

Instruction Finetuning for Leaderboard Generation from Empirical AI Research

Salomon Kabongo

Leibniz University of Hannover
Hannover, Germany
kabenamualu@l3s.de

Jennifer D'Souza

TIB
Hannover, Germany
jennifer.dsouza@tib.eu

Abstract

This study demonstrates the application of instruction finetuning of pretrained Large Language Models (LLMs) to automate the generation of AI research leaderboards, extracting (Task, Dataset, Metric, Score) quadruples from articles. It aims to streamline the dissemination of advancements in AI research by transitioning from traditional, manual community curation, or otherwise taxonomy-constrained natural language inference (NLI) models, to an automated, generative LLM-based approach. Utilizing the FLAN-T5 model, this research enhances LLMs' adaptability and reliability in information extraction, offering a novel method for structured knowledge representation.

1 Introduction

The burgeoning complexity and volume of scientific literature (Fortunato et al., 2018; Bornmann et al., 2021; Altbach and De Wit, 2019) necessitate sophisticated methods for distilling and structuring vast amounts of data (Auer et al., 2020), particularly in fields like Artificial Intelligence (AI) research. Instruction finetuning of Large Language Models (LLMs) emerges as a pivotal innovation, addressing this need by honing models' abilities to precisely interpret (Wei et al., 2021a) and execute specific instructions for tasks such as information extraction. This precision is not just a technical requirement but a transformative approach to how models interact with and process the unstructured text, shifting the paradigm from broad, conversational responses to targeted, information-rich outputs. Recent studies (Lu et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023) underscore the importance of fine-tuning in guiding LLMs to better understand and respond to nuanced task-specific directives, thereby enhancing their utility across diverse research and industry applications.

At the heart of this study is the State-Of-The-Art (SOTA) task, an innovative venture into ex-

tracting leaderboards from empirical AI research publications in the form of (Task, Dataset, Metric, Score) quadruples, or (T, D, M, S) henceforward (Hou et al., 2019). Leaderboards serve as a critical tool for benchmarking and navigating scientific progress. Traditional leaderboards have been community-curated, exemplified by platforms like [PapersWithCode](#) (PwC) or Open Research Knowledge Graph's [benchmarks](#) feature. However, text mining can expedite leaderboard construction, capturing the (T, D, M, S) quadruple information buried within the discourse of scholarly AI articles. Only two prior works, IBM-TDMS (Hou et al., 2019) and AxCell (Kardas et al., 2020), have assessed automated text mining systems for the (T, D, M, S) quadruple extraction task. IBM-TDMS achieved 7.5 micro F1 and 8.8 macro F1 scores, while AxCell improved upon this with 25.8 micro F1 and 19.7 macro F1. These systems treated (T, D, M, S) extraction as a Natural Language Inference (NLI) task, reliant on a predefined (T, D, M) taxonomy. The drawback of this approach is its inability to detect newly introduced (T, D, M) elements outside the taxonomy, rendering the systems impractical. In this work, we introduce a novel objective: *text generation within a given context*, aiming to overcome these limitations. Furthermore, this work adopts instruction fine-tuning to accomplish SOTA as a text generation task, and enhance the model's adaptability to the domain-specific nuances of AI research. SOTA, in our work, aims to achieve two core goals: first, to determine if an article reports a leaderboard, and second, to extract relevant (T, D, M, S) quadruples within a generation framework. This innovative approach overcomes previous limitations of NLI systems, enabling us to detect newly introduced (T, D, M) elements and rendering our approach practically feasible. The remaining research question we address in this work is the challenge to move the needle in terms of performance on SOTA such that the system is indeed

reliable in a practical setting.

In this study, we harness the capabilities of the FLAN-T5 model (Chung et al., 2022), an instruction-tuned variant from the T5 model class (Raffel et al., 2020), boasting 780M parameters and sourced from Google’s open-access repository on the [Transformers library](#). There could have been one of two directions for this work: scaling the models or instruction fine-tuning of a moderate-sized LLM, i.e. with parameters in millions versus 1000x more in billions. We chose the latter. We believe that our choice makes model tuning more accessible within the research community while empirically proving to be nonetheless effective (experimental details in [section 5](#)). For instruction-based finetuning, we use applicable instructions from the *open-sourced instruction generalization efforts* introduced as the “Flan 2022 Collection” (Longpre et al., 2023). Our approach differs from finetuning a pretrained LM as we instead finetune an instruction-tuned LM, enabling the model to effectively follow instructions it has been trained on and adapt to a new domain and task, without the need to handle variability in learning new instruction formats. This methodological choice not only enhances the model’s performance but also promotes reproducibility and innovation in automated information extraction and knowledge representation within AI research.

Summarily, our contributions include: 1) A novel methodological approach that employs “single-task instruction-finetuning” with the FLAN-T5 model, to enhance its domain and task adaptation. Our [source code](#) is released. 2) A departure from traditional NLI methods towards an LLM-based system that utilizes moderate-sized models for greater practical application viability. 3) The introduction of a new corpus for experimental validation, promoting standardized comparisons in future SOTA task research. 4) Demonstrated improvements in task performance, with our model surpassing previous NLI-based systems by nearly 10% in F1 scores, thereby validating the efficacy and feasibility of our approach.

2 Related Work

At the heart of SOTA is a scientific information extraction (IE) task. Different from most previous work on IE from scientific literature which concentrates mainly on the titles or abstract section or individual paragraphs (Gupta and Man-

ning, 2011; QasemiZadeh and Schumann, 2016; Augenstein et al., 2017; Luan et al., 2018; D’Souza and Auer, 2021; D’Souza and Auer, 2022), our task needs to analyze the entire paper addressing document-level IE. Relatedly, other works that address document-level IE via extraction objectives that are similar to our (T, D, M, S) is the IBM-TDMS system (Hou et al., 2019), AxCell (Kardas et al., 2020), SciREX (Jain et al., 2020) which addresses (Task, Dataset, Method, Metric) replacing Score by Method, the ORKG-TDM (Kabongo et al., 2023a,b) and SciNLPKG (Mondal et al., 2021) which address only the (T, D, M) objective. While (Hou et al., 2019) addressed the (T, D, M, S) objective, their experimental dataset was relatively small and LLMs were not the focus of their experiments. Nevertheless, they seminally introduced the DocTAET context feature as a shorter, focused representation of the full paper in which the task, dataset, metric, and scores are most likely to be mentioned. The TAET in DocTAET represents the Title, Abstracts, Experimental setup, and Tables including captions and headers of the paper extracted with the help of customized heuristic-based extraction parsers and supplied as context to the machine learning model. This context representation is also used in our work. Notably, we employ LLMs for leaderboard construction and adopt an open-world assumption for text generation, a first in this context, moving away from the closed-world models reliant on a fixed (T, D, M) taxonomy. Constraining the (T, D, M) taxonomy via a closed-world assumption does not reflect the real-world where new tasks or datasets are constantly being introduced. Thus the traditional reported NLI models are not generalizable compared to our generation approach.

3 Our Corpus

Corpus with (T, D, M, S) annotations. We created a new corpus as a collection of scholarly papers with their (T, D, M, S) quadruple annotations for evaluating the SOTA task (Hou et al., 2019). This dataset is derived from the community-curated (T, D, M, S) annotations for thousands of AI articles available on PwC (CC BY-SA). Its articles span Natural Language Processing and Computer Vision domains, among other AI domains such as Robotics, Graphs, Reasoning, etc, thus, being representative for empirical AI research. The specific PwC source download timestamps is December 09,

	Our Corpus		Prior Work	
	Train	Test - Zeroshot	Train	Test set
Papers w/ leaderboards	7,987	241	170	167
Papers w/o leaderboards	4,401	548	-	-
Total TDM-triples	415,788	14,800	327	294
Distinct TDM-triples	11,998	1,267	78	78
Distinct <i>Tasks</i>	1,374	236	18	18
Distinct <i>Datasets</i>	4,816	647	44	44
Distinct <i>Metrics</i>	2,876	412	31	31
Avg. no. of TDM per paper	5.12	6.11	2.64	2.41
Avg. no. of TDMS per paper	6.95	7.86	-	-

Table 1: Our Corpus vs Prior Work (Hou et al., 2019) corpora statistics. The “papers w/o leaderboard” refers to papers that do not report leaderboard .

2023. As such the corpus comprised over 7,500 articles. **Corpus with (T, D, M, S) annotations.** We created a new corpus as a collection of scholarly papers with their (T, D, M, S) quadruple annotations for evaluating the SOTA task (Hou et al., 2019). This dataset is derived from the community-curated (T, D, M, S) annotations for thousands of AI articles available on PwC (CC BY-SA). Its articles span Natural Language Processing and Computer Vision domains, among other AI domains such as Robotics, Graphs, Reasoning, etc, thus, being representative for empirical AI research. The specific PwC source download timestamps is **December 09, 2023**. As such the corpus comprised over 7,500 articles. These articles, originally sourced from arXiv under CC-BY licenses, are available as latex code source, each accompanied by one or more (T, D, M, S) annotations from PwC. While the respective articles’ metadata was directly obtained from the PwC data release, the articles collection had to be reconstructed by downloading them from arXiv under CC-BY licenses. Once downloaded, the articles being in .tex format needed to undergo pre-processing for tex-to-text conversion so that their contents could be mined. For this, the Pandoc alongside a custom script was applied to extract targeted regions of the paper DocTEAT which stands for **DOC**ument, **T**itle, **A**bstract, **E**xpSetup, and **T**ableInfo (Hou et al., 2019). Each article’s parsed text was then finally annotated with (T, D, M, S) quadruples via distant labeling.

Corpus with no leaderboards. In addition to our base dataset reported in Table 1, we additionally included a set of approximately 4,401 and 548 articles that do not report leaderboards into the train

and test sets, respectively. These articles were randomly selected by leveraging the arxiv category feature, then filtering it to papers belonging to domains unrelated to AI/ML/Stats. These articles were annotated with the *unanswerable* label to fine-tune our language model in recognizing papers without (T,D,M,S) mentions in them.

Our final corpus statistics are reported in Table 1. Since in this work, the model complexity and the time required to fine-tune a language model is far greater than the approaches we used in our previous work (Kabongo et al., 2023b), we only reported our experiments based on the results from Fold 1. Furthermore, in the first main column, i.e. the “Our corpus” column, when compared with the corpus from existing work by (Hou et al., 2019), i.e. the “Prior work” column, our corpus shows itself to be significantly larger thus showing a more large-scale evaluation setting.

The SOTA task objective. We phrased the following question to formulate our task objective w.r.t. the (T, D, M, S) extraction target: *What are the values for the following properties to construct a Leaderboard for the model introduced in this article: task, dataset, metric, and score?* In essence, it encapsulates an IE task.

Instructions for the LLM. LLMs progress through initial pretraining and subsequent finetuning stages (Khashabi et al., 2020; Xie et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022; Sanh et al., 2022; Honovich et al., 2022; Longpre et al., 2023), but they might still struggle to interpret instructions. The practice of instruction finetuning (Wei et al., 2021a) has surfaced as an essential approach for augmenting the capability of LLMs to interpret and respond to

instructions (Lu et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023). As such the choice of the instruction is also crucial since it acts as a template that encodes the task and its objectives, instructing the LLM on how to achieve the specified objective.

The “Flan 2022 Collection” is an extensive, open-source compilation of 62 previously released NLP datasets, organized into 12 task types including reading comprehension, sentiment analysis, natural language inference, and more, making it a vital resource for developing generic multi-task LLMs. Significantly, FLAN provided over 10 human-curated natural instructions per dataset, detailing the tasks, which we utilized to direct our LLM for complex IE tasks. We specifically chose instructions from the SQuAD_v2 (Rajpurkar et al., 2016, 2018) and DROP (Dua et al., 2019) datasets, with 8 from SQuAD and 7 from DROP deemed appropriate. The general characteristic of the selected instructions, detailed in our appendix A, is that they encode a context (in our case the DocTAET representation of an article) and the SOTA task objective, and instruct the model to fulfill the objective.

4 Approach

Our approach examines the effectiveness of single-task instruction-finetuning on a novel task, i.e. the SOTA task, advancing the instruction-tuning paradigm initially proposed by FLAN (Finetuned Language Net)(Wei et al., 2021b; Chung et al., 2022; Longpre et al., 2023). Equipped with the relevant set of 15 total instructions (8 SQuAD and 7 DROP), we needed to do two things: **1.** For each instance in the dataset, instantiate the “Context” placeholder in the instructions with the DocTAET context feature of a paper and the “Question” placeholder with formulated question for the SOTA objective. **2.** The LLM could then be finetuned with the instruction-instantiated training set. From Table 1, given our training dataset had approximately 7,987 (T, D, M, S) papers x 15 instructions x 1 SOTA objective question = 119,805 instruction-instantiated data points to train the LLM. To this, the 4,401 papers without leaderboards x 15 instructions x 1 SOTA objective = 66,015 instruction-instantiated data points were added.

4.1 Model

We select the FLAN-T5 XL model (Chung et al., 2022) from its range of public checkpoints, which

come in various sizes (Small 80M, Base 250M, Large 780M, XL 3B, and XXL 11B). The choice of the Large model strikes a balance between the Small and XXL models, offering an ample number of parameters for our intricate IE task while remaining practical for deployment. This decision stems from considerations of efficiency, as extensive-scale LLMs were deemed impractical for a single task. Our choice of Flan-T5 was motivated by prior empiricism (Longpre et al., 2023) proving instruction-tuned models as more computationally efficient starting checkpoints for new tasks – FLAN-T5 required less finetuning to converge higher and faster than T5 on single downstream tasks (Longpre et al., 2023). Our model choice builds upon previous research, enhancing the T5 text-to-text sequence generation model (Rafael et al., 2020) with FLAN-T5 (Chung et al., 2022) to improve alignment with instructions in unseen tasks and zero-shot settings. Our resulting model is called SOTA-Flan-T5.

5 Evaluations

Experimental setup. For training, we had one main experimental setting based on the 15 instructions. As elicited earlier in section 3, i.e. the Corpus section, each of the 15 instruction were instantiated with the 12,388 (T, D, M, S) data instances including both papers with leaderboard and w/o leaderboards and the SOTA question resulting in a total of 185,820 instances to instruction finetune Flan-T5 Large. In this scenario, we hypothesized that this repetition in the data instances across the instructions would cause the resulting model to overfit the training dataset. Thus to control for this, we applied the following experimental setup. Each instruction was instantiated with a random selection of only half the total templates occurrences of every data instances resulting in a finetuning dataset of a sizeable 92,910 instances. In the test scenario, however, we report per instruction (T, D, M, S) instantiated data results. As shown in Table 1, for the test set with approximately 241 (T, D, M, S) and 548 papers with and without leaderboards respectively, evaluations results are shown for each instruction separately with a total of 789 underlying papers representing those with and without leaderboards. Model hyperparameter details are in Appendix B. In terms of compute, all experiments including inference were run on an NVIDIA h100 GPU.

Instruction	General					General					Instruction
	Rouge1	Rouge2	RougeL	RougeLsum	-Accuracy	Rouge1	Rouge2	RougeL	RougeLsum	-Accuracy	
Drop 1	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/91	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/91	Squad 1
Drop 2	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/91	72/62	11/8	72/63	72/62	95/91	Squad 2
Drop 3	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/92	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/91	Squad 3
Drop 4	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/91	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/91	Squad 4
Drop 5	73/61	11/8	72/62	72/61	96/91	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/91	Squad 5
Drop 6	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/91	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/91	Squad 6
Drop 7	73/61	11/8	73/61	73/61	96/90	73/63	11/8	73/63	73/63	96/92	Squad 7
-	-	-	-	-	-	73/62	11/8	73/62	73/62	96/91	Squad 8

Table 2: Evaluation results of SOTA-Flan-T5 Large with output evaluations as a structured summary generation task (reported with ROUGE metrics) as well as binary classification between papers with and without leaderboards (reported as General Accuracy) for each of the 15 instructions from DROP and SQuAD datasets vs w/o templates instruction, respectively.

		Drop Instructions					SQuAD v2 Instructions					
		Task	Dataset	Metric	Score	Overall	Task	Dataset	Metric	Score	Overall	
D1	Exact	36/14	12/08	24/12	0.2/0.1	18/08	37/14	13/08	24/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	S1
	Partial	55/28	22/17	36/18	0.2/0.4	28/16	55/29	23/18	37/17	0.1/0.3	29/16	
D2	Exact	36/14	12/08	23/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	35/14	12/08	22/13	0.1/0.2	17/09	S2
	Partial	55/29	23/18	36/17	0.1/0.3	28/16	54/29	21/18	35/18	0.1/0.4	27/16	
D3	Exact	36/14	12/08	23/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	36/14	12/08	23/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	S3
	Partial	55/29	23/18	36/17	0.1/0.3	29/16	37/29	12/18	23/17	0.1/0.5	18/16	
D4	Exact	36/14	13/08	23/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	37/14	12/08	23/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	S4
	Partial	55/29	23/18	36/18	0.1/0.5	29/16	55/29	23/18	36/17	0.1/0.5	29/16	
D5	Exact	36/14	13/08	25/12	0.1/0.2	18/08	37/14	12/08	23/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	S5
	Partial	56/29	22/17	37/18	0.1/0.3	29/16	55/28	23/18	36/17	0.1/0.5	29/16	
D6	Exact	36/14	12/08	23/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	37/14	12/08	23/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	S6
	Partial	55/29	23/18	36/18	0.1/0.5	29/16	55/29	23/17	36/17	0.1/0.5	29/16	
D7	Exact	36/14	13/8	24/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	35/14	12/08	23/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	S7
	Partial	56/28	22/17	36/17	0.1/0.5	29/16	56/29	22/18	35/18	0.1/0.3	28/16	
-	Exact	-	-	-	-	-	35/14	12/08	23/12	0.1/0.2	18/09	S8
	Partial	-	-	-	-	-	55/29	22/18	35/18	0.1/0.5	28/16	

Table 3: Evaluation results of SOTA-Flan-T5 Large w.r.t. the individual (Task, Dataset, Metric, Score) elements and Overall in the model JSON generated output in terms of F1 score for each of the 15 instructions from DROP and SQuAD datasets vs w/o templates instruction respectively.

Metrics. We evaluated the SOTA-Flan-T5 model in two settings. In the first setting, we treated the SOTA task objective as a structured summarization task. In this setting, we applied standard summarization ROUGE metrics (Lin, 2004) (details in Appendix C). Furthermore, we also tested the models ability to identify papers with leaderboards and those without. This task was simple. For the papers with leaderboards, the model replied with a structured summary and for those it identified as without it replied as “unanswerable.” For these evaluations we applied simple accuracy measure. In the second setting, we evaluated the model JSON output in a fine-grained manner w.r.t. each of the individual (T, D, M, S) elements and overall for which we reported the results in terms of the standard F1 score.

5.1 Results and Discussion

Structured summary generation evaluations. Table 2 results show model’s capacity in generating structured summaries per the SOTA objective. The results obtained were consistent across all 15 instructions which indicates that the model systematically follows all instructions and handles them all in more or less the same way. Notably, the general accuracy, i.e. the ability of the model to discriminate between papers with leaderboards and those without is nearly perfect at 95% indicating a core strength of the model.

The ROUGE metrics, which measure the overlap between the model’s output and reference summaries, have improved by approximately 10 points for ROUGE1 and 3 points for ROUGE2 when comparing the instruction-conditioned model to the baseline shown in Table 3. The improvement is

indicative of the model’s enhanced ability to generate summaries that are not only more aligned with human judgments but also more informative and concise.

SOTA objective (Task, Dataset, Metric, Score) element-wise generation evaluations. Next we examine the results reported in Table 3. Specifically, we examine how well the finetuned SOTA-Flan-T5 model performs when evaluated to precisely extract each of the SOTA objective elements i.e. the Task, Dataset, Metric, and Score in a response produced as one or more related quadruples per paper. These results are reported in terms of F1 scores in an exact match and partial match settings of the model output. Consistent with the results in Table 2, the model responds consistently across the DROP and SQuAD instruction types. Understandably the results in the exact match setting are at least 10 points lower than the results in the partial match setting. We see that across all four elements, the Task is easiest to extract at $\sim 36\%$ exact-match evaluations and $\sim 56\%$ partial-match evaluations. The Metric element was shown to be second easiest to extract at $\sim 25\%$ exact-match and $\sim 37\%$ partial-match evaluations followed the Dataset element at $\sim 13\%$ exact-match and $\sim 23\%$ partial-match evaluations. The model failed in extracting the Score element indicating that an alternate strategy is warranted here. Conclusively, we started out with the research question that examined whether SOTA addressed in a task generation objective would work at all and whether the resulting LLM would be effective? Examining the results in the “Overall” column we see our approach is competitive with the prior state-of-the-art, i.e. the AxCell system (Kardas et al., 2020). Additionally, a point to note here is that our labels are all unnormalized and obtained directly from the community-curated PwC labels which can account in part for lower scores by our approach and our zeroshot test set contains at least a leaderboard that was not seen at training time. In this case, our annotated test dataset with distantly supervised (Task, Dataset, Metric, Score) annotations versus our LLM predictions can be browsed here <https://scinext-project.github.io/#/sota>.

The incorporation of the FLAN-T5 instruction collection into our model’s training regimen has demonstrably enhanced its performance across both structured summarization and SOTA Objective tasks. This effect is quantitatively evident in the results presented in Table 2 and Table 3, which showcases a consistent improvement in ROUGE

scores as well as Task, Dataset, Metric and Score element-wise F1 Score when the model is conditioned with FLAN-T5 instructions.

6 Error Analysis

In this section, we perform the error analysis of our finetuned SOTA-Flan-T5 model.

Type 1 - Missing information The most prominent cause of error in the leaderboard generation is the need for the appropriate entities of interest in the provided context, which refers to our DOCTEAT in this context. FLAN-T5 family of models suffers from the same limitation of 512 max token length caused by the quadratic nature of the underlying attention mechanism. Similarly to (Hou et al., 2019), we obtained a summarized version of the paper, called **DOCTEAT** which stands for **DOC**ument, **T**itle, **A**bstract, **E**xpSetup, and **T**ableInfo. We noticed that, the abstracted representation doesn’t usually contain the score numeric value associated with the dataset and metric reported in a paper. Thus making the Language Model learn to generate a value that is not available in the context.

Type 2 - Crowdsourced label discrepancies Discrepancies between all the Tasks, Datasets, Metrics, and Scores reported in a particular paper vs the metadata available from papers with code data dump is a cause of confusion in the LLM training. We noticed instances of papers with code leaderboard mentions unrelated to the paper’s main contribution, and cases of mentions completely unrelated to the paper. We noticed that, the language model tend to learn the grammatical structure leading to the mention of these entities in the DOCTEAT, but struggle to learn the appropriate representation caused by the misalignment between the leaderboard entities captured by papers with code compared to the ground truth leaderboard addressed in the paper. Thus, an extra human validation of the dataset curated through PWC becomes necessary for future experiments.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we have demonstrated how LLMs can be leveraged for the automated construction of leaderboards from empirical AI research papers modeled as the SOTA objective. As such, we specifically investigated instruction finetuning of the FLAN-T5 model. Our experimental results showed that the finetuned SOTA-Flan-T5 model was effective for the task. This in turn impacts fu-

ture directions for the task from an NLI paradigm aptly situating it in the area of LLM research as a text generation paradigm instead.

8 Limitations

Our approach depends heavily on the quality of data processing and the inherent limitations of the tools employed, such as Pandoc, for converting LaTeX documents to plain text. Errors introduced during this conversion can significantly affect the extraction accuracy of (Task, Dataset, Metric, Score) quadruples. Additionally, our model’s generalizability across various domains of academic research beyond computer science is not yet verified. The distinct formats and terminologies prevalent in different disciplines may pose a challenge, and as such, the model’s applicability across these varied fields remains a topic for future research.

9 Ethics Statement

The datasets used in this study were sourced from the arXiv repository, adhering to open access policies. Despite this, the automated nature of our information extraction poses ethical considerations, primarily due to potential misinterpretations or oversimplifications of nuanced academic content. The potential of propagation errors from source materials to final outputs due to preprocessing tools underscores the need for clear communication regarding these limitations to users of our system. This is crucial to ensure that the information provided through the generated leaderboards accurately reflects the advancements in AI research without misleading the academic community or the public.

References

Philip G Altbach and Hans De Wit. 2019. Too much academic research is being published. *International Higher Education*, (96):2–3.

Sören Auer, Allard Oelen, Muhammad Haris, Markus Stocker, Jennifer D’Souza, Kheir Eddine Farfar, Lars Vogt, Manuel Prinz, Vitalis Wiens, and Mohamad Yaser Jaradeh. 2020. Improving access to scientific literature with knowledge graphs. *Bibliothek Forschung und Praxis*, 44(3):516–529.

Isabelle Augenstein, Mrinal Das, Sebastian Riedel, Lakshmi Vikraman, and Andrew McCallum. 2017. [SemEval 2017 task 10: ScienceIE - extracting keyphrases and relations from scientific publications](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop*

on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017), pages 546–555, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Lutz Bornmann, Robin Haunschild, and Rüdiger Mutz. 2021. Growth rates of modern science: a latent piecewise growth curve approach to model publication numbers from established and new literature databases. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8(1):1–15.

Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*.

Jennifer D’Souza and Soeren Auer. 2021. Pattern-based acquisition of scientific entities from scholarly article titles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00199*.

Dheeru Dua, Yizhong Wang, Pradeep Dasigi, Gabriel Stanovsky, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2019. Drop: A reading comprehension benchmark requiring discrete reasoning over paragraphs. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2368–2378.

Jennifer D’Souza and Sören Auer. 2022. Computer science named entity recognition in the open research knowledge graph. In *International Conference on Asian Digital Libraries*, pages 35–45. Springer.

Santo Fortunato, Carl T Bergstrom, Katy Börner, James A Evans, Dirk Helbing, Staša Milojević, Alexander M Petersen, Filippo Radicchi, Roberta Sinatra, Brian Uzzi, et al. 2018. Science of science. *Science*, 359(6379):eaao0185.

Sonal Gupta and Christopher Manning. 2011. [Analyzing the dynamics of research by extracting key aspects of scientific papers](#). In *Proceedings of 5th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 1–9, Chiang Mai, Thailand. Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing.

Or Honovich, Thomas Scialom, Omer Levy, and Timo Schick. 2022. Unnatural instructions: Tuning language models with (almost) no human labor. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09689*.

Yufang Hou, Charles Jochim, Martin Gleize, Francesca Bonin, and Debasis Ganguly. 2019. [Identification of tasks, datasets, evaluation metrics, and numeric scores for scientific leaderboards construction](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Sarthak Jain, Madeleine van Zuylen, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Iz Beltagy. 2020. Scirex: A challenge dataset for document-level information extraction. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7506–7516.

- Salomon Kabongo, Jennifer D’Souza, and Sören Auer. 2023a. Orkg-leaderboards: A systematic workflow for mining leaderboards as a knowledge graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11068*.
- Salomon Kabongo, Jennifer D’Souza, and Sören Auer. 2023b. Zero-shot entailment of leaderboards for empirical ai research. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries in 2023*.
- Marcin Kardas, Piotr Czapla, Pontus Stenetorp, Sebastian Ruder, Sebastian Riedel, Ross Taylor, and Robert Stojnic. 2020. Axccl: Automatic extraction of results from machine learning papers. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8580–8594.
- Daniel Khashabi, Sewon Min, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2020. Unifiedqa: Crossing format boundaries with a single qa system. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1896–1907.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, et al. 2023. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13688*.
- Keming Lu, Xiaoman Pan, Kaiqiang Song, Hongming Zhang, Dong Yu, and Jianshu Chen. 2023. **PIVOINE: Instruction tuning for open-world entity profiling**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 15108–15127, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yi Luan, Luheng He, Mari Ostendorf, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2018. Multi-task identification of entities, relations, and coreference for scientific knowledge graph construction. In *Proc. Conf. Empirical Methods Natural Language Process. (EMNLP)*.
- Ishani Mondal, Yufang Hou, and Charles Jochim. 2021. **End-to-end construction of NLP knowledge graph**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 1885–1895, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Behrang QasemiZadeh and Anne-Kathrin Schumann. 2016. **The ACL RD-TEC 2.0: A language resource for evaluating term extraction and entity recognition methods**. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’16)*, pages 1862–1868, Portorož, Slovenia. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. 2018. Know what you don’t know: Unanswerable questions for squad. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 784–789.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. 2022. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. In *ICLR 2022-Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Noam Shazeer and Mitchell Stern. 2018. Adafactor: Adaptive learning rates with sublinear memory cost. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4596–4604. PMLR.
- Xiao Wang, Weikang Zhou, Can Zu, Han Xia, Tianze Chen, Yuansen Zhang, Rui Zheng, Junjie Ye, Qi Zhang, Tao Gui, et al. 2023. Instructuie: Multi-task instruction tuning for unified information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08085*.
- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoor-molabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Anjana Arunkumar, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Atharva Naik, David Stap, et al. 2022. Super-naturalinstructions: generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ tasks. In *EMNLP*.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021a. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021b. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*.
- Tianbao Xie, Chen Henry Wu, Peng Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Torsten Scholak, Michihiro Yasunaga, Chien-Sheng Wu, Ming Zhong, Pengcheng Yin, Sida I Wang, et al. 2022. Unifedskg: Unifying and multi-tasking structured knowledge grounding with text-to-text language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 602–631.

A Instructions: Qualitative Examples

In this section, we elicit each of the instructions that were considered in this work as formulated in the FLAN 2022 Collection for the SQuAD_v2 and DROP datasets.

A.1 The Stanford Question Answering Dataset (SQuAD_v2)

Instruction 1 (S1):

{Context} \n\n Please answer a question about this article. If the question is unanswerable, say "unanswerable". {Question}

Instruction 2 (S2):

{Context} \n {Question} If the question is unanswerable, say "unanswerable"

Instruction 3 (S3):

{Context}\n Try to answer this question if possible (otherwise reply "unanswerable"): {Question}

Instruction 4 (S4):

{Context} \n\n Please answer a question about this article. If the question is unanswerable, say "unanswerable". {Question}' {Context} \n Try to answer this question if possible (otherwise reply "unanswerable"): {Question}

Instruction 5 (S5):

{Context}\n If it is possible to answer this question, answer it for me (else, reply "unanswerable"): {Question}

Instruction 6 (S6):

{Context}\n \n Answer this question, if possible (if impossible, reply "unanswerable"): {Question}

Instruction 7 (S7):

Read this: {Context}\n \n {Question} \n What is the answer? (If it cannot be answered, return "unanswerable")

Instruction 8 (S8):

Read this: {Context}\n Now answer this question, if there is an answer (If it cannot be answered, return "unanswerable"): {Question}

A.2 Discrete Reasoning over Paragraphs (DROP) Dataset

Instruction 1 (D1):

Answer based on context:\n \n {Context}\n \n {Question}

Instruction 2 (D2):

{Context}\n \n Answer this question based on the article: {Question}

Instruction 3 (D3):

{Context}\n \n {Question}

Instruction 4 (D4):

{Context}\n Answer this question: {Question}

Instruction 5 (D5):

Read this article and answer this question {Context}\n {Question}

Instruction 6 (D6):

{Context}\n \n Based on the above article, answer a question. {Question}

Instruction 7 (D7):

Context: {Context}\n \n Question: {Question}\n \n Answer:

B Our Experimental Hyperparameters

We used two main experimental settings in this work. The first consists of a dataset of a randomly selected half of every individual template instance, and the second one is a dataset with no template instances called baseline in the paper.

Given that the average context length of our dataset was close to the 512 sequence length limit by T5 and the size of the available GPU, a batch size of 4 and gradient_accumulation_steps of 1 were used. All experiments were run on five epochs and we used AdafactorSchedule and Adafactor optimizer (Shazeer and Stern, 2018) with scale_parameter=True, relative_step=True, warmup_init=True, lr=None.

The evaluations were all done on a dataset made of individual template instructions separately, as reported in table Table 2.

C ROUGE Evaluation Metrics

The ROUGE metrics (Lin, 2004) are commonly used for evaluating the quality of text summarization systems. ROUGE-1 measures the overlap of unigram (single word) units between the generated summary and the reference summary. ROUGE-2 extends this to measure the overlap of bigram (two consecutive word) units. ROUGE-L calculates the longest common subsequence between the generated and reference summaries, which takes into account the order of words. ROUGE-LSum is an extension of ROUGE-L that considers multiple reference summaries by treating them as a single summary. These metrics provide a quantitative assessment of the similarity between the generated and reference summaries, helping researchers and

developers evaluate and compare the effectiveness of different summarization approaches. They have become widely used benchmarks in the field of automatic summarization.