLM collaboration strategies and to inspire future research.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Large Language Models

Language modeling has always been a cornerstone of natural language processing (NLP). Recently, plenty of studies scale up of Transformer-based lan-

guage models (Vaswani et al., 2017; Radford et al., 2018) to substantial more than billions of parameters, exemplified by models like GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), PaLM (Chowdhery et al., 2023; Anil et al., 2023), LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023a,b). These models are typically considered as *Large Language Models* (LLMs) due to their massive amount of parameters (Zhao et al., 2023). This subsection discusses the architecture and scaling of LLMs, their training objectives, and the emergent abilities they exhibit.

**Architecture and Scaling** Similar to pre-trained language models (PLMs) (Radford et al., 2018; Devlin et al., 2019), LLMs primarily adopt the Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017) as their backbone, consisting of stacked multi-head attention and feed-forward layers. Unlike PLMs, most currently released LLMs are built upon decoder-only architectures for training efficiency and few-shot capabilities. This approach also shows potential when the number of parameters increases (Zhang et al., 2022). Recent studies have investigated the quantitative relationship between model capacity, the amount of training data, and model size, known as the scaling law (Kaplan et al., 2020; Hoffmann et al., 2022).

**Training Objectives** In the previous studies about PLMs, various language modeling tasks are proposed. For example, *masked language modeling* for BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), *De-noising language modeling* for BART (Lewis et al., 2020) and T5 (Raffel et al., 2020). However, current LLMs typically utilize the standard *causal language modeling* as their training objective, which aims to predict the next token based on the preceding tokens in a sequence. This training objective is well-suited for decoder-only architectures.

Beyond the pre-training objective, recent studies have aimed to model human preferences to better align LLMs with human expectations. For example, the well-known InstructGPT (Ouyang et al., 2022) introduces *reinforcement learning from human feedback* (RLHF), which uses preference rewards as an additional training objective. Although RLHF is effective at making LLMs more helpful to users, it inevitably incurs an alignment tax, which refers to performance degradation after RLHF. Recent research has explored various techniques to mitigate alignment tax issues (Lin et al., 2023; Lu et al., 2024b; Fu et al., 2024b).




Figure 2: The illustration of different collaboration strategies, with each animal in the figures representing a different LLM.

**Emergent Abilities** The fundamental capability of language models is text generation, where tokens are auto-regressively generated based on preceding tokens using greedy search or nucleus sampling (Holtzman et al., 2020a):

$$y_i \sim p(y_i | y_{<i}) \quad (1)$$

Interestingly, LLMs can not only generate realistic text but also perform specific tasks when provided with task-specific prompts, without requiring fine-tuning on particular downstream tasks (Brown et al., 2020). This phenomenon is one of the most important differences between LLMs and previous PLMs. Wei et al. (2022b) define the emergent ability as “an ability that is not present in smaller models but is present in larger models.” Among these emergent abilities, *in-context learning* (ICL) (Brown et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2022) and *instruction following* are commonly used and significantly enhance the ability of LLMs to process various tasks.

ICL helps LLMs understand tasks by using several task examples as demonstrations. When provide these demonstrations as prompts, LLMs can automatically generate reasonable output for the given test example, which can be formalized as:

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \text{demonstration}(\{\{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^k\})) \quad (2)$$

*Instruction following* ability are typically emerge in LLMs that have been fine-tuned on examples formatted with instructions on multiple tasks. The generation process can be formalized as:

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{I}) \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}$  refers to the given instruction for current example  $\mathbf{x}$ . The instruction tuning technique (Sanh et al., 2021; Ouyang et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022a) can enhance the generalization capabilities of LLMs, enabling them to perform well with instructions on a variety of tasks, including unseen ones (Thoppilan et al., 2022).

## 2.2 Collaboration for LLMs

For previous task-dependent NLP models, collaboration strategies typically aimed to improve performance on specific tasks (Jia et al., 2023). Recently, LLMs have revolutionized NLP by demonstrating remarkable versatility across a wide range of tasks. This shift has also shifted the focus of collaboration strategies for LLMs toward enhancing versatility and achieving more general objectives. Consequently, some recently proposed collaboration strategies have become more flexible and tailored specifically for LLMs.

**The Necessity of LLM Collaboration** Although almost all LLMs demonstrate strong versatility across various tasks through *in-context learning* and *instruction following*, different LLMs still have distinct strengths and weaknesses (Jiang et al., 2023a).

Differences in training corpora and model architectures among various LLM families—such as LLaMA, GLM (Zeng et al., 2023), and QWen (Bai et al., 2023)—result in significant variations in their capabilities. Even within the same family, fine-tuning on specific corpora (*e.g.*, mathematics (Azerbaiyev et al., 2023), code (Roziere et al., 2023), or medical domains (Wu et al., 2024)) can lead to noticeable performance differences. Effective collaboration among these LLMs can unlock




Figure 3: The primary categorization of LLM collaboration in this survey.

their full potential, significantly enhancing their overall performance and versatility.

Furthermore, LLMs inevitably suffer from computational inefficiencies (Zhou et al., 2024c), hallucinations (Rawte et al., 2023; Ji et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023), and privacy leaks Fan et al. (2024). Recent studies explore the collaboration strategies between LLMs, which provides potential solutions to mitigate these issues and compensate for their shortcomings.

### The Category of LLM Collaboration Methods

Collaboration between LLMs refers to the process where *multiple LLMs work together, leveraging their individual strengths and capabilities to achieve a shared objective*. In this survey, we categorize LLM collaboration methods into three aspects: *merging*, *ensemble* and *cooperation*. As shown in Figure 2,

- *Merging* involves integrating multiple LLMs into a unified, stronger one, primarily through arithmetic operations in the model parameter space.
- *Ensemble* combines the outputs of different models to obtain coherent results. Recent studies have proposed various ensemble methods tailored for LLMs.
- *Cooperation* is a relatively broad concept. This survey focuses on cooperation methods that leverage the diverse capabilities of different LLMs to accomplish specific objectives, such as efficient computation or knowledge transfer.

It should be noted that as we move from *merging* to *ensemble* to *cooperation*, the requirements for LLMs gradually relax, making the proposed methods increasingly flexible. Specifically, *merging* methods are effective only when the LLMs share a compatible parameter space, allowing seamless integration. *Ensemble* methods require LLMs to have diverse yet comparable abilities; without this balance, the ensemble may be less effective. In contrast, *cooperation* methods are more flexible, focusing on leveraging LLMs with various capabilities that are specially designed to achieve particular objectives.

For each category, we further classify specific methods based on their focus or stages of implementation. The comprehensive categorization is shown in Figure 3.

## 3 Merging

Single models have inherent limitations, such as potentially missing important information (Sagi and Rokach, 2018), and being prone to getting stuck in local optima or lacking multi-task capabilities. To address these limitations, researchers have explored model *merging* methods, which combine multiple models in the parameter space to create a unified, stronger model. Model merging has made significant progress in recent years, with various techniques cataloged in existing surveys (Li et al., 2023a). In the era of LLMs, model merging has become an important solution for model collaboration, usually employing basic merging methods and demonstrate the effectiveness. This section focuses on the merging techniques that are proven to be effective for LLMs<sup>2</sup>.

Current studies on model merging typically focus on two key issues: merging to approach a relatively optimal solution (M-ROS) and merging to enhance multi-task capability (M-MTC). Research on M-ROS is based on the finding that gradient-optimized solutions often converge near the boundary of a wide flat region rather than at the central point (Izmailov et al., 2018). Model merging offers a way to approach this relatively optimal point, thereby yielding a stronger model. M-MTC, on the other hand, aims to utilize model merging techniques to enrich a single model with capabilities across multiple tasks (Ilharco et al., 2023; Yadav et al., 2023). In the following subsection, we will introduce the techniques for each objective and their application to LLMs.

It is important to note that for both M-ROS and M-MTC, current model merging methods are applicable only to models with the same architecture and parameters within the same space. Therefore, most candidate models for merging should be trained with identical initialization. For instance, the candidate models  $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k\}$  should be fine-tuned from the same pre-trained model  $\mathcal{M}_0$ . This requirement ensures compatibility and coherence among the model parameters, promoting successful merging. Unfortunately, for models with incompatible parameters, such as LLaMA and QWen, current merging techniques are ineffective.

<sup>2</sup>Some advanced methods, such as merging after neuron alignments - like OT Fusion (Singh and Jaggi, 2020), Re-Basin techniques (Peña et al., 2023; Ainsworth et al., 2023), and REPAIR (Jordan et al., 2023) - have not been widely explored for LLMs. We leave the implementation of these techniques on LLMs for future work.

### 3.1 Merging for Relatively Optimal Solution (M-ROS)

Machine learning models, particularly deep learning models, often fail to achieve precisely optimal solutions during training (Li et al., 2023a). Researchers have demonstrated that the local optima of modern deep neural networks are connected by simple curves, and the paths along these curves can maintain nearly constant training and test accuracy. This indicates that different local optima in the weight space are not isolated but can be connected through low-loss paths (Garipov et al., 2018). The model obtained by the weighted averaging method can be considered a point on the low-loss path. Parameter averaging integrates the advantages of different models by averaging various local optima, reducing the bias and variance of individual models (Rame et al., 2022).

To improve model performance, M-ROS methods have been proposed. These methods aim to combine the parameters of multiple models, merging relatively optimized points into a better one. We categorize these methods into two groups: *Simple Average* and *Weighted Average*. Although initially developed for small deep models, these techniques are also effective for LLMs. We will first introduce the basic M-ROS methodologies and then discuss their application to LLMs.

#### 3.1.1 Basic M-ROS Methodologies

**Simple Average** Simple parameter averaging is a kinds of methods used to combine the parameters of multiple fine-tuned models with equal coefficients (Guo et al., 2023), thus creating a stronger one (Singh and Jaggi, 2020). Empirical evidence shows that these fused models often outperform individual models in terms of accuracy, robustness and stability. For  $k$  candidate models,  $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \dots, \mathcal{M}_k\}$ , simple parameter averaging can be formalized as:

$$\theta^* = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_{\mathcal{M}_i} \quad (4)$$

where  $\theta_{\mathcal{M}_i}$  refers to the parameters of  $i$ -th model and  $\theta^*$  is the merged parameters.

To maximize the benefits of multiple models, Model Soup (Wortsman et al., 2022) introduces Uniform Soup and Greedy Soup. Uniform Soup simply averages the model parameters. Greedy Soup adds models to the pool one at a time, ensuring each new model either improves or maintains

performance on a validation set. Similarly, DiWA (Rame et al., 2022) ranks candidate models by their performance on the validation set and adds new models only if they enhance performance. Typically, Greedy Soup and DiWA average the parameters of selected models for inference.

**Weighted Average** Weighted averaging allows for the assignment of different coefficients to individual models based on their significance or quality, ensuring a better merging. For trained networks with significant weight differences, the simple averaging method often performs poorly (Singh and Jaggi, 2020). Therefore, selecting appropriate merging coefficients for different models becomes a crucial factor. Weighted averaging can be formalized as:

$$\theta^* = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \cdot \theta_{\mathcal{M}_i} \quad (5)$$

where  $\alpha_i$  refers to the normalized coefficient for the candidate model  $\mathcal{M}_i$ .

Currently, several methods are available to find the optimal merging coefficients. For instance, Learned Soup (Wortsman et al., 2022) optimizes the mixing coefficients on a validation set to minimize the loss function, thereby combining the strengths of multiple models to enhance overall performance. Matena and Raffel (2022) propose to utilize *Fisher Information Matrix* to measure the importance of parameters of models fine-tuned with different random seeds, and employ the importance scores as coefficients to merge them. Furthermore, Jang et al. (2024) propose a method based on geometric relationships, interpolating fine-tuned models based on the angular divergence between parameters.

#### 3.1.2 Adaptation to LLMs

The above model merging techniques have been successfully adapted to LLMs for the objective of acquiring stronger LLMs and enhancing RLHF.

**Acquiring Stronger LLMs** To obtain stronger LLMs, some studies propose novel methods tailored for LLMs. Wan et al. (2024b) suggest calculating the merging coefficients based on the variation ratio of parameter matrices before and after fine-tuning. Similarly, Liu et al. (2024b) propose leveraging LLM checkpoints saved during pre-training, in conjunction with Bayesian optimization, to navigate the extensive search space




Figure 4: Illustration of the parameter conflicts. The direction denoting sign and length denoting magnitude of task vectors. The conflicts occur when the task vectors have opposite signs.

and identify optimal merging coefficients. To address concerns about gradient mismatch, Lin et al. (2023) introduce an adaptive method that assigns different combination ratios to various layers of the model, optimizing these combinations to balance human preference alignment and pre-training proficiency.

Other studies employ existing model merging techniques to create stronger LLMs for specific objectives. For example, Fu et al. (2024a) propose a disperse-then-merge framework, which first train multiple sub-models using different instruction-tuning data portions and then fuse them into a single LLM with weighted merging.

**Enhancing RLHF** Model merging techniques also help improve the alignment of LLMs with human preferences. Lin et al. (2023) present an adaptive method where different combination ratios are assigned to various layers of the model, optimizing these combinations to balance human preference alignment and pretraining proficiency. Ram’e et al. (2024) propose fine-tuning multiple reward models and then averaging their parameters to create a superior reward model that aligns better with human preferences. Similarly, Fu et al. (2024b) use a weighted averaging approach to improve alignment in LLMs during the supervised fine-tuning (SFT), effectively reducing the impact of data bias. Lu et al. (2024b) propose to use model merging technique to reduce alignment taxes during RLHF training for LLMs.

### 3.2 Merging for Enhancing Multi-Task Capability (M-MTC)

Recently, some studies have attempted to merge models with different capability to construct a unified model with multi-task capability (Li et al., 2022). Typically, these models are fine-tuned from the same pre-trained model but with different task-specific data, leading to divergence in their param-

eter spaces. Such divergence often reflects task-related information. Consequently, M-MTC methods aim to relieve the divergence and achieve a balanced merging of models with different capabilities, thereby producing a single model capable of handling multiple tasks.

Early studies addressed the issue of divergence by using different merging coefficients for various models (§3.2.1, Weight Average), while current research prefers to extract task properties from the divergence to achieve more flexible merging (§3.2.2, Task Property). Furthermore, recent works have started to employ incremental learning techniques to enhance model merging performance (§3.2.3, Incremental Training). We separately introduce these methods in the following subsections.

#### 3.2.1 Methods based on Weighted Average

Some studies adopt weighted-average strategies (as introduced in §3.1.1) to adjust the importance of different models. Jin et al. (2022) propose Reg-Mean to selectively integrate the linear layers of Transformer models while using simple averaging for other layers, thereby minimizing the divergence between the merged model and multiple models fine-tuned on various datasets. Daheim et al. (2023) advocate refining model merging using estimates derived from the Hessian matrix, facilitating more precise adjustments to model parameters. Nathan et al. (2024) combine Fisher weighted averaging with model pruning, achieving efficient model merging.

#### 3.2.2 Methods based on Task Property

Merging methods based on weighted average emphasize the importance of parameters but overlook their task-specific properties, leading to significant performance degradation in certain tasks. Ilharco et al. (2023) find that “*Simple Averaging suffers from a 10% performance drop*”. To address this issue, recent studies introduce a new paradigm known as the *task vector*. Ilharco et al. (2023) define the task vector  $\tau_t$  as “*a vector specifies a direction in the parameter space of a pre-trained model, such that movement in that direction improves performance on the task*”, which can be formalized as:

$$\tau_t = \theta_t^{\text{ft}} - \theta^{\text{pre}} \quad (6)$$

where  $\theta_t^{\text{ft}}$  refers to the parameters fine-tuned with the specific data for task  $t$ , and  $\theta^{\text{pre}}$  refers to the original parameters of the pre-trained model.

Task vector can more effectively resolve parameter conflicts during the model merging. As illustrated in Figure 4, using the pre-trained model as a reference, the variation in the direction of task vectors of the fine-tuned models indicates the presence of conflicts in the parameter space. To address parameter conflicts problem, recent studies aim to exploring methods to mitigate conflicts and strike a balance between the different models. *Parameter Conflict* methods resolve parameter conflicts at same position of parameters, while *Fewer Parameter* methods identify and prune redundant parameters to reduce conflict. In addition, we introduce a tool that includes some methods in *Toolkit*.

**Resolving Parameter Conflicts** TASK ARITHMETIC (Ilharco et al., 2023) initially derives task vectors through arithmetic operations between fine-tuned and pre-trained parameters, as shown in equation (6). These task vectors are subsequently used to merge models for enhancing performance on target tasks. To further address the issue of parameter conflicts in model merging, TIES-MERGING (Yadav et al., 2023) identifies two primary causes of interference: redundant parameter values and sign inconsistencies across models. Building on these advancements, ADAMERGING (Yang et al., 2023) reduces conflicts even further by considering the importance of different model parameters. METAGPT (Zhou et al., 2024a) proposes efficient methods based on ADAMERGING and TASK ARITHMETIC. Akiba et al. (2024) propose a merging method for LLMs, which not only employ TIES-MERGING for merging in parameter space, but also adopt evolutionary algorithms to optimize the data inference path inside the merge model. The above methods have been successfully adapted to LLMs. Kim et al. (2024) apply the above methods to fuse the LLMs obtain a stronger LLM evaluator. Hammoud et al. (2024) investigate the effects of above methods on LLM safety alignment.

Unlike the aforementioned task vector based methods to resolve conflicting parameters, Stoica et al. (2024) propose ZIPIT that retains similar parameters from another perspective. ZIPIT first identifies highly correlated parameters between different models. It then merges these parameters while retaining significantly different layers, thus improving the merging flexibility.

**Pruning Redundant Parameters** Given that conflicts may exist in the parameters of different models, another solution is to employ pruning tech-

niques to reduce these conflicts before merging. Such methods further enhances the relevance of parameters to the task, and we introduce these methods separately. DARE (Yu et al., 2023), a technique that efficiently reduces redundancy in fine-tuned language models by dropping and rescaling parameters. DELLA-MERGING (Deep et al., 2024) further selects important parameters for fusion on the basis of DARE. As domain-specific data and training techniques grow, the distinctions between fine-tuned models and their base models become more significant. However, DARE experiences significant performance drops, resulting in insufficient capability to process multiple domains effectively. DPPA (Zhu et al., 2024) presents a dual-stage pruning approach as Dynamic Pruning Partition Amplification (DPPA) for effectively merging divergent fine-tuned large language models across different domains.

**Toolkit** Recently, Goddard et al. (2024) have developed Arcee’s MergeKit, an open-source toolkit that integrates various model merging methods, including Model Soups, DARE, and TIES-MERGING. This toolkit significantly advances the application of model merging strategies in LLMs<sup>3</sup>.

### 3.2.3 Methods based on Incremental Training

The aforementioned methods still suffer from performance degradation. Therefore, several approaches involving incremental training have been proposed to restore their original performance. Concrete TA/AM (Tang et al., 2023) aims to find a shared low-dimensional subspace within the model parameter space to minimize task interference without significantly impacting performance. Surgery (Yang et al., 2024a) introduces a representation surgery technique to mitigate representation bias in multi-task model fusion.

## 4 Ensemble

Ensemble learning is another effective collaboration strategy that differs from model merging methods by focusing on the combination of model outputs. Traditional techniques like Adaboost (Freund and Schapire, 1997), Bagging (Breiman, 1996), and Stacking (Wolpert, 1992) have significantly advanced machine learning research. In the era of LLMs, ensemble learning continues to be crucial, enhancing the overall performance of various LLMs.

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/arcee-ai/mergokit>



However, LLMs typically solve various tasks through text generation, resulting in more flexible and naturally expressive outputs. Therefore, traditional ensemble methods designed for classification tasks cannot be directly applied to LLMs. To address this issue, many studies explore specific ensemble methodologies tailored for various LLMs<sup>4</sup>. Additionally, the benefits of ensemble learning have inspired research into various applications of these techniques. In the following sections, we will separately introduce LLM ensemble methodologies and applications in detail.

## 4.1 LLM Ensemble Methodology

For different inputs, LLM that performs best is not always the same, prompting extensive research into ensemble methods for LLMs. Unlike classification-based machine learning models, LLMs typically generate a sequence of tokens as output. This output is often discrete, making direct ensemble challenging. Additionally, structural differences between various LLMs result in vocabularies and output distributions that are difficult to unify, further complicating ensemble strategies (Xu et al., 2024b).

Since ensemble generally occurs during the inference period, we categorize and introduce existing ensemble methods employed BEFORE, DURING, and AFTER the inference period. As illustrated in Figure 5, ensemble methods BEFORE inference select the most suitable LLM for different input examples, ensemble methods DURING inference combine outputs at each decoding step, and ensemble methods AFTER inference aim to select the best response from several outputs generated by various LLMs.

### 4.1.1 Ensemble BEFORE Inference

Such methods aim to select the best LLM for specific examples before inference. Similar but different from various Mixture-of-Expert (MOE) approaches (Jacobs et al., 1991; Collobert et al., 2003; Eigen et al., 2013; Fedus et al., 2022; Jiang et al., 2024), which learn sparse networks from scratch, ensemble BEFORE Inference focuses on training external routers (Rosenbaum et al., 2017) for several pre-trained LLMs to achieve optimal LLM selection.

<sup>4</sup>It is worth noting that many studies explore self-ensemble approaches, such as self-consistency (Wang et al., 2023b) and rationale augmentation (Wang et al., 2022). Our survey focuses on ensembles across different LLMs and does not cover these methods.

Shnitzer et al. (2023) take the lead to explore the feasibility and limitations of learning routers by using various benchmark datasets. Lu et al. (2023) introduce ZOOTER, a system that first employs a reward model to calculate scores for query-output pairs using the training set. These scores are then utilized to train a router using the knowledge distillation strategy, allowing it to select the optimal LLM based solely on input queries. Ding et al. (2024) employ a router that assigns queries to either a small model or LLMs based on the predicted query difficulty and the required quality level, significantly reducing inference costs. Srivatsa et al. (2024) investigate the feasibility of classifier-based and clustering-based routing methods for LLMs. Inspired by self-play in reinforcement learning, Mohammadshahi et al. (2024) train the router by recycling the self-produced triplets, (*query, response, score*). Unlike previous studies, Lu et al. (2024c) integrate multiple Chat LLMs by randomly selecting an LLM at each turn in the dialogue, rather than learning a router. To effectively evaluate the router capability and limitations, Hu et al. (2024) propose a new benchmark, ROUTERBENCH, mainly focusing on performance and economic cost.

### 4.1.2 Ensemble DURING Inference

During the inference period, LLMs generate tokens auto-regressively. This process often results in early errors compounding over time, causing subsequent tokens to deviate from the intended meaning (Ranzato et al., 2016) and leading to hallucinations (Zhang et al., 2023a).

To address this problem, some studies perform ensemble LLMs at each decoding step. Li et al. (2024c) combine untrusted LLMs with a benign smaller LLM by weighted-averaging the output distributions, mitigating issues such as copyright infringement, data poisoning, and privacy violations. Hoang et al. (2023) interpolate the output distributions from the machine translation model and the LLM, boosting translation performance. Wang et al. (2024b) formulate the *Frugal Fusion of Experts* problem and proposes an efficient fusion method by addressing it as a graph shortest path problem. These methods require the ensemble to occur among LLMs which must at least have the same vocabulary. This restriction ensures that the output distributions are aligned and can be interpolated effectively.

However, most open-source LLMs are heterogeneous and have different vocabularies, hinder-




Figure 5: The illustrations of LLM *ensemble* methods BEFORE (a), DURING (b), AFTER (c) inference.

ing direct ensembling. To address this issue, Fu et al. (2023) employ dynamic programming to recursively minimize the total cost measured by the exact match scores of editing one sequence of tokens to match another. To further enhance the success rate of token alignments, Wan et al. (2024a) replace the exact match constraint with a minimum edit distance strategy. Mavromatis et al. (2024) follow the above token alignments, proposing the use of perplexity to compute the coefficients for the outputs of diverse LLMs during ensemble. Xu et al. (2024b), Huang et al. (2024c), and (Yu et al., 2024) consider overlapping tokens as anchors to project the output distribution produced by heterogeneous LLMs into the same space. Specifically, Xu et al. (2024b) propose to directly learn the projection matrices between different vocabularies using the anchors as bridges, while Huang et al. (2024c) and Yu et al. (2024) calculate the relative representations from anchors to different vocabularies, thereby indirectly achieving the vocabulary projection.

#### 4.1.3 Ensemble AFTER Inference

The final LLM ensemble methods combine the generated outputs AFTER the inference period.

One approach to achieving the LLM ensemble involves building LLM cascades to reduce the inference cost associated with using large LLMs exclusively. Chen et al. (2023d) employ a sequence of LLMs ranked by the number of parameters to generate outputs, halting the process and returning results once a preceding smaller LLM produces outputs of sufficient quality. Yue et al. (2024) propose verifying the correctness of answers generated by a smaller LLM first and utilizing LLMs to solve the problem if the initial answer is incorrect.

Another line of research focuses on selecting the best candidate from several produced by various

LLMs. Lee et al. (2023) select the best instruction from several candidates produced by LLMs for instruction-tuning data construction. Jiang et al. (2023a) explore various unsupervised metrics for selection, including BERTScore (Zhang\* et al., 2020), BLEURT (Sellam et al., 2020), BARTScore (Yuan et al., 2021), and ChatGPT scores. However, they find that the effectiveness of the selection is constrained by the quality of candidate pools. To address this problem, Jiang et al. (2023a) adopt an additional fusion model to generate the final output using the top-ranked candidates as inputs.

#### 4.1.4 Discussion about LLM Ensemble Methods

The methods described above focus on ensemble techniques at different stages of inference, each with its own strengths and weaknesses. We discuss them in terms of *inference speed*, *ensemble granularity*, and *limitations*.

**Inference Speed** *Almost all ensemble methods decrease inference speed.* Ensemble methods BEFORE inference slightly slow down the process, as they involve selecting the optimal LLM via additional routers. Ensemble methods DURING inference require each LLM to perform forward computation for test examples. If we have  $k$  LLMs, the inference speed will slow down by a factor of  $k$ , although this can be mitigated by using  $k$  times the number of GPUs. Ensemble methods AFTER inference not only require  $k$  times the computational cost but also spend additional time on output selection or fusion (Jiang et al., 2023a), resulting in the lowest inference speed.

**Ensemble Granularity** The aforementioned ensemble methods operate at different levels of granularity. Ensemble methods BEFORE and AFTER in-

Inference Stage	Inference Speed	Ensemble Granularity	Limitations & Challenge
BEFORE	↘	<i>example-level</i>	Accuracy of Routers
DURING	↘↘	<i>token-level</i>	Heterogeneous Architectures
AFTER	↘↘↘	<i>example-level</i>	Accuracy of Candidate Pools

Table 1: The characteristic of LLM ensemble methods employed at different inference stages.

ference typically work at the example level, providing a coarse-grained ensemble. Ensemble methods DURING inference perform ensemble at the token level, offering a fine-grained approach. Since preceding tokens often influence succeeding tokens, this fine-grained ensemble can reduce exposure bias (Ranzato et al., 2015; Xu et al., 2020) and decrease hallucination in LLMs, thus holding better potential for performance enhancement.

**Limitations** Each category of ensemble methods have specific limitations, as shown in Table 1. Although ensemble methods BEFORE inference offer better speed, they require additional training of the router. The data used for router training can limit the generalization and performance of these ensemble methods (Shnitzer et al., 2023). Ensemble methods DURING inference are typically constrained by the heterogeneous architecture of LLMs. For example, differences in vocabularies can lead to non-corresponding output distributions, hindering direct ensemble (Huang et al., 2024c; Yu et al., 2024). Ensemble methods AFTER inference often require multiple LLMs to generate several candidates, construct a candidate pool, and then select or reorganize the final output. Thus, the accuracy of the candidate pool (Jiang et al., 2023a) and the selection strategy are the main limitations.

## 4.2 LLM Ensemble Application

In addition to methodological research, many studies apply LLM ensembles to specific applications. This is due to the capability of ensemble learning ability on specific tasks, domains and strong calibration. We categorize these related studies based on their objectives.

### LLM Ensemble for Specific Tasks or Domains

Ensemble learning for LLMs are typically employed for specific tasks. Si et al. (2023) improve LLM reasoning performance by training a classifier to select the best answer generated by various reasoning experts. Gundabathula and Kolar (2024) employ LLM ensemble for SQL generation. Some studies employ LLM ensemble for medical tasks.

Gundabathula and Kolar (2024) adopt LLM ensemble to enhance the clinical text error detection and correction. Oniani et al. (2023) and Barabucci et al. (2024) utilize majority voting and average weighting, respectively, to select the most frequent candidate disease.

### LLM Ensemble for Overestimation Mitigation in RLHF

Ensemble learning can alleviate the poor calibration and unreliable prediction problems of LLMs. Therefore, Eisenstein et al. (2023), Coste et al. (2024) and Ramé et al. (2024) perform ensemble with multiple reward LLMs to mitigate the overoptimization problem in RLHF. Considering that fine-tuning reward models based on LLMs can be computationally expensive, Zhang et al. (2024c) and Zhai et al. (2023) respectively employ lightweight LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) to adapt the LLM to multiple reward models. Ahmed et al. (2024) propose using a shared LLM but separate linear heads for reward ensemble. These methods successfully reduce the overestimation in RLHF and improve the alignment performance..

## 5 Cooperation

In the era of LLMs, collaborative strategies extend beyond mere merging or ensemble. Increasingly, studies are focusing on broader approaches to solving various problems or specific tasks through cooperation between LLMs. In the following sections, we introduce the cooperation strategies based on their objectives: *efficient computation* (§5.1), *knowledge transferring* (§5.2), *compensatory cooperation* (§5.3), *federated cooperation* (§5.4).

### 5.1 Efficient Computation

As LLMs grow in scale, the computational resources required for their inference increase significantly. Consequently, accelerating model inference has become an urgent necessity. Smaller LLMs play a crucial role in accelerating larger LLMs due to their lightweight nature (Miao et al., 2023). Research on model acceleration through cooperation can be divided into two main categories: Input Compression (§5.1.1) and Speculative Decoding

(§5.1.2). Input Compression achieves efficient computation by using smaller LLMs to compress inputs, thereby reducing the context length. Speculative Decoding involves leveraging smaller LLMs to draft multiple tokens speculatively, with larger LLMs verifying these draft tokens in parallel.

### 5.1.1 Input Compression




Figure 6: LLMs cooperate with compression module for input compression.

Input compression aims to use small models to compress input prompts or long text content. When processing long input sequences, the self-attention mechanism of LLMs results in significant increases in computational cost and memory usage due to its quadratic time complexity (Xu et al., 2024a). Input compression reduces computational costs, memory usage, and access costs by shortening input lengths and reducing the number of tokens the model needs to handle during the pre-fill phase, thereby improving memory efficiency (Wan et al., 2024c). Additionally, input compression accelerates token generation in autoregressive decoding by shortening input sequence lengths, thus enhancing inference efficiency.

Zhou et al. (2024c) propose a review on efficient inference, where input compression being a significant part of the review. Input compression mainly focuses on *prompt pruning*, *prompt summarization*, and *soft prompt compression*. The core idea of prompt pruning is to delete unimportant tokens, sentences, or documents in the input prompt based on predefined or learnable importance metrics. Prompt summarization aims to compress the original prompt into a shorter summary while retaining similar semantic information. Soft prompt compression involves designing a soft prompt which is a sequence of learnable continuous tokens. It is much shorter than the original prompt and will be utilized as the input for LLMs.

Among the above-mentioned methods, they usually need to cooperate with a compression model, such as a summarization model, to achieve the input compression.

**Prompt Pruning** The core idea behind the prompt pruning is to remove unimportant tokens, sentences, or documents, where the cooperation model targets at prompt pruning. Ali et al. (2024) utilize graph-construct model to obtain a graph from the textual information in the prompt and extracting key information elements from the graph to obtain the compressed prompt. Pan et al. (2024) introduce the LLMLingua-2 distillation method, which classifies each input token using a Transformer encoder. Then it preserves the top  $N$  tokens with the highest classifying probability, capturing all key information for prompt compression. (Huang et al., 2024b) propose a coarse-to-fine pruner that initially identifies crucial CoT examples from a large batch and then further prunes the unimportant tokens.

**Prompt Summarization** The core idea of prompt summarization is to condense the original prompt into a shorter summary which preserves the same semantic information, where the cooperation model is an extractive or abstractive summarization model. Liu et al. (2023) propose two compression methods. The first method trains a summarization model to compress the context. The second method further reduces the number of tokens by deleting words with less semantic impact. RECOMP (Xu et al., 2023) introduces an abstractive compressor that takes a question and retrieved documents as input to produce a concise summary. Then the LLM generate the answer based on the concise summary. SemanticCompression (Fei et al., 2023) proposes a method that breaks text into sentences, groups sentences by topic, and then summarizes each group with pre-trained model. Finally, the LLM generate the response based on all the groups. To address the different tasks, Li et al. (2024b) propose PCToolkit, which consists compressors that are developed with different targets.

**Soft Prompt Compression** Soft prompt compression involves using virtual tokens to assist in prompt compression, where the cooperation model is a text feature extractor. For example, SelfCP (Gao, 2024a) uses a frozen LLM as an encoder and decoder, inserting special tokens into the prompt to generate virtual tokens, thereby achieving prompt

compression and response generation collaboration. (Gao, 2024b) projects candidate demonstrations into virtual tokens via a LLM during in-context learning, then it selects appropriate demonstrations based on semantic similarity. Finally, it generates the response using a frozen LLM.

In general, we can observe that from *prompt pruning* to *prompt summarization* to *soft prompt compression*, the compression ratios increase which results in higher efficiency. However, the corresponding information loss is also greater.

### 5.1.2 Speculative Decoding




Figure 7: LLMs cooperate with draft generator for speculative decoding.

The primary focus of decoding acceleration is to cooperate smaller models to generate drafts, which are then verified by larger models to expedite inference (Stern et al., 2018). This approach is currently referred to as speculative decoding (Leviathan et al., 2023; Xia et al., 2023). Xia et al. (2024) summarize various drafting strategies, including Independent Drafting and Self-Drafting. The drafted tokens are then verified in parallel by the target LLM, with verification methods such as Greedy Decoding (Gu et al., 2017) and Nucleus Sampling (Holtzman et al., 2020b). The acceleration effect of speculative decoding largely depends on the acceptance rate of drafted tokens at each step. This acceptance rate is influenced by several factors, including the quality of the drafts, the verification criteria, and the behavioral consistency between the drafter and the target LLM.

For instance, Ou et al. (2024) propose the use of an adaptive  $N$ -gram model based on the current context for the rapid drafting phase, followed by a verification phase where the original LLM evaluates and confirms the proposed tokens. In addition to using draft models to reduce the number of actual

model predictions, some studies have introduced early stopping mechanisms. This method terminates the prediction process early based on specific conditions, thereby saving computational resources. For example, Huang et al. (2024a) and Liu et al. (2024c) propose using probabilistic predictions to assess the acceptance rate of draft model’s hypotheses, deciding whether to continue generating more drafts based on predefined thresholds. Furthermore, Liu et al. (2024d) incorporate an early stopping mechanism after the initial  $N$  layers of the model during draft hypothesis generation.

## 5.2 Knowledge Transfer via Cooperation

LLMs typically encompass various capabilities. However, due to the difficulty in obtaining training data and the high training costs, directly transferring knowledge or capabilities from one LLM to another has attracted significant attention. Considering that the output probabilities of LLMs often contain the embedded knowledge of the models, recent methods have primarily focused on transferring knowledge between LLMs. For example, Wan et al. (2024a,b) transfer knowledge from multiple LLMs to a target model via continued training with knowledge distillation (Hinton et al., 2015). Nonetheless, most of the recently proposed methods focus on cooperation at the inference stage without involving training and can be categorized based on their objectives: *Mitigating Incorrect Knowledge*, *Strengthening Correct Knowledge*, and *Supplying New Knowledge*.

### 5.2.1 Mitigating Incorrect Knowledge

Hallucination (Rawte et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023) and bias (Wang et al., 2024a) are common issues in LLMs. Ji et al. (2023) argue that LLMs trained with the next-word prediction objective store superficial patterns instead of recognizing real-world knowledge extracted from the training corpora. Therefore, many studies aim to explore cooperation methods for removing incorrect knowledge existed in the output logits.

Drawing on the observation that the shortcomings of larger LLMs are even more pronounced in smaller ones, Li et al. (2023b) propose Contrastive Decoding (CD). CD encourages token  $y_i$  selection from the delta distribution between LLMs and their corresponding weaker, amateur models, thereby eliminating incorrect knowledge from output distri-

### Who discovered the law of gravity?




Figure 8: Illustration of core idea of CD. The amateur model is more prone to errors, thus the target LLMs needs to reconsider the answer accordingly.

butions:

$$y_i \sim \underbrace{\log p_{\text{LLM}}(y_i|y_{<i})}_{\text{vanilla distribution}} - \underbrace{\log p_{\text{AMA}}(y_i|y_{<i})}_{\text{amateur distribution}} \quad (7)$$

This work has significantly inspired subsequent studies. Some studies employ CD to enhance reasoning capabilities. O'Brien and Lewis (2023) demonstrate that CD improves reasoning for LLMs by preventing certain abstract reasoning errors. Phan et al. (2024) utilize distillation techniques to obtain amateur models and perform contrastive decoding to enhance reasoning capabilities. Additionally, some studies use CD for trustworthy generation. Waldendorf et al. (2024) experiment with CD in various amateur models for machine translation, showing that CD reduces hallucinations in large multilingual machine translation models. Liu et al. (2021) employ CD for language detoxification and sentiment-controlled generation. Zhang et al. (2023b) and Niu et al. (2024) induce hallucinations or toxic content into LLMs by fine-tuning with non-factual or toxic examples and then use these models as amateurs for contrastive decoding. Qu et al. (2024) leverage counterfactual CD for distractor generation. Some studies explore diverse contrastive strategies. Shi et al. (2024) observe that output distributions from an MoE model using different routing strategies differ substantially, thus they utilize unchosen experts as the amateur model to achieve contrastive decoding. Yuan et al. (2023) combine CD with speculative decoding to achieve both acceleration in decoding and quality improvements.

Although CD can help mitigate incorrect knowledge during inference, LLMs and the corresponding amateur models typically belong to the same family and require aligned output distributions.

## 5.2.2 Strengthening Correct Knowledge

Beside mitigating hallucination or bias from the output distributions, another line of research focuses on enhancing the faithfulness of decoding outputs to the input or instructions through LLMs cooperation. This typically involves using additional models to strengthen the correct knowledge - increasing the likelihood of potentially correct outputs. This line of research can be traced back to studies on attribute-controlled text generation, which encourage language models to output tokens that effectively predict the input attributes, thereby improving faithfulness. Notable examples include FUDGE (Yang and Klein, 2021) and GEDI (Krause et al., 2021), which are based on Bayesian factorization:

$$p(y_i|y_{<i}, c) \propto p(y_i|y_{<i}) \cdot p(c|y_i, y_{<i}) \quad (8)$$

$$y_i \sim \underbrace{\log p_{\text{LLM}}(y_i|y_{<i})}_{\text{vanilla distribution}} + \underbrace{\log p_{\text{VER}}(c|y_i, y_{<i})}_{\text{verification}} \quad (9)$$

where  $c$  is the input attribute and  $\log p(c|y_i, y_{<i})$  is derived from additionally learned attribute predictors, namely *verifier*. It should be noted that any suitable model, including the LLM itself, can serve as the *verifier*.

### Who discovered the law of gravity?




Figure 9: Illustration of core idea of *verification* based methods. The LLM *verifier* needs to check and assist selecting the correct output from candidates.

Recently, Deng and Raffel (2023) employ an auxiliary reward model as the verifier to encourage LLMs to generate text that has certain properties. Tu et al. (2023) verify each decoding position according to equation (9) in language generation tasks, enhancing the faithfulness of LLMs. To achieve accurate verification with sufficient information, Lu et al. (2024a) introduce DIVER, which employs dynamic token spans that can potentially be generated to calculate point-wise mutual information (PMI) for verification. Additionally, they

demonstrate that using smaller LLMs for verification can alleviate the decrease in inference speed without significantly affecting performance.

### 5.2.3 Supplying New Knowledge

Recently, some studies have observed that the variation of output logits reflect the variation of LLMs capabilities. Inspired by this, they propose to tune larger LLMs without training. Instead, they modify the output logits to provide new capabilities extracted smaller LLMs:

$$\log p_{\text{LARGE-C}}(y_i|y_{<i}) \propto \underbrace{\log p_{\text{LARGE}}(y_i|y_{<i})}_{\text{vanilla distribution}} + \underbrace{[\log p_{\text{SMALL-C}}(y_i|y_{<i}) - \log p_{\text{SMALL}}(y_i|y_{<i})]}_{\text{capability reflection}} \quad (10)$$

where LARGE-C and SMALL-C refers to models with specific capability while LARGE and SMALL refers to the original models.

Ormazabal et al. (2023) and Liu et al. (2024a) separately propose emulated tuning and proxy tuning, extracting *Chat* capability from smaller LLMs and integrate the capability into larger LLMs with the aforementioned equation (10). Zhao et al. (2024b) employ safe and unsafe smaller models to adversarially modify a significantly larger safe model’s decoding probabilities, achieving jailbreaking for LLMs.

The above methods require that both small and large LLMs share the same vocabulary. To address this issue, Zhou et al. (2024b) introduce *weak-to-strong search*, utilizing the log-likelihood difference between small tuned and untuned LLMs as rewards to guide the decoding of larger LLMs with tree search, mitigating the need for shared vocabularies.

## 5.3 Compensatory Cooperation

In practical applications, large models still face some uncontrollable issues due to their lack of interpretability (Zhao et al., 2024a). Therefore, it is necessary to introduce additional controllers to compensate for the deficiencies of LLMs. Depending on the desired properties, controllers can be served as: 1) detector, 2) retriever, etc..

### 5.3.1 Detector

LLMs may generate incorrect responses or hallucinations due to a lack of relevant knowledge. Therefore, detecting hallucinations in LLMs is crucial




Figure 10: LLMs cooperate with detector.

for ensuring the reliability and credibility of generated content. We introduce related work from two types of hallucinations: factual hallucinations and faithfulness hallucinations.

**Factual Hallucinations.** Factuality hallucination emphasizes the discrepancy between generated content and verifiable real-world facts (Bai et al., 2024). Current mainstream methods for detecting factual hallucinations can be divided into: 1) retrieve external facts: identifying factual inaccuracies by comparing the model-generated content against external knowledge sources (Min et al., 2023b; Tang et al., 2024). 2) uncertainty estimation: retrieving external facts introduces additional cost. Therefore, several methods rely on internal knowledge to alleviate hallucinations (Chen et al., 2024; Tsai et al., 2024). Among them, the cooperation studies of LLMs mainly falls into the first category.

Some studies directly utilizes additional models as detectors to identify fact errors in the output of LLMs. RARR (Gao et al., 2022) leverages a NLI model to evaluate the factuality between the generated sentences and evidence. Consider that some evidence may not fully support a claim, thus Factcheck (Wang et al., 2023c) identifies the stance of evidences and gathers the relevant evidence, then it uses RARR to determine whether the gathered evidence supports the original text. Additionally, to detect the factuality of the model regarding complex multi-step problems, PROGRAMFC (Pan et al., 2023) decomposes complex claims into simpler sub-tasks that can be solved using question-answer module, NLI module, in-context learning module. However, single-pass verification cannot fully utilize the experience gained from similar cases and may repeat past errors. Therefore, SALAM (Wang and Li, 2023) exploits a auxiliary model to assist the main LLM in learning from mistakes through interactive cooperation model.

Other studies exploits auxiliary models to col-

lect relevant evidence for verification (Chen et al., 2023c; Huo et al., 2023; Ousidhoum et al., 2022; Yao et al., 2022). Huo et al. (2023) adopt information retrieval model to obtain related passages for factual detecting. The retrieved documents contain up to several thousand words, which becomes cumbersome for both humans and models to make a judgment based on them. Therefore, Chen et al. (2023c) compress retrieved text with an summarization model and obtains relevant claims, which is provided for verifying the fact of LLMs output.

**Faithfulness Hallucinations.** Faithfulness hallucination refers to the divergence of generated content from user instructions or the context provided by the input (Bai et al., 2024). The current mainstream methods for detecting faithfulness hallucinations can be divided into: 1) rule-based: which measures the overlap of pivotal facts between the generated content and the source content (Nan et al., 2021; Goodrich et al., 2019); 2) classifier-based, leveraging trained classifiers to obtain the degree of entailment between the generated and the source content (Falke et al., 2019; Mishra et al., 2021); 3) QA-driven, employing question-answering systems to verify the consistency between the generated and the source content; 4) uncertainty estimation, which evaluates faithfulness by assessing the model’s confidence in its generated outputs; 5) prompting-based, where LLMs are prompted to function as evaluators, assessing the faithfulness of generated content through specific prompting strategies. Among these, the collaborative studies of LLMs mainly falls into categories 2) and 3). Their difference mainly lies in the use of different cooperation models for hallucination detection.

The classifier-based methods employ NLI models to filter out generated sentences that is not supported by the fact of evidence document (Chen et al., 2023b; Wang et al., 2024c). Chen et al. (2023b) exploit an NLI model to make entailment decisions for each document sentence and answer sentence pair, then aggregates the results by taking the maximum value over all the pairs. To avoid obtaining hallucinated information in the process of retrieval, Wang et al. (2024c) utilize an NLI model to determine whether the retrived passages indeed entail the target information. The QA-driven methods apply QA model to obtain the faithfulness of the generation. Qiu et al. (2023) formulate faithfulness evaluation as binary classification problem. Then it develop a classifier to distill knowledge

from QAFactEval (Fabbri et al., 2022).

In brief, by collaborating with a different detectors, LLMs can often verify or correct some errors, thereby alleviating the issue of uncontrolled content generation.

### 5.3.2 Retriever




Figure 11: LLMs cooperate with retriever.

The information possessed by LLMs is limited. To extend the knowledge of large models, retrieval augmentation generation (RAG) (Gao et al., 2024) aims to use external data sources to assist text generation. Collaborative models serve as bridges to external knowledge, assisting in the retrieval of information. The cooperation models for retrieving different types of data vary significantly, including: 1) unstructured data; 2) structured data.

For unstructured data, such as text, some studies retrieve world knowledge to expand the corpus of the LLMs. Izacard et al. (2022) start by retrieving the top-k relevant documents from a large corpus of text with Contriever (Izacard et al., 2021). Then, these documents are fed to the LLM, along with the query, which in turns generates the output. Besides, it is inconvenient to train language models with special cross attention mechanisms to encode the retrieved text. Thus REPLUG (Ma et al., 2023a) treats the LLMs as a black box and augments it with a tuneable retrieval model. Ma et al. (2023b) note that there is inevitably a gap between the input text and the needed knowledge in retrieval. Therefore, to better align the query to the retriever, it adopts a small language model as a trainable rewriter to cater to the black-box LLM reader. However, query rewriting lacks the utilization of effective and general signals. Therefore, RaFe (Mao et al., 2024) first trains an initial query rewriting model by standard supervised fine-tuning. Subsequently, it utilizes the ranking scores from the reranker to conduct feedback training on the query rewriting model.



For structured data, such as knowledge graph and SQL, it requires additional effort to convert structured data to text (Li et al., 2024d; Su et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2023a; He et al., 2024). Therefore, the retriever needs to have the ability to convert between natural language and structured language. For knowledge graph, the retriever is an entity linking model to retrieve relative structured knowledge (Su et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2023a). Additionally, for SQL knowledge, the retriever is a query generator that allows the generation of queries for various types of query languages, including SPARQL, SQL, and natural sentences (Li et al., 2024d; Zha et al., 2023).

## 5.4 Federated Cooperation




Figure 12: LLMs cooperate with client models in federated learning.

Large-scale language models have received increasing attention, but they face many challenges in real-world applications. These challenges mainly stem from the scarcity of public domain data and the need to maintain privacy for private data. To address these issues, federated learning (FL) (Li et al., 2020) has emerged as a very promising technology because it can protect private data while allowing the sharing of public models. Federated learning can be mainly divided into two parts: federated training and federated prompt engineering (Chen et al., 2023a). Existing collaborative studies are distributed across two aspects mentioned above.

### 5.4.1 Federated Training

The knowledge of the LLMs on the server can be transferred to the small language models on the client, while the unique knowledge of the client can enrich the distribution of the LLMs. Consequently, the above methods greatly expand the pre-training corpora for both LLMs and small models (Fan et al., 2024; Ye et al., 2024). To bridge the

gap in the simultaneous mutual enhancement of both the servers’ LLM and clients’ SLMs, Fan et al. (2024) develop FedMKT, a parameter-efficient federated mutual knowledge transfer framework for large and small language models. Ye et al. (2024) build a research-friendly framework, called OpenFedLLM, where multiple data owners collaboratively train a shared model without transmitting raw data. Additionally, to minimize resource consumption of parameters exchange, FedCyBGD (Wang et al., 2024d) design a compression scheme to further decrease the model download.

### 5.4.2 Federated Prompt Engineering

The goal of large model collaboration is to protect user privacy while efficiently executing commands. Therefore, using local small models to protect user privacy and cloud large models to execute user commands is a feasible approach (Zhang et al., 2024b; Li et al., 2024a; Guo et al., 2022). For example, Zhang et al. (2024b) deploy the small model locally to convert user instructions into general instructions. The large model in the cloud executes these general instructions and then returns the results to the local device. Because of discrepancies between LLMs’ generated data and clients’ domain-specific data, the existing methods cannot yield substantial improvements in the domain-specific tasks. Therefore, it introduces FDKT framework, which enables LLMs to augment data based on domain-specific few-shot demonstrations (Li et al., 2024a). Furthermore, FL may cost excessive training time for convergence and produce inaccurate models. PromptFL (Guo et al., 2022) introduces prompt learner which updates the prompts instead of the whole model. Therefore, both the local training and the global aggregation can be significantly accelerated.

In addition to the aspects discussed above, we want to emphasize that cooperation among LLMs is a very broad research area. Topics such as RLHF and the use of agents also fall under LLM cooperation. As these topics have been extensively reviewed (Kaufmann et al., 2023; Xi et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2024), we do not cover them in the current version of our paper but will address them in future work.

## 6 Challenges and Future Directions

### 6.1 Flexible LLMs Merging Methods

Current LLM merging methods are typically restricted to models with same architecture and compatible parameters. However, most open-source LLMs are heterogeneous, rendering current merging methods ineffective.

Interestingly, [Xu et al. \(2024b\)](#) demonstrate that the token embeddings of heterogeneous LLMs can be projected into a common space by using overlapping tokens as a bridge. However, this method cannot be successfully adapted to other parameters of LLMs, such as self-attention layers and feed-forward layers, due to the lack of aligned neurons and the complexity of parameter distributions. We believe that explore the highly correlated neurons ([Singh and Jaggi, 2020](#); [Peña et al., 2023](#); [Ainsworth et al., 2023](#); [Jordan et al., 2023](#); [Stolica et al., 2024](#)) in diverse LLMs hold significant potential and interest. Such advancements could revolutionize model fusion techniques, enhancing their flexibility and practicality.

### 6.2 Balanced Speed and Performance for LLM Ensemble

As we discussed in §4.1.4, different LLM ensemble methods have their own strengths and weaknesses. Achieving a balance between speed and performance can be challenging.

LLM ensemble methods employed BEFORE inference typically select a appropriate LLM for current example according to the pre-trained routers ([Shnitzer et al., 2023](#)). While these methods improve decoding speed, they are coarse-grained and do not fully harness the potential of ensemble learning. In contrast, methods used DURING inference operate at a finer granularity, achieving ensemble integration at the token level ([Xu et al., 2024b](#); [Huang et al., 2024c](#); [Yu et al., 2024](#)). Such methods can alleviate errors at each decoding step via ensemble, relieving exploration bias ([Ranzato et al., 2015](#); [Xu et al., 2020](#)) and holding greater promise for enhancing performance. However, these methods suffer from the slower inference speed. Effectively combining these two strategies may strike a balance between speed and performance improvements, benefiting practical deployments.

### 6.3 Broader Applications via Cooperation

This work primarily discusses several objectives achievable through cooperation among LLMs, in-

cluding: efficient computation, knowledge transferring, compensatory cooperation and federated cooperation. Given the remarkable emergent capabilities of LLMs, we believe that a wide range of applications can be realized through flexible and judicious cooperation between different LLMs. For example, exploring cross-domain applications, where LLMs can combine their expertise in various fields will unlock new possibilities. Additionally, human-centered collaboration is also a promising direction ([Ma et al., 2024](#)).

## 7 Conclusion

This work presents a survey of collaboration strategies for LLMs, categorized into three aspects: *merging*, *ensemble*, and *cooperation*. For each aspect, we provide a detailed classification and an in-depth review of advanced approaches. We believe that the collaboration of LLMs will play an increasingly important role in future research and hope that this paper offers valuable insights into future research directions.

## Contributions

**Jinliang Lu** designed the overall architecture of this paper and was primarily responsible for §1, §2, §4 and §5.2.

**Ziliang Pang** and **Yaochen Zhu** are responsible for the architecture of §3, Merging. Specifically, **Ziliang Pang** reviewed the literature in §3.1, §5.1, and **Yaochen Zhu** reviewed the literature in §3.2.

**Min Xiao** is responsible for the architecture of §5 Cooperation and reviewed the literature in §5.3 and §5.4, primarily categorizing the corresponding studies based on their objectives.

**Jiajun Zhang** and **Rui Xia** led the project, designed and optimized the overall architecture of the survey, responsible for reviewing the entire work.

If you have suggestions or questions about this survey, please contact with us. We are very happy to hear from you.

## References

- Ahmed M Ahmed, Rafael Rafailov, Stepan Sharkov, Xuechen Li, and Sanmi Koyejo. 2024. Scalable ensembling for mitigating reward overoptimisation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01013*.
- Samuel Ainsworth, Jonathan Hayase, and Siddhartha Srinivasa. 2023. [Git re-basin: Merging models modulo permutation symmetries](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Takuya Akiba, Makoto Shing, Yujin Tang, Qi Sun, and David Ha. 2024. [Evolutionary optimization of model merging recipes](#). *CoRR*, abs/2403.13187.
- Muhammad Asif Ali, Zhengping Li, Shu Yang, Keyuan Cheng, Yang Cao, Tianhao Huang, Lijie Hu, Lu Yu, and Di Wang. 2024. [Prompt-saw: Leveraging relation-aware graphs for textual prompt compression](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.00489.
- Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. 2023. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*.
- Zhangir Azerbayev, Hailey Schoelkopf, Keiran Paster, Marco Dos Santos, Stephen McAleer, Albert Q Jiang, Jia Deng, Stella Biderman, and Sean Welleck. 2023. Llemma: An open language model for mathematics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10631*.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*.
- Zechen Bai, Pichao Wang, Tianjun Xiao, Tong He, Zongbo Han, Zheng Zhang, and Mike Zheng Shou. 2024. [Hallucination of multimodal large language models: A survey](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.18930.
- Gioele Barabucci, Victor Shia, Eugene Chu, Benjamin Harack, and Nathan Fu. 2024. Combining insights from multiple large language models improves diagnostic accuracy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08806*.
- Leo Breiman. 1996. Bagging predictors. *Machine learning*, 24:123–140.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. 2024. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 15(3):1–45.

- Chao Chen, Kai Liu, Ze Chen, Yi Gu, Yue Wu, Mingyuan Tao, Zhihang Fu, and Jieping Ye. 2024. [Inside: LLMs’ internal states retain the power of hallucination detection](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2402.03744.
- Chaochao Chen, Xiaohua Feng, Jun Zhou, Jianwei Yin, and Xiaolin Zheng. 2023a. [Federated large language model: A position paper](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.08925.
- Hung-Ting Chen, Fangyuan Xu, Shane A. Arora, and Eunsol Choi. 2023b. [Understanding retrieval augmentation for long-form question answering](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2310.12150.
- Jifan Chen, Grace Kim, Aniruddh Sriram, Greg Durrett, and Eunsol Choi. 2023c. [Complex claim verification with evidence retrieved in the wild](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.11859.
- Lingjiao Chen, Matei Zaharia, and James Zou. 2023d. [Frugalgpt: How to use large language models while reducing cost and improving performance](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05176*.
- Shouyuan Chen, Sherman Wong, Liangjian Chen, and Yuandong Tian. 2023e. [Extending context window of large language models via positional interpolation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15595*.
- Yukang Chen, Shengju Qian, Haotian Tang, Xin Lai, Zhijian Liu, Song Han, and Jiaya Jia. 2023f. [Longlora: Efficient fine-tuning of long-context large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12307*.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2023. [Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(240):1–113.
- Ronan Collobert, Yoshua Bengio, and Samy Bengio. 2003. [Scaling large learning problems with hard parallel mixtures](#). *International Journal of pattern recognition and artificial intelligence*, 17(03):349–365.
- Thomas Coste, Usman Anwar, Robert Kirk, and David Krueger. 2024. [Reward model ensembles help mitigate overoptimization](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Nico Daheim, Thomas Möllenhoff, Edoardo Maria Ponti, Iryna Gurevych, and Mohammad Emtiyaz Khan. 2023. [Model merging by uncertainty-based gradient matching](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12808*.
- Pala Tej Deep, Rishabh Bhardwaj, and Soujanya Poria. 2024. [Della-merging: Reducing interference in model merging through magnitude-based sampling](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.11617.
- Haikang Deng and Colin Raffel. 2023. [Reward-augmented decoding: Efficient controlled text generation with a unidirectional reward model](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11781–11791, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas G Dietterich. 2000. [Ensemble methods in machine learning](#). In *International workshop on multiple classifier systems*, pages 1–15. Springer.
- Dujian Ding, Ankur Mallick, Chi Wang, Robert Sim, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Victor Ruhle, Laks VS Lakshmanan, and Ahmed Hassan Awadallah. 2024. [Hybrid llm: Cost-efficient and quality-aware query routing](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14618*.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, and Zhifang Sui. 2022. [A survey on in-context learning](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*.
- David Eigen, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, and Ilya Sutskever. 2013. [Learning factored representations in a deep mixture of experts](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.4314*.
- Jacob Eisenstein, Chirag Nagpal, Alekh Agarwal, Ahmad Beirami, Alex D’Amour, DJ Dvijotham, Adam Fisch, Katherine Heller, Stephen Pfohl, Deepak Ramachandran, et al. 2023. [Helping or herding? reward model ensembles mitigate but do not eliminate reward hacking](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.09244*.
- Alexander Fabbri, Chien-Sheng Wu, Wenhao Liu, and Caimeing Xiong. 2022. [QAFactEval: Improved QA-based factual consistency evaluation for summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2587–2601, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tobias Falke, Leonardo F. R. Ribeiro, Prasetya Ajie Utama, Ido Dagan, and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Ranking generated summaries by correctness: An interesting but challenging application for natural language inference](#). In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Tao Fan, Guoqiang Ma, Yan Kang, Hanlin Gu, Lixin Fan, and Qiang Yang. 2024. [Fedmkt: Federated mutual knowledge transfer for large and small language models](#).
- William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. 2022. [Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(120):1–39.

- Weizhi Fei, Xueyan Niu, Pingyi Zhou, Lu Hou, Bo Bai, Lei Deng, and Wei Han. 2023. [Extending context window of large language models via semantic compression](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.09571.
- Yoav Freund and Robert E Schapire. 1997. [A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting](#). *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 55(1):119–139.
- Tingchen Fu, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Shuming Shi, and Rui Yan. 2024a. [Disperse-then-merge: Pushing the limits of instruction tuning via alignment tax reduction](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13432*.
- Tingchen Fu, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Shuming Shi, and Rui Yan. 2024b. [Disperse-then-merge: Pushing the limits of instruction tuning via alignment tax reduction](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13432*.
- Yao Fu, Hao Peng, Litu Ou, Ashish Sabharwal, and Tushar Khot. 2023. [Specializing smaller language models towards multi-step reasoning](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10421–10430. PMLR.
- Jun Gao. 2024a. [Selfcp: Compressing long prompt to 1/12 using the frozen large language model itself](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.17052.
- Jun Gao. 2024b. [Unifying demonstration selection and compression for in-context learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.17062.
- Luyu Gao, Zhu Yun Dai, Panupong Pasupat, Anthony Chen, Arun Tejasvi Chaganty, Yicheng Fan, Vincent Zhao, N. Lao, Hongrae Lee, Da-Cheng Juan, and Kelvin Guu. 2022. [Attributed text generation via post-hoc research and revision](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2210.08726.
- Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, Meng Wang, and Haofen Wang. 2024. [Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.10997.
- Timur Garipov, Pavel Izmailov, Dmitrii Podoprikin, Dmitry Vetrov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. 2018. [Loss surfaces, mode connectivity, and fast ensembling of dnns](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1802.10026.
- Charles Goddard, Shamane Siriwardhana, Malikeh Ehghaghi, Luke Meyers, Vlad Karpukhin, Brian Benedict, Mark McQuade, and Jacob Solawetz. 2024. [Arcee’s mergekit: A toolkit for merging large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13257*.
- Ben Goodrich, Vinay Rao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J. Liu. 2019. [Assessing the factual accuracy of generated text](#). *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*.
- Jiatao Gu, Kyunghyun Cho, and Victor O. K. Li. 2017. [Trainable greedy decoding for neural machine translation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1702.02429.
- Satya Kesav Gundabathula and Sriram R Kolar. 2024. [Promptmind team at mediqa-corr 2024: Improving clinical text correction with error categorization and llm ensembles](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08373*.
- Hao Guo, Jiyong Jin, and Bin Liu. 2023. [Stochastic weight averaging revisited](#). *Applied Sciences*, 13(5):2935.
- Taicheng Guo, Xiuying Chen, Yaqi Wang, Ruidi Chang, Shichao Pei, Nitesh V Chawla, Olaf Wiest, and Xi-angliang Zhang. 2024. [Large language model based multi-agents: A survey of progress and challenges](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01680*.
- Tao Guo, Song Guo, Junxiao Wang, and Wenchao Xu. 2022. [Promptfl: Let federated participants cooperatively learn prompts instead of models – federated learning in age of foundation model](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2208.11625.
- Hasan Abed Al Kader Hammoud, Umberto Michieli, Fabio Pizzati, Philip Torr, Adel Bibi, Bernard Ghanem, and Mete Ozay. 2024. [Model merging and safety alignment: One bad model spoils the bunch](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14563*.
- Xiaoxin He, Yijun Tian, Yifei Sun, Nitesh V. Chawla, Thomas Laurent, Yann LeCun, Xavier Bresson, and Bryan Hooi. 2024. [G-retriever: Retrieval-augmented generation for textual graph understanding and question answering](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.07630.
- Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. 2015. [Distilling the knowledge in a neural network](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*.
- Hieu Hoang, Huda Khayrallah, and Marcin Junczys-Dowmunt. 2023. [On-the-fly fusion of large language models and machine translation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08306*.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. 2022. [Training compute-optimal large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*.
- Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2020a. [The curious case of neural text degeneration](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2020b. [The curious case of neural text degeneration](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1904.09751.
- Edward J Hu, yelong shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Qitian Jason Hu, Jacob Bieker, Xiuyu Li, Nan Jiang, Benjamin Keigwin, Gaurav Ranganath, Kurt Keutzer, and Shriyash Kaustubh Upadhyay. 2024. Router-bench: A benchmark for multi-llm routing system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12031*.
- Kaixuan Huang, Xudong Guo, and Mengdi Wang. 2024a. Specdec++: Boosting speculative decoding via adaptive candidate lengths. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19715*.
- Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. 2023. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232*.
- Xijie Huang, Li Lina Zhang, Kwang-Ting Cheng, Fan Yang, and Mao Yang. 2024b. Fewer is more: Boosting llm reasoning with reinforced context pruning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.08901.
- Yichong Huang, Xiaocheng Feng, Baohang Li, Yang Xiang, Hui Wang, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2024c. Enabling ensemble learning for heterogeneous large language models with deep parallel collaboration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12715*.
- Siqing Huo, Negar Arabzadeh, and Charles L. A. Clarke. 2023. Retrieving supporting evidence for llms generated answers. *ArXiv*, abs/2306.13781.
- Gabriel Ilharco, Marco Túlio Ribeiro, Mitchell Wortsman, Ludwig Schmidt, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. 2023. Editing models with task arithmetic. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net.
- Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2021. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2022.
- Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, Fabio Petroni, Timo Schick, Jane A. Yu, Armand Joulin, Sebastian Riedel, and Edouard Grave. 2022. Few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2208.03299.
- Pavel Izmailov, Dmitrii Podoprikin, Timur Garipov, Dmitry Vetrov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. 2018. Averaging weights leads to wider optima and better generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05407*.
- Robert A Jacobs, Michael I Jordan, Steven J Nowlan, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 1991. Adaptive mixtures of local experts. *Neural computation*, 3(1):79–87.
- Dong-Hwan Jang, Sangdoon Yun, and Dongyoon Han. 2024. Model stock: All we need is just a few fine-tuned models. *ArXiv*, abs/2403.19522.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38.
- Jianguo Jia, Wen Liang, and Youzhi Liang. 2023. A review of hybrid and ensemble in deep learning for natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05589*.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. 2024. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*.
- Dongfu Jiang, Xiang Ren, and Bill Yuchen Lin. 2023a. Llm-blender: Ensembling large language models with pairwise ranking and generative fusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02561*.
- Huiqiang Jiang, Qianhui Wu, Chin-Yew Lin, Yuqing Yang, and Lili Qiu. 2023b. LLMLingua: Compressing prompts for accelerated inference of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 13358–13376, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xisen Jin, Xiang Ren, Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro, and Pengxiang Cheng. 2022. Dataless knowledge fusion by merging weights of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09849*.
- Keller Jordan, Hanie Sedghi, Olga Saukh, Rahim Entezari, and Behnam Neyshabur. 2023. REPAIR: REnormalizing permuted activations for interpolation repair. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- Timo Kaufmann, Paul Weng, Viktor Bengs, and Eyke Hüllermeier. 2023. A survey of reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14925*.
- Seungone Kim, Juyoung Suk, Shayne Longpre, Bill Yuchen Lin, Jamin Shin, Sean Welleck, Graham Neubig, Moontae Lee, Kyungjae Lee, and Minjoon Seo. 2024. Prometheus 2: An open source language model specialized in evaluating other language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.01535*.
- Ben Krause, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Bryan McCann, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Shafiq Joty, Richard Socher, and Nazneen Fatema Rajani. 2021. GeDi: Generative discriminator guided sequence generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 4929–4952, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Elie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. 2023. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model.
- Young-Suk Lee, Md Arafat Sultan, Yousef El-Kurdi, Tahira Naseem Asim Munawar, Radu Florian, Salim Roukos, and Ramón Fernández Astudillo. 2023. Ensemble-instruct: Generating instruction-tuning data with a heterogeneous mixture of lms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13961*.
- Yaniv Leviathan, Matan Kalman, and Yossi Matias. 2023. Fast inference from transformers via speculative decoding. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19274–19286. PMLR.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haoran Li, Xinyuan Zhao, Dadi Guo, Hanlin Gu, Ziqian Zeng, Yuxing Han, Yangqiu Song, Lixin Fan, and Qiang Yang. 2024a. Federated domain-specific knowledge transfer on large language models using synthetic data.
- Jinyi Li, Yihuai Lan, Lei Wang, and Hao Wang. 2024b. Pctoolkit: A unified plug-and-play prompt compression toolkit of large language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.17411.
- Margaret Li, Suchin Gururangan, Tim Dettmers, Mike Lewis, Tim Althoff, Noah A Smith, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Branch-train-merge: Embarrassingly parallel training of expert language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.03306*.
- Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. 2020. Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 37(3):50–60.
- Tianlin Li, Qian Liu, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Qing Guo, Yang Liu, and Min Lin. 2024c. Purifying large language models by ensembling a small language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14845*.
- Weishi Li, Yong Peng, Miao Zhang, Liang Ding, Han Hu, and Li Shen. 2023a. Deep model fusion: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15698*.
- Xiang Lisa Li, Ari Holtzman, Daniel Fried, Percy Liang, Jason Eisner, Tatsunori B Hashimoto, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2023b. Contrastive decoding: Open-ended text generation as optimization. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12286–12312.
- Xingxuan Li, Ruochen Zhao, Yew Ken Chia, Bosheng Ding, Shafiq Joty, Soujanya Poria, and Lidong Bing. 2024d. Chain-of-knowledge: Grounding large language models via dynamic knowledge adapting over heterogeneous sources. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Mikel Artetxe, Tianlu Wang, Shuohui Chen, Daniel Simig, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Shruti Bhosale, Jingfei Du, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Sam Shleifer, Punit Singh Koura, Vishrav Chaudhary, Brian O’Horo, Jeff Wang, Luke Zettlemoyer, Zornitsa Kozareva, Mona Diab, Veselin Stoyanov, and Xian Li. 2022. Few-shot learning with multilingual generative language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9019–9052, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yong Lin, Lu Tan, Hangyu Lin, Zeming Zheng, Renjie Pi, Jipeng Zhang, Shizhe Diao, Haoxiang Wang, Han Zhao, Yuan Yao, and T. Zhang. 2023. Mitigating the alignment tax of rlhf.
- Alisa Liu, Xiaochuang Han, Yizhong Wang, Yulia Tsvetkov, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. 2024a. Tuning language models by proxy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08565*.
- Alisa Liu, Maarten Sap, Ximing Lu, Swabha Swayamdipta, Chandra Bhagavatula, Noah A Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Dexperts: Decoding-time controlled text generation with experts and anti-experts. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*.
- Deyuan Liu, Zecheng Wang, Bingning Wang, Weipeng Chen, Chunshan Li, Zhiying Tu, Dianhui Chu, Bo Li, and Dianbo Sui. 2024b. Checkpoint merging via bayesian optimization in llm pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19390*.
- Fangcheng Liu, Yehui Tang, Zhenhua Liu, Yunsheng Ni, Kai Han, and Yunhe Wang. 2024c. Kangaroo: Lossless self-speculative decoding via double early exiting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18911*.
- Jiahao Liu, Qifan Wang, Jingang Wang, and Xunliang Cai. 2024d. Speculative decoding via early-exiting for faster llm inference with thompson sampling control mechanism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03853*.
- Junyi Liu, Liangzhi Li, Tong Xiang, Bowen Wang, and Yiming Qian. 2023. TCRA-LLM: Token compression retrieval augmented large language model for inference cost reduction. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 9796–9810, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jinliang Lu, Chen Wang, and Jiajun Zhang. 2024a. Diver: Large language model decoding with span-level mutual information verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02120*.

- Keming Lu, Bowen Yu, Fei Huang, Yang Fan, Runji Lin, and Chang Zhou. 2024b. Online merging optimizers for boosting rewards and mitigating tax in alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17931*.
- Keming Lu, Hongyi Yuan, Runji Lin, Junyang Lin, Zheng Yuan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Routing to the expert: Efficient reward-guided ensemble of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08692*.
- Xiaoding Lu, Adian Liusie, Vyas Raina, Yuwen Zhang, and William Beauchamp. 2024c. Blending is all you need: Cheaper, better alternative to trillion-parameters llm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02994*.
- Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023a. [Query rewriting for retrieval-augmented large language models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2305.14283.
- Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023b. [Query rewriting in retrieval-augmented large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5303–5315, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yongqiang Ma, Lizhi Qin, Jiawei Liu, Yangyang Kang, Yue Zhang, Wei Lu, Xiaozhong Liu, and Qikai Cheng. 2024. From model-centered to human-centered: Revision distance as a metric for text evaluation in llms-based applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07108*.
- Aman Madaan, Pranjal Aggarwal, Ankit Anand, Srividya Pranavi Potharaju, Swaroop Mishra, Pei Zhou, Aditya Gupta, Dheeraj Rajagopal, Karthik Kappaganthu, Yiming Yang, et al. 2023. Automix: Automatically mixing language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12963*.
- Shengyu Mao, Yong Jiang, Boli Chen, Xiao Li, Peng Wang, Xinyu Wang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2024. [Rafe: Ranking feedback improves query rewriting for rag](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2405.14431.
- Michael S Matena and Colin A Raffel. 2022. Merging models with fisher-weighted averaging. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17703–17716.
- Costas Mavromatis, Petros Karypis, and George Karypis. 2024. Pack of llms: Model fusion at test-time via perplexity optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11531*.
- Xupeng Miao, Gabriele Oliaro, Zhihao Zhang, Xinhao Cheng, Zeyu Wang, Rae Ying Yee Wong, Zhuoming Chen, Daiyaan Arfeen, Reyna Abhyankar, and Zhihao Jia. 2023. [Specinfer: Accelerating generative llm serving with speculative inference and token tree verification](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2305.09781.
- Bonan Min, Hayley Ross, Elior Sulem, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Thien Huu Nguyen, Oscar Sainz, Eneko Agirre, Ilana Heintz, and Dan Roth. 2023a. Recent advances in natural language processing via large pre-trained language models: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(2):1–40.
- Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxi Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen tau Yih, Pang Wei Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023b. [Factscore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.14251.
- Anshuman Mishra, Dhruvesh Patel, Aparna Vijayakumar, Xiang Lorraine Li, Pavan Kapanipathi, and Kartik Talamadupula. 2021. [Looking beyond sentence-level natural language inference for question answering and text summarization](#). In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Alireza Mohammadshahi, Ali Shaikh, and Majid Yazdani. 2024. Leeroo orchestrator: Elevating llms performance through model integration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13979*.
- Feng Nan, Ramesh Nallapati, Zhiguo Wang, Cícero Nogueira dos Santos, Henghui Zhu, Dejiao Zhang, Kathleen McKeown, and Bing Xiang. 2021. [Entity-level factual consistency of abstractive text summarization](#). In *Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Ganesh Nathan et al. 2024. Fisher mask nodes for language model merging. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09891*.
- Tong Niu, Caiming Xiong, Semih Yavuz, and Yingbo Zhou. 2024. Parameter-efficient detoxification with contrastive decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06947*.
- Sean O’Brien and Mike Lewis. 2023. Contrastive decoding improves reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09117*.
- David Oniani, Jordan Hilsman, Hang Dong, Fengyi Gao, Shiven Verma, and Yanshan Wang. 2023. Large language models vote: Prompting for rare disease identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12890*.
- Aitor Ormazabal, Mikel Artetxe, and Eneko Agirre. 2023. [CombLM: Adapting black-box language models through small fine-tuned models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2961–2974, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jie Ou, Yueming Chen, and Wenhong Tian. 2024. [Lossless acceleration of large language model via adaptive n-gram parallel decoding](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2404.08698.



- Nedjma Djouhra Ousidhoum, Moy Yuan, and Andreas Vlachos. 2022. [Varifocal question generation for fact-checking](#). In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 27730–27744. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Liangming Pan, Xiaobao Wu, Xinyuan Lu, Anh Tuan Luu, William Yang Wang, Min-Yen Kan, and Preslav Nakov. 2023. [Fact-checking complex claims with program-guided reasoning](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2305.12744.
- Zhuoshi Pan, Qianhui Wu, Huiqiang Jiang, Menglin Xia, Xufang Luo, Jue Zhang, Qingwei Lin, Victor Rühle, Yuqing Yang, Chin-Yew Lin, H. Vicky Zhao, Lili Qiu, and Dongmei Zhang. 2024. [Llmlingua-2: Data distillation for efficient and faithful task-agnostic prompt compression](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.12968.
- Liviu Panait and Sean Luke. 2005. Cooperative multi-agent learning: The state of the art. *Autonomous agents and multi-agent systems*, 11:387–434.
- Fidel A Guerrero Peña, Heitor Rapela Medeiros, Thomas Dubail, Masih Aminbeidokhti, Eric Granger, and Marco Pedersoli. 2023. Re-basin via implicit sinkhorn differentiation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 20237–20246.
- Phuc Phan, Hieu Tran, and Long Phan. 2024. Distillation contrastive decoding: Improving llms reasoning with contrastive decoding and distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14874*.
- Yifu Qiu, Yftah Ziser, Anna Korhonen, Edoardo Ponti, and Shay Cohen. 2023. [Detecting and mitigating hallucinations in multilingual summarisation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8914–8932, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fanyi Qu, Hao Sun, and Yunfang Wu. 2024. Unsuper-vised distractor generation via large language model distilling and counterfactual contrastive decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01306*.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Alexandre Rame, Matthieu Kirchmeyer, Thibaud Rahier, Alain Rakotomamonjy, Patrick Gallinari, and Matthieu Cord. 2022. Diverse weight averaging for out-of-distribution generalization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:10821–10836.
- Alexandre Ram’e, Nino Vieillard, L’eonard Hussenot, Robert Dadashi, Geoffrey Cideron, Olivier Bachem, and Johan Ferret. 2024. [Warm: On the benefits of weight averaged reward models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2401.12187.
- Alexandre Ramé, Nino Vieillard, Léonard Hussenot, Robert Dadashi, Geoffrey Cideron, Olivier Bachem, and Johan Ferret. 2024. Warm: On the benefits of weight averaged reward models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12187*.
- Marc’ Aurelio Ranzato, Sumit Chopra, Michael Auli, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2015. Sequence level training with recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06732*.
- Marc’ Aurelio Ranzato, Sumit Chopra, Michael Auli, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2016. Sequence level training with recurrent neural networks. In *The Sixth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Vipula Rawte, Amit Sheth, and Amitava Das. 2023. A survey of hallucination in large foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05922*.
- Clemens Rosenbaum, Tim Klinger, and Matthew Riemer. 2017. Routing networks: Adaptive selection of non-linear functions for multi-task learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.01239*.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*.
- Omer Sagi and Lior Rokach. 2018. Ensemble learning: A survey. *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews: data mining and knowledge discovery*, 8(4):e1249.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. 2021. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*.
- Thibault Sellam, Dipanjan Das, and Ankur Parikh. 2020. Bleurt: Learning robust metrics for text generation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7881–7892.
- Chufan Shi, Cheng Yang, Xinyu Zhu, Jiahao Wang, Taiqiang Wu, Siheng Li, Deng Cai, Yujiu Yang, and Yu Meng. 2024. Unchosen experts can contribute too: Unleashing moe models’ power by self-contrast. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14507*.

- Tal Shnitzer, Anthony Ou, Mírian Silva, Kate Soule, Yuekai Sun, Justin Solomon, Neil Thompson, and Mikhail Yurochkin. 2023. Large language model routing with benchmark datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15789*.
- Chenglei Si, Weijia Shi, Chen Zhao, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. 2023. Getting more out of mixture of language model reasoning experts. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 8234–8249.
- Sidak Pal Singh and Martin Jaggi. 2020. Model fusion via optimal transport. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:22045–22055.
- KV Srivatsa, Kaushal Kumar Maurya, and Ekaterina Kochmar. 2024. Harnessing the power of multiple minds: Lessons learned from llm routing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00467*.
- Mitchell Stern, Noam Shazeer, and Jakob Uszkoreit. 2018. [Blockwise parallel decoding for deep autoregressive models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc.
- George Stoica, Daniel Bolya, Jakob Bjorner, Pratik Ramesh, Taylor Hearn, and Judy Hoffman. 2024. [Zipit! merging models from different tasks without training](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.03053.
- Xin Su, Tiej Le, Steven Bethard, and Phillip Howard. 2024. [Semi-structured chain-of-thought: Integrating multiple sources of knowledge for improved language model reasoning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.08505.
- Chuanneng Sun, Songjun Huang, and Dario Pompili. 2024. Llm-based multi-agent reinforcement learning: Current and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11106*.
- Anke Tang, Li Shen, Yong Luo, Liang Ding, Han Hu, Bo Du, and Dacheng Tao. 2023. [Concrete subspace learning based interference elimination for multi-task model fusion](#). *CoRR*, abs/2312.06173.
- Liyan Tang, Philippe Laban, and Greg Durrett. 2024. [Minicheck: Efficient fact-checking of llms on grounding documents](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2404.10774.
- Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, et al. 2022. Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023a. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023b. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Yao-Hung Tsai, Walter Talbott, and Jian Zhang. 2024. [Efficient non-parametric uncertainty quantification for black-box large language models and decision planning](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2402.00251.
- Lifu Tu, Semih Yavuz, Jin Qu, Jiacheng Xu, Rui Meng, Caiming Xiong, and Yingbo Zhou. 2023. Unlocking anticipatory text generation: A constrained approach for faithful decoding with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06149*.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Jonas Waldendorf, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2024. Contrastive decoding reduces hallucinations in large multilingual machine translation models. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2526–2539.
- Fanqi Wan, Xinting Huang, Deng Cai, Xiaojun Quan, Wei Bi, and Shuming Shi. 2024a. [Knowledge fusion of large language models](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Fanqi Wan, Ziyi Yang, Longguang Zhong, Xiaojun Quan, Xinting Huang, and Wei Bi. 2024b. Fusechat: Knowledge fusion of chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16107*.
- Zhongwei Wan, Xin Wang, Che Liu, Samiul Alam, Yu Zheng, Jiachen Liu, Zhongnan Qu, Shen Yan, Yi Zhu, Quanlu Zhang, Mosharaf Chowdhury, and Mi Zhang. 2024c. [Efficient large language models: A survey](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.03863.
- Boxin Wang, Weixin Chen, Hengzhi Pei, Chulin Xie, Mintong Kang, Chenhui Zhang, Chejian Xu, Zidi Xiong, Ritik Dutta, Rylan Schaeffer, et al. 2024a. Decodingtrust: A comprehensive assessment of trustworthiness in gpt models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Danqing Wang and Lei Li. 2023. [Learning from mistakes via cooperative study assistant for large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10667–10685, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hongyi Wang, Felipe Maia Polo, Yuekai Sun, Souvik Kundu, Eric Xing, and Mikhail Yurochkin. 2024b. [Fusing models with complementary expertise](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Keheng Wang, Feiyu Duan, Peiguang Li, Sirui Wang, and Xunliang Cai. 2024c. [LLMs know what they need: Leveraging a missing information guided framework to empower retrieval-augmented generation](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2404.14043.
- Lin Wang, Zhichao Wang, and Xiaoying Tang. 2024d. [Save it all: Enabling full parameter tuning for federated large language models via cycle black gradient descent](#).
- Xintao Wang, Qianwen Yang, Yongting Qiu, Jiaqing Liang, Qianyu He, Zhouhong Gu, Yanghua Xiao, and Wei Wang. 2023a. [Knowledgegpt: Enhancing large language models with retrieval and storage access on knowledge bases](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.11761.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, and Denny Zhou. 2022. [Rationale-augmented ensembles in language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.00747*.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023b. [Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yuxia Wang, Revanth Gangi Reddy, Zain Muhammad Mujahid, Arnav Arora, Aleksandr Rubashevskii, Jiahui Geng, Osama Mohammed Afzal, Liangming Pan, Nadav Borenstein, Aditya Pillai, Isabelle Augenstein, Iryna Gurevych, and Preslav Nakov. 2023c. [Factcheck-bench: Fine-grained evaluation benchmark for automatic fact-checkers](#).
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2022a. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. 2022b. [Emergent abilities of large language models](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Survey Certification.
- David H Wolpert. 1992. Stacked generalization. *Neural networks*, 5(2):241–259.
- Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Samir Ya Gadre, Rebecca Roelofs, Raphael Gontijo-Lopes, Ari S Morcos, Hongseok Namkoong, Ali Farhadi, Yair Carmon, Simon Kornblith, et al. 2022. [Model soups: averaging weights of multiple fine-tuned models improves accuracy without increasing inference time](#). In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 23965–23998. PMLR.
- Chaoyi Wu, Weixiong Lin, Xiaoman Zhang, Ya Zhang, Weidi Xie, and Yanfeng Wang. 2024. [Pmc-llama: toward building open-source language models for medicine](#). *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, page ocae045.
- Jiayang Wu, Wensheng Gan, Zefeng Chen, Shicheng Wan, and Philip S. Yu. 2023a. [Multimodal large language models: A survey](#). In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*, pages 2247–2256.
- Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhanjan Kam-badur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. 2023b. [Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17564*.
- Zhiheng Xi, Wenxiang Chen, Xin Guo, Wei He, Yiwen Ding, Boyang Hong, Ming Zhang, Junzhe Wang, Senjie Jin, Enyu Zhou, et al. 2023. [The rise and potential of large language model based agents: A survey](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07864*.
- Heming Xia, Tao Ge, Peiyi Wang, Si-Qing Chen, Furu Wei, and Zhifang Sui. 2023. [Speculative decoding: Exploiting speculative execution for accelerating seq2seq generation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 3909–3925, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Heming Xia, Zhe Yang, Qingxiu Dong, Peiyi Wang, Yongqi Li, Tao Ge, Tianyu Liu, Wenjie Li, and Zhifang Sui. 2024. [Unlocking efficiency in large language model inference: A comprehensive survey of speculative decoding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.07851.
- Fangyuan Xu, Weijia Shi, and Eunsol Choi. 2023. [Recomp: Improving retrieval-augmented lms with compression and selective augmentation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.04408.
- Mengwei Xu, Wangsong Yin, Dongqi Cai, Rongjie Yi, Daliang Xu, Qipeng Wang, Bingyang Wu, Yihao Zhao, Chen Yang, Shihe Wang, Qiyang Zhang, Zhenyan Lu, Li Zhang, Shangguang Wang, Yuanchun Li, Yunxin Liu, Xin Jin, and Xuanzhe Liu. 2024a. [A survey of resource-efficient llm and multimodal foundation models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.08092.
- Yangyifan Xu, Jinliang Lu, and Jiajun Zhang. 2024b. [Bridging the gap between different vocabularies for llm ensemble](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09492*.
- Yifan Xu, Kening Zhang, Haoyu Dong, Yuezhou Sun, Wenlong Zhao, and Tu Zhuowen. 2020. [Rethinking exposure bias in adversarial language modeling](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.11235*.
- Prateek Yadav, Derek Tam, Leshem Choshen, Colin A. Raffel, and Mohit Bansal. 2023. [Ties-merging: Resolving interference when merging models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.

- Enneng Yang, Li Shen, Zhenyi Wang, Guibing Guo, Xiaojun Chen, Xingwei Wang, and Dacheng Tao. 2024a. [Representation surgery for multi-task model merging](#). *CoRR*, abs/2402.02705.
- Enneng Yang, Zhenyi Wang, Li Shen, Shiwei Liu, Guibing Guo, Xingwei Wang, and Dacheng Tao. 2023. [Adamerging: Adaptive model merging for multi-task learning](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.02575.
- Kevin Yang and Dan Klein. 2021. [FUDGE: Controlled text generation with future discriminators](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3511–3535, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Songhua Yang, Hanjie Zhao, Senbin Zhu, Guangyu Zhou, Hongfei Xu, Yuxiang Jia, and Hongying Zan. 2024b. [Zhongjing: Enhancing the chinese medical capabilities of large language model through expert feedback and real-world multi-turn dialogue](#). In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 19368–19376.
- Barry Menglong Yao, Aditya Shah, Lichao Sun, Jin-Hee Cho, and Lifu Huang. 2022. [End-to-end multimodal fact-checking and explanation generation: A challenging dataset and models](#). *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- Rui Ye, Wenhao Wang, Jingyi Chai, Dihan Li, Zexi Li, Yinda Xu, Yaxin Du, Yanfeng Wang, and Siheng Chen. 2024. [Openfedllm: Training large language models on decentralized private data via federated learning](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2402.06954.
- Le Yu, Bowen Yu, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2023. [Language models are super mario: Absorbing abilities from homologous models as a free lunch](#). *CoRR*, abs/2311.03099.
- Yao-Ching Yu, Chun-Chih Kuo, Ziqi Ye, Yu-Cheng Chang, and Yueh-Se Li. 2024. [Breaking the ceiling of the llm community by treating token generation as a classification for ensembling](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12585*.
- Hongyi Yuan, Keming Lu, Fei Huang, Zheng Yuan, and Chang Zhou. 2023. [Speculative contrastive decoding](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08981*.
- Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. [Bartscore: Evaluating generated text as text generation](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:27263–27277.
- Murong Yue, Jie Zhao, Min Zhang, Liang Du, and Ziyu Yao. 2024. [Large language model cascades with mixture of thought representations for cost-efficient reasoning](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, Weng Lam Tam, Zixuan Ma, Yufei Xue, Jidong Zhai, Wenguang Chen, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2023. [GLM-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Liangyu Zha, Junlin Zhou, Liyao Li, Rui Wang, Qingyi Huang, Saisai Yang, Jing Yuan, Changbao Su, Xi-ang Li, Aofeng Su, Tao Zhang, Chen Zhou, Kaizhe Shou, Miao Wang, Wufang Zhu, Guoshan Lu, Chao Ye, Yali Ye, Wentao Ye, Yiming Zhang, Xinglong Deng, Jie Xu, Haobo Wang, Gang Chen, and Junbo Zhao. 2023. [Tablegpt: Towards unifying tables, nature language and commands into one gpt](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.08674.
- Yuanzhao Zhai, Han Zhang, Yu Lei, Yue Yu, Kele Xu, Dawei Feng, Bo Ding, and Huaimin Wang. 2023. [Uncertainty-penalized reinforcement learning from human feedback with diverse reward lora ensembles](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00243*.
- Biao Zhang, Behrooz Ghorbani, Ankur Bapna, Yong Cheng, Xavier Garcia, Jonathan Shen, and Orhan Firat. 2022. [Examining scaling and transfer of language model architectures for machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 26176–26192. PMLR.
- Jingyi Zhang, Jiaying Huang, Sheng Jin, and Shijian Lu. 2024a. [Vision-language models for vision tasks: A survey](#). *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–20.
- Kaiyan Zhang, Jianyu Wang, Ermo Hua, Biqing Qi, Ning Ding, and Bowen Zhou. 2024b. [Cogenesis: A framework collaborating large and small language models for secure context-aware instruction following](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2403.03129.
- Muru Zhang, Ofir Press, William Merrill, Alisa Liu, and Noah A Smith. 2023a. [How language model hallucinations can snowball](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13534*.
- Shun Zhang, Zhenfang Chen, Sunli Chen, Yikang Shen, Zhiqing Sun, and Chuang Gan. 2024c. [Improving reinforcement learning from human feedback with efficient reward model ensemble](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16635*.
- Tianyi Zhang\*, Varsha Kishore\*, Felix Wu\*, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. [Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yue Zhang, Leyang Cui, Wei Bi, and Shuming Shi. 2023b. [Alleviating hallucinations of large language models through induced hallucinations](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15710*.

- Haiyan Zhao, Hanjie Chen, Fan Yang, Ninghao Liu, Huiqi Deng, Hengyi Cai, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, and Mengnan Du. 2024a. [Explainability for large language models: A survey](#). *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, 15(2).
- Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*.
- Xuandong Zhao, Xianjun Yang, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Lei Li, Yu-Xiang Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2024b. Weak-to-strong jailbreaking on large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.17256*.
- Yuyan Zhou, Liang Song, Bingning Wang, and Weipeng Chen. 2024a. [Metagpt: Merging large language models using model exclusive task arithmetic](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.11385.
- Zhanhui Zhou, Zhixuan Liu, Jie Liu, Zhichen Dong, Chao Yang, and Yu Qiao. 2024b. Weak-to-strong search: Align large language models via searching over small language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19262*.
- Zixuan Zhou, Xuefei Ning, Ke Hong, Tianyu Fu, Jiaming Xu, Shiyao Li, Yuming Lou, Luning Wang, Zhihang Yuan, Xiuhong Li, Shengen Yan, Guohao Dai, Xiao-Ping Zhang, Yuhao Dong, and Yu Wang. 2024c. [A survey on efficient inference for large language models](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2404.14294.
- Yaochen Zhu, Rui Xia, and Jiajun Zhang. 2024. [DPPA: pruning method for large language model to model merging](#). *CoRR*, abs/2403.02799.