

Lower Layer Matters: Alleviating Hallucination via Multi-Layer Fusion Contrastive Decoding with Truthfulness Refocused

Dingwei Chen¹³, Feiteng Fang²⁴, Shiwen Ni^{2*}, Feng Liang³,
Ruifeng Xu⁵, Min Yang^{2*}, Chengming Li^{3*}

¹Sun Yat-Sen University ²Shenzhen Institute of Advanced Technology, CAS ³Shenzhen MSU-BIT University

⁴University of Science and Technology of China ⁵Harbin Institute of Technology (Shenzhen)

chendw26@mail2.sysu.edu.cn, feitengfang@mail.ustc.edu.cn,

{sw.ni, min.yang}@siat.ac.cn, {licm, fliang}@smbu.edu.cn, xurui Feng@hit.edu.cn

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated exceptional performance across various natural language processing tasks, yet they occasionally tend to yield content that factually inaccurate or discordant with the expected output, a phenomenon empirically referred to as "hallucination". To tackle this issue, recent works have investigated contrastive decoding between the original model and an amateur model with induced hallucination, which has shown promising results. Nonetheless, this method may undermine the output distribution of the original LLM caused by its coarse contrast and simplistic subtraction operation, potentially leading to errors in certain cases. In this paper, we introduce a novel contrastive decoding framework termed **LOL** (**L**ower **L**ayer **M**atters). Our approach involves concatenating the contrastive decoding of both the final and lower layers between the original model and the amateur model, thereby achieving multi-layer fusion to aid in the mitigation of hallucination. Additionally, we incorporate a truthfulness refocused module that leverages contextual guidance to enhance factual encoding, further capturing truthfulness during contrastive decoding. Extensive experiments conducted on two publicly available datasets illustrate that our proposed LOL framework can substantially alleviate hallucination while surpassing existing baselines in most cases. Compared with the best baseline, we improve by average 4.5 points on all metrics of TruthfulQA. **The source code is coming soon.**

Introduction

By virtue of their extensive pre-training corpus and precise fine-tuning alignment, Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated excellent capabilities in context-awareness and language question-answering (Brown et al. 2020; Ouyang et al. 2022; Schulman et al. 2017; Radford et al. 2019). Despite these advancements, LLMs are often plagued by a critical issue that the contents they generated occasionally diverges from user expectations or contradict real-world knowledge, which is referred to as "Hallucination" (Chuang et al. 2023). This issue raises concerns about the accuracy and robustness of LLMs, making the alleviating hallucination a pressing challenge that is attracting increasing attention. (Huang et al. 2023a; Zhao et al. 2023).

*Corresponding author.




Figure 1: Brief description of our LOL method and compared with previous contrastive decoding method.

Recently, plenty of works have investigated the hallucination of LLMs. Chuang et al. (Chuang et al. 2023) assert that hallucination arises from imperfections in the training and decoding process, resulting in the deviations from the training data and facts for generated content. Similarly, Ye et al. (Ye et al. 2023) and Zhang et al. (Zhang et al. 2023b) identify that the occurrence of hallucination mainly originates from pre-training data, model training and optimization, as well as model inference. Specifically, the vast and complex nature of pre-training data inevitably includes fallacious or outdated information, which will increase the risk of model hallucination after pre-training. In addition, although supervised fine-tuning achieves alignment for LLMs and enhances their interactive capability, it may cause the models to overfit the fine-tuning data and blindly answer questions beyond the scope of knowledge they possess (Zhang et al. 2023a). Meanwhile, the inherent randomness and drawbacks of the decoding strategies employed may lead to inaccurate decoding representations, which in turn cause the output content to be tainted with hallucination (Huang et al. 2023a; Zhang et al. 2023b).

Existing methods to alleviate hallucination for LLMs are various and from the different aspects as discussed above,

such as methods based on reinforcement learning with human feedback (Ouyang et al. 2022; Stiennon et al. 2020), model editing to modify the knowledge of hallucination (Ilharco et al. 2023; Meng et al. 2023; Ni et al. 2023), retrieval-augmented generation with external knowledge base (Peng et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2023; Jiang et al. 2023), strategy of filtering for high-quality corpus (Zhou et al. 2024), representation editing for activation or knowledge representation (Li et al. 2023c; Zhang, Yu, and Feng 2024), etc. In this work, we focus on the inference process of LLMs for mitigating hallucination. Previous works have explored contrastive decoding strategies during inference time, which refers to the contrast between the original logits of output distribution and an extra output distribution from other related models or other layers within LLMs. In intelligible terms, it is a convenient and effective method to enhance the original output or alleviate hallucination by subtracting the logits of a different distribution from the logits of the original output distribution. For example, Li et al. (Li et al. 2023d) utilize contrastive decoding from two different scales of LLMs to improve the truthfulness and fluency of the generated context. Chuang et al. (Chuang et al. 2023) alleviate hallucination through contrastive decoding between the final layer and lower layer with early exiting within a LLM. Zhang et al. (Zhang et al. 2023a) innovatively induce hallucination to fine-tune an amateur model to contrast with the original model. By dint of knowledge with hallucination it has learned, it assists the main model to better identify and alleviate hallucination. This framework called ICD obtains excellent results. Nevertheless, the distribution of the original model is probably damaged in certain cases by rough contrast and straightforward subtraction of contrastive decoding between the original model and amateur model. Empirically, the core issue is the uncertainty of training and output for amateur model, which greatly affects the performance of contrastive decoding and undermines its robustness.

Chuang et al. (Chuang et al. 2023) propose DoLa, as well as suggesting in their experiments that the low-layers and high-layers of LLMs may have different tendencies in focusing on knowledge. The low layers may mainly store semantic information, while the high layers may mainly store more factual information. They consider the low layer with early exiting as the object for contrastive decoding due to its lack of factual knowledge. Motivated by this insight, we propose a novel contrastive decoding framework called **LOL** (**LO**wer **L**ayer **M**atters). We believe that the form of knowledge stored in the lower or higher layers of LLMs may be more complex and cannot be simply distinguished in practice. The knowledge stored in the lower layers with early exiting could be the supplement and correct the output of final layer, rather than simply being leveraged for contrast. Consequently, as shown in Figure 1, our method merges the contrastive decoding of final layer and early-exiting layer between the original model and amateur model respectively to facilitate hallucination alleviation. Then we design a plug-and-play module called truthfulness refocused, which incorporates contextual guidance into the encoding process to encourage LLMs to pay more attention to the truthfulness of sentences in contrastive decoding. The main contributions

of this work can be summarised as follows:

- We propose a novel framework LOL for alleviating hallucination, which achieves multi-layer fusion contrastive decoding and leverages low-layer with early exiting to modify the output of final layer.
- We design a truthfulness refocused module, which is plug-and-play, playing a role in capturing and enhancing the factuality of sentences during contrastive decoding.
- We conduct extensive experiments on two widely used benchmarks. Experimental results show that LOL outperforms the existing baselines in most cases. Compared with the best baseline, we improve by average 4.5 points on all metrics of TruthfulQA.

Related Work

Currently, the methods of alleviating hallucination are mainly classified into various classes (Huang et al. 2023a; Zhang et al. 2023b), such as the following categories:

Alignment with assessment feedback is a significant step to train LLMs, which promotes the model alignment with specific feedback while reducing hallucination for LLMs (Stiennon et al. 2020; Liu, Sferrazza, and Abbeel 2023; Shinn, Labash, and Gopinath 2023; Menick et al. 2022). Stiennon et al. (Stiennon et al. 2020) construct high-quality corpus with human feedback to train the model to accurately predict human-preferred and more factual summarization. Menick et al. (Menick et al. 2022) utilize reinforcement learning to encourage model to cite files or references from the real world to increase truthfulness when generating content. Similarly, Shinn et al. (Shinn, Labash, and Gopinath 2023) put forward a method that generating reflective feedback based on the previously failed cases to strengthen model capabilities.

Retrieval-augmented generation is practically aimed at revising the output of LLMs with an external knowledge base to retrieve the factual knowledge for reducing hallucination (Peng et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2023; Li et al. 2023a; Trivedi et al. 2023; Liu et al. 2023). Peng et al. (Peng et al. 2023) propose an augmentation system that enables LLMs to exploit external knowledge to generate truthful responses. Trivedi et al. (Trivedi et al. 2023) leverage an improved retrieval method based on chain of thought to mitigate hallucination in multi-hop question answering. Wang et al. (Wang et al. 2023) design a framework called Knowledgept to face the challenge of integrating LLMs with various knowledge bases for better storage and retrieval of needed knowledge.

Model editing refers to the technique of editing the knowledge stored in the LLMs, which modifies the knowledge with hallucination or outdated knowledge through fine-tuning, locate and edit, etc (Zheng et al. 2023; Mitchell et al. 2022; Huang et al. 2023b; Meng et al. 2022, 2023; Gupta et al. 2023). For example, Ni et al. (Ni et al. 2023) employ parametric arithmetic to facilitate the forgetting of old knowledge with hallucination before learning new knowledge. Mitchell et al. (Mitchell et al. 2021) propose an auxiliary network to assist LLMs to update knowledge in the light of new input-output pair. For locate-based methods, Meng et al. (Meng et al. 2022) identify the specific neuron activations




Figure 2: The overview of our proposed LOL framework, which consists of multi-layer fusion and truthfulness refocused module based on contrastive decoding.

through causal reasoning and update factual associations by editing the parameters in FFN.

Representaion editing is empirically a inference-time method. It only modifies and edits the representation of model output during the inference process (Li et al. 2023c; Zhang, Yu, and Feng 2024; Chen et al. 2024; Burns et al. 2022). Li et al. (Li et al. 2023c) propose Inference-time Intervention (ITI) which focuses on the attention heads of LLMs for editing to improve factuality and alleviate hallucination. Chen et al. (Chen et al. 2024) introduce the orthogonal constraint to ameliorate the probe and more effectively discover the hidden truth representation. Zhang et al. (Zhang, Yu, and Feng 2024) edit the factual representation according to the factual directions found by contrastive learning in the truthful space.

Contrastive decoding works by execute the logits of output distribution with the contrast between original model and the other model (usually two models are strong and weak in truthfulness, respectively). Li et al. (Li et al. 2023d) leverage the contrastive decoding to encourage LLMs to generate fluent and truthful content, which is an earlier attempt to apply contrastive decoding to hallucination mitigation. O’Brien and Lewis (O’Brien and Lewis 2023) find out that the reasoning capabilities of LLMs can be promoted through contrastive decoding. Furthermore, Chuang et al. (Chuang et al. 2023) utilize specific early layers within a LLM for contrast with the final layer. Zhang et al. (Zhang et al. 2023a) execute the contrastive decoding between the original model and an amateur model built with hallucination to attain the promising results.

In this paper, regarding the promising effect of contrastive decoding as well as its limitation, we develop a novel framework based on contrastive decoding. We first operate the

contrastive decoding of final layer and layer with early-exiting between the original model and amateur model, respectively. Then we merge these two results to achieve multi-layer fusion of contrastive decoding and leverage a truthfulness refocused module to further improve the factuality.

Method

In this section, we will illustrated our method of alleviating hallucination for LLMs in detail. Briefly, it consists of two parts: multi-layer fusion contrastive decoding and truthfulness refocused by contextual guidance, which is shown in Figure 2. Our method is implemented through Algorithm 1.

Multi-layer fusion contrastive decoding

First we need to construct the amateur model induced with hallucination for contrastive decoding. Specifically, we follow the setting of (Zhang et al. 2023a) and fine-tune the LLMs with plenteous non-factual data (such as negative samples in some fine-tuning datasets for simpicy) to inject the hallucination information to the model.

Given an original model θ , we fine-tune it with a hallucination dataset to obtain the amateur model θ^* . This procedure is defined as follows:

$$\theta^* = \text{FT}\{\theta, D\} \quad (1)$$

where FT is the operation of supervised fine-tuning, it can be full fine-tuning or LoRA fine-tuning. While θ, θ^* refer to the original model and amateur model, respectively. D is the dataset with hallucination or negative samples.

Following the definition of contrastive decoding as (Zhang et al. 2023a), with the original model θ and the amateur models θ^* , we normally subtract the logits of output

distribution of amateur model θ^* from those of the original model θ to obtain the result of contrastive decoding from the **final layer** between the original model and amateur model, which is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_t = \log p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta) - \lambda \log p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta^*) \quad (2)$$

$$p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta) = \text{softmax}(\text{logit}_\theta(x_t|x_{<t})) \quad (3)$$

$$p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta^*) = \text{softmax}(\text{logit}_{\theta^*}(x_t|x_{<t})) \quad (4)$$

Noting that hyperparameter λ is used to control the ratio of the contrast. $p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta)$ is the decoding process of autoregressive LLMs (Zhang et al. 2023a; Chuang et al. 2023; Li et al. 2023d). It predicts the $t - th$ token based on the results of the previous $t - 1$ tokens, and logit_θ represents the probability of the prediction.

Similarly, we perform parallel execution to obtain the result of contrastive decoding from the **lower layer with early exiting** between the original model and amateur model, which is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}'_t = \log p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta; L) - \lambda' \log p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta^*; L) \quad (5)$$

where λ' is a hyperparameter to control this ratio of the contrast like λ described above, while L refer to the specific layer of early exiting chosen for contrastive decoding. Specifically, we artificially control the hyperparameter L to select a suitable layer with early exiting. The aim of this module is to leverage the result of contrast decoding from lower-layer with early exiting to assist the contrastive decoding of the final layer, so as to avoid the potential injury to the logits probability of distribution caused by the rough contrast and overly simple calculation of single set of contrast decoding. Being different from (Chuang et al. 2023), we empirically hold that the knowledge of layers in LLMs is more complex and unknown so that it is difficult to simply distinguish through certain definition. In the view of this insight, we consider the lower layers as the supplement or balance for final layer instead of simply being weak object for contrastive decoding.

we merge the results of two set of contrastive decoding to achieve the multi-layer fusion, as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_{ML} = \mathcal{F}_t + \omega \mathcal{F}'_t \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{F}_{ML} refers to the result of our multi-layer fusion contrastive decoding, $\omega \in (0, 1]$ is a hyperparameter representing the ratio.

Truthfulness refocused

To further enhance the truthfulness during contrastive decoding, we design a plug-and-play module called truthfulness refocused which encourages LLMs to assign the higher weight to words that are more representative for the factuality of the sentence by contextual guidance. The aim is to highlight the factual words and promote more fine-grained contrastive decoding.

To be detailed, we penish a context guidance $x_{context}$ to the prefix instruction and lead the model to focus on key words from the generated content that can represent the

Algorithm 1: LOL

Input: original model θ , amateur model θ^* , context $x_{context}$ hyperparameters $\lambda, \lambda', \lambda'', \omega, \omega'$, early exiting layer L

Output: final logits \mathcal{F}_{Final}

1. **for** token $t \leftarrow 1$ **do**
 2. logits $\mathcal{F}_t \leftarrow \log p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta) - \lambda \log p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta^*)$
 3. logits $\mathcal{F}'_t \leftarrow \log p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta; L) - \lambda' \log p(x_t|x_{<t}; \theta^*; L)$
 4. multi-layer fusion logits: $\mathcal{F}_{ML} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_t + \omega \mathcal{F}'_t$
 5. truthfulness refocused logits:
 $\mathcal{F}_{TR} \leftarrow \log p(x_t|(x_{<t}|x_{context}); \theta)$
 $\quad - \lambda'' \log p(x_t|(x_{<t}|x_{context}); \theta^*)$
 6. final logits $\mathcal{F}_{Final} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{ML} + \omega' \mathcal{F}_{TR}$
 7. **return** \mathcal{F}_{Final}
-

factuality of the whole sentence during encoding and contrastive decoding. This process is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_{TR} = \log p(x_t|(x_{<t}|x_{context}); \theta) - \lambda'' \log p(x_t|(x_{<t}|x_{context}); \theta^*) \quad (7)$$

where \mathcal{F}_{TR} refers to the result of contrastive decoding for truthfulness refocused module, $\lambda'' \in (0, 1]$ is a hyperparameter to control the ratio for contrast.

Finally, we combine the two module of our framework to obtain the final logits of output distribution and leverage it for prediction and generation, as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_{Final} = \mathcal{F}_{ML} + \omega' \mathcal{F}_{TR} \quad (8)$$

$$p(x_t|x_{<t}) = \text{softmax}(\mathcal{F}_{Final}) \quad (9)$$

where \mathcal{F}_{Final} refers to the result of our LOL framework based on contrastive decoding, $\omega' \in (0, 1]$ is a hyperparameter to control the ratio of fusion. We use the *softmax* to regularize the logits output and derive the final result.

Experiment

Datasets

In this paper, we use **TruthfulQA** (Lin, Hilton, and Evans 2022) and **FACTOR** (Muhlgay et al. 2024) datasets in the experiments, which are two widely used benchmarks for evaluation of alleviating hallucination.

For TruthfulQA, it is a famous dataset to examine the truthfulness of LLMs. It consists of 817 questions across 38 categories. We employ the multiple-choice form to conduct our experiments on TruthfulQA. The task is defined that identifying and assigning scores for different answers from a set of best answer, correct answers and incorrect answers, which will be evaluated through following three metrics: MC1, MC2, MC3. Specifically, **MC1** refers to assess whether the model assigns the highest probability value to the best answer among all answer judgments; while **MC2** is to evaluate whether the normalized probability of all correct answers (including the best answer) is higher than the normalized probability of all incorrect answers; and **MC3** is calculated that whether the probability value assigned by the

Setting	Value
Model	Llama2-7B-Base
Epochs	5
Device	4 Nvidia A800 GPU (80GB)
Batch size	256
Learning rate	5×10^{-4}
LoRA Target	$q_{proj}, k_{proj}, v_{proj}$

Table 1: Finetuning setting for building amateur model in our experiments on both TruthfulQA and FACTOR.

Setting	TruthfulQA	FACTOR
ratio λ	1	0.1
ratio λ'	1	1
ratio ω	1	0.2
ratio λ''	1	0.8
ratio ω'	0.5	0.2

Table 2: Hyperparameters for experiments on TruthfulQA and FACTOR.

model to each correct answer (including the best answer) is higher than that of all incorrect answers.

For FACTOR dataset, it is a benchmark about content completion. We conduct the experiments on its three sub-datasets (**News**, **Wiki**, **Expert**) and we just consider the accuracy as the evaluation indicator to evaluate the accuracy of text completion for LLMs.

What calls for special attention is that we following the same setting as (Zhang et al. 2023a) and use the **HaluEval** (Li et al. 2023b) to construct our amateur model with induced hallucination for constrstive decoding. HaluEval is also a well-known hallucination dataset which contains 35,000 negative samples with hallucination. It consists of user’s question-answering pairs generated by ChatGPT and instructions for abundant different downstream tasks.

Baselines

To evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed LOL method for mitigating hallucination. We conduct experiments with many inference-time baselines, which will be illustrated as follows:

- **Greedy decoding** is a common decoding strategy for auto-regressive LLMs which selects the token with highest probability for prediction and generation.
- **CD** (Li et al. 2023d) is an initial and ordinary method of contrastive decoding, which executes contrastive decoding from two different scales of LLMs with different parameters. In particular, we following the setting of (Zhang et al. 2023a; Zhang, Yu, and Feng 2024) and set the contrastive decoding between the scales of 13B-Chat and 7B-Chat for CD experiments.
- **ITI** (Li et al. 2023c), which is called Inference-Time-Intervention, is a representation editing method to allevi-

ate hallucination by editing model activation for attention head in LLMs during inference stage.

- **DoLa** (Chuang et al. 2023) is an improved method based on contrastive decoding, which determines the low layer with early exiting as the target for contrast with the final layer by maximizing the Jensen-Shannon divergence.
- **ICD** (Zhang et al. 2023a) is an effective method to operate the contrastive decoding between the original model and an amateur model induced with hallucination, which obtains promising results.

Completion Details

We leverage LLAMA2-7B-Chat as the original model to conduct the experiments. And we follow the similar setting as (Zhang et al. 2023a) to fine-tune the LLM to build an amateur model with hallucinated data in HaluEval dataset. We select LLAMA2-7B-Base as the base model for fine-tuning owing to its purity without the additional supervised fine-tuning or reinforcement learning with human feedback. Specifically, we use LoRA (Hu et al. 2021) technique to achieve the parameter-efficient fine-tuning and hallucination injection. For the hardware, one A800-80G GPU is used for our experiments. Noting that we utilize the LLAMA-Factory (Zheng et al. 2024) for building amateur model, which is a widely used and effective fine-tuning framework. More details about fine-tuning of amateur model and selection of hyperparameters are shown in the table 1 and 2.

Experiments results

The experimental results are reported in Table 3, indicating that our proposed LOL framework outperforms other baselines in most cases. We derive the promising results in experiments, which presents that our method improves the effectiveness of alleviating hallucination by multi-layer fusion contrastive decoding with truthfulness refocused mechanism. Specifically, we first examine the performance of LLAMA2-7B-Chat and LLAMA2-7B-Base on two datasets to confirm the results of greedy decoding. Meanwhile we verify the performance of the amateur model on the TruthfulQA, it can be found that the truthfulness of model is significantly weakened after being induced with hallucination.

Then we conduct the experiments to compare our method with other baselines. In general, the improvement brought by various methods on TruthfulQA is greater than that on FACTOR. To be detailed, it can be obviously observed that ITI declines greatly in several metrics, which may owing to its representation editing to activation likely to injure the output distribution of models. For CD, it drops a lot on MC1 of the TruthfulQA, while gaining progress on other metrics This may be attributed to that CD utilizes two models of the same type with different parameter scales but small differences for contrastive decoding. When it comes to DoLa, which considers the lower layer with early exiting as the object for contrastive decoding, it achieve more significant improvement due to the divergence between final layer and low layer (empirically with different knowledge storage). ICD performs contrastive decoding from the original model and the amateur model, deriving satisfying outcome. Compared

Method	TruthfulQA			FACTOR		
	MC1	MC2	MC3	News	Wiki	Expert
Greedy (7B-Base)	28.68	43.32	20.82	44.52	37.13	42.44
Greedy (amateur model)	19.11	36.76	17.37	-	-	-
Greedy (7B-Chat)	37.62	54.60	28.12	64.71	56.61	64.85
ITI (Li et al. 2023c)	37.01	54.66	27.82	53.28	43.82	51.69
CD (Li et al. 2023d)	28.15	54.87	29.75	64.57	58.47	67.12
DoLa (Chuang et al. 2023)	32.97	60.84	29.50	64.32	57.63	67.30
ICD (Zhang et al. 2023a)	45.09	69.10	41.59	65.20	56.57	67.66
LOL (Ours)	49.87	73.62	46.53	65.96	57.14	71.11
w/o Multi-Layer Fusion	46.32	70.20	42.81	65.37	56.35	68.40
w/o Truthfulness Refocused	49.14	72.52	46.00	65.53	56.64	71.54

Table 3: Experimental results on TruthfulQA and FACTOR datasets based on LLAMA2-7B-Chat. Our method obtains significant improvement, and outperforms other baselines in most cases on both two benchmarks.

with ICD, Our LOL framework gains an average improvement about 4.5 points and 0.6 points on all metrics of the two datasets, respectively, which indicates that our method could alleviate hallucination well through multi-layer fusion and truthfulness refocused contrastive decoding.

Analysis

Ablation study

To verify the effectiveness of multi-layer fusion and truthfulness refocused in LOL framework, we conduct an ablation study on benchmarks illustrated above. Specifically, we remove the multi-layer fusion module (denoted as "w/o **Multi-Layer Fusion**") and truthfulness refocused module (denoted as "w/o **Truthfulness Refocused**"), respectively. The ablation results are summarized in Table 3. Our designed modules both assist LLM to get enhanced performance in most cases. It also indicates that multi-layer fusion plays a significant role in our framework while truthfulness refocused improving less.

Analysis of fusion with different layers

The method we proposed for alleviating hallucination introduces the contrastive decoding of lower layer with early existing within original model and amateur model for multi-layer fusion contrastive decoding. From the perspective of robustness and interpretability, here we analyze the multi-layer fusion with different low layers. The results are shown in Figure 3. Specifically, we conduct experiments on TruthfulQA based on LLAMA2-7B-Chat and its corresponding amateur model which contain 32 layers of transformer. We remove the truthfulness refocused module for clarity and select layers $L = [6, 12, 18, 24, 28, 30]$ to exhibit.

Noting that we take $L = [0]$ as the results that contrastive decoding without multi-layer fusion (i.e. ICD (Zhang et al. 2023a)). In general, our method benefits from multi-layer fusion module with most lower layer fused. It is worth noting that the fusion of contrast decoding from a certain high-layer is more effective for mitigating hallucination, while the effect of higher or lower layers will decrease. This is related to




Figure 3: Experimental results of multi-layer fusion contrastive decoding with different low layers on TruthfulQA based on LLAMA2-7B-Chat.

the knowledge storage of different layers within the model. For instance, the 24th layer may contain more supplementary knowledge that is beneficial to the final layer. This is of significance for exploring the knowledge in LLMs.

Analysis of strength for truthfulness refocused

In order to investigate the effect of strength for truthfulness refocused module on our proposed approach, here we conduct the experiments about analysis of parameter sensitivity. In particular, we change the rate of truthfulness refocused by using different values of hyperparameter ω' . The results are shown in Figure 4. Similarly, the experiments are on TruthfulQA based on LLAMA2-7B-Chat and its corresponding amateur model. Noting that we retain the multi-layer fusion module to demonstrate the compatibility of two components. Then we select hyperparameter $\omega' = [0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0]$ to exhibit. The hyperparameter of low layer with early exiting is selected as 24, which results in the




Figure 4: Experimental results of truthfulness refocused module with different ratio ω' on TruthfulQA based on LLAMA2-7B-Chat.

Method	TruthfulQA		
	MC1	MC2	MC3
LLAMA2-13B-Chat	37.75	55.67	28.16
+ICD	48.47	73.47	46.04
LOL (7B-Chat)	49.87	73.62	46.53
Mistral-7B-Instruct	39.09	55.80	28.25
+ICD	58.53	74.73	50.38
+LOL	59.83	75.2	51.62
Baichuan2-7B-Chat	34.93	52.14	27.19
+ICD	45.75	65.51	39.67
+LOL	48.11	68.3	42.31

Table 4: Experimental results of adaptability testing with different settings of models on TruthfulQA.

best results of experiments illustrated above.

We take $\omega' = [0]$ as the results that contrastive decoding without truthfulness refocused. Experimental results reveal that the truthfulness refocused we designed brings about general improvement. We gain the best results when ω' is 0.5 or 1.0. On the whole, the effect of our method remains relatively stable as ω' changes, indicating the robustness and stability of our truthfulness refocused module.

Adaptability testing

We conduct the experiments on different scales of model and on different base models as well. The aim is to verify the adaptability of our method. Particularly, we mainly compare our LOL with ICD method (Zhang et al. 2023a) on TruthfulQA based on 13B-Chat in LLAMA2-Chat families, Baichuan2-7B-Chat and Mistral-7B-Instruct. The setting of our method is as same as the experiments in Table 3, while others refer to the setting of (Zhang et al. 2023a). The experimental results are exhibited in Table 4. For LLAMA2

Question: What is the purpose of a rabbit's foot?

Greedy decoding:

- (1) To bring good luck. (**Incorrect**)
- (2) Its foot is used to help with fertility. (**Incorrect**)
- (3) Its foot is used to bear the rabbit's weight. (**Correct**)

ICD:

- (1) Its main purpose is to help rabbits walk. (**Correct**)
- (2) It is used to bring good luck. (**Incorrect**)
- (3) Its foot is used to aid in the rabbit's locomotion. (**Best**)

LOL:

- (1) Its foot is used to aid in the rabbit's locomotion. (**Best**)
- (2) The purpose is to help rabbits walk. (**Correct**)
- (3) Its foot is used to bear the rabbit's weight. (**Correct**)

Table 5: Examples of alleviating hallucination results for different methods. Noting that (1), (2), (3) refer to the order selected by model according to the probability. Best, Correct, Incorrect are the three categories for answers.

with a larger number of parameters, our method (with just LLAMA2-7B as the base model) still surpasses the ICD method based on LLAMA2-13B. As for the results of the other two base models from different families, it showcases that our method can work well across different model architectures, representing the fine adaptability of LOL.

Case study

To further showcase the effect of our proposed method, we present a case study on the results of alleviating hallucination with different methods on TruthfulQA. The case is summarized in Table 5. We can find that contrastive decoding generally has a significant effect, but the ICD method still inevitably selects the incorrect answer and has a lower priority for the best answer. Our method selects the best answer first and then two correct answers, indicating that it can improve the factuality of the model through multi-layer fusion and truthfulness capturing during contrastive decoding.

Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel framework for alleviating hallucination based on contrastive decoding called **LOL** (**LO**wer **L**ayer **M**atters), which leverages the contrastive decoding of low layer with early exiting to achieve multi-layer fusion contrastive decoding with final layer. In addition, a truthfulness refocused module is designed for further capturing the truthfulness of content during the contrastive decoding process. The experiments on TruthfulQA and FACTOR datasets show that our method surpasses other baselines in most cases. Compared with the best baseline, we improve by average 4.5 points on all metrics of TruthfulQA. Simultaneously we conduct more analysis and demonstrate the robustness and adaptability of our LOL approach. We will further explore the more effective and efficient contrastive decoding for alleviating hallucination.

References

- Brown, T.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J. D.; Dhariwal, P.; Neelakantan, A.; Shyam, P.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 1877–1901.
- Burns, C.; Ye, H.; Klein, D.; and Steinhart, J. 2022. Discovering Latent Knowledge in Language Models Without Supervision. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Chen, Z.; Sun, X.; Jiao, X.; Lian, F.; Kang, Z.; Wang, D.; and Xu, C. 2024. Truth forest: Toward multi-scale truthfulness in large language models through intervention without tuning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, 20967–20974.
- Chuang, Y.-S.; Xie, Y.; Luo, H.; Kim, Y.; Glass, J. R.; and He, P. 2023. DoLa: Decoding by Contrasting Layers Improves Factuality in Large Language Models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Gupta, A.; Mondal, D.; Sheshadri, A.; Zhao, W.; Li, X.; Wiegrefe, S.; and Tandon, N. 2023. Editing Common Sense in Transformers. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 8214–8232.
- Hu, E. J.; Wallis, P.; Allen-Zhu, Z.; Li, Y.; Wang, S.; Wang, L.; Chen, W.; et al. 2021. LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Huang, L.; Yu, W.; Ma, W.; Zhong, W.; Feng, Z.; Wang, H.; Chen, Q.; Peng, W.; Feng, X.; Qin, B.; et al. 2023a. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232*.
- Huang, Z.; Shen, Y.; Zhang, X.; Zhou, J.; Rong, W.; and Xiong, Z. 2023b. Transformer-Patcher: One Mistake Worth One Neuron. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ilharco, G.; Ribeiro, M. T.; Wortsman, M.; Schmidt, L.; Hajishirzi, H.; and Farhadi, A. 2023. Editing models with task arithmetic. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jiang, Z.; Xu, F. F.; Gao, L.; Sun, Z.; Liu, Q.; Dwivedi-Yu, J.; Yang, Y.; Callan, J.; and Neubig, G. 2023. Active retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06983*.
- Li, D.; Rawat, A. S.; Zaheer, M.; Wang, X.; Lukasik, M.; Veit, A.; Yu, F.; and Kumar, S. 2023a. Large Language Models with Controllable Working Memory. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, 1774–1793.
- Li, J.; Cheng, X.; Zhao, W. X.; Nie, J.-Y.; and Wen, J.-R. 2023b. HaluEval: A Large-Scale Hallucination Evaluation Benchmark for Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 6449–6464.
- Li, K.; Patel, O.; Viégas, F.; Pfister, H.; and Wattenberg, M. 2023c. Inference-Time Intervention: Eliciting Truthful Answers from a Language Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03341*.
- Li, X. L.; Holtzman, A.; Fried, D.; Liang, P.; Eisner, J.; Hashimoto, T. B.; Zettlemoyer, L.; and Lewis, M. 2023d. Contrastive Decoding: Open-ended Text Generation as Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 12286–12312.
- Lin, S.; Hilton, J.; and Evans, O. 2022. TruthfulQA: Measuring How Models Mimic Human Falsehoods. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 3214–3252.
- Liu, H.; Sferrazza, C.; and Abbeel, P. 2023. Chain of Hindsight aligns Language Models with Feedback. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Liu, J.; Jin, J.; Wang, Z.; Cheng, J.; Dou, Z.; and Wen, J. 2023. RETA-LLM: A Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Model Toolkit. *ArXiv*, abs/2306.05212.
- Meng, K.; Bau, D.; Andonian, A.; and Belinkov, Y. 2022. Locating and editing factual associations in GPT. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 17359–17372.
- Meng, K.; Sharma, A. S.; Andonian, A. J.; Belinkov, Y.; and Bau, D. 2023. Mass-Editing Memory in a Transformer. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Menick, J.; Trebacz, M.; Mikulik, V.; Aslanides, J.; Song, F.; Chadwick, M.; Glaese, M.; Young, S.; Campbell-Gillingham, L.; Irving, G.; et al. 2022. Teaching language models to support answers with verified quotes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11147*.
- Mitchell, E.; Lin, C.; Bosselut, A.; Finn, C.; and Manning, C. D. 2021. Fast Model Editing at Scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Mitchell, E.; Lin, C.; Bosselut, A.; Manning, C. D.; and Finn, C. 2022. Memory-based model editing at scale. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 15817–15831. PMLR.
- Muhlgay, D.; Ram, O.; Magar, I.; Levine, Y.; Ratner, N.; Belinkov, Y.; Abend, O.; Leyton-Brown, K.; Shashua, A.; and Shoham, Y. 2024. Generating Benchmarks for Factuality Evaluation of Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 49–66.
- Ni, S.; Chen, D.; Li, C.; Hu, X.; Xu, R.; and Yang, M. 2023. Forgetting before learning: Utilizing parametric arithmetic for knowledge updating in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08011*.
- O’Brien, S.; and Lewis, M. 2023. Contrastive decoding improves reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09117*.
- Ouyang, L.; Wu, J.; Jiang, X.; Almeida, D.; Wainwright, C.; Mishkin, P.; Zhang, C.; Agarwal, S.; Slama, K.; Ray, A.;

- et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 27730–27744.
- Peng, B.; Galley, M.; He, P.; Cheng, H.; Xie, Y.; Hu, Y.; Huang, Q.; Liden, L.; Yu, Z.; Chen, W.; et al. 2023. Check your facts and try again: Improving large language models with external knowledge and automated feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12813*.
- Radford, A.; Wu, J.; Child, R.; Luan, D.; Amodei, D.; Sutskever, I.; et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8): 9.
- Schulman, J.; Wolski, F.; Dhariwal, P.; Radford, A.; and Klimov, O. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- Shinn, N.; Labash, B.; and Gopinath, A. 2023. Reflexion: an autonomous agent with dynamic memory and self-reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11366*, 2(5): 9.
- Stiennon, N.; Ouyang, L.; Wu, J.; Ziegler, D.; Lowe, R.; Voss, C.; Radford, A.; Amodei, D.; and Christiano, P. F. 2020. Learning to summarize with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 3008–3021.
- Trivedi, H.; Balasubramanian, N.; Khot, T.; and Sabharwal, A. 2023. Interleaving Retrieval with Chain-of-Thought Reasoning for Knowledge-Intensive Multi-Step Questions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 10014–10037.
- Wang, X.; Yang, Q.; Qiu, Y.; Liang, J.; He, Q.; Gu, Z.; Xiao, Y.; and Wang, W. 2023. Knowledgpt: Enhancing large language models with retrieval and storage access on knowledge bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11761*.
- Ye, H.; Liu, T.; Zhang, A.; Hua, W.; and Jia, W. 2023. Cognitive mirage: A review of hallucinations in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06794*.
- Zhang, S.; Yu, T.; and Feng, Y. 2024. Truthx: Alleviating hallucinations by editing large language models in truthful space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17811*.
- Zhang, Y.; Cui, L.; Bi, W.; and Shi, S. 2023a. Alleviating hallucinations of large language models through induced hallucinations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15710*.
- Zhang, Y.; Li, Y.; Cui, L.; Cai, D.; Liu, L.; Fu, T.; Huang, X.; Zhao, E.; Zhang, Y.; Chen, Y.; et al. 2023b. Siren’s song in the AI ocean: a survey on hallucination in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01219*.
- Zhao, W. X.; Zhou, K.; Li, J.; Tang, T.; Wang, X.; Hou, Y.; Min, Y.; Zhang, B.; Zhang, J.; Dong, Z.; et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*.
- Zheng, C.; Li, L.; Dong, Q.; Fan, Y.; Wu, Z.; Xu, J.; and Chang, B. 2023. Can We Edit Factual Knowledge by In-Context Learning? In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 4862–4876.
- Zheng, Y.; Zhang, R.; Zhang, J.; Ye, Y.; and Luo, Z. 2024. Llamafactory: Unified efficient fine-tuning of 100+ language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13372*.
- Zhou, C.; Liu, P.; Xu, P.; Iyer, S.; Sun, J.; Mao, Y.; Ma, X.; Efrat, A.; Yu, P.; Yu, L.; et al. 2024. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.