

Fine-tuning Large Language Models with Human-inspired Learning Strategies in Medical Question Answering

Yushi Yang, Andrew M. Bean, Robert McCraith, Adam Mahdi
University of Oxford

Abstract

Training Large Language Models (LLMs) incurs substantial data-related costs, motivating the development of data-efficient training methods through optimised data ordering and selection. Human-inspired learning strategies, such as curriculum learning, offer possibilities for efficient training by organising data according to common human learning practices. Despite evidence that fine-tuning with curriculum learning improves the performance of LLMs for natural language understanding tasks, its effectiveness is typically assessed using a single model. In this work, we extend previous research by evaluating both curriculum-based and non-curriculum-based learning strategies across multiple LLMs, using human-defined and automated data labels for medical question answering. Our results indicate a moderate impact of using human-inspired learning strategies for fine-tuning LLMs, with maximum accuracy gains of 1.77% per model and 1.81% per dataset. Crucially, we demonstrate that the effectiveness of these strategies varies significantly across different model-dataset combinations, emphasising that the benefits of a specific human-inspired strategy for fine-tuning LLMs do not generalise. Additionally, we find evidence that curriculum learning using LLM-defined question difficulty outperforms human-defined difficulty, highlighting the potential of using model-generated measures for optimal curriculum design.

1 Introduction

Training Large Language Models (LLMs) incurs substantial data-related costs both in compute resources [16, 17] and in data collection efforts [28, 43]. Recent efforts have been made to improve model performance through more efficient use of the same training data [35, 15]. Building on the historic success of machine learning methods inspired by human cognition [36], human-inspired learning strategies offer the possibility to organise data ordering according to human learning practices to achieve efficient training.

The most established technique for data ordering is curriculum learning, in which training samples are ordered from easiest to hardest [15, 42]. This method has led to some improvements in general knowledge acquisition [22], natural language reasoning [25] and information retrieval [33] benchmarks. In addition, variations in curriculum learning, such as interleaving different subject areas, have also been effective in increasing world knowledge and common sense reasoning [22].

Despite the evidence supporting curriculum learning’s benefits for foundational natural language processing tasks, its application to domain-specific question-answering, particularly in high-stakes fields like medical question-answering, remains under-explored. To address this gap, several language models fine-tuned on medical data have recently been released to enhance accurate information retrieval in the medical context [34, 9, 38]. On the other hand, previous

studies on curriculum learning have primarily focused on a single model with a specific curriculum strategy [25, 42], offering valuable insights but leaving questions about the generalisability of the results. Our study extends previous research to medical question answering by rigorously evaluating a range of human-inspired learning strategies, including non-curriculum-based approaches, across multiple models and diverse data labeling scenarios for fine-tuning LLMs. Through this comprehensive evaluation, we offer crucial insights into the effectiveness and variability of human-inspired learning strategies for optimising the fine-tuning process of LLMs.

Our contributions are as follows:

- **Broad-based evaluation of human-inspired learning strategies:** Unlike previous work that focused on individual language model and curriculum learning, we extended the analysis to four LLMs of different sizes and architectures and non-curriculum-based learning strategies. This comprehensive approach reveals that the effectiveness of human-inspired learning strategies varies significantly across different model-dataset combinations, suggesting caution in generalising these strategies across diverse contexts.
- **Comparison of machine-generated and human-generated data labels:** We introduce a novel method for annotating question difficulty and category using ensemble LLM responses and text clustering. This leverages pre-trained LLM knowledge for data labeling, offering a cost-effective alternative to human annotations. Our findings show that LLM-defined question difficulty improves curriculum learning performance compared to human-defined labels.

2 Related Work

Data-efficient fine-tuning of LLMs Data selection and ordering methods are crucial for data-efficient LLM fine-tuning. Sachdeva et al. [35] investigated fine-tuning methods that select high-quality training examples using zero-shot reasoning, ensuring diverse samples represent the data distribution. Das and Khetan [10] employed unsupervised core-set selection to minimise data requirements while maintaining model accuracy. Chen et al. [8] proposed a framework using an ordered data sampling algorithm for efficient learning of advanced language processing skills. Unlike these approaches which focus on selecting high-quality data subsets, our research adopts human-inspired learning strategies for ordering data to improve fine-tuning efficiency.

Human-inspired learning strategies for training LLMs Curriculum learning has been explored for pretraining and fine-tuning LLMs for natural language tasks. Daniel [6] explored curriculum learning on BERT pretraining using various linguistically motivated curricula and found no compelling evidence of improvements. In contrast, Xu et al. [42] showed that using multiple teacher models to define question difficulty and applying this curriculum to fine-tune BERT improved performance on natural language understanding tasks by up to 1.3%. Maharana et al. [25] reported that RoBERTa fine-tuned with fixed and adaptive curricula defined by a teacher model improved common sense reasoning tasks by up to 2%. Lee et al. [22] demonstrated that interleaving curricula by subjects using Llama 2-13B improved MMLU benchmark scores by up to 3%. Our work extends previous studies by evaluating multiple language models, learning strategies, and data labeling scenarios in medical question answering.




Figure 1: **Human-inspired learning strategies.** The five human-inspired learning strategies are demonstrated by ordering data based on a continuous measure of question difficulty (indicated by arrows) and category (represented by block colors), alongside the *Random Shuffle* baseline. The first row presents non-curriculum-based strategies, the second row presents curriculum-based strategies: (i) *Blocked Learning*: Questions are grouped by category and randomised within each group. (ii) *Interleaved Learning*: Questions are grouped by category, then each category is randomly divided into three equal parts, and questions from each part are arranged in an interleaved manner. (iii) *Curriculum Learning*: Questions are sorted by difficulty in ascending order. (iv) *Blocked Curriculum*: Questions are grouped by category and then arranged in ascending difficulty within each category. (v) *Interleaved Curriculum*: Following Blocked Curriculum, questions in each category are further divided into three equal parts, and then interleaved.

3 Methods

3.1 Experimental design

We conducted a comprehensive evaluation to determine the optimal data ordering strategy, inspired by human learning, for fine-tuning language models in medical question answering. Our study compared the effectiveness of five human-inspired learning strategies against a Random Shuffled baseline (Section 3.2). This evaluation was carried out on four LLMs (Section 3.5), resulting in a total of 24 fine-tuned models (6 strategies \times 4 models). We further evaluated these fine-tuned models on three different medical datasets (Section 3.3). Additionally, we implemented human-inspired learning strategies with model-generated data labels, resulting in three distinct data-labeling scenarios (Section 3.4). This brought the total to 72 fine-tuned models ¹

3.2 Human-inspired learning strategies

Figure 1 defines five learning strategies using data orderings that mimic common human learning practices. These strategies are based on two data labels: (i) a continuous measure of question difficulty and (ii) a discrete question category. *Blocked Learning* and *Interleaved Learning* are solely defined by category and are not curriculum-based. The remaining strategies use the difficulty measure to define the curriculum. Inspired by Lee et al. [22], who integrated blocking and interleaving practices into curriculum design, we modified these strategies by strictly sorting questions based on continuous difficulty values. This approach avoids arbitrary distinctions between questions of similar difficulty, unlike the original easy, medium, and hard categorisations.

¹Our code for the fine-tuning experiments can be found at <https://github.com/Oxford-AI-for-Society/human-learning-strategies>.

The incorporation of human learning practices can potentially improve the effectiveness of LLMs by structuring their learning process to promote better memory retention, generalisation, and prevent catastrophic forgetting [24]. **Blocked Learning** groups questions by category, akin to blocked practice in education, where focusing on one subject at a time deepens understanding [30, 12]. **Interleaved Learning** mixes questions from different categories and revisits them periodically, similar to interleaved practice, which mitigates cognitive decay and improves memory retention [7, 13]. **Curriculum Learning** orders questions from easiest to hardest, similar to traditional educational curricula where students build foundational knowledge before tackling more complex tasks [40]. **Blocked Curriculum** combines the two approaches by sorting questions within each category, allowing learners to build knowledge progressively in each category [22]. **Interleaved Curriculum** (also called Spiral Curriculum), cycles through categories in rounds with increasing difficulty, mimicking the process of revisiting subjects with progressively challenging material to reinforce learning [21].

3.3 Datasets

We fine-tuned on one medical question answering dataset, and evaluated on three to test generalisation. For fine-tuning, we used the Lekarski Egzamin Końcowy (LEK) dataset [3], which consists of questions from the Polish medical licensing exams². Unlike other medical exam datasets, LEK includes meta-information about human test takers’ responses for each question, allowing us to assess question difficulty based on actual performance. We used the English version of the questions from the last five exam sittings between spring 2021 and spring 2023. The final dataset contains 874 unique questions divided into ten medical categories. For evaluation, we used the LEK dataset with cross-validation, as well as the official MedMCQA validation set [32]³, and the test set of MedQA [20], two popular medical question answering benchmarks.

3.4 Data labelling scenarios

We tested the effects of learning strategies defined by three data labelling scenarios on question difficulty and category:

- Difficulty defined by human responses and categories based on pre-existing labels (already present in LEK);
- Difficulty defined by LLM responses and categories based on pre-existing labels;
- Difficulty defined by LLM responses and categories identified through clustering.

The automated data labels generated by LLM responses and clustering were tested to extend learning strategies to unlabelled data, where human annotations are expensive to obtain. The details of automated labelling are described below.

LLM-annotated question difficulty We prompted several general-purpose and medical LLMs to answer the questions in the training set, following the instruction prompt in Section 3.6. For each LLM, we computed an *expected accuracy* score for each question, defined as the probability that the LLM assigns to the correct choice index.

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Acc}] = \sum_c P(c) \cdot \mathbb{1}(c = c^*), \quad (1)$$

²The LEK dataset is publically available at <https://cem.edu.pl/>

³Following Wu et al. [41] and Chen et al. [9], we used the validation set as the MedMCQA test set does not publicly provide answer keys.

where $P(c)$ is the probability assigned to choice $c \in \{A, B, C, D, E\}$, and $\mathbb{1}(c = c^*)$ is 1 if c is the correct answer c^* , otherwise 0. This equates to the probability the model assigns to the correct answer. The LLM-annotated difficulty for each question is defined as *(1 - expected accuracy)*, averaged across the LLMs. The LLMs used to compute difficulty on the LEK dataset include GPT-4 Turbo [31], GPT-3.5 [5], PaLM 2 [1], Mixtral 8x7B [19], Meditron 70B [9], and Llama 2 70B [39]. These models were chosen to cover popular architectures and a broad range of pre-training knowledge. The models demonstrated reasonable agreement on a per-question basis with an average pairwise correlation of 0.54, assuming that their averaged responses reflect the general medical knowledge that LLMs possess. We present results using other ensemble models in Appendix D.

Clustering-based question categories To automate category assignment, we performed text clustering to group questions into semantically similar clusters, creating question categories based on the clustering results. We applied the BioMedBERT sentence embedding [14] to the question context and the answer choices. For clustering, we used Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP) [27] for dimensionality reduction, followed by Hierarchical Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise (HDBSCAN) [26]. The density-based algorithm was chosen to handle noisy data and generate clusters with variable densities without the need to specify the number of clusters [2]. The noise points identified by HDBSCAN were treated separately as an additional block in Blocked Learning. The hyperparameters of the UMAP and HDBSCAN hyperparameters were optimised using Bayesian optimisation to minimise the proportion of data points with a low probability (below 5%) of belonging to any cluster. The final hyperparameters for clustering are presented in Appendix C.

3.5 Language models

We used four open-source language models for fine-tuning: TinyLlama 1.1B [44], Llama 2 7B [39], Llama 2 13B [39], and Mistral 7B [18]. This selection measures the effects of learning strategies across three varying sizes and two different model architectures. The TinyLlama 1.1B model follows the same architecture and tokenizer as Meta’s Llama 2 models, with 1.1B parameters pre-trained on 3 trillion tokens [44]. For all Llama 2 models, we used the chat series optimised for dialogue, as they allow us to focus on fine-tuning medical knowledge instead of instruction styles. All models were accessed through Hugging Face and fine-tuned on two NVIDIA RTX 6000 Ada cards. To optimise memory usage, the models loaded from Hugging Face were quantised to 4-bits with double quantisation. We did not test the 70B models because of the computational costs of repeatedly fine-tuning such large models.

3.6 Supervised fine-tuning

Instruction prompt We used zero-shot prompting for each question, starting with the following instruction:

*Answer the following multiple-choice question by giving the most appropriate response.
The answer should be one of [A, B, C, D, E].*

This was followed by the multiple choice question. The response template began with ‘*Answer:*’, and the correct answer index was learned to be predicted as the next token during fine-tuning. While more optimised prompts can be used for improving performance [29, 38], our zero-shot prompt structure is designed to reflect typical exam instructions and serves as a baseline for performance. The same prompt structure was used for inference, where the correct answer index was masked and predicted.

Fine-tuning method We employed the QLoRA [11] method for parameter-efficient fine-tuning of the linear layers in the LLMs. During fine-tuning, we disabled automatic data shuffling in PyTorch and trained the entire data sequence in a single epoch to maintain the specified learning order. Repeating the training across multiple epochs would violate the learning strategy design outlined in Figure 1; for example, looping through a Blocked practice multiple times would effectively turn it into an Interleaved practice. Similarly, going through a curriculum multiple times would cause the model to jump from difficult questions to easy questions across epochs, violating the curriculum design. We also tried repeating the samples three times within each block to simulate multiple batches while maintaining the curriculum order, and obtained similar results to those with no data repetition. The hyperparameters used for fine-tuning each model, selected by grid search from a defined range, are provided in Appendix C. To ensure fair comparisons, all learning strategies applied to a model used the same hyperparameters on the Random Shuffle baseline.

3.7 Model evaluation

Metrics for evaluation As we are dealing with multiple-choice questions with single-label answers, we relied on the LLMs to generate the next token as one of the option indexes [A, B, C, D, E] following the instruction prompt in Section 3.6. We used greedy decoding to generate the model’s answer and compared it to the true answer to determine the *accuracy score*. To evaluate the effectiveness of learning strategies for fine-tuning, we calculated the *maximum accuracy gain* as the difference in the accuracy score between the best-performing learning strategy and the Random Shuffle baseline.

Evaluation on learning strategies The accuracy score for each learning strategy and the Random Shuffle baseline was calculated by sampling each strategy five times and averaging the results. To ensure consistent comparisons, the category orders used in Blocked and Interleaved strategies remain consistent across all five samples.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Impact of fine-tuning with human-inspired learning strategies

Among the three data labelling scenarios, all learning strategies achieved a positive accuracy gain over Random Shuffle. The highest model-wise accuracy gain was 1.77%, and the highest dataset-wise accuracy gain was 1.81% (Table 1), both significant at the 5% level using a paired t-test compared to the Random Shuffle baseline. Among the four models considered, TinyLlama-1.1B consistently demonstrated the highest accuracy gains (1.40%, 1.44%, and 1.77%) in all three sets of data labels. Following the definition of maximum accuracy gain in Section 3.7, the average maximum accuracy gain was 0.94% across models and 1.02% across datasets, both achieved with LLM-defined difficulty and pre-existing categories (Table 1). Table 2 presents the accuracy scores for all the learning strategies averaged across either datasets or models.

Modest improvement of human-inspired learning strategies over Random Shuffle

Overall, adopting a human-inspired learning strategy can yield an accuracy gain over Random Shuffle for any model or dataset up to 2%. However, the optimal learning strategy is not consistent, as discussed in Section 4.2. The maximum accuracy gains (up to 2%) are consistent in scale with the impact of curriculum learning found in previous studies [25, 42], but are slightly lower than those reported by Lee et al. [22]. Using Blocked and Interleaved Curriculum for fine-tuning

Table 1: **maximum accuracy gains in models and datasets.** The *maximum accuracy gain* (in %) is calculated as the difference between the best-performing learning strategy and the Random Shuffle baseline in Table 2. This table presents the maximum accuracy gains across models and datasets for the three data labelling scenarios: (a) Human-defined difficulty and pre-existing categories, (b) LLM-defined difficulty and pre-existing categories, and (c) LLM-defined difficulty and clustered categories. *Best in models* and *Average by models* indicate the highest and average maximum accuracy gains across models. *Best in datasets* and *Average by datasets* indicate the highest and average maximum accuracy gains across datasets.

	Data labelling scenarios		
Max accuracy gain	(a)	(b)	(c)
Best in models	1.40	1.44	1.77
Best in datasets	1.13	1.81	1.15
Average by models	0.94	0.94	0.80
Average by datasets	0.83	1.02	0.74

Llama-13B on general knowledge tasks, they found that Interleaved Curriculum consistently outperformed Blocked Curriculum, improving the World Knowledge and Commonsense Reasoning benchmarks by 3.28% and 1.73%. We identify two main reasons for the differences in results: a broader curriculum span and a more distinctive categorisation of difficulty levels. First, Lee et al. [22] generated a synthetic dataset covering a wide range of subjects from secondary to graduate school levels, whereas our dataset focusses solely on medical exams from graduate school, offering a narrower curriculum range. Second, they generated questions into distinct categories of difficulty levels—remembering, understanding, and applying knowledge—based on Bloom’s taxonomy [4], while our medical questions are naturally more semantically similar and lack such clear distinctions in difficulty. These factors likely contribute to the better performance of LLMs in curriculum-based learning in their study.

4.2 Generalisation of human-inspired learning strategies across contexts

As shown in Table 2, the accuracy gains over Random Shuffle varied significantly between models, and the best learning strategy was not consistent across models and datasets. Taking the case where we used human-defined difficulty and predefined categories as data labels (Table 2a), Curriculum Learning was the best learning strategy for Llama 2 7B and Llama 2 13B (+0.34 and +1.11), but failed to outperform the Random Shuffle for the other two models (-0.61 and -0.66). Among the four models, three different best learning strategies were identified, each achieving maximum accuracy gains for one or two models. However, only one strategy, Interleaved Learning, consistently outperformed Random Shuffle across all models. A similar pattern was observed in the accuracy gains in datasets. Overall, Curriculum Learning was the best strategy most often (8 out of 21 times), followed by Interleaved Learning (Table 2).

Variation of best learning strategy across models Most previous studies used a single model to examine the effectiveness of curriculum learning, consistently showing performance improvements on several data benchmarks [42, 25, 22]. However, our study found that the best learning strategy for one model may not be optimal for another and may not even outperform the Random Shuffle baseline. Additionally, a strategy that consistently outperforms Random Shuffle across all models may not be the best for any specific model. Therefore, the effectiveness of a learning strategy for one model does not necessarily generalise to others.

Table 2: **Accuracy scores across models and datasets.** The accuracy scores (in %) for applying the human-inspired learning strategies in three data labelling scenarios are shown in Tables (a)-(c). In the *Models* columns, accuracy scores are averaged across the three datasets for each model. In the *Datasets* columns, accuracy scores are averaged across the four models for each dataset. The learning strategies marked in grey in Tables (b) and (c) indicate unchanged results from Table (a) due to unchanged data labels. Abbreviations: *Blocked Curri.* = Blocked Curriculum, *Interleaved Curri.* = Interleaved Curriculum, *AVG* = average.

Strategy	Models				Datasets			
	Tiny Llama 1.1B	Llama 2 7B	Llama 2 13B	Mistral 7B	LEK	Med MCQA	Med QA	AVG
Random Shuffle	20.40	38.71	42.57	47.97	43.55	36.28	32.40	37.41
Curriculum	19.79	39.05	43.68	47.31	44.68	36.36	31.35	37.46
Blocked	20.47	38.46	42.83	48.10	43.99	36.45	31.97	37.47
Blocked Curri.	21.80	38.32	42.57	47.10	43.84	36.46	32.05	37.45
Interleaved	21.74	38.87	42.79	48.88	44.18	37.04	32.99	38.07
Interleaved Curri.	21.10	38.10	42.69	48.04	43.81	36.44	32.20	37.48

(a) Data labels: human-defined difficulty and pre-existing categories.

Strategy	Models				Datasets			
	Tiny Llama 1.1B	Llama 2 7B	Llama 2 13B	Mistral 7B	LEK	Med MCQA	Med QA	AVG
Random Shuffle	20.40	38.71	42.57	47.97	43.55	36.28	32.40	37.41
Curriculum	20.88	39.21	42.82	48.39	44.36	36.86	32.26	37.83
Blocked	20.47	38.46	42.83	48.10	43.99	36.45	31.97	37.47
Blocked Curri.	21.84	37.89	42.67	48.71	43.64	37.20	32.51	37.78
Interleaved	21.74	38.87	42.79	48.88	44.18	37.04	32.99	38.07
Interleaved Curri.	21.67	38.98	43.02	49.32	44.22	38.09	32.43	38.25

(b) Data labels: LLM-defined difficulty and pre-existing categories.

Strategy	Models				Datasets			
	Tiny Llama 1.1B	Llama 2 7B	Llama 2 13B	Mistral 7B	LEK	Med MCQA	Med QA	AVG
Random Shuffle	20.40	38.71	42.57	47.97	43.55	36.28	32.40	37.41
Curriculum	20.88	39.21	42.82	48.39	44.36	36.86	32.26	37.83
Blocked	20.95	38.23	43.09	47.94	43.22	36.77	32.67	37.55
Blocked Curri.	21.50	38.39	43.00	47.62	43.12	37.43	32.32	37.62
Interleaved	22.17	38.23	43.03	47.77	43.61	37.39	32.41	37.80
Interleaved Curri.	20.74	38.45	43.01	47.87	43.33	37.34	31.88	37.52

(c) Data labels: LLM-defined difficulty and clustered categories.

Variation of best learning strategy across datasets We found that no single learning strategy consistently perform the best across all datasets, even that strategy outperformed Ran-




Figure 2: **Averaged accuracy gains for the learning strategies.** Each bar plot shows the accuracy gains (in %) over Random Shuffle for each learning strategy, averaged over all model-data combinations, under the three data labelling scenarios.

dom Shuffle on all datasets. This contrasts with the results of Lee et al. [22], where they found Interleaved Curriculum was consistently the best-performing strategy across multiple datasets. This discrepancy may be due to differences in the experimental design, as discussed in Section 4.1. Although our results show that on average Interleaved Curriculum achieved the highest accuracy gain (+0.66) compared to other strategies (Figure 2a), the margin of improvement compared to Lee et al. [22] was slightly smaller, who observed an average improvement of +1.85 across datasets.

4.3 Performance of curriculum-based learning with LLM-defined difficulty

With human-defined difficulty and pre-existing categories, only Interleaved Learning showed a noticeable accuracy improvement (+0.66) over Random Shuffle (Figure 2a). Upon switching to LLM-defined difficulty, there was an increase in accuracy across all three curriculum-based strategies: Curriculum Learning (+0.05 to +0.42), Blocked Curriculum (+0.04 to +0.37) and Interleaved Curriculum (+0.07 to +0.84) (Figure 2b). These increases were significant at the 10% level using a paired t-test. Dataset-wise, switching to LLM-defined difficulty resulted in the greatest increases for MedMCQA in Blocked Curriculum (+0.18 to +0.92) and Interleaved Curriculum (+0.16 to +1.81); for MedQA, the greatest increase was observed in Curriculum Learning (-1.05 to -0.14) (Appendix B). Additionally, we fine-tuned the MedQA training set (11.4k data) with the Mistral 7B model, the best performing model among the four, using the LLM-defined difficulty (Appendix D). We similarly observed that curriculum learning (+0.70) consistently outperformed other learning strategies across all three datasets (Table 6). On the other hand, switching to clustered categories for fine-tuning had less noticeable effects on improving any specific learning strategy compared to using pre-existing categories (Figure 2c).

Improvements of LLM-defined difficulty for curriculum design These results indicate that switching to LLM responses to generate difficulty measures can lead to modest improvements in the performance of curriculum-based learning strategies, resulting in more effective learning. This resonates with previous studies that found curriculums based language-model-ranked difficulty produced consistent accuracy gains across datasets [25, 42]. As a result, LLM-generated difficulty may offer a more accurate indicator of curriculum difficulty for training

LLMs, highlighting its potential as a cost-effective and viable alternative to human annotations for curriculum-based learning.

4.4 Conclusions

Our study conducted a comprehensive evaluation of fine-tuning LLMs with human-inspired learning strategies in medical question answering. The evaluation spanned four key dimensions: learning strategies, models, datasets, and data labelling scenarios. The main findings are as follows: First, adopting human-inspired learning strategies showed moderate impacts for fine-tuning performance, with the maximum accuracy gains of 1.77% per model and 1.81% per dataset. This indicates some transferability of human learning behaviours to LLMs for data-efficient fine-tuning. Second, evaluating across model-dataset combinations revealed significant variability in the effectiveness of learning strategies, with no single strategy universally outperforming the others across all models and datasets. This suggests caution when generalising the effects of human-inspired learning strategies, as effectiveness for one model or dataset does not necessarily transfer to others. Third, using LLM-defined difficulty measures led to moderate accuracy improvements for curriculum-based learning strategies when compared to human-defined difficulty. This shows the potential of model-generated difficulty measures as a cost-effective alternative to human-defined metrics, offering improvements in curriculum design for fine-tuning LLMs.

5 Limitations and future work

We identify several limitations in our experiments. First, the five-time repetition we ran for each model-data combination gave dependent samples, which may make it less precise to establish reliable confidence intervals and statistical testing; aggregating these dependent samples into independent observations would also lead to sample sizes too small for accurate statistical analysis. Second, the LLM-defined difficulty measure relies on the choices of LLMs and their pre-training knowledge (e.g. if the model is fine-tuned on medical knowledge); similarly, the results for clustered categories heavily depend on the choice of clustering algorithm and selected hyperparameters. Both of these may introduce result variation. Third, the relatively small size of the LEK dataset, due to the limited human labels on questions, may not fully reveal the effects of learning strategies that only emerge with more training data. For example, the benefits of Interleaved Learning might become apparent over longer revision intervals, which our dataset might not fully capture in the evaluation. Although our preliminary results with fine-tuning on the MedQA training set (11.4k data) showed similar scale accuracy improvements (up to 2%) on medical datasets using both Llama 7B and Mistral 7B models. Also, the span of question difficulties in the LEK dataset, which only encompass questions from one exam board, may be insufficient for curriculum-based learning to be effective.

Future research could explore a medical curriculum that encompasses a broader spectrum of questions, spanning from fundamental medical concepts to advanced-level knowledge, to test the effects of curriculum-based learning more comprehensively. The range of categories and question proportions in each category could be controlled to reveal how much these factors affect the performance of category-based learning strategies. In addition, alternative LLM-defined difficulty measures for curriculum design could be investigated. For example, using the average language modelling objective loss on sequences across LLMs could serve as an indication of pre-training knowledge, while evaluating perplexity on sequences within specific topics could provide insights into the topic familiarity of LLMs. Moreover, experiments could be extended to evaluate larger language models (e.g. with 70B parameters) and specialised LLMs (e.g. medically fine-tuned models), to further assess how model size and pre-training knowledge affect the impact of learning

strategies. Designing a careful data sampling strategy with clustering algorithms could lead to improved LLM performance. For example, Shao et al. [37] proposed ClusterClip Sampling, which balances common and rare samples during language model training based on clustered data distribution, resulting in an improvement 1%-2% over randomly sampled data. Therefore, future experiments could explore alternative clustering algorithms for category labelling with balanced data sampling to improve model performance. Lastly, investigating the fine-grained temporal dynamics of fine-tuning—such as whether easy questions are answered correctly first and how the distribution of correct answers evolves throughout the process—could provide valuable new insights into the mechanisms of human-inspired fine-tuning.

References

- [1] Rohan Anil et al. *PaLM 2 Technical Report*. 2023. arXiv: 2305.10403.
- [2] R. Awasthi, A. Tiwari, and Seema Pathak. “Analysis of Mass Based and Density Based Clustering Techniques on Numerical Datasets”. In: *Journal of Information Engineering and Applications* 3 (2013), pp. 29–34.
- [3] Andrew M. Bean, Karolina Korgul, Felix Krones, Robert McCraith, and Adam Mahdi. *Exploring the landscape of large language models in medical question answering*. 2024. arXiv: 2310.07225.
- [4] Benjamin S. Bloom, Max D. Engelhart, Edward J. Furst, Walker H. Hill, and David R. Krathwohl. *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook 1: Cognitive domain*. New York: McKay, 1956.
- [5] Tom B. Brown et al. *Language Models are Few-Shot Learners*. 2020. arXiv: 2005.14165.
- [6] Daniel Campos. *Curriculum learning for language modeling*. 2021. arXiv: 2108.02170.
- [7] Paulo F. Carvalho and Robert L. Goldstone. “Effects of interleaved and blocked study on delayed test of category learning generalization”. In: *Frontiers in Psychology* 5 (Aug. 22, 2014), p. 936. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00936.
- [8] Mayee F. Chen et al. *Skill-it! A Data-Driven Skills Framework for Understanding and Training Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2307.14430.
- [9] Zeming Chen et al. *MEDITRON-70B: Scaling Medical Pretraining for Large Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2311.16079.
- [10] Devleena Das and Vivek Khetan. *DEFT: Data Efficient Fine-Tuning for Pre-Trained Language Models via Unsupervised Core-Set Selection*. 2024. arXiv: 2310.16776.
- [11] Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. *QLoRA: Efficient Finetuning of Quantized LLMs*. 2023. arXiv: 2305.14314.
- [12] David Fazeli, Taheri Hamidreza, and Alireza Saberi Kakhki. “Random Versus Blocked Practice to Enhance Mental Representation in Golf Putting”. In: *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 124 (Apr. 2017), p. 003151251770410. DOI: 10.1177/0031512517704106.
- [13] Jonathan Firth, Ian Rivers, and James Boyle. “A Systematic Review of Interleaving as a Concept Learning Strategy”. In: *Social Science Protocols* 2 (2019), pp. 1–7. DOI: 10.7565/ssp.2019.2650.
- [14] Yu Gu et al. “Domain-Specific Language Model Pretraining for Biomedical Natural Language Processing”. In: *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare* 3.1 (Oct. 2021), pp. 1–23. ISSN: 2637-8051. DOI: 10.1145/3458754.
- [15] Peter Hase, Mohit Bansal, Peter Clark, and Sarah Wiegrefe. *The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Easy Training Data for Hard Tasks*. 2024. arXiv: 2401.06751.
- [16] Jordan Hoffmann et al. *Training Compute-Optimal Large Language Models*. 2022. arXiv: 2203.15556.

- [17] Hong Jun Jeon and Benjamin Van Roy. *An Information-Theoretic Analysis of Compute-Optimal Neural Scaling Laws*. 2023. arXiv: 2212.01365.
- [18] Albert Q. Jiang et al. *Mistral 7B*. 2023. arXiv: 2310.06825.
- [19] Albert Q. Jiang et al. *Mixtral of Experts*. 2024. arXiv: 2401.04088.
- [20] Di Jin et al. *What Disease does this Patient Have? A Large-scale Open Domain Question Answering Dataset from Medical Exams*. 2020. arXiv: 2009.13081.
- [21] Howard Johnston. *The Spiral Curriculum*. 2012. URL: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED538282.pdf> (visited on 07/21/2024).
- [22] Bruce W. Lee, Hyunsoo Cho, and Kang Min Yoo. *Instruction Tuning with Human Curriculum*. 2024. arXiv: 2310.09518.
- [23] Opher Lieber et al. *Jamba: A Hybrid Transformer-Mamba Language Model*. 2024. arXiv: 2403.19887.
- [24] Yun Luo et al. *An Empirical Study of Catastrophic Forgetting in Large Language Models During Continual Fine-tuning*. 2023. arXiv: 2308.08747.
- [25] Adyasha Maharana and Mohit Bansal. “On Curriculum Learning for Commonsense Reasoning”. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Ed. by Marine Carpuat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, and Ivan Vladimir Meza Ruiz. Seattle, United States: Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2022, pp. 983–992. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.72.
- [26] Leland McInnes and John Healy. “Accelerated Hierarchical Density Based Clustering”. In: *2017 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 33–42. DOI: 10.1109/ICDMW.2017.12.
- [27] Leland McInnes, John Healy, and James Melville. *UMAP: Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection for Dimension Reduction*. 2020. arXiv: 1802.03426.
- [28] Niklas Muennighoff et al. *Scaling Data-Constrained Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2305.16264.
- [29] Harsha Nori et al. *Can Generalist Foundation Models Outcompete Special-Purpose Tuning? Case Study in Medicine*. 2023. arXiv: 2311.16452.
- [30] J.S. North et al. “The effect of consistent and varied follow-through practice schedules on learning a table tennis backhand”. In: *Journal of Sports Sciences* 37.6 (2018), pp. 613–620. DOI: 10.1080/02640414.2018.1522683.
- [31] OpenAI et al. *GPT-4 Technical Report*. 2024. arXiv: 2303.08774.
- [32] Ankit Pal, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, and Malaikannan Sankarasubbu. *MedMCQA : A Large-scale Multi-Subject Multi-Choice Dataset for Medical domain Question Answering*. 2022. arXiv: 2203.14371.
- [33] Gustavo Penha and Claudia Hauff. *Curriculum Learning Strategies for IR: An Empirical Study on Conversation Response Ranking*. 2019. arXiv: 1912.08555.
- [34] Khaled Saab et al. *Capabilities of Gemini Models in Medicine*. 2024. arXiv: 2404.18416.
- [35] Noveen Sachdeva et al. *How to Train Data-Efficient LLMs*. 2024. arXiv: 2402.09668.
- [36] Anu Sayal et al. “Neural Networks And Machine Learning”. In: *2023 IEEE 5th International Conference on Cybernetics, Cognition and Machine Learning Applications (ICCCMLA)* (2023), pp. 58–63. DOI: 10.1109/ICCCMLA58983.2023.10346612.
- [37] Yunfan Shao et al. *Balanced Data Sampling for Language Model Training with Clustering*. 2024. arXiv: 2402.14526.
- [38] Karan Singhal et al. *Towards Expert-Level Medical Question Answering with Large Language Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2305.09617.
- [39] Hugo Touvron et al. *Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models*. 2023. arXiv: 2307.09288.

- [40] Xin Wang, Yudong Chen, and Wenwu Zhu. “A Survey on Curriculum Learning”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 44 (2021), pp. 4555–4576. DOI: 10.1109/TPAMI.2021.3069908.
- [41] Chaoyi Wu et al. *PMC-LLaMA: Towards Building Open-source Language Models for Medicine*. 2023. arXiv: 2304.14454.
- [42] Benfeng Xu et al. “Curriculum Learning for Natural Language Understanding”. In: *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Ed. by Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2020, pp. 6095–6104. DOI: 10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.542.
- [43] Fuzhao Xue, Yao Fu, Wangchunshu Zhou, Zangwei Zheng, and Yang You. *To Repeat or Not To Repeat: Insights from Scaling LLM under Token-Crisis*. 2023. arXiv: 2305.13230.
- [44] Peiyuan Zhang, Guangtao Zeng, Tianduo Wang, and Wei Lu. *TinyLlama: An Open-Source Small Language Model*. 2024. arXiv: 2401.02385.

A Accuracy differences from Random Shuffle

In this section, we presented the accuracy differences (in %) of each learning strategy compared to the Random Shuffle baseline, as shown in Table 3, following a similar format to Table 2.

B Accuracy gains by dataset

In this section, we presented a fine-grained analysis of the accuracy gains (in %) of learning strategies for each dataset in Figure 3, providing a breakdown of the results shown in Figure 2.

C Hyperparameters for fine-tuning and clustering

In this section, we presented the hyperparameters for fine-tuning, including those for training models and clustering for category labelling. For training models, the fixed hyperparameters are as follows: for QLoRA, the parameters were set $\text{tor} = 16$, $\alpha = 64$ and the dropout was set to 0.1. The optimiser used was AdamW. The learning rate decay followed a linear scheduler with no warmup steps, and the maximum sequence length was set to 512. Table 4 shows the model-specific hyperparameters selected by grid search for each model on the Random Shuffle baseline. The ranges of grid search were: learning rate in $[5\text{e-}4, 1\text{e-}4, 5\text{e-}5, 1\text{e-}5, 5\text{e-}6, 1\text{e-}6, 5\text{e-}7, 1\text{e-}7]$, batch size in $[4, 8, 16]$, and gradient accumulation steps in $[1, 2, 4]$. For fine-tuning Mistral 7B on the MedQA training set (Appendix D), we changed the learning rate to $1\text{e-}7$ and kept the same batch size and gradient accumulation step as shown in Table 4.

Table 5 shows the hyperparameters for clustering with UMAP and HDBSCAN for automated category labelling. It also specifies the hyperparameter ranges for Bayesian Optimisation.

D Results for fine-tuning on MedQA

In this section, we presented the results for fine-tuning the MedQA training set (11.4k data) using the Mistral 7B model, our best-performing model, as a further experiment. We used LLM-defined difficulty and clustered categories as data labels, as the MedQA dataset does not contain pre-existing medical categories [20]. The LLMs used to compute the difficulty measures are Mixtral 8x7B [19], Meditron 70B [9], Llama 2 70B [39], and Jamba [23].

Table 6 showed that Curriculum Learning consistently outperformed other learning strategies in all three datasets. When averaged across all datasets, Curriculum Learning also showed the highest accuracy gain over Random Shuffle (+0.70).

Table 3: **Accuracy differences compared to Random Shuffle baseline.** The accuracy differences (in %) of each learning strategy compared to Random Shuffle in three data-labelling scenarios shown in Tables (a)-(c). The accuracy difference for each model or dataset is calculated relative to the Random Shuffle baseline in Table 2. Learning strategies in gray in Tables (b) indicate unchanged results from Table (a) due to unchanged data labels. Abbreviations: *Blocked Curri.* = Blocked Curriculum, *Interleaved Curri.* = Interleaved Curriculum, *AVG* = average.

Strategy	Models				Datasets			
	Tiny	Llama	Llama	Mistral	LEK	Med	Med	AVG
	Llama	2	2			MCQA	QA	
	1.1B	7B	13B	7B				
Curriculum	-0.61	0.34	1.11	-0.66	1.13	0.08	-1.05	0.05
Blocked	0.07	-0.25	0.26	0.13	0.44	0.17	-0.43	0.06
Blocked Curri.	1.40	-0.39	0.00	-0.87	0.29	0.18	-0.35	0.04
Interleaved	1.34	0.16	0.22	0.91	0.63	0.76	0.59	0.66
Interleaved Curri.	0.70	-0.61	0.12	0.07	0.26	0.16	-0.20	0.07

(a) Data labels: human-defined difficulty and pre-existing categories.

Strategy	Models				Datasets			
	Tiny	Llama	Llama	Mistral	LEK	Med	Med	AVG
	Llama	2	2			MCQA	QA	
	1.1B	7B	13B	7B				
Curriculum	0.48	0.50	0.25	0.42	0.81	0.58	-0.14	0.42
Blocked	0.07	-0.25	0.26	0.13	0.44	0.17	-0.43	0.06
Blocked Curri.	1.44	-0.82	0.10	0.74	0.09	0.92	0.11	0.37
Interleaved	1.34	0.16	0.22	0.91	0.63	0.76	0.59	0.66
Interleaved Curri.	1.27	0.27	0.45	1.35	0.67	1.81	0.03	0.84

(b) Data labels: LLM-defined difficulty and pre-existing categories.

Strategy	Models				Datasets			
	Tiny	Llama	Llama	Mistral	LEK	Med	Med	AVG
	Llama	2	2			MCQA	QA	
	1.1B	7B	13B	7B				
Curriculum	0.48	0.50	0.25	0.42	0.81	0.58	-0.14	0.42
Blocked	0.55	-0.48	0.52	-0.03	-0.33	0.49	0.27	0.14
Blocked Curri.	1.10	-0.32	0.43	-0.35	-0.43	1.15	-0.08	0.21
Interleaved	1.77	-0.48	0.46	-0.20	0.06	1.11	0.01	0.39
Interleaved Curri.	0.34	-0.26	0.44	-0.10	-0.22	1.06	-0.52	0.11

(c) Data labels: LLM-defined difficulty and clustered categories.




Figure 3: **Averaged accuracy gains for the learning strategies across datasets.** Each bar plot shows the accuracy gains (in %) of the learning strategies over Random Shuffle, when averaged across models. Figures (a)-(c) represent three data labeling scenarios: (a) Human-defined difficulty with pre-existing categories; (b) LLM-defined difficulty with pre-existing categories; and (c) LLM-defined difficulty with clustered categories.

Table 4: **Model-specific hyperparameters for fine-tuning on LEK.** For each model, the hyperparameters were selected by grid search on the Random Shuffle baseline. Abbreviations: *TinyLla.* = TinyLlama model, *Grad accum.* = gradient accumulation steps.

	TinyLla. 1.1B	Llama 2 7B	Llama 2 13B	Mistral 7B
Learning rate	5e-4	5e-5	1e-4	1e-4
Batch size	16	4	4	4
Grad accum.	1	2	2	2

Table 5: **Hyperparameters for clustering with UMAP and HDBSCAN.** *Range* specifies the range for hyperparameter search in Bayesian Optimisation., *Set* specifies the hyperparameter value selected.

		LEK		MedQA	
		Range	Set	Range	Set
UMAP	Number of Neighbours	[8, 20]	15	[5, 30]	5
	Number of Components	[3, 15]	5	[3, 20]	17
HDBSCAN	Minimum Cluster Size	[25, 35]	25	[200, 250]	202

Table 6: **Accuracy scores of Mistral 7B fine-tuned on MedQA training set.** The accuracy scores (in %) were computed using LLM-defined difficulty and clustered categories as data labels. Abbreviations: *Blocked Curri.* = Blocked Curriculum, *Interleaved Curri.* = Interleaved Curriculum.

Strategy	LEK	Med MCQA	MedQA	AVG
Random Shuffle	44.38	41.67	50.57	45.54
Curriculum	45.40	42.19	51.14	46.24
Blocked	44.76	41.70	50.71	45.72
Blocked Curri.	44.64	41.89	50.64	45.72
Interleaved	44.65	41.75	50.87	45.76
Interleaved Curri.	44.92	42.06	50.73	45.90