

What to do if language models disagree? Black-box model ensembling for textual and visual question answering

Yuxi Xia^{1,2} Kilm Zaporozjets³ Benjamin Roth^{1,4}

Abstract

A diverse range of large language models (LLMs), e.g., ChatGPT, and visual question answering (VQA) models, e.g., BLIP, have been developed for solving textual and visual question answering tasks. However, both LLMs and VQA models encounter challenges when applied to task-specific datasets. Fine-tuning these models is either difficult, as it requires access via APIs, rendering them as black-boxes, or costly due to the need of tuning a large number of parameters. To address this, we introduce *InfoSel*, a data-efficient and lightweight ensemble method that learns to dynamically pick the winner from existing black-box models for predictions on both textual and multimodal visual question answering tasks. Unlike traditional ensemble models, *InfoSel* does not rely on prediction probabilities or confidences, which typically are not available in black-box models. Experimental results on four datasets demonstrate that our approach achieves an absolute increase of up to +5.27% in the F1-score compared to standalone LLMs. Remarkably, this improvement is achieved by utilizing only 1K training instances and 110M model parameters for training task-specific ensemble models.

1. Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable proficiency across a wide range of tasks, predominantly attributed to their ability to comprehend instructions and tap into vast repositories of high-quality data (Bubeck et al., 2023; Laskar et al., 2023). For example, ChatGPT finds extensive utilization in daily textual question answering

(TQA) tasks, rendering substantial convenience to a myriad of users (Touvron et al., 2023).¹ For visual question answering (VQA) tasks, VQA models have exhibited exceptional versatility, primarily due to their capability to comprehend both visual and textual context (Gong et al., 2023).

However, recent work (Kocoń et al., 2023; Laskar et al., 2023) indicates that LLMs, such as ChatGPT, fall short of state-of-the-art performance on task-specific datasets. Similarly, VQA models (Li et al., 2022; 2021b; Bao et al., 2022) face challenges when applied to specialized datasets due to the idiosyncrasies in the content, format or structure of these datasets (Arora et al., 2018). Unfortunately, fine-tuning LLMs (e.g., LLaMA-2-70b-chat (Touvron et al., 2023)) on task-specific data requires a large number of GPU hours. Alternatively, training smaller, task-specific models from scratch requires large amount of labeled data in order to achieve comparable performance. Furthermore, fine-tuning LLMs through proprietary APIs with self-uploaded labeled training data not only requires LLM experts' knowledge but is also expensive.² These fine-tuned models further remain black-box, with restricted access to details regarding architectural intricacies, model weights, training data, and even prediction confidences.

In order to address these computational and accessibility challenges associated with fine-tuning, we introduce a scalable ensemble method called *InfoSel* (*Informed Selection*). *InfoSel* allows for training with just a few task-specific samples and is lightweight, with only a few million parameters. Unlike current LM-ensemble methods (e.g., MetaQA (Puerto et al., 2021), LLM-Blender (Jiang et al., 2023)) which depend on the confidence scores or log probabilities and thus can not be applied to black-box models like GPT3.5 text-davinci models, *InfoSel* does not rely on such information and offers black-box ensembling. Furthermore, our proposed ensemble method incorporates *task-specific* optimization, allowing it to be easily adapted to different datasets, considering variations of both the inputs and predicted answers from the ensembled LLMs (*base models*). This contrasts with traditional ensemble methods

¹Faculty of Computer Science, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria ²UniVie Doctoral School Computer Science, Vienna, Austria ³Department of Computer Science, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark ⁴Faculty of Philosophical and Cultural Studies, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. Correspondence to: Yuxi Xia <yuxi.xia@univie.ac.at>.

¹<https://chat.openai.com/>

²<https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/fine-tuning/>

such as OLA (Woods et al., 1997) and PageRank (Brin & Page, 2012), which are not adapted to task-specific particularities (e.g., different features) of different datasets. Finally, our method efficiently deals with *multimodal* inputs. Concretely, our results exhibit superior performance on multimodal VQA inputs compared to state-of-the-art LLM-Blender (Jiang et al., 2023) ensemble method which is designed to work exclusively with text. Table 1 compares our method with alternatives.

Table 1. Our method (*InfoSel*) aims to optimize *task-specific* ensembling of *black-box* models, where confidences and parameters can not be accessed. We use only a small portion of training data (*data-efficient*), and employ small-size trainable models (*lightweight*). Note that we focus on optimizing the performance of the *ensemble* instead of standalone fine-tuned (FT) models. Finally, our method can be applied not only to textual data but also to *multimodal* data in the context of visual question answering.

	OLA/			
	FT	LLM-Blender	PageRank	<i>InfoSel</i>
Task-specific	✓	✓	✗	✓
Data-efficient	✗	✗	✓	✓
Lightweight	✗	✗	✓	✓
Black-box	✗	✗	✓	✓
Multimodal	✗	✗	✓	✓
Ensemble	✗	✓	✓	✓

At its core, *InfoSel* (see Figure 1) trains a lightweight ensemble model to dynamically identify the most accurate base model (i.e., LLM or VQA model) for a given input, which we refer to as the *winner*. This is achieved by designing a meta-level classification task considering all the base models as labels for every input. We designed and implemented two ensemble architectures for textual and visual QA tasks. Our first proposed architecture, *InfoSel*-TT, uses textual transformer (TT, 110M parameters) (Devlin et al., 2019) as the backbone to generate textual representation of the question with the predicted answers by base models, and linearly mapping it to predict the F1-scores of these answers. Although *InfoSel*-TT is straightforward and effective, it cannot handle multimodal data. To address this, we propose a second architecture named *InfoSel*-MT, where we incorporate a multimodal transformer (MT, 115M parameters) (Li et al., 2019) to generate fused contextual representations of a multimodal input (image, question, and the predicted answers). These fused representations are used to train a dense layer for selecting the winner. The challenge with this approach is the lack of exposure of the base models to new (unseen) labels appearing in the task-specific datasets. To address this, we fine-tune TT and MT models (FT-TT and FT-MT) separately to learn these new labels. The predictions of these fine-tuned models are fused with the output from *InfoSel* using a second, separately trained *InfoSel** ensemble model. We experiment with and without *InfoSel**

as this component is considered optional when *InfoSel* is already performing well.

We select three LLMs (ChatGPT, LLaMA-2-70b-chat and GPT3.5 text-davinci-003) and three VQA models (ALBEF (Li et al., 2021a), BLIP (Li et al., 2022) and VLMO (Bao et al., 2022)). These models are used as ensemble base models to provide answers for textual and visual QA tasks respectively. To demonstrate the *data efficiency* of the proposed architectures, we train them on a subsample of training data from public benchmark datasets and test on the corresponding full test data, a setting referred to as “Mini-*”. Specifically, the Mini-SDv2 and Mini-NQ are sampled from SQuAD v2 (Rajpurkar et al., 2018) and NQ-Open (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) respectively, for textual QA tasks. On the other hand, the Mini-GQA and Mini-Viz datasets are sampled from GQA (Hudson & Manning, 2019) and VizWiz (Gurari et al., 2018) VQA datasets (see details in Section 4.1). Experimental results showcase improvements of the performance up to +5.27% on Mini-SDv2 with *InfoSel* and +31.63% on Mini-Viz with *InfoSel** when compared to the ensembled base models.

In summary, our contributions are: (1) *InfoSel*, a novel lightweight and data-efficient approach to ensemble black-box models without relying on access to model architecture, weights or prediction confidences for optimizing on task-specific datasets; (2) Assessment of the performance on textual and multimodal visual QA tasks, demonstrating gains of up to +5.27% with *InfoSel* and up to +31.63% with *InfoSel** compared to ensembled base models on four benchmark datasets; (3) A detailed analysis of data efficiency, demonstrating that *InfoSel* surpasses the performance of the leading base models with as few as 10 training samples.³

2. Related Work

Domain Adaptation. These methods aim to improve the performance of a model on a task-specific domain by leveraging knowledge from other domains (Zhou et al., 2022). Methods such as fine-tuning (Yosinski et al., 2014), feature adaptation (Long et al., 2015) and data augmentation (Choi et al., 2019) aim to improve the performance of standalone models and thus typically require large amounts of labeled training data or access to the model architecture and weights. *InfoSel* addresses this challenge by employing a lightweight ensemble model trained on a small amount of labeled data, and restricted to access exclusively the predictions produced by black-box base models.

Ensemble Learning. Ensemble methods generate and combine multiple learners (ML models) to address a particular ML task (Sagi & Rokach, 2018). Classical ensembling approaches like boosting (Schapire, 2013) and bag-

³Code and data will be released upon acceptance.

ging (Breiman, 1996) are designed to train and combine a large number of individual models and are thus computationally expensive. Snapshot ensemble method (Huang et al., 2017) uses several local minima from one single model for ensembling, which requires full access to model weights and architecture. Stacking (Wolpert, 1992) uses a meta-learner to integrate the probabilities of the predictions from base models for providing the final output. A recent LLM ensembling method proposed by Jiang et al. (2023) uses log probabilities generated by LLMs to train LLM-Blender models. Similarly, Puerto et al. (2021) introduce MetaQA to select the best answer from multiple experts which requires both the knowledge of confidence score and base models’ training data. Other methods train their base models to avoid dataset biases (Han et al., 2021), while Xu et al. (2019) aim to learn joint feature embeddings across different domains. However, these methods require at least one piece of knowledge that the black-box models can not provide, including base models’ confidence scores or even training data (not available for LLMs like ChatGPT). *InfoSel* is designed to not rely on any of the above elements.

Black-box Models Ensembling. The black-box ensembling can be achieved by classical dynamic classifier selection methods, most notably OLA (Woods et al., 1997), which learns to rank the best classifier dynamically by its overall local accuracy in the nearest region of the input. Alternatively, majority voting (Chan & van der Schaar, 2022) and PageRank (Brin & Page, 2012) weight the predictions by their internal agreements. Yet, these methods are not designed for task-specific optimization and do not consider the information about inputs and predicted answers from base models simultaneously. To address this, *InfoSel* proposes a transformer-based setup that utilizes all the information available in the black-box setting, but not more, to enhance task-specific performance.

3. *InfoSel* Ensemble Training

Figure 1 illustrates the proposed *InfoSel* and *InfoSel** frameworks to ensemble LLMs for TQA tasks (left), and VQA models for VQA tasks (right). We differentiate TQA components using LLMs and VQA components using VQA models by denoting them with superscripts l and v respectively. Similarly, to distinguish between *InfoSel*, *InfoSel** and FT models used in TQA and VQA tasks, we add suffixes “-TT” and “-MT” respectively. For example, the *InfoSel*-MT model in Figure 1, refers to the *InfoSel* for the VQA task.

3.1. *InfoSel* Training for TQA

Before training *InfoSel*, we first perform the *data preparation* (top of Figure 1) for both training and testing. Next, we train *InfoSel* and FT models, which is a necessary step before training the *InfoSel**.

Data Preparation. First, we randomly sample N content-question pairs $\{(C_i, Q_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ and the corresponding ground truth answers $\{\tilde{A}_i^l\}_{i=1}^N$ from various benchmark datasets (refer to Section 4.1). Next, we build prompts P_i following specific prompt rules $P_i = R(C_i, Q_i)$ (refer to Section 4.1). Using these prompts instead of plain (C_i, Q_i) text improves the LLMs’ answer quality (Bach et al., 2022).

We select K ($K=3$) black-box LLMs $\{M_j^l\}_{j=1}^K$ to generate answers on the N prompts. The answer generated by M_j^l on P_i is denoted as A_{ij}^l ($A_{ij}^l = M_j^l(P_i)$). Thereby, K LLMs provide $N * K$ candidate answers for N prompts. We calculate the word-level $F1$ -scores (Rajpurkar et al., 2018) of all the candidate answers $\{A_{ij}^l\}_{j=1}^K$ respectively for P_i . These $F1$ -scores serve as target Y_i^l to optimize the ensemble model:

$$Y_i^l = \{F1(A_{ij}^l, \tilde{A}_i^l)\}_{j=1}^K, Y_i^l \in \mathbb{R}^K.$$

The input for the ensemble training consists of K texts. Each text is formed by concatenating P_i with each individual answer predicted by a base model j , A_{ij}^l . More formally, the input X_i^l is:

$$X_i^l = \{[P_i, A_{ij}^l]\}_{j=1}^K, |X_i^l| = K.$$

The inputs $\{X_i^l\}_{i=1}^N$ and the corresponding target labels $\{Y_i^l\}_{i=1}^N$ are used for ensemble training.

***InfoSel*-TT.** We use a textual BERT-base (Devlin et al., 2019) transformer f_θ^t , (θ denote trainable model parameters) as the backbone of *InfoSel*-TT. To achieve faster convergence, we load the pre-trained weights of *bert-base-uncased* model.⁴ The input vector X_i^l is passed to f_θ^t to generate K sentence representations for each value in X_i^l respectively. Thus, the sentence representation R_{ij}^t of $[P_i, A_{ij}^l]$ from f_θ^t is:

$$R_{ij}^t = f_\theta^t([P_i, A_{ij}^l]), R_{ij}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{768}.$$

A dense layer (f_θ^d) is followed to classify $\{R_{ij}^t\}_{j=1}^K$, and is trained to match the target label Y_i^l using binary cross entropy loss \mathcal{L}_{BCE} . More formally, the training objective of *InfoSel*-TT is:

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}_{BCE}(f_\theta^d([f_\theta^t([P_i, A_{ij}^l])\}_{j=1}^K), Y_i^l).$$

Finally, the trained *InfoSel*-TT model (M^{it}) selects the winner model $M_{i,win}^l$ from $\{M_j^l\}_{j=1}^K$ for the input P_i with the highest probability score based on the selection logits produced by f_θ^d . $A_{i,win}^l$ denotes the answer provided by $M_{i,win}^l$.

$$M_{i,win}^l = M^{it}(\{[P_i, A_{ij}^l]\}_{j=1}^K), M_{i,win}^l \in \{M_j^l\}_{j=1}^K,$$

⁴<https://huggingface.co/google-bert/bert-base-uncased>




Figure 1. Architecture of our *InfoSel*, fine-tuned (FT) and *InfoSel** models. M_*^l and M_*^v refer to black-box LLMs and VQA base models respectively, which are not trainable. The number of these base models is flexible, and is not restricted to 3 as in the figure. The models on the left (suffixed with -TT) are trained for the TQA tasks, while the models on the right (suffixed with -MT) are trained for the VQA tasks. All our models are trained independently. Note that FT and *InfoSel** are optional if the task-specific datasets do not contain high percentage of unseen labels.

$$A_{i,win}^l = M_{i,win}^l(P_i).$$

FT-TT. A potential limitation of using *InfoSel*-TT model only is the lack of exposure of the base models to new (unseen) labels appearing in the task-specific datasets. To address this, we fine-tune a separate lightweight TT model directly on the TQA datasets to learn these new labels. Specifically, the training objective is to locate the start and end token position of the answer from the context C_i . We provide the token positions of \tilde{A}_i^l as the target label, such that the model is optimized to classify each token in two classes (start/end token). This fine-tuned textual transformer model is referred to as FT-TT (M^{ft}).⁵ We denote the answer predicted by M^{ft} on P_i as A_i^{ft} .

InfoSel*-TT. This model performs a further ensemble training of FT-TT and *InfoSel*-TT models with the same training scheme and labeled training data as *InfoSel*-TT. We anticipate that the thus trained *InfoSel**-TT model (M^{it+}) on the output of *InfoSel*-TT and the label finetuned FT-TT, will improve the ability to handle labels unseen by base models. As a result, we expect an improvement in the overall task-specific performance. The winner model selected by M^{it+} belong to $\{M^{it}, M^{ft}\}$.

⁵The training scheme is adapted from <https://huggingface.co/learn/nlp-course/chapter7/7?fw=pt> with the additional option to allow the model to return empty answers for unanswerable questions.

3.2. InfoSel Training for VQA

Data Preparation. Given N image-question pairs $\{(I_i, Q_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ from dev data of VQA benchmark datasets, we use K ($K=3$) pre-trained VQA models to predict answers A_{ij}^v as follows: $\{M_j^v((I_i, Q_i)) \rightarrow A_{ij}^v\}_{j=1}^K$. We denote the ground truth answer for image-question pair (I_i, Q_i) as A_i^v . Target labels Y_i^v for ensemble training are given by the accuracy scores of the K candidate answers evaluated on \tilde{A}_i^v :

$$Y_i^v = \{Acc(A_{ij}^v, \tilde{A}_i^v)\}_{j=1}^K, Y_i^v \in \mathbb{R}^K.$$

The concatenation of question (Q_i) with each of the candidate answers (A_{ij}^v) obtained from the base models and the corresponding image (I_i) serves the input to our ensemble model *InfoSel*-MT:

$$X_i^v = \{(I_i, [Q_i, A_{ij}^v])\}_{j=1}^K, |X_i^v| = K.$$

InfoSel-MT. A Multimodal Transformer (MT, f_θ^m) (Li et al., 2021b) is employed as the backbone for *InfoSel*-MT. Specifically, we first generate visual features V_i of I_i using a pre-trained R-CNN model (M_r) (Anderson et al., 2018). V_i is composed of a vector of the image region features v_i and the detected tags (i.e., object labels of the image) (Li et al., 2021b). The concatenated question-answer pair $[Q_i, A_{ij}^v]$ and V_i is then passed together with to MT (f_θ^m) to generate

a fused contextual representation R_{ij}^m :

$$V_i = (v_i, tags) = M^r(I_i),$$

$$R_{ij}^m = f_{\theta}^m(V_i, [Q_i, A_{ij}^v]), R_{ij}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{768}.$$

Finally, we use an additional dense layer (f_{θ}^d) to map R_{ij}^m to the target label Y_i^v . The training is optimized using binary cross-entropy loss:

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}_{BCE}(f_{\theta}^d([f_{\theta}^m(V_i, [Q_i, A_{ij}^v])])_{j=1}^K), Y_i^v).$$

We denote M^{im} to the trained *InfoSel*-MT model, M^{im} selects the winner model $M_{i,win}^v$ from $\{M_j^v\}_{j=1}^K$ to predict answer $A_{i,win}^v$ for the image-question pair (I_i, Q_i) based on the selection logits produced by f_{θ}^d .

$$M_{i,win}^v = M^{im}(\{(I_i, [Q_i, A_{ij}^v])\}_{j=1}^K), M_{i,win}^v \in \{M_j^v\}_{j=1}^K,$$

$$A_{i,win}^v = M_{i,win}^v(I_i, Q_i).$$

FT-MT. Similar to FT-TT, FT-MT composed of a trainable MT and a Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) is fine-tuned with the same training data as *InfoSel*-MT. Differently, FT-MT solves a multi-label classification task by classifying the fused contextual representation of Q_i (instead of $[Q_i, A_{ij}^v]$ like *InfoSel*-MT) and V_i to a predefined answer list (labels). This list contains frequent answers from the training data. As a result, a trained FT-MT model (M^{fm}) can learn to predict the unseen (new) labels (answers) contained in the task-specific datasets, but not in the pre-training data of the base models. A_i^{fm} denotes the answer predicted by M^{fm} over (I_i, Q_i) . The training scheme is adapted from (Li et al., 2021b).

InfoSel*-MT. Similar to *InfoSel**-TT, *InfoSel**-MT model M^{im+} ensembles the FT-MT and *InfoSel*-MT models using the same training scheme as in *InfoSel*-MT. The winner model selected by M^{im+} belong to $\{M^{im}, M^{fm}\}$.

4. Experiments and Analysis

4.1. Datasets

To demonstrate the *data efficiency* of our approach, we subsampled four publicly available benchmark datasets. This resulted in four *Mini* datasets, amounting to $\sim 1\%$ of the TQA datasets’ and $\sim 10\%$ of the VQA datasets’ original size. Table 2 presents the details of these datasets.

TQA datasets. We generated two *Mini* datasets, Mini-SDv2 and Mini-NQ, consisting of 1,000 randomly sampled instances from SQuAD-V2 (Rajpurkar et al., 2018) and NQ-Open (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) train splits, respectively. For Mini-NQ, we followed (Fisch et al., 2019) to use long answers as the context, and short answers as the ground

truth answers. The 1,000 samples are divided into train and validation data using an 8:2 ratio, while the trained models are tested on the dev data of the original datasets due to the unavailability of original test data. We use the setup proposed in (Laskar et al., 2023) to generate the answers from LLMs. Concretely, this setting relies on prompts generated by PromptSource (Bach et al., 2022), which we apply to our Mini-SDv2 dataset (unavailable for Mini-NQ). The prompts are in two forms depending on the context: (1) “What is the answer? [Context]; [Question]; If you can’t find the answer, please respond ‘unanswerable’. Answer:”; (2) “Answer the question depending on the context. [Context]; [Question]; If you can’t find the answer, please respond ‘unanswerable’. Answer:”. Differently, Mini-NQ does not contain unanswerable questions and thus we use the prompt “Answer the question depending on the context without explanation. [Context]; [Question]; Answer:”. Note that the answers of LLMs can be greatly influenced by some factors such as the use of different prompts or temperatures. However, our study does not focus on prompt engineering but rather on selecting the optimal base model to generate an answer. We will publicly release our prompts as well as the answers from LLMs for reproducibility.

VQA datasets. Our results (Figure 2) reveal that VQA tasks demand a greater quantity of training samples compared to TQA tasks. Therefore, we constructed Mini-GQA and Mini-Viz datasets using a larger fraction (the dev data) of GQA (Hudson & Manning, 2019) and VizWiz (Gurari et al., 2018) datasets compared to TQA datasets. The resulting Mini-GQA and Mini-Viz were divided into train and validation subsets using 8:2 ratio, while the test subset remained the same as in the original datasets.

Table 2. Details of the *Mini* datasets used for *InfoSel* ensemble training.

<i>Mini</i> Dataset	Source Dataset	Num.	% Dataset
Mini-SDv2 train	SQuAD-V2 train	800	0.56
Mini-SDv2 validation	SQuAD-V2 train	200	0.14
Mini-SDv2 test	SQuAD-V2 dev	11,873	8.39
Mini-NQ train	NQ-Open train	800	0.87
Mini-NQ validation	NQ-Open train	200	0.22
Mini-NQ test	NQ-Open dev	3,499	3.83
Mini-GQA train	GQA dev	105,640	9.80
Mini-GQA validation	GQA dev	26,422	2.45
Mini-GQA test	GQA test	12,578	1.17
Mini-Viz train	VizWiz dev	3,456	10.5
Mini-Viz validation	VizWiz dev	863	2.63
Mini-Viz test	VizWiz test	8,000	24.39

4.2. Base Models

We experiment with ensembling GPT-3.5-turbo-0613 (ChatGPT), LLaMA-2-70b-chat (hereinafter referred to as “LLaMA”) (Touvron et al., 2023) and GPT-3.5 text-davinci-

003 (hereinafter referred to as “Davinci”) to generate answers for TQA tasks.⁶ To tackle VQA tasks, we employ three VQA models (VLMo (Bao et al., 2022), ALBEF (Li et al., 2021a) and BLIP (Li et al., 2022)), which are pre-trained on VQA v2 dataset (Antol et al., 2015). Note that we use the publicly accessible VQA models to save experimental costs, but these models are assumed to be black-box. This means that they can only provide predictions without any logits or confidence scores, which is the restriction assumed for the purpose of our study.

Finally, we use **Oracle** to represent the maximum capability of a combination of base models. Specifically, for each input, the Oracle selects the answer with the highest agreement to the ground truth among all the answers predicted by the base models. Thus, the Oracle score represents the performance of an ideal ensemble model.

4.3. Baselines

Majority Voting (MV). MV makes a collective decision by considering the predicted answers as a group of individuals voting on a particular input. The answer that receives the most votes is the winner, otherwise, ties are broken randomly.

Weighted Voting (WV). We adopt a strategy similar to Schick et al. (2020), where the model accuracy of the train data before training is used as the weight for average weighting. In our case, we use the corresponding accuracy of the base models as the weight for voting.

PageRank (Brin & Page, 2012). We adapt PageRank as a baseline to determine the most suitable answer in a graph where all the answers to one question are connected by their BLEURT (Sellam et al., 2020) similarities.

Overall Local Accuracy (OLA) (Woods et al., 1997). Following (Cruz et al., 2018), we use the k-nearest neighbors algorithm to divide the input space (representations of prompts for TQA, representations of images and questions for VQA) of training data into 7 regions. The overall local accuracy of each base model in different regions is computed as its region competence. The model presenting the highest competence level is selected to predict the label of inputs that fall in the same region.

PairRanker and LLM-Blender (Jiang et al., 2023). Both methods were originally designed for text generation tasks (e.g., machine translation and speech recognition). PairRanker model (DeBERTa (He et al., 2023), 400M parameters) is trained to rank a pair of candidate predictions from two LLMs using multiple optimizing objectives (i.e., log probabilities, BART score, BERTScore, etc). A bubble

⁶GPT3.5 text-davinci-003 is deprecated after our experiments, but this fact does not influence the effectiveness of our method.

sort is applied to get the top k (we use k=2) predictions among multiple pairwise comparison results to feed to a GENFUSER model (Flan-T5-XL (Chung et al., 2022), 3B parameters) to generate the final fused prediction. LLM-Blender is a composite of the PairRanker and the GENFUSER model. We use a pre-trained (0-shot) PairRanker and LLM-Blender models which have been trained over massive data (105k) including TQA data as baselines to test on our data.

4.4. Experimental Setup

Evaluation Metric. LLMs tend to generate contextual answers that lead to lower scores in the exact match (EM). Therefore, we mainly use the (per-answer) token-level F1-score from the official evaluation guidance of the datasets as the main evaluation metric for TQA performance. Our results differ from the ones reported in (Laskar et al., 2023; Kocoń et al., 2023) because we do not apply any post-processing, human evaluation or output constraints for the generated answers.

Setup. We fixed the batch size to the upper limit of the server capacity, while the learning rates and epochs are selected after a grid search on a set of values (learning rates: {e3, 5e4, e4, 5e5, e5, 5e6, e6}, epochs: {3, 5, 10, 15, 20}). Models for TQA are trained for 5 epochs using a learning rate of 5×10^{-5} and batch size of 4. Models for VQA use the same learning rate but a batch size of 16 for 20 epochs. We spent ~ 74 and ~ 290 seconds training 1 epoch on 1,000 samples for TQA and 4,319 samples for VQA respectively. The training was performed on 1 GPU with 16GB memory of a DGX1 server ((Pascal) Tesla P100).

4.5. Performance Comparison

In this section, we analyze the performance of our method, taking into account its distinctive characteristics as described in Table 1. Concretely, we focus on comparing our models in terms of *task-specific* performance, *data efficiency*, *lightweight* design, and *multimodal* capabilities.

Task-specific Performance. Table 3 demonstrates the *task-specific* performance of *InfoSel*, base models and baselines on textual and visual QA datasets. For TQA, we observe that LLaMA underperforms other base models. Upon closer examination, we found that LLaMA generates longer explanation text which, although often accurate, decreases the EM and F1-score values. Conversely, a more consistent performance of base models is observed for VQA. All the models demonstrate superior performance on Mini-NQ compared to Mini-SDv2. This is because Mini-SDv2 contains 50% of unanswerable questions, written adversarially and specifically designed to be challenging for the QA task (Rajpurkar et al., 2018). Similarly, Mini-Viz contains 28% of unanswerable questions, and the label “unanswerable”

Table 3. Test performance comparison on textual and visual QA datasets. The overall best results are highlighted in bold, and the best results of base models are underlined. The test data of Mini-Viz is not publicly accessible and thus the Oracle cannot be reported.

Textual Question Answering					Visual Question Answering		
Model	Mini-SDv2		Mini-NQ		Model	Mini-GQA	Mini-Viz
	EM	F1	EM	F1		ACC	ACC
LLaMA-2-70b-chat	0.24	11.34	28.07	46.47	ALBEF	<u>50.60</u>	<u>21.28</u>
text-davinci-003	<u>52.37</u>	<u>58.44</u>	52.24	69.44	BLIP	48.08	20.80
ChatGPT	30.89	44.95	<u>57.53</u>	<u>71.54</u>	VLMo	48.21	19.77
Oracle	58.61	66.20	64.02	79.21	Oracle	65.03	-
MV	26.95	37.75	46.07	62.43	MV	51.05	21.47
WV	52.37	58.44	57.53	71.54	WV	52.10	19.43
PageRank	25.39	37.31	51.76	68.53	PageRank	51.47	21.66
OLA	47.90	55.59	54.70	70.05	OLA	48.65	20.32
(0-shot) PairRanker	7.28	19.63	35.30	53.05	(0-shot) PairRanker	47.69	20.74
(0-shot) LLM-Blender	4.90	21.20	1.03	25.06	(0-shot) LLM-Blender	0.0	0.0
FT-TT	46.80	47.68	36.52	40.60	FT-MT	50.48	51.76
InfoSel-TT (ours)	57.74	63.63	58.45	73.37	InfoSel-MT (ours)	55.16	23.16
InfoSel*-TT (ours)	49.09	49.85	48.16	53.70	InfoSel*-MT (ours)	52.54	52.91




Figure 2. Test performance of our *InfoSel* and FT models compared to the OLA baseline over increasing size of training data. The yellow dot highlights the point when *InfoSel* models outperform the best base LLM model.

has never been seen by base models. Consequently, this lack of exposure leads to significantly lower performance scores. The Oracle scores of the base model indicate the performance of an ideal ensemble method.

Baseline methods such as WV, PageRank and OLA achieve only marginal improvements compared to base models ($\leq +1.5\%$) on VQA datasets. These results highlight the limitations of these methods when applied to *task-specific* datasets (see also Table 1). Although 0-shot PairRanker and LLM-Blender models have been trained on massive amounts of data (including question answering data), they exhibit very low performance. LLM-Blender tends to generate longer answers compared to PairRanker which leads to a lower score especially when evaluated in the exact-match settings (EM, ACC).

InfoSel-TT achieves 5.19% (63.63-58.44) improvement compared to individual base models, and reaches 96.12% (63.63/66.20) of the Oracle on Mini-SDv2. Similarly, the corresponding improvement in Mini-NQ performance is 1.83%, reaching 93.06% of the performance achieved by

the Oracle. In contrast, FT-TT, despite its superior performance over two base models on Mini-SDv2, underperforms *InfoSel-TT* by more than 15% due to the small-size training data (refer to Figure 2). We hypothesize that this poor performance of FT-TT models has a direct impact on the performance of *InfoSel**, which did not bring an additional improvement upon *InfoSel*. Furthermore, Table 3 showcases that *InfoSel-MT* achieves an improvement of 4.56% in accuracy score compared to the base models (55.16-50.60) on Mini-GQA, reaching 84.81% (55.16/65.03) of the Oracle performance. Furthermore, FT-MT improves 30.48% (51.76-21.28) accuracy on Mini-Viz due to additional new labels (e.g., “unanswerable”) introduced during fine-tuning. The base models in *InfoSel-MT* lacked exposure to these labels, leading to lower scores compared to FT-MT. Finally, the superior performance of *InfoSel*-MT* model on Mini-Viz dataset demonstrates the effectiveness of the proposed blending approach, which improves 31.63% (52.91-21.28) accuracy upon the *InfoSel-MT* model. Thus, we conclude that the obtained results indicate that *InfoSel* not only improves the task-specific performance of the base models

over four datasets, but also outperforms all the baselines.

Data Efficiency. The experimental results shown in Figure 2 demonstrate the *data efficiency* of our method by evaluating the model’s performance across varying training data sizes. We observe that *InfoSel*-TT achieves a higher F1-score compared to the base models when trained on as little as 10 samples from Mini-SDv2. This result has been further verified with the mean F1-score of 10 test results using different seed variations for sampling the training data. Conversely, the number of training of samples needed to surpass the performance of base models is higher for VQA datasets: 5% (6,603 samples) for Mini-GQA and 20% (864 samples) for Mini-Viz. We hypothesize that this is due to the inherent complexity of the VQA task.

Additionally, we find that a larger training data size benefits FT-TT more than *InfoSel*-TT and OLA. For example, the F1-score of FT-TT increases $\sim 200\%$ and $\sim 500\%$ from 10 to 10,000 training samples on Mini-SDv2 and Mini-NQ respectively, while *InfoSel*-TT only increases only $\sim 3\%$ and $\sim 4\%$. However, FT-TT still underperforms the best base model, which suggests that fine-tuning a small-size model requires larger training data for getting a comparable performance with LLMs or *InfoSel*. Finally, we observe that a larger training data size does not necessarily lead to improved performance for the fine-tuned FT-TT model (e.g., when increasing from 80% to 100% the training data size on Mini-GQA). In contrast, OLA does not benefit as much as *InfoSel* and FT from a larger size of training data, only outperforming *InfoSel*-TT on Mini-NQ when 10 and 20 training samples are used.

Lightweight Model. Table 4 reports the parameter size of the base models and their ensemble models (*InfoSel*-TT and *InfoSel*-MT). *InfoSel* provides an efficient method for ensembling large LLMs such as ChatGPT (175B parameters) using only 110M trainable parameters. Even though only 37% ((182M-115M)/182M) trainable parameters are saved for the VQA task, we still demonstrate that *InfoSel* can effectively enhance the task-specific performance of small-size black-box VQA models, offering a lightweight solution.

Table 4. Parameter size of the models used in our experiments.

LLMs		VQA Models	
Model	#Param	Model	#Param
LLaMA-2-70b-chat	70B	ALBEF	290M
text-davinci-003	175B	BLIP	361M
ChatGPT	175B	VLMo	182M
<i>InfoSel</i> -TT	110M	<i>InfoSel</i> -MT	115M

Multimodal Data. *InfoSel* is able to utilize multimodal data (image and text) for VQA tasks, and thus outperform the latest text-exclusive LLM ensemble methods (PairRanker and LLM-Blender) as evidenced in Table 3. In contrast,




Figure 3. The portions of answers selected from different base models by *InfoSel* models on Mini-SDv2 and Mini-NQ test data. The upper row represents the results of the *InfoSel* model ensemble with all three LLMs, and the model in the lower row excluded the worst base model (LLaMA).

LLM-Blender cannot process image features, thereby lacking crucial information in the multimodal setting, leading to an accuracy of 0.0 on VQA datasets.⁷ Further insights into the significance of modality information are elaborated in Section 4.6 and Table 5.

4.6. Ablation Studies

Is *InfoSel* robust to the base models’ individual performances? We carry out this study to assess whether *InfoSel* can effectively utilize the predictions obtained from various base models, regardless of their individual performance levels. In Figure 3, we observe a minor F1-score difference (0.07%) on the Mini-SDv2 dataset between the *InfoSel* model ensemble with and without the lowest performing base model (LLaMA). This finding suggests that *InfoSel* is robust, and not significantly affected by the individual model’s performance. In a more detailed analysis, we observe that *InfoSel* selects 4% of answers from LLaMA, resulting in an overall gain of +0.28% of the F1-score. This observation highlights the effectiveness of *InfoSel*, as it can leverage the knowledge contained in the answers provided even by the lowest performing base model to some extent.

Which modality information helps the most for ensembling? In the Table 5, we compare the effect of providing different modality information to *InfoSel*-MT during ensemble training. Notice that even with just the question and answer (Q+A) information, our model surpasses the performance of the 0-shot PairRanker and LLM-Blender. The setting that yields the lowest accuracy solely utilizes the image (V) as the signal. This can be explained by the fact

⁷The most frequent answer of LLM-Blender on VQA datasets is “I’m sorry, I don’t have enough context to answer that question.”

that a single image often corresponds to multiple questions in VQA datasets, making it challenging for the model to acquire discriminative features. Furthermore, we conclude that a superior performance of our model when utilizing image, question, and answer (V+Q+A) data demonstrates the effectiveness of our model in *multimodal* setting.

Table 5. Accuracy of *InfoSel*-MT models when using different input information for training compared to baseline models. V, Q, and A represent visual, question, and answer information respectively.

Model	Mini-GQA	Mini-Viz
(0-shot) PairRanker(Q+A)	47.69	20.74
(0-shot) LLM-Blender(Q+A)	0.0	0.0
<i>InfoSel</i> -MT(V)	50.56	20.79
<i>InfoSel</i> -MT(Q)	51.11	21.21
<i>InfoSel</i> -MT(V+Q)	50.83	20.06
<i>InfoSel</i> -MT(V+A)	52.38	22.66
<i>InfoSel</i> -MT(Q+A)	54.76	22.89
<i>InfoSel</i> -MT(V+Q+A)	55.16	23.16



4.7. Case Study

Table 6. Case study of our models on Mini-SDv2 and Mini-NQ test data. Answers of LLMs are shortened to keywords for better demonstration. Ground truth answers are bolded, and one incorrect ground truth answer is colored red.

	Mini-SDv2	Mini-NQ
Context:	...Derrick Norman Lehmer’s list of primes up to 10,006,721...	...in 2005 and the release of her eponymous debut album the following year...
Question:	How many primes were included in Derrick Norman Lehmer’s list of prime numbers?	When did Taylor Swift’s first album release?
LLaMA	unanswerable	2006
Davinci	10,006,721	2006
ChatGPT	unanswerable	2006
FT-TT	unanswerable	2005
<i>InfoSel</i> -TT	10,006,721	2006
<i>InfoSel</i> *-TT	unanswerable	2005

Table 6 illustrates two insightful cases from the predictions of different models on textual Mini-SDv2 and Mini-NQ QA datasets. The first case showcases the ability of *InfoSel*-TT to select the right model (Davinci) when the rest of the models is incorrect. However, *InfoSel**-TT selects the wrong answers from the FT-TT model and underperforms *InfoSel*-TT. The second case illustrates the ability of LLMs to generate correct answer (“2006”) despite the ground truth annotation error (“2005”). This demonstrates the advantage of ensembling highly expressive LLMs instead of relying only on fine-tuning small-size models such as FT-TT.

Table 7. Case study of our models on Mini-GQA test and Mini-Viz validation data. Ground truth answers are bolded.

	Mini-GQA	Mini-Viz
Image:		
Question:	What appliance is it?	What is this product?
ALBEF	blender	refrigerator
BLIP	toaster	toilet
VLMo	microwave	door
FT-MT	coffee maker	unanswerable
<i>InfoSel</i> -MT	toaster	toilet
<i>InfoSel</i> *-MT	coffee maker	unanswerable

The first case of Table 7 further indicates that *InfoSel* captures the only correct answer (“toaster”). The second case demonstrates the ability of *InfoSel** to recognize task-specific labels (i.e., “unanswerable”) introduced by FT-MT. *InfoSel*-MT struggles with such labels as they are unfamiliar to the base models. This showcases the benefits of training *InfoSel** models on datasets containing a high percentage of task-specific labels.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose *InfoSel*, a novel lightweight and task-specific ensemble method designed to learn the dynamic selection of the optimal model from a range of distinct black-box base LLMs. We find that using only 110M trainable parameters, our method is able to substantially increase the performance upon the best performing base LLM. Additionally, our analysis reveals that *InfoSel* remains robust regardless the incorrect predictions of the lowest performing LLM. Our findings also show that our solution is highly data-efficient. Concretely, it requires only a fraction of instances (as few as 10) from the training set to outperform base LLMs. Finally, our experimental results reveal the ability of *InfoSel* to be adapted to multimodal setting, showing a substantial increase in performance compared to state-of-the-art alternatives.

6. Acknowledgements

This research has been funded by the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF) [10.47379/VRG19008] “Knowledge-infused Deep Learning for Natural Language Processing”.

References

- Anderson, P., He, X., Buehler, C., Teney, D., Johnson, M., Gould, S., and Zhang, L. Bottom-up and top-down attention for image captioning and visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 6077–6086, 2018.
- Antol, S., Agrawal, A., Lu, J., Mitchell, M., Batra, D., Zitnick, C. L., and Parikh, D. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pp. 2425–2433, 2015.
- Arora, S., Ge, R., Neyshabur, B., and Zhang, Y. Stronger generalization bounds for deep nets via a compression approach. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 254–263. PMLR, 2018.
- Bach, S. H., Sanh, V., Yong, Z.-X., Webson, A., Raffel, C., Nayak, N. V., Sharma, A., Kim, T., Bari, M. S., Fevry, T., Alyafeai, Z., Dey, M., Santilli, A., Sun, Z., Ben-David, S., Xu, C., Chhablani, G., Wang, H., Fries, J. A., Al-shaibani, M. S., Sharma, S., Thakker, U., Almubarak, K., Tang, X., Radev, D., Jiang, M. T.-J., and Rush, A. M. Promptsources: An integrated development environment and repository for natural language prompts, 2022.
- Bao, H., Wang, W., Dong, L., Liu, Q., Mohammed, O. K., Aggarwal, K., Som, S., Piao, S., and Wei, F. Vlm0: Unified vision-language pre-training with mixture-of-modality-experts. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:32897–32912, 2022.
- Breiman, L. Bagging predictors. *Machine learning*, 24: 123–140, 1996.
- Brin, S. and Page, L. Reprint of: The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual web search engine. *Comput. Networks*, 56:3825–3833, 2012. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:911040>.
- Bubeck, S., Chandrasekaran, V., Eldan, R., Gehrke, J., Horvitz, E., Kamar, E., Lee, P., Lee, Y. T., Li, Y., Lundberg, S., Nori, H., Palangi, H., Ribeiro, M. T., and Zhang, Y. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4, 2023.
- Chan, A. J. and van der Schaar, M. Synthetic model combination: An instance-wise approach to unsupervised ensemble learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05320*, 2022.
- Choi, J., Kim, T., and Kim, C. Self-ensembling with gan-based data augmentation for domain adaptation in semantic segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 6830–6840, 2019.
- Chung, H. W., Hou, L., Longpre, S., Zoph, B., Tay, Y., Fedus, W., Li, Y., Wang, X., Dehghani, M., Brahma, S., Webson, A., Gu, S. S., Dai, Z., Suzgun, M., Chen, X., Chowdhery, A., Castro-Ros, A., Pellat, M., Robinson, K., Valter, D., Narang, S., Mishra, G., Yu, A., Zhao, V., Huang, Y., Dai, A., Yu, H., Petrov, S., Chi, E. H., Dean, J., Devlin, J., Roberts, A., Zhou, D., Le, Q. V., and Wei, J. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models, 2022.
- Cruz, R. M., Sabourin, R., and Cavalcanti, G. D. Dynamic classifier selection: Recent advances and perspectives. *Information Fusion*, 41:195–216, 2018.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding, 2019.
- Fisch, A., Talmor, A., Jia, R., Seo, M., Choi, E., and Chen, D. MRQA 2019 shared task: Evaluating generalization in reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of 2nd Machine Reading for Reading Comprehension (MRQA) Workshop at EMNLP*, 2019.
- Gong, T., Lyu, C., Zhang, S., Wang, Y., Zheng, M., Zhao, Q., Liu, K., Zhang, W., Luo, P., and Chen, K. Multimodal-gpt: A vision and language model for dialogue with humans. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04790*, 2023.
- Gurari, D., Li, Q., Stangl, A. J., Guo, A., Lin, C., Grauman, K., Luo, J., and Bigham, J. P. Vizwiz grand challenge: Answering visual questions from blind people. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 3608–3617, 2018.
- Han, X., Wang, S., Su, C., Huang, Q., and Tian, Q. Greedy gradient ensemble for robust visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 1584–1593, 2021.
- He, P., Gao, J., and Chen, W. Debertav3: Improving deberta using electra-style pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing, 2023.
- Huang, G., Li, Y., Pleiss, G., Liu, Z., Hopcroft, J. E., and Weinberger, K. Q. Snapshot ensembles: Train 1, get m for free. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.00109*, 2017.
- Hudson, D. A. and Manning, C. D. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 6700–6709, 2019.
- Jiang, D., Ren, X., and Lin, B. Y. Llm-blender: Ensembling large language models with pairwise ranking and generative fusion, 2023.

- Kocoń, J., Cichecki, I., Kaszyca, O., Kochanek, M., Szydło, D., Baran, J., Bielaniewicz, J., Gruza, M., Janz, A., Kanclerz, K., Kocoń, A., Koptyra, B., Mielezczenko-Kowszewicz, W., Miłkowski, P., Oleksy, M., Piasecki, M., Radliński, Ł., Wojtasik, K., Woźniak, S., and Kazienko, P. ChatGPT: Jack of all trades, master of none. *Information Fusion*, 99:101861, nov 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.inffus.2023.101861. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.inffus.2023.101861>.
- Kwiatkowski, T., Palomaki, J., Redfield, O., Collins, M., Parikh, A., Alberti, C., Epstein, D., Polosukhin, I., Devlin, J., Lee, K., Toutanova, K., Jones, L., Kelcey, M., Chang, M.-W., Dai, A. M., Uszkoreit, J., Le, Q., and Petrov, S. Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466, 2019. doi: 10.1162/tacl.a.00276. URL <https://aclanthology.org/Q19-1026>.
- Laskar, M. T. R., Bari, M. S., Rahman, M., Bhuiyan, M. A. H., Joty, S., and Huang, J. A systematic study and comprehensive evaluation of ChatGPT on benchmark datasets. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pp. 431–469, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.29. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.29>.
- Li, J., Selvaraju, R. R., Gotmare, A. D., Joty, S., Xiong, C., and Hoi, S. Align before Fuse: Vision and Language Representation Learning with Momentum Distillation, October 2021a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.07651>. arXiv:2107.07651 [cs].
- Li, J., Li, D., Xiong, C., and Hoi, S. BLIP: Bootstrapping Language-Image Pre-training for Unified Vision-Language Understanding and Generation, February 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2201.12086>. arXiv:2201.12086 [cs].
- Li, L. H., Yatskar, M., Yin, D., Hsieh, C.-J., and Chang, K.-W. Visualbert: A simple and performant baseline for vision and language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.03557*, 2019.
- Li, L. H., You, H., Wang, Z., Zareian, A., Chang, S.-F., and Chang, K.-W. Unsupervised Vision-and-Language Pre-training Without Parallel Images and Captions, April 2021b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.12831>. arXiv:2010.12831 [cs].
- Long, M., Cao, Y., Wang, J., and Jordan, M. Learning transferable features with deep adaptation networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 97–105. PMLR, 2015.
- Puerto, H., Şahin, G. G., and Gurevych, I. Metaqa: Combining expert agents for multi-skill question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.01922*, 2021.
- Rajpurkar, P., Jia, R., and Liang, P. Know what you don’t know: Unanswerable questions for squad, 2018.
- Sagi, O. and Rokach, L. Ensemble learning: A survey. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 8(4):e1249, 2018.
- Schapire, R. E. Explaining adaboost. In *Empirical Inference: Festschrift in Honor of Vladimir N. Vapnik*, pp. 37–52. Springer, 2013.
- Sellam, T., Das, D., and Parikh, A. P. Bleurt: Learning robust metrics for text generation. In *Proceedings of ACL*, 2020.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D., Blecher, L., Ferrer, C. C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G., Esiobu, D., Fernandes, J., Fu, J., Fu, W., Fuller, B., Gao, C., Goswami, V., Goyal, N., Hartshorn, A., Hosseini, S., Hou, R., Inan, H., Kardas, M., Kerkez, V., Khabsa, M., Kloumann, I., Korenev, A., Koura, P. S., Lachaux, M.-A., Lavril, T., Lee, J., Liskovich, D., Lu, Y., Mao, Y., Martinet, X., Mihaylov, T., Mishra, P., Molybog, I., Nie, Y., Poulton, A., Reizenstein, J., Rungta, R., Saladi, K., Schelten, A., Silva, R., Smith, E. M., Subramanian, R., Tan, X. E., Tang, B., Taylor, R., Williams, A., Kuan, J. X., Xu, P., Yan, Z., Zarov, I., Zhang, Y., Fan, A., Kambadur, M., Narang, S., Rodriguez, A., Stojnic, R., Edunov, S., and Scialom, T. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023.
- Wolpert, D. H. Stacked generalization. *Neural networks*, 5(2):241–259, 1992.
- Woods, K., Kegelmeyer, W. P., and Bowyer, K. Combination of multiple classifiers using local accuracy estimates. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 19(4):405–410, 1997.
- Xu, Y., Chen, L., Cheng, Z., Duan, L., and Luo, J. Open-ended visual question answering by multi-modal domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.04058*, 2019.
- Yosinski, J., Clune, J., Bengio, Y., and Lipson, H. How transferable are features in deep neural networks? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- Zhou, K., Liu, Z., Qiao, Y., Xiang, T., and Loy, C. C. Domain generalization: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2022.