

SimCT: A Simple Consistency Test Protocol in LLMs Development Lifecycle

Fufangchen Zhao^{+*} 1,2,3 Guoqiang Jin^{* 3} Jiaheng Huang³ Rui Zhao³ Fei Tan^{† 3}

¹ Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing, China

² State Key Laboratory of Networking and Switching Technology

³ SenseTime Research

zhaofufangchen@bupt.edu.cn

{jingguoqiang, huangjiaheng, zhaorui, tanfei}@sensetime.com

Abstract

In this work, we report our efforts to advance the standard operation procedure of developing Large Language Models (LLMs) or LLMs-based systems or services in industry. We introduce the concept of Large Language Model Development Lifecycle (LDLC) and then highlight the importance of consistency test in ensuring the delivery quality. The principled solution of consistency test, however, is usually overlooked by industrial practitioners and not urgent in academia, and current practical solutions are insufficiently rigorous and labor-intensive. We thus propose a simple yet effective consistency test protocol, named SimCT. SimCT is mainly to proactively check the consistency across different development stages of "bare metal" LLMs or associated services without accessing the model artifacts, in an attempt to expedite the delivery by reducing the back-and-forth alignment communications among multiple teams involved in different development stages.

Specifically, SimCT encompasses response-wise and model-wise tests. We implement the protocol with LightGBM and Student's t-test for two components respectively, and perform extensive experiments to substantiate the effectiveness of SimCT and the involved components. Our code and protocol demo are available at <https://github.com/SenseTime-Research-Language/SimCT>

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have revolutionized natural language processing (NLP) with their significantly improved text generation capabilities (Jakesch et al., 2023; Sadasivan et al., 2023; Lu et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2024), promoting the rapid development of NLP. The GPT family




Figure 1: Diagram of LDLC and an example illustrating the necessity of consistency test for LLM-based systems in typical development stages.

(Ouyang et al., 2022), launched by OpenAI, which includes the popular ChatGPT and GPT-4, has become one of the most widely used LLMs in industrial applications. Concurrently, the open-source community has also given rise to non-commercial LLMs such as Llama (Touvron et al., 2023), GLM (Zeng et al., 2022), and Mistral (Jiang et al., 2023), contributing to technological diversity. Furthermore, LLM-based technologies, such as RAG (Retrieval-Augmented Generation) (Gao et al., 2023) and Agent (Bubeck et al., 2023) applications, are being increasingly widely adopted, further solidifying LLMs' leadership in the field of NLP.

In software development, teams commonly employ the Software Development Lifecycle (SDLC) methodology to design and construct high-quality software (Iwuh, 2022). This cost-effective and time-efficient process aims to reduce project risks through proactive planning, ensuring that the software meets customer expectations both during production and in the long term. Likewise, in industrial LLMs research and development projects, teams are expected to adhere to a comparable procedure which we refer to as the Large Language

⁺Work was done during internship at SenseTime Research

^{*}Equal contribution

[†]Corresponding author

Model Development Life Cycle (LDLC) as delineated in Fig. 1.

In industrial scenarios, multiple teams usually collaboratively work on different development stages of LLMs. Consistency testing is essential to guarantee that these teams consistently deliver model or system artifacts. Unfortunately, LDLC is yet to be studied or executed fully as opposed to SDLC. Consistency test involved in LDLC, however, is urgent and challenging. Multiple factors may shape the consistency checking. Firstly, the decoder structure of LLMs intrinsically introduces randomness amid the generation. Secondly, external factors include differentiation in hardware architectures (e.g., Nvidia’s Ampere/Volta and TPU), heterogeneous inference and deployment tools among multiple teams throughout the development course. Moreover, misaligned hyper-parameters (e.g., temperature coefficient), may also lead to different responses systematically. The interplay between intrinsic and external factors complicates the task of ensuring the consistency of LDLC deliverables, as illustrated in Figure 1.

In this context, we propose SimCT, a Simple Consistency Test protocol in LDLC. It attempts to pinpoint impacts of external factors (e.g., devices, hyper-parameters) on LLMs or LLMs-centric systems conditioned on the responses or outputs for proactively diagnosing potential gaps throughout different development stages. Specifically, SimCT involves response-wise and model-wise tests as detailed in Section 3. We formulate the former as a binary classification, which takes as input features classical generation metrics (e.g., BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), ROUGE (Lin, 2004), METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005)) to determine if two responses are generated by the same model. We then aggregate response pairs of all queries for two models and perform model-wise consistency test utilizing statistical t-test. To facilitate the development and evaluation of SimCT, we have also crafted consistency test datasets and benchmarks in this regard.

Our contributions are summarized as: 1) We introduce the concept of LDLC to describe the current industrial procedure of large model development; (2) We emphasize the essential role of consistency test in LDLC to facilitate the synergy across different teams; (3) We propose SimCT protocol and craft a pertinent dataset to instanzialize consistency test and demonstrate its effectiveness and generalization.

2 Related Work

2.1 Model Generation Analysis

Previous research on single model generation often employs traditional evaluation metrics to quantitatively assess the model-generated content. BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) is currently the predominant metric for evaluating machine translation, whereas ROUGE (Lin, 2004) assesses generation performance based on recall rate. METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005), an enhancement of BLEU, offers a more user-friendly approach. These metrics, however, have been criticized for their inability to effectively reflect the NLG system’s performance (Stent et al., 2005; Reiter and Belz, 2009) especially in LLMs era. Recently, GPTScore (Fu et al., 2023) utilizes LLMs (e.g., GPT-3) for evaluation purposes. Liu et al. (2023) has suggested employing GPT-4 as a powerful evaluator to achieve better alignment with human judgment. They aim to evaluate the quality of generated content based on human intent. Our work, however, capitalize on the existing metrics to address the consistency issue among multiple parties.

Beyond this, multi-model analysis in generation is currently limited, yet there is still some relevant work. LMdiff (Strobelt et al., 2021) assesses differences between models by conducting white-box analysis. Chatbot Arena (Zheng et al., 2023) enables users to compare the responses of two models through a black-box approach and rank them accordingly. However, the automatic consistency analysis tool in a black-box manner is yet to be explored.

2.2 LLM Consistency

There are also some studies on the consistency of large language models (LLMs). Raj et al. (2022) measures the reliability of LLMs through semantic consistency evaluations. Tam et al. (2023) assesses the factual consistency of LLMs, specifically in the context of news summarization. Cui et al. (2023a) proposes DCR, an automated framework that employs a divide-and-conquer reasoning strategy to evaluate and enhance the consistency of LLM-generated text against human judgment. Raj et al. (2023) underscores the significance of fully understanding LLM consistency in open text generation scenarios. Chen et al. (2023) introduces the concept of universal self-consistency aimed at improving the performance of LLM generation. The consistency here mainly refers to whether mod-




Figure 2: The overall framework of SimCT involves the response-wise test and the model-wise test (aggregating all response pairs).

els/systems are consistent with the ground truth or human preference. Our work, however, emphasizes if models developed at different stages are intricately consistent regardless of they align with ground truth or human preference as well as develops a consistency test protocol. It is an essential effort to advance the standard operation procedure for LLMs development in industry. By introducing automatic end-to-end consistency testing into LDLC, we aim to ensure the delivered services are consistent with what LLMs are developed for initially.

3 SimCT Protocol

The pivotal parts of SimCT are to perform response-wise consistency test and then predict the model-wise consistency by evaluating and aggregating typical response pairs from different models. The overall framework of SimCT is delineated in Figure 2.

3.1 Response-wise CT

To determine whether models A and B are consistent with each other, we can only pinpoint relevant signals from their responses if model parameters are not accessible. Specifically, given query q , we have two responses r_A^q and r_B^q from models A and B , respectively. The challenge here is that two identical models (e.g., calling the same API twice)

don't necessarily give the exactly same responses due to sampling nature, and two different models (e.g., models of different parameter scale) are likely to respond similarly given some query. We thus introduce classical metrics including ROUGE, BLUE, METEOR, and DENSE[†] to measure the consistency signals of response pairs at the lexical/semantic level. Furthermore, the TYPE of the query strongly influences the consistency of the responses, so we roughly divide them into two categories, i.e., closed-end and open-end. Formally, we have response-wise consistency test:

$$CT_{AB}^q = f_R(\text{ROUGE}(r_A^q, r_B^q), \text{BLEU}(r_A^q, r_B^q), \text{METEOR}(r_A^q, r_B^q), \text{DENSE}(r_A^q, r_B^q), \text{TYPE}(q)) \quad (1)$$

where f_R is a model-agnostic learning function to map the query and the associated responses into consistency likelihood.

Intuitively, it is not statistically significant to evaluate the consistency of LLMs or associated system quantitatively based on the response pair of a single query. Furthermore, it's challenging to pinpoint the consistent signals by ruling out intrinsic randomness due to sampled decoding as mentioned in Section 1. Therefore, it's demanding to apply

[†]We use m3e (Wang Yuxin, 2023) embedding model to generate semantic similarity as dense features.

response-wise consistency test to more queries for amplifying the patterns.

3.2 Model-wise CT

In this context, we propose model-wise consistency test, which is the end-to-end goal of simCT as well. Specifically, given models A (assumed as the upstream one) and B (assumed as the downstream one) and query set $Q = q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N$, the protocol has the following steps:

- Given query q_i , collect two sampled responses $r_A^{q_i}$ and $\bar{r}_A^{q_i}$ from model A , and single response $r_B^{q_i}$
- Utilize Eq. 1 to estimate response-wise consistency likelihood $CT_{AB}^{q_i}$ for two models and $CT_{AA}^{q_i}$ as response-pair reference of upstream model A
- Armed with set $\{CT_{AB}^{q_i}, CT_{AA}^{q_i}\}_{i=1}^N$, we perform classical Student’s t-test for paired samples with null hypothesis that the mean of $CT_{AB}^{q_i}$ is not equal to the mean of $CT_{AA}^{q_i}$. If the test is statistically significant (e.g., p-value ≤ 0.05), models A and B are regarded as consistent, otherwise it’s inconsistent.

The comparison with reference helps to get rid of intrinsic randomness involved in the decoding.

3.3 Dataset Craft

It’s noted that f_R involved in the proposed SimCT is supposed to be learnt from model responses and generalized in unseen scenarios. Therefore, we report the way we craft training and test/benchmark datasets to simulate the real-world applications as detailed in Fig. 3 in Appendix.

3.3.1 Training dataset

We follow InstructGPT (Ouyang et al., 2022) to gather passages from Chinese Wikipedia[†] and utilize ChatGPT to generate corresponding questions for them. Following a manual screening procedure to evaluate quality and difficulty meticulously, we obtain 1,000 high-quality, medium-difficulty queries. As indicated in Eq. 1, we categorize the queries in our dataset into ‘open-end’ and ‘closed-end’ types, encoded as 1 and 0, respectively. They are roughly 50-50 split (52.1% vs 47.9%) to simplify the model training without loss of generality.

[†]Wikipedia.org

In this work, consistent model pairs refer to the final decoding distribution remains unchanged given all queries. That’s to say, all possible factors don’t alter decoding distribution throughout the development lifecycle. It’s inconsistent if the distribution shifts due to any intrinsic or external factors as mentioned before.

Specifically, given 1,000 queries, we have 4 different LLMs as detailed in Table 6 in Appendix to build 7 consistent and 8 inconsistent model pairs, respectively. For consistent model pairs, we generate 6,263 response pairs by calling the same LLMs or APIs twice. For inconsistent model pairs, we generate 7,518 response pairs by simulating the possible scenarios (e.g., different LLMs or the same LLMs with different hyper-parameters or deployment environment) as detailed in Appendix C. In total, we have 13,781 response-wise training samples to develop f_R .

3.3.2 Test Dataset

Regarding the test set, we collect 138 high-quality queries with 48.6% and 51.4% being open-end and closed-end respectively. As with training part, we build 14 consistent model pairs and 15 inconsistent model pairs as described in Table 6 in Appendix. We thus have a total of 4,002 response pairs. In addition, to facilitate the model-wise CT as mentioned before, we generate references for 4,002 response pairs by calling the upstream model one more time.

3.4 Implementation Instance

For f_R in response-wise test, we introduce LightGBM (Ke et al., 2017) as the classifier due to its lightweight serving and compelling capability. The specific implementation details (such as parameter settings) are shown in Table 5 in Appendix.

Regarding model-wise test, we have the null hypothesis that the mean of $CT_{AB}^{q_i}$ is not equal to the mean of $CT_{AA}^{q_i}$, if the test is statistically significant (i.e., p-value ≤ 0.05), models A and B are regarded as consistent. It’s inconsistent if it is not statistically significant (i.e., p-value ≥ 0.95)[†]. For cases without statistical significance (i.e., $0.05 < \text{p-value} < 0.95$), we regard them as inconsistent. The rationale is that if it’s falsely predicted as consistent, the potential impact is worse than the other way around in industrial practice and leads to more workloads.

[†]It’s noted that p-value ≥ 0.95 is equivalent to that the null hypothesis of their means are equal with p-value ≤ 0.05 .

	GPT-4o	Human	RoFormer	GLM4-9B	SimCT
Single-stage	68.97	–	–	–	–
Threshold (dual-stage)	65.52	61.72	63.45	55.17	79.31
T-test (dual-stage)	86.21	62.07	82.76	75.86	93.10
Optimal	86.21	62.07	82.76	75.86	93.10

Table 1: Accuracy comparison of our SimCT and diverse baselines. ‘–’ stands for no experiments performed.

4 Experiment

4.1 Baselines

To make the entire consistency testing experiment more robust and comprehensive, we introduce the following two different baselines:

For the first baseline, we select GPT-4o as the single-stage test scheme by using all the response pairs $\{r_A^{q_i}, r_B^{q_i}\}_{i=1}^N$ straightly from model pair (mentioned in Section 3.3.2) as input. This allow GPT-4o to directly determine whether the model pair is consistent. To avoid randomness, we replicate the experiment 10 times for each model pair. We then calculate the overall judgement accuracy as the baseline metric.

For the second baselines (dual-stage schemes), we instantiate f_R with advanced models such as RoFormer (Su et al., 2024), GLM4-9B (Zeng et al., 2022; Du et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023) and GPT-4o to derive the response-wise CT_{AB}^q for the given query q . As vanilla RoFormer cannot generate reasonable quantitative metrics with only prompts like GLM4-9B and GPT-4o, we additionally fine-tune RoFormer on the training set (Section 3.3.1). For human annotation, we recruit seven graduate students in NLP/LLMs to independently vote the consistency of all response pairs. We take the ratio of voting for consistency as response-wise score (e.g., 5/7). We then employ a *Threshold* (majority voting) as described in Appendix B and *T-test* to ascertain whether it’s consistent or inconsistent for all methods.

4.2 Main Result

As shown in Table 1, our SimCT is significantly superior to other baselines. Especially, SimCT surpasses the best setting of GPT-4o, which substantiates the necessity of SimCT dedicated to consistency test. It’s also noted that human annotation doesn’t necessarily excel in diagnosing the consistency among models, further suggesting the complication of this task.

Furthermore, SimCT with LightGBM being

	GPT-4o	Human	RoFormer	GLM4-9B	SimCT
Optimal	86.21	62.07	82.76	75.86	93.10
Optimal (w/o TYPE)	72.21	55.86	57.74	62.04	82.76

Table 2: Comparison of optimal results and their counterparts without question type (TYPE). For GPT-4o, question type is taken off from the prompt.

response-wise f_R performs significantly better than other baselines across both Threshold and T-test schemes. T-test as model-wise protocol in the two-stage scheme is also generally better than threshold protocol, substantiating its reasonability and statistical rationality.

4.3 Ablation Study

As presented in Table 2, the query type largely shapes the consistency test performance across our proposed SimCT and baselines. Intuitively, if two different students of similar level are asked to answer a multiple-choice question (closed-end) and write an email (open-end), the responses of the latter can provide more differential signals. likewise, if the case is to ask the same students twice, multiple-choice question (closed-end) is more helpful.

4.4 Case Study

To facilitate the understanding of our simCT intuitively, we perform response-wise and model-wise case studies.

4.4.1 Response-wise

We randomly sample three different queries from the test set, as shown in Table 3. It is evident that for identical response pairs, f_R tends to give a very high score, while for responses that convey the same meaning but differ in content, f_R gives a relatively medium score. For completely different response pairs, the score is quite low. Although the scores vary for different response pairs, it remains tricky to directly determine whether the underlying models are consistent. This intuitively highlights the rationality of our protocol of combining response-wise and model-wise tests.

4.4.2 Model-wise

To further demonstrate the statistical significance of our SimCT, we sample the p-value results of the t-test for Baichuan-7B and Baichuan-13B (Baichuan, 2023), as detailed in Table 4. For inconsistent model pairs (Baichuan-7B vs Baichuan-13B), the p-value is close to 1, while for consistent model pairs,

Query	Response A	Response B	SimCT (LightGBM)	RoFormer
What is the main food of the Three Striped Flag Seabream?	Coral.	The three banded flag snapper feeds mainly on coral polyps.	56.76	58.64
Please select [positive, negative] from the options based on the following question ...	Positive	Positive	88.54	73.31
What is the largest known organism at present?	The currently known tallest plant is the African cotton tree.	The largest known organism is the blue whale.	21.31	38.84

Table 3: Three typical queries and their responses from different models checked by SimCT and RoFormer with response-wise test, where all SimCT values are multiplied by 100.

Model A \ Model B	Baichuan-13B $\tau=0.2$	Baichuan-7B $\tau=0.2$	Baichuan-13B $\tau=0.5$
Baichuan-13B $\tau=0.2$	4.87e-17	0.99	0.79
Baichuan-7B $\tau=0.2$	0.99	3.58e-10	0.99
Baichuan-13B $\tau=0.5$	0.82	0.99	0.02

Table 4: Illustrative cases of model-wise test.

the p-value is close to 0. For model pairs differing in temperature coefficient (e.g., Baichuan-13B with $\tau = 0.2$ vs $\tau = 0.5$), the p-value is not that informative (e.g., p-value = 0.79). This further confirms the challenges of pinpointing the subtle variations involved in model development and deployment.

5 Discussion

LLMs are regarded as the cutting-edge technology and have gradually been employed in industry. The routine development work mainly consists of data cleaning, model training, performance evaluation and deployment. Performance evaluation is a highly frequent item though it’s not as fancy as model training throughout LDLC. The back and forth sync-up and double checking, however, is time-consuming. Unfortunately, the most typical solution is far from being principled.

Our SimCT protocol is developed to bridge this gap. It can not only improve the efficiency of large teams or multiple teams working together, but also effectively avoid the butterfly effect caused by small problems in the R&D procedure and ensure the smooth progress of the project. In addition, our work has far-reaching implications and will inspire further exploration and research into safety and authenticity in large-scale model industrial R&D in the future. This not only provides a solid foundation for existing technology, but also paves the way for future innovation. Our work highlights the importance of SOP in LLMs development and the involved test (e.g., the proposed consistency test)

to ensure the SOP can be executed.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we develop SimCT, a simple yet principled consistency test protocol in LLMs development lifecycle, dedicated to addressing common consistency issues involved in the industrial R&D procedure of LLMs. Furthermore, we have made the relevant code and datasets publicly available, detailing the construction procedure of these datasets to facilitate the community to further advance the SOP of LLMs development.

7 Limitations

There are inevitably differences between our experimental settings and the real application scenarios of LLMs development. We can’t cover all scenarios though we try our best.

References

- Abubakar Abid, Ali Abdalla, Ali Abid, Dawood Khan, Abdulrahman Alfozan, and James Zou. 2019. Gradio: Hassle-free sharing and testing of ml models in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02569*.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*.
- Baichuan. 2023. [Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305*.

- Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, pages 65–72.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. 2023. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*.
- Xinyun Chen, Renat Aksitov, Uri Alon, Jie Ren, Kefan Xiao, Pengcheng Yin, Sushant Prakash, Charles Sutton, Xuezhi Wang, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Universal self-consistency for large language model generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17311*.
- Wendi Cui, Jiaxin Zhang, Zhuohang Li, Damien Lopez, Kamalika Das, Bradley Malin, and Sricharan Kumar. 2023a. Evaluating and improving generation consistency of large language models via a divide-conquer-reasoning approach.
- Yiming Cui, Ziqing Yang, and Xin Yao. 2023b. Efficient and effective text encoding for chinese llama and alpaca. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08177*.
- Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2022. Glm: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 320–335.
- Jinlan Fu, See-Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. 2023. Gptscore: Evaluate as you desire. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04166*.
- Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, and Haofen Wang. 2023. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997*.
- Praise Iwuh. 2022. [The complete guide to sdlc](#).
- Maurice Jakesch, Jeffrey T Hancock, and Mor Naaman. 2023. Human heuristics for ai-generated language are flawed. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(11):e2208839120.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Guolin Ke, Qi Meng, Thomas Finley, Taifeng Wang, Wei Chen, Weidong Ma, Qiwei Ye, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2017. Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Donald E Knuth. 1992. Two notes on notation. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 99(5):403–422.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuhang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. 2023. Gpteval: Nlg evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16634*.
- Jinghui Lu, Dongsheng Zhu, Weidong Han, Rui Zhao, Brian Mac Namee, and Fei Tan. 2022. What makes pre-trained language models better zero-shot learners? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15206*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318.
- Harsh Raj, Vipul Gupta, Domenic Rosati, and Subhabrata Majumdar. 2023. Semantic consistency for assuring reliability of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09138*.
- Harsh Raj, Domenic Rosati, and Subhabrata Majumdar. 2022. Measuring reliability of large language models through semantic consistency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05853*.
- Ehud Reiter and Anja Belz. 2009. An investigation into the validity of some metrics for automatically evaluating natural language generation systems. *Computational Linguistics*, 35(4):529–558.
- Vinu Sankar Sadasivan, Aounon Kumar, Sriram Balasubramanian, Wenxiao Wang, and Soheil Feizi. 2023. Can ai-generated text be reliably detected? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11156*.
- sensetime research. sensetime. <https://chat.sensetime.com/wb>. Aug 21, 2023.
- Amanda Stent, Matthew Marge, and Mohit Singhai. 2005. Evaluating evaluation methods for generation in the presence of variation. In *International conference on intelligent text processing and computational linguistics*, pages 341–351. Springer.
- Hendrik Strobelt, Benjamin Hoover, Arvind Satyanarayan, and Sebastian Gehrmann. 2021. Lmdiff: A visual diff tool to compare language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.01582*.
- Jianlin Su, Murtadha Ahmed, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Wen Bo, and Yunfeng Liu. 2024. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding. *Neurocomputing*, 568:127063.

Derek Tam, Anisha Mascarenhas, Shiyue Zhang, Sarah Kwan, Mohit Bansal, and Colin Raffel. 2023. [Evaluating the factual consistency of large language models through news summarization](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 5220–5255, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.

Junjie Wang, Yuxiang Zhang, Lin Zhang, Ping Yang, Xinyu Gao, Ziwei Wu, Xiaoqun Dong, Junqing He, Jianheng Zhuo, Qi Yang, Yongfeng Huang, Xiayu Li, Yanghan Wu, Junyu Lu, Xinyu Zhu, Weifeng Chen, Ting Han, Kunhao Pan, Rui Wang, Hao Wang, Xiaojun Wu, Zhongshen Zeng, Chongpei Chen, Ruyi Gan, and Jiaying Zhang. 2022. Fengshenbang 1.0: Being the foundation of chinese cognitive intelligence. *CoRR*, abs/2209.02970.

Weihan Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, Jiazheng Xu, Bin Xu, Juanzi Li, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, and Jie Tang. 2023. [Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.03079.

He sicheng Wang Yuxin, Sun Qingxuan. 2023. M3e: Moka massive mixed embedding model.

Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, et al. 2022. Glm-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02414*.

Hengyuan Zhang, Yanru Wu, Dawei Li, Zacc Yang, Rui Zhao, Yong Jiang, and Fei Tan. 2024. Balancing speciality and versatility: a coarse to fine framework for supervised fine-tuning large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10306*.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2023. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05685*.

A Prompts for Quantitative Indicators

Our prompt is as follows:

Now, here are two paragraphs for you. These two texts are two outputs generated by two models. These two models may be the same or different. Please confirm if the two models used to generate these two texts are the same, and give a score between "0" and "1", where "0" represents that the two models are different and "1" represents that the two models are the same, with the result rounded to three decimal places.

Requirement: 1) The score cannot be equal to "0" or "1"! 2) Provide the reason for giving this score!

You can use the following indicators as a basis for judgment:

1. The semantic similarity between two paragraphs of text. Generally, the semantic similarity between replies obtained from the same question is relatively high.

2. Differences in narrative logic between the two texts. Generally, there are significant differences in the narrative logic of different models, while the narrative logic of the same model is basically the same.

3. The generation quality of two paragraphs of text generally varies among different models, and the generation quality of the same model is basically similar.

4. The generation confidence of two paragraphs of text is generally different for different models, while the generation confidence of the same model is basically the same.

B Threshold-based Test

Given $\{CT_{AB}^{q_i}\}_{i=1}^N$, the overall consistency likelihood CT_{AB} is as follows:

$$CT_{AB} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N [CT_{AB}^{q_i} \geq \lambda_{\text{response}}]}{N} \quad (2)$$

where N represents the number of response pairs in a single case as mentioned in main text, and $\lambda_{\text{response}}$ is a response-wise hyper-parameter optimized for different baselines. It should be noted that $[\cdot]$ denotes an Iverson bracket[†] (Knuth, 1992). For model-wise CT_{AB} , we take the majority voting (more than 1/2) to decide if the model is consistent or not.

$$\dagger[P] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{If } P \text{ is true} \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Param	Value	Param	Value	Param	Value
objective	binary	metric	auc	num_leaves	20
max_bin	40	max_depth	2	learning_rate	0.1
colsample_bytree	0.9	bagging_fraction	0.9	min_child_samples	1
n_jobs	-1	silent	True	seed	1

Table 5: Implementation details in LightGBM fo SimCT.

train	test	
Ziya Wang et al. (2022)	Ziya	SenseChat- α
SenseChat- α (sensetime research)	SenseChat- β	SenseChat- γ
SenseChat- β	Baichuan2-7B Baichuan (2023)	Bichuan-13B
SenseChat- γ	LLaMa-70B Touvron et al. (2023)	Qwen Bai et al. (2023)
	Llama2-Chinese-7B Cui et al. (2023b)	Llama2-Chinese-13B

Table 6: Detailed LLMs involved in dataset crafting.




Figure 3: Dataset Construction Rules

C Dataset Construction Rules

The data craft process is shown in Figure 3. It includes three methods. In the first method, we input the query into the same large language model twice to obtain consistent response pairs. For inconsistent response pairs, we have two methods: either input the query into two completely different large language models, or input the query into the large language model once, then change the model’s temperature coefficient, and input the query into the large language model again.

D SimCT Demo

We design a demo for SimCT using Gradio (Abid et al., 2019). The web interface is shown in Figure 4. This demo requires users to provide two outputs: one for the test data (to obtain CT_{AB}) and one for the reference data (to obtain CT_{AA}). The final outputs are labels indicating whether two models are consistent and the associated confidence level.


Note that the label and confidence are derived

from the P-value of the T-test. Specifically, as hypothesised in main text (i.e., the mean of $CT_{AB}^{q_i}$ is not equal to the mean of $CT_{AA}^{q_i}$), we consider model pairs with p-value ≤ 0.05 to be consistent and those with p-value > 0.05 to be inconsistent. Then for confidence level, it’s equal to $1 - p - \text{value}$ if label==‘consistent’ and p-value if label==‘inconsistent’.


SimCT

Upload two files.

test file


 Drop File Here
 - or -
 Click to Upload

reference file


 Drop File Here
 - or -
 Click to Upload

Clear
Submit

Label

Confidence

Flag

Figure 4: SimCT Demo

test file

Inconsistent_baichuan_7b_13b_final.json
223.4 KB ↓

reference file

baichuan_13b_reference.json
227.0 KB ↓

Clear
Submit

Label

Confidence

Flag

(a) Demo for inconsistent model pair test

test file

consistent_baichuan_13b_final.json
227.0 KB ↓

reference file

baichuan_13b_reference.json
227.0 KB ↓

Clear
Submit

Label

Confidence

Flag

(b) Demo for consistent model pair test

Figure 5: Illustrative cases for SimCT Demo.