

# Small Language Model as Data Prospector for Large Language Model

Shiwen Ni<sup>1\*</sup>, Haihong Wu<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Di Yang<sup>1,2</sup>, Qiang Qu<sup>1</sup>, Hamid Alinejad-Rokny<sup>3</sup>, Min Yang<sup>1,4†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Shenzhen Key Laboratory for High Performance Data Mining,

Shenzhen Institute of Advanced Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences

<sup>2</sup>University of Science and Technology of China <sup>3</sup>The University of New South Wales

<sup>4</sup>Shenzhen University of Advanced Technology

{sw.ni, min.yang}@siat.ac.cn; {haihongw, di-yang}@mail.usstc.edu.cn

## Abstract

The quality of instruction data directly affects the performance of fine-tuned Large Language Models (LLMs). Previously, (Li et al., 2023c) proposed NUGGETS, which identifies and selects high-quality data from a large dataset by identifying those individual instruction examples that can significantly improve the performance of different tasks after being learnt as one-shot instances. In this work, we propose SuperNUGGETS, an improved variant of NUGGETS optimised for efficiency and performance. Our SuperNUGGETS uses a small language model (SLM) instead of a large language model (LLM) to filter the data for outstanding one-shot instances and refines the predefined set of tests. The experimental results show that the performance of SuperNUGGETS only decreases by 1-2% compared to NUGGETS, but the efficiency can be increased by a factor of 58. Compared to the original NUGGETS, our SuperNUGGETS has a higher utility value due to the significantly lower resource consumption.

## 1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated excellent performance on a wide range of Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks by scaling model size and datasets (OpenAI, 2023; Google, 2023; Bai et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2024). Fine-tuning LLMs can further enhance the utility of these models by enabling them to better follow human instructions. This process usually involves supervised fine-tuning of input-output pairs, also known as instruction fine-tuning. This kind of fine-tuning not only awakens the knowledge acquired by the model during the pre-training phase, but also allows the model to interact with humans in a more natural conversational form.

Currently, much research (Chung et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022b, 2023) is devoted to optimiz-




Figure 1: Comparison of Nuggets and SuperNuggets on the Alpaca-Eval benchmark.

ing instruction fine-tuning by collecting larger, diverse, and complex datasets, often derived from open source data or expanded based on large language models. However, some recent studies (Bai et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2023; Cao et al., 2023) have shown that smaller but carefully selected high-quality datasets in the instruction fine-tuning phase can be more helpful in improving model performance. Performing simply the quantity of data while neglecting the quality of the data may lead to degradation of the performance of the model. It (Dai et al., 2022) has been shown that context learning can be approximated as implicitly forward-propagating fine-tuning, whereas instruction fine-tuning is realized by back-propagation. Therefore, (Li et al., 2023c) proposes the Nuggets method, which predicts the effect of instruction fine-tuning by the performance of context learning. NUGGETS utilizes one-shot learning<sup>3</sup> to sift through large amounts of data to find high-quality instruction data. Specifically, if an instruction example can significantly improve the model’s performance on a specific task, then it is an example worth training. If an example can have a positive impact on multiple examples, then it is an important instruction data. This is done by first identifying a predefined set of tasks containing multiple examples, and then using the remaining examples as a candidate set. An example from the candidate set is

\*Equal contribution

†Corresponding author




Figure 2: Comparison of SuperNUGGETS and NUGGETS.

sequentially selected as a one-shot example for contextual learning and scored by observing its impact on the perplexity of the predefined examples. This score reflects the correlation between the predefined examples and the candidate examples and serves as a criterion for data selection. Since the NUGGETS method needs to calculate the one-shot score and zero-shot score for each piece of data, the computation is very large. Moreover, the set of predefined tasks in NUGGETS is obtained by random sampling, and has not been quality checked and filtered, which may contain noise and will inevitably contain some low-quality data, which will directly affect the correctness of the subsequent score calculation. To address the above shortcomings in the original NUGGETS approach, we propose SuperNUGGETS, which utilises SLM to identify high-quality one-shot instances and perform refinement based on quality and diversity on the predefined set of test tasks.

## 2 SuperNUGGETS

**Motivation** NUGGETS (Li et al., 2023c) utilizes one-shot learning to filter out high-quality instruction data from a large amount of instruction data, achieving excellent data prospecting results. However the original NUGGETS method requires calculating the one-shot score and zero-shot score for each piece of data, and the original size of the predefined task set is 1,000 pieces. To filter Alpaca’s 52k pieces of data requires the model to inference a total of  $52,002$  (zero-shot) +  $[52,002 \times 1,000]$  (one-shot) =  $52,054,002$  times. Using LLM to inference 104 million times is very time costing as well as a big resource drain. In addition, the predefined task set in the original NUGGETS method is obtained by random sampling, which will inevitably contain

some low-quality data, which will directly affect the correctness of the subsequent calculation of the gold score. Therefore, to address the above limitations and problems, we propose SuperNUGGETS, an enhanced version of NUGGETS.

### 2.1 Predefined Task Set Refinement

The number of the alpaca dataset is 52,002, and our first step is to start with the reward model reward-model-deberta-v3-large-v2, to score the overall data. Then the top 10,000 data are filtered based on the score, of which the top 20 are taken separately as a high quality subset, this step is to ensure the high quality of the data. The second step encodes the first 20-10,000 data to obtain semantic vectors, which are clustered using the kcenter\_greedy algorithm. Specifically, an initial centroid is selected from the 20-10,000 dataset, usually the data point furthest from the other centroids. The data point furthest from the current set of centroids is then iteratively selected as the new centroid to ensure broader coverage. Finally the point furthest from the current set of centroids is iteratively selected, which ensures that the selected data is as dispersed as possible, covering all aspects of the instruction types, ensuring diversity and coverage of the selected instruction data. This step selects 80 examples from 20-1,000 data, and finally combines the 20 examples from the first step with the 80 examples from the second step to form a refined predefined test set containing 100 examples.

### 2.2 SLM as Instruction Data Prospector

With an instruction tuning dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , we aim to identify a set of examples  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gold}}$  that are most closely aligned with the golden instructions. Like the original NUGGETS (Li et al., 2023c) method, we first need to calculate the zero-shot score for refined predefined task set. The predefined test set after the previous refinement encompasses a variety of  $m$  tasks, where each task is structured as  $\{\text{Task (T), Answer (A)}\}$ . Each token in Task or Answer is denoted as  $tk_i^T$  or  $tk_i^A$ . Let SLM denote the instruction data prospector we use. For the  $j$ -th task represented by  $T_j$ , the probability of zero-shot inference by the data prospector can be calculated by continuously predicting the next tokens based on the given task and the preceding words:

$$s_{\text{zero}}^j = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L \log p(tk_i^{A_j} | \text{InP}_{\text{zero}}; \text{SLM}), \quad (1)$$

$$\text{InP}_{\text{zero}} = [T_j, tk_1^{A_j}, tk_2^{A_j}, \dots, tk_{i-1}^{A_j}],$$

Data Prospector	Data ratios	Helpful_base	Koala	Self-instruct	Oasst	Vicuna	Length	Overall
/	0%	6.98	10.26	11.17	9.92	0.09	1,593	9.69
/	100% (full)	24.81	18.59	13.10	24.47	15.00	357	<u>18.51</u>
Llama2-7B	1% (top)	26.36	14.74	10.32	22.34	16.25	434	17.14
	5% (top)	37.98	23.72	18.65	27.66	16.25	433	<b>24.47</b>
	10% (top)	24.03	29.49	17.86	26.60	20.00	426	<b>23.29</b>
	30% (top)	26.36	21.15	16.67	26.60	17.50	384	<b>21.37</b>
	50% (top)	18.60	16.67	14.68	27.66	13.75	358	<b>18.63</b>
	50% (bottom)	20.93	15.38	11.90	19.15	13.75	331	15.53
Opt-350m	1% (top)	21.71	13.46	10.32	22.34	11.25	439	15.65
	5% (top)	38.76	23.08	12.30	31.38	21.25	490	<b>23.98</b>
	10% (top)	31.01	21.79	14.29	28.19	18.75	491	<b>21.99</b>
	30% (top)	23.26	19.23	15.08	30.85	17.50	405	<b>20.99</b>
	50% (top)	23.26	23.72	15.87	29.26	15.00	393	<b>21.61</b>
	50% (bottom)	13.95	13.46	12.70	22.87	10.00	295	14.91
Opt-125m	1% (top)	20.16	13.46	11.90	21.28	16.25	421	16.15
	5% (top)	32.56	20.51	14.68	27.13	20.00	406	<b>22.11</b>
	10% (top)	27.91	18.59	13.89	28.19	25.00	405	<b>21.37</b>
	30% (top)	24.81	18.59	19.44	29.26	26.25	393	<b>23.04</b>
	50% (top)	21.71	20.51	16.67	25.53	16.25	385	<b>20.12</b>
	50% (bottom)	10.08	12.82	9.92	18.62	6.25	295	11.86

Table 1: The win\_rate results of models fine-tuned using different data under the Alpaca-Eval benchmark.

where  $L$  is the number of tokens of the ground-truth answer  $A$ . The score  $s_{zero}^j$  is used to denote the competence level of the SLM on the  $j$ th task. A higher  $s_{zero}^j$  denotes superior model performance on the  $j$ -th task, whereas a lower  $s_{zero}^j$  implies inferior performance. Therefore, we can acquire the data prospector’s performance across  $m$  tasks as:

$$\mathbf{S}_{zero} = [s_{zero}^1, s_{zero}^2, \dots, s_{zero}^{m-1}, s_{zero}^m]. \quad (2)$$

For each example  $\mathbf{z}_k = \{\text{IQ}_k, \text{IA}_k\}$ , we initially perform one-shot learning on the base model using that specific example. Here,  $\text{IQ}_k$  denotes the question associated with the  $k$ -th example  $\mathbf{z}_k \in \mathcal{D}$ , while  $\text{IA}_k$  signifies its corresponding answer. Subsequently, we employ the model with in-context learning to conduct another round of testing on the tasks within the predefined task set. That is,

$$s_{\text{one}}^j(\mathbf{z}_k) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L \log p(w_i^{A_j} | \text{InP}_{\text{one}}; \text{SLM}),$$

$$\text{InP}_{\text{one}} = [T_j, \underbrace{(\text{IQ}_k, \text{IA}_k)}_{\text{One-Shot Prompt}}, w_1^{A_j}, w_2^{A_j}, \dots, w_{i-1}^{A_j}], \quad (3)$$

where  $(\text{IQ}_k, \text{IA}_k)$  can be considered *one-shot prompt*. Similarly, we can obtain the performance of the model after implicit fine-tuning across  $m$  different tasks:

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{one}}^k = [s_{\text{one}}^1(\mathbf{z}_k), s_{\text{one}}^2(\mathbf{z}_k), \dots, s_{\text{one}}^m(\mathbf{z}_k)]. \quad (4)$$

We use **Golden Score (GS)** to reflect the score of our data prospector SLM for that instruction data. The GS of the example  $\mathbf{z}_k$  is calculated as

$$\text{GS}(\mathbf{z}_k) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{I} [s_{\text{one}}^i(\mathbf{z}_k) > s_{\text{zero}}^i] \in [0, 1], \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}[\cdot]$  is the indicator function. The GS measures the increment of performance improvement of the model after one-shot learning through the given instruction. Finally, we use GS to filter the data to get the top  $n\%$  of datasets  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gold}}^{n\%}$  with the highest GS as appropriate. Using SLM prospecting to get  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{gold}}^{n\%}$  can be used to fine-tune the LLM.

## 3 Experiment

### 3.1 Experimental Setup

As with (Li et al., 2023c), we chose Alpaca as the instruction dataset to be used for data filtering. This dataset is pivotal within the open-source sphere for the purpose of instruction tuning. It was created using the self-instruct (Wang et al., 2022a) technique, which extracts instruction data from text-davinci-003. The dataset’s effectiveness in refining the LLaMA model has catalyzed a wave of research into the realm of instruction fine-tuning (Li et al., 2023a; Ji et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023).

Same as the original NUGGETS (Li et al., 2023c), we compare the responses generated by the model with those generated by the davincici -003 model, using the well-established **Alpaca-Eval** dataset (Li

Data Prospector	Predefined test sets	top 1%	top 5%	top 10%	top 30%	top 50%	bottom 50%
Llama2-7B	100 (Refined)	17.14	24.47	23.29	21.37	18.63	15.53
	100 (Random)	12.11	16.27	18.51	17.76	16.27	19.19
	1000 (Random)	18.63	21.49	23.79	21.37	19.32	17.14
Opt-350m	100 (Refined)	15.65	23.98	21.99	20.99	21.61	14.91
	100 (Random)	15.28	20.56	18.14	17.45	19.57	17.70
	1000 (Random)	16.15	24.47	23.17	25.47	20.68	15.28
Opt-125m	100 (Refined)	16.15	22.11	21.37	23.04	20.12	11.86
	100 (Random)	12.11	19.38	20.62	21.37	18.32	16.71
	1000 (Random)	13.29	20.56	20.62	22.86	20.56	15.28

Table 2: Ablation study of predefined task set refinement.

Data Prospector	Llama2-7B	Opt-350m	Opt-125m
Llama2-7B	1	0.701	0.653
Opt-350m	0.701	1	0.786
Opt-125m	0.653	0.786	1

Table 3: Percentage of identical data between the top 30% of data screened by different data prospectors.

et al., 2023b). This dataset uses ‘win\_rate’ as the evaluation metric. In our experiments, we use three models, Opt-125m, Opt-350m, and Llama2-7B, respectively, as data Prospector. We specify the Llama2-7B model as the base model for generation fine-tuning. In the model fine-tuning phase, we use an Adam optimiser with a learning rate of  $2 \times 10^{-5}$ , a learning rate of 2e-5, a batch size of 16, a warmup\_ratio of 0.03, and an epoch of 3. In the subsequent model evaluation phase, we use the gpt-4o-mini for the measurement.

### 3.2 Experimental Results

As shown in Table 1, we use Opt-125m, Opt-350m, and Llama2-7B as data prospectors, respectively, and the predefined test set is the refined 100 data. The results of model performance over using 100% data (52,002) fine-tuning are bolded in the table. From the experimental results, it is evident that our SuperNUGGETS filtered data using only the top 5% exceeds the effect of fine-tuning the model out of 100% of the data. We found that the model trained on top 5% of the data obtained using Opt-350m (20 times smaller than Llama2-7B) as the data prospector also achieves a score of 23.98, which is much higher than the model fine-tuned on 100% of the full amount of data. Even the model trained with TOP 5% of the data obtained using Opt-125m (56 times smaller than Llama2-7B) as the data Prospector achieves a score of 22.11, which is much higher than the model fine-tuned with 100% of the full amount of data. All three models Opt-

125m, Opt-350m, and Llama2-7B screened the top 50% of the data better than the bottom 50% of the data, which demonstrates the effectiveness of our SuperNUGGETS. As shown in Table 3, we find that the top 30% of the data screened by the three sizes of prospectors are very similar, which also indicates that SLM is an alternative to LLM as a data prospector. Case studies are in the appendix A.

## 4 Ablation Study

While the original NUGGETS used 1,000 random data as a predefined task test set, our SuperNUGGETS uses a refined set of 100 data, which makes the number of computations 10 times smaller. As shown in Table 2, using the refined 100 data as the predefined task test set is far better than randomly selecting 100 data, regardless of which model the data prospector is. We found that the effect of the refined 100 data was even similar to that of the randomly filtered 1,000 data. The above experimental results illustrate the validity letter of our refinement of the predefined task test set.

## 5 Conclusion

Previously, (Li et al., 2023c) proposed NUGGETS, which identifies and selects high-quality data from large datasets through the effect of one-shot learning. In this work, we propose SuperNUGGETS, which is an NUGGETS improved variant optimized for efficiency and performance. Our SuperNUGGETS uses a small language model (SLM) instead of a large language model (LLM) to filter unprocessed single instance data and refines a predefined test set. Experimental results show that SuperNUGGETS is only 1-2% less performant than NUGGETS, but 58 times more efficient. Compared to the original NUGGETS, our SuperNUGGETS has a much higher utility value because of the significantly lower resource consumption.

## Limitations

Due to funding and resource constraints, full-parameter fine-tuning was not carried out for models at scales above 7B. The performance of the filtered high-quality data on larger scale models is unknown.

## References

- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*.
- Yuelin Bai, Xinrun Du, Yiming Liang, Yonggang Jin, Ziqiang Liu, Junting Zhou, Tianyu Zheng, Xincheng Zhang, Nuo Ma, Zekun Wang, et al. 2024. Coigcqia: Quality is all you need for chinese instruction fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18058*.
- Yihan Cao, Yanbin Kang, and Lichao Sun. 2023. Instruction mining: High-quality instruction data selection for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06290*.
- Xuxin Cheng, Zhihong Zhu, Hongxiang Li, Yaowei Li, Xianwei Zhuang, and Yuexian Zou. 2024. Towards multi-intent spoken language understanding via hierarchical attention and optimal transport. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 17844–17852.
- 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*.
- Damai Dai, Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Zhifang Sui, and Furu Wei. 2022. Why can gpt learn in-context? language models secretly perform gradient descent as meta optimizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10559*.
- Google. 2023. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*.
- Yunjie Ji, Yong Deng, Yan Gong, Yiping Peng, Qiang Niu, Lei Zhang, Baochang Ma, and Xiangang Li. 2023. Exploring the impact of instruction data scaling on large language models: An empirical study on real-world use cases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14742*.
- Lei Li, Yuwei Yin, Shicheng Li, Liang Chen, Peiyi Wang, Shuhuai Ren, Mukai Li, Yazheng Yang, Jingjing Xu, Xu Sun, et al. 2023a. M3it: A large-scale dataset towards multi-modal multilingual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04387*.
- Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023b. AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models. [https://github.com/tatsu-lab/alpaca\\_eval](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/alpaca_eval).
- Yunshui Li, Binyuan Hui, Xiaobo Xia, Jiayi Yang, Min Yang, Lei Zhang, Shuzheng Si, Junhao Liu, Tongliang Liu, Fei Huang, et al. 2023c. One shot learning as instruction data prospector for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10302*.
- OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Yizhong Wang, Hamish Ivison, Pradeep Dasigi, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, David Wadden, Kelsey MacMillan, Noah A Smith, Iz Beltagy, et al. 2023. How far can camels go? exploring the state of instruction tuning on open resources. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04751*.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hananeh Hajishirzi. 2022a. Self-instruct: Aligning language model with self generated instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560*.
- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Atharva Naik, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Anjana Arunkumar, David Stap, et al. 2022b. SupernaturalInstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ nlp tasks. In *EMNLP*, pages 5085–5109.
- Canwen Xu, Daya Guo, Nan Duan, and Julian McAuley. 2023. Baize: An open-source chat model with parameter-efficient tuning on self-chat data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01196*.
- Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srinu Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, et al. 2023. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11206*.

## A Case Study

To qualitatively evaluate SuperNUGGETS, we also selected some example instructions from the Alpaca dataset for a case study, as shown in Figure 3. We observe that instructions with very short and meaningless outputs give low gold scores for all three different sizes of data prospectors. In contrast, instructions with high gold scores are usually linguistically fluent, logically well thought out, have complete output, and are oriented towards helping humans solve problems.

---

[ **Instruction** ] Compose a wedding song in a slow tempo.  
[ **Output** ] <output audio>  
[ **Golden Score** ] 🟡 **Llama2-7b: 0.09; Opt-350m: 0.07; Opt-125m: 0.09**

---

[ **Instruction** ] Compose a musical piece with a title that denotes sorrow.  
[ **Output** ] <nooutput>  
[ **Golden Score** ] 🟡 **Llama2-7b: 0.13; Opt-350m: 0.08; Opt-125m: 0.06**

---

[ **Instruction** ] Generate a search query to find the average temperature on a given day.  
[ **Output** ] \"What is the average temperature on [date]\"  
[ **Golden Score** ] 🟡 **Llama2-7b: 0.12; Opt-350m: 0.03; Opt-125m: 0.09**

---

[ **Instruction** ] Answer the following question in an essay format.  
[ **Input** ] What are the positive and negative effects of technology in our society?  
[ **Output** ] Technology has both positive and negative effects on our society. On the positive side, the advances in technology have made our lives much easier and more comfortable. Technology has allowed us to communicate with people around the world in real-time, stay informed with news happening everywhere, create amazing tools and devices, and take advantage of unprecedented opportunities for education. \n\nOn the other hand, technology has also had some negative effects on our society. The rise of technology has led to increased levels of distraction, a decrease in face-to-face interaction, and a decrease in physical activity and physical interaction. Additionally, the rise of technology has led to increased levels of cybercrime, data privacy, and security issues. \n\nOverall, it is clear that technology has both positive and negative effects on our society. It is important for us to make sure that we are utilizing technology in a responsible way and taking control of the technology we use, rather than allowing it to control us.  
[ **Golden Score** ] 🟢 **Llama2-7b: 0.98; Opt-350m: 0.85; Opt-125m: 0.78**

---

[ **Instruction** ] What are the main benefits of eating a vegandiet?  
[ **Output** ] The main benefits of eating a vegan diet include improved health, weight loss, protection from diseases, reduced impact on the environment, and saved animal lives. Eating vegan eliminates all animal-based products, meaning that vegans are less prone to many diseases, such as certain types of cancer, diabetes, and hypertension. Furthermore, vegans tend to have lower cholesterol levels and blood pressure compared to non-vegans. A vegan diet is also known to help with weight loss and improve overall health due to its high content of dietary fiber and vitamins. Additionally, a vegan diet has a significantly lower carbon footprint, helping to reduce one's impact on the environment. Finally, a vegan diet is beneficial to animals, as it does not require the deaths of any animals for food products.  
[ **Golden Score** ] 🟢 **Llama2-7b: 0.99; Opt-350m: 0.86; Opt-125m: 0.80**

---

Figure 3: Examples of instructions and their corresponding golden scores.