

A Survey on LLM Inference-Time Self-Improvement

Xiangjue Dong* Maria Teleki* James Caverlee
Texas A&M University

{xj.dong, mariateleki, caverlee}@tamu.edu

Abstract

Techniques that enhance inference through increased computation at test-time have recently gained attention. In this survey, we investigate the current state of LLM Inference-Time Self-Improvement from three different perspectives: Independent Self-improvement, focusing on enhancements via decoding or sampling methods; Context-Aware Self-Improvement, leveraging additional context or datastore; and Model-Aided Self-Improvement, achieving improvement through model collaboration. We provide a comprehensive review of recent relevant studies, contribute an in-depth taxonomy, and discuss challenges and limitations, offering insights for future research.



<https://github.com/dongxiangjue/Awesome-LLM-Self-Improvement>

1 Introduction

The capabilities of large language models (LLMs) have advanced dramatically in recent years (Achiam et al., 2023; Team et al., 2023). These advancements have largely been driven by scaling up model training compute (Kaplan et al., 2020; Brown et al., 2024), with investments in larger models, extensive pretraining datasets, and enhanced alignment techniques (Ouyang et al., 2022; Bai et al., 2022a,b; Rafailov et al., 2023).¹

Recently, scaling computation *during* inference-time to improve task performance has gained attention (Snell et al., 2024), e.g., increasing test-time compute (i.e., model thinking time) (OpenAI, 2024) and scaling inference compute through repeated sampling (Brown et al., 2024). Test-time capabilities enable smaller models to replace larger

* Equal Contribution

¹These investments are expensive in terms of both capital and carbon footprint – to the point that technology companies are investing in nuclear power (Frank Holmes, 2024).




Figure 1: Conceptual examples of methods in the three main categories of *LLM Inference-Time Self-Improvement* without altering the original LLM parameters or additional training.

ones by trading size for extra inference computation and pave the way for self-improvement with minimal human supervision (Brown et al., 2024). Self-improvement approaches at inference-time offer a new set of opportunities for researchers to continue pushing the boundaries of AI models beyond scaling model size and training data. Concurrent reviews about methods at inference-time are from the perspective of (i) token-level generation versus meta-generation (Welleck et al., 2024), and (ii) verification methods (Song et al., 2024). However, there has not yet been a comprehensive review of self-improvement at inference-time. This survey aims to bridge this gap by categorically reviewing existing literature and contributing the first taxonomy (Figure 2) of these methods.

We survey in this work this notion of **LLM Inference-Time Self Improvement (ITSI²)** – i.e., *relying on the LLM’s own frozen parameters without additional training or parameter updating to improve performance and/or efficiency at inference-time*. These methods often incorporate specialized decoding algorithms to refine the next-token selection by adjusting logits (raw model outputs), the probability distribution (*softmax* applied to the

²Pronounced “itsy.”




Figure 2: Taxonomy of Large Language Model Inference-Time Self-Improvement.

logits), and the decoding objective. We classify these methods into three categories: **Independent Self-Improvement**, which operates independently; **Context-Aware Self-Improvement**, which leverages external support (i.e. context and datastore retrieval); and **Model-Aided Self-Improvement**, which relies on external models for collaboration. We draw from recent high-quality papers published in top conferences (ACL, EMNLP, NAACL, NeurIPS, ICLR, ICML) and highly cited works. We highlight key challenges and potential directions for future research.

2 Independent Self-Improvement

Independent Self-Improvement is achieving improvements in performance using the model’s own frozen parameters without additional training – i.e., by modifying the decoding process (§2.1, §2.2, and §2.3); increasing efficiency (§2.4); sampling multiple candidate generations (§2.5); and isolating layers or neurons (§2.7).

2.1 Constrained Decoding

Constrained decoding guides the generation process via hard constraints or soft constraints.

Hard Constraint. These are strict rules that must

be adhered to in the output, such as requiring a specific word to appear in the generated sentence. [Lu et al. \(2022\)](#) propose NEUROLOGIC* (Neuro-Logic A*esque Decoding), extending NeuroLogic Decoding ([Lu et al., 2021](#)) with lookahead heuristics to estimate future constraint satisfaction and enforce logical constraints. [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#) propose CONTROL-DAG, a constrained decoding algorithm for Directed Acyclic models. It enables *lexical, vocabulary, and length controls* to ensure the generation of designated entities (*lexical constraints*), eliminate out-of-vocabulary words (*vocabulary constraints*), and regulate the target length of the output using a Viterbi decoding algorithm (*length constraints*).

Soft Constraint. These are more flexible guidelines that the model aims to satisfy, but they are not strictly enforced. The model attempts to generate text that adheres to these constraints while still optimizing for fluency and relevance. [Zhu et al. \(2023\)](#) propose PENALTY DECODING via a forgetting mechanism – i.e., an adjustment to the probability distribution with a repetition penalty. [Yao et al. \(2023\)](#) propose IPS (Isotropic and Proximal Search), wherein they modify the generated token selection via terms for (i) isotropy – i.e., responses should be similar to all previous turns, and (ii) proximity – i.e., generated tokens should be similar to previously generated tokens. These criteria are incorporated via a weighted penalty in the decoding objective.

2.2 Contrastive Decoding

Contrastive decoding adjusts the next-token probability based on differences in logits.

Faithfulness and Hallucinations. [Nandwani et al. \(2023\)](#) propose PMI-DECODE (Point-wise Mutual Information Decode), a decoding method which incorporates PMI-FAITH in its objective to ensure faithfulness to the text. PMI-FAITH is based on conditional (dialog history) pointwise mutual information between the generated response and the document. [Manevich and Tsarfaty \(2024\)](#) propose LCD (Language Contrastive Decoding) which adjusts the output probabilities of a large vision-language model based on its internal LLM’s probability distribution using a *dynamic weighting mechanism guided by entropy*. [Sia et al. \(2024\)](#) propose ANTI-LM (Anti-Language Model), a decoding objective which applies exponential decay to penalize the logits of the next token conditioned on the test

sentences being translated – without considering other contexts or subsequent generations. [Chuang et al. \(2024\)](#) propose DOLA (Decoding by Contrasting Layers) which improves model factuality by contrasting logits from higher and lower layers.

Repetition, Coherence, and Diversity. [Xu et al. \(2023\)](#) propose LOOK-BACK decoding, which relies on KL-Divergence to avoid token/phrase repetition and topic changes. [Zhu et al. \(2024\)](#) propose ADAPTIVE DECODING that dynamically adjusts the candidate set size through a confidence-increasing procedure based on entropy. Tokens with the highest probability are selected to enhance confidence, updating the candidate set to determine the optimal set during generation.

2.3 Minimum Bayes-Risk Decoding

Unlike MAP decoding, Minimum Bayes-Risk (MBR) decoding selects the output sentence that maximizes the *expected utility* over the set of translation hypotheses ([Kumar and Byrne, 2004](#)).

Clustering. [Jinnai et al. \(2024a\)](#) propose DMBR (Diverse MBR) and KMBR (*k*-medoids MBR): DMBR adds a diversity penalty to optimize utility and diversity, while KMBR reframes decoding as clustering. [Deguchi et al. \(2024\)](#) propose CBMBR (Centroid-Based MBR), which accelerates MBR decoding by clustering reference translations in feature space and employing cluster centroids to compute *expected utility*.

Matrix Approximation. [Trabelsi et al. \(2024\)](#) propose PMBR (Probabilistic MBR decoding), which leverages the MBR matrix’s low-rank structure and applies matrix completion to a subset of scores to estimate the full matrix.

Others. [Cheng and Vlachos \(2023\)](#) propose PRUNING MBR, which speeds up traditional MBR by pruning low-utility hypotheses via sampling estimation. Improving on this, [Jinnai and Ariu \(2024\)](#) propose AMBR (Adaptive Minimum Bayes-Risk), which uses the *Correlated Sequential Halving* algorithm to compute the sample-based MBR decoding objective and automatically optimize resource allocation based on the computational budget. [Jinnai et al. \(2024b\)](#) propose MBMBR (Model-Based MBR), replacing the Monte Carlo estimate with the model’s own probability distribution.

2.4 Parallel Decoding

Parallel decoding generates multiple tokens simultaneously during the decoding phases for faster gen-

eration, rather than sequentially. For machine translation tasks, Santilli et al. (2023) propose HGJ (Hybrid GS-Jacobi Decoding) for “a parallel formulation leveraging Jacobi and Gauss-Seidel fixed-point iteration methods for fast inference.” Vilnis et al. (2023) propose ARITHMETIC SAMPLING, which generates diverse, unbiased samples from LLMs using an implicitly defined arithmetic code book. Fu et al. (2024) propose LOOKAHEAD DECODING, a parallel algorithm that accelerates LLM decoding by generating and verifying n -grams in a single step. Ning et al. (2024) propose SOT (Skeleton-of-Thought), which generates an answer outline, fills in details via batched decoding or parallel API calls, and aggregates the results.

2.5 Sampling-based Decoding

Sampling-based methods introduce randomness for token selection to generate diverse text or sample multiple generation paths from the model.

Open-Ended Generation. Finlayson et al. (2024) propose BAT (Basis-Aware Truncation) sampling, based on *the softmax bottleneck* (Yang et al., 2017). BAT applies two constraints – a threshold and a basis-aware constraint – using a linear programming solver. It discards higher-probability tokens while keeping lower-probability, higher-quality tokens, achieving strong results in low-entropy open-ended generation. Ji et al. (2024) propose DAE-MON (Decoding As DirECT Metrics Optimization), which draws on a “*sampling-importance-resampling*” process. It identifies a decoding distribution that aligns sampled texts with human texts by searching for the decoding distribution that minimizes the reverse KL divergence between the decoding and input language model’s distribution.

Reasoning. Wang et al. (2023c) propose SELF-CONSISTENCY, which improves chain-of-thought prompting by replacing greedy decoding with a “*sample-and-marginalize*” procedure: multiple diverse reasoning paths are sampled, then the most consistent answer is obtained by marginalizing over them. Additionally, Li et al. (2024b) propose ESC (Early-stopping Self-Consistency), which improves efficiency by segmenting the large sample size into sequential small windows and halting sampling when all answers within a window converge, resulting in zero entropy in the predicted answer probability distribution.

Others. Park et al. (2024) propose ASAP (Adaptive Sampling with Approximate Expected Fu-

tures), an adaptive sampling algorithm that ensures grammatical output while aligning with an LLM’s probability distribution under grammar constraints. It iteratively refines grammaticality predictions by sampling and focusing on ungrammatical regions, ultimately converging to exact samples from the constrained probability distribution.

2.6 Tree-Search-based Decoding

Planning algorithms, such as Monte-Carlo tree search (MCTS), have also been applied to identify optimal text outputs for various tasks. For example, Zhang et al. (2023) propose PG-TD (Planning-Guided Transformer Decoding), a model-agnostic algorithm that enhances code generation by integrating an MCTS-inspired planning mechanism for lookahead search without requiring program grammar knowledge. Yu et al. (2023) propose GDP-ZERO (Goal-oriented Dialogue Planning with Zero training) which prompts an LLM to simulate dialogue interactions at each stage of an Open-Loop MCTS. Hao et al. (2023) propose RAP (Reasoning via Planning (RAP), wherein the LLM interacts with a *world model* – the same LLM simulating the environment via specialized prompts – and engages in planning via MCTS using candidate actions from the *world model*.

2.7 Model-level Decoding

Model-level methods operate inside the intermediate layers of the model. Gera et al. (2023) propose ACD (Autocontrastive Decoding), which leverages an *early-exit* setup, contrasting the probability distributions from an early layer (anti-expert) and a later layer (expert). Zhang et al. (2024c) propose SELF-SPECULATIVE DECODING, using a single LLM for drafting and verification. By selectively skipping intermediate layers with Bayesian optimization, draft tokens are generated efficiently and verified in single forward pass. To enhance factual accuracy, Zhang et al. (2024b) propose SLED (Self Logits Evolution Decoding), which refines the logits with latent knowledge from early layers via minimizing KL divergence. Kojima et al. (2024) propose LANGUAGE-SPECIFIC NEURONS, activating certain language-specific neurons during inference increases the probability of specific language occurrence (e.g. French) during generation. Similarly, Halawi et al. (2024) identify OVERTHINKING AND FALSE INDUCTION HEADS, analyze where correct and incorrect classifications occur in terms of a *critical layer*, then identify and remove the

offending *attention heads*, reducing the accuracy gap with minimal effects on correct prompts.

3 Context-Aware Self-Improvement

Context-Aware Self-Improvement enhances performance using specialized prompt-based (§3.1 and §3.2) or retrieval-based (§3.3) techniques.

3.1 Prompting

Prompting uses carefully crafted prompts to enable few-shot or zero-shot learning without parameter updates (Liu et al., 2023).

Reasoning. Wei et al. (2022) propose CoT PROMPTING (Chain-of-Thought Prompting), which allows language models to generate coherent reasoning steps leading to an answer, given few-shot examples of such reasoning. Meanwhile, Kojima et al. (2022) propose ZERO-SHOT CoT PROMPTING, which uses two-step template prompting: (i) “*Let’s think step by step*” to generate reasoning, followed by (ii) “*Therefore, the answer is*” to extract the final answer. To improve zero-shot CoT, Mekala et al. (2024) propose ECHOPROMPT, which adds query rephrasing as an initial step – modifying the first prompt to “*Let’s repeat the question and also think step by step.*” However, Shaikh et al. (2023) evaluates zero-shot CoT in harmful questions and stereotype benchmarks, finding it *significantly increases the likelihood of harmful outputs* across different prompts and models.

Others. For methods used in other tasks, Wang et al. (2023a) propose DECODINGTRUST, a multi-task (toxicity, stereotypes, adversarial robustness, out-of-distribution robustness, privacy, machine ethics, and fairness) *trustworthiness evaluation suite* for LLMs with a focus on GPT models. Huang et al. (2024) propose GENERATION EXPLOITATION ATTACK which investigates system prompt strategies (prepending or excluding prompts) and decoding strategies, including temperature, Top- K , and Top- p (nucleus) sampling. Lin et al. (2024) propose URIAL (Untuned LLMs with Restyled In-context ALignment), which aligns base LLMs using in-context learning with a few curated examples and a designed system prompt.

3.2 Disturbed Prompt

Disturbed prompt methods use a specialized prompt (e.g., disturbance or noisy instruction) to

obtain and contrast the model’s probability distributions *with and without the specialized prompt* during the decoding. Wang et al. (2024b) propose ICD (Instruction Contrastive Decoding), a method using disturbance instructions as role prefixes (e.g., “*You are a confused object detector*”). The model’s probability distributions *with and without the disturbance instruction* are contrasted during decoding for hallucination reduction. Shi et al. (2024b) propose CAD (Context-Aware Decoding), which contrasts the model’s probability distributions *with and without additional context* – which may contain information that is contradictory to the model’s prior knowledge – during decoding for hallucination reduction. Kim et al. (2024) propose ID (Instructive Decoding), where the model’s probability distributions *with and without the noisy instruction* are contrasted during decoding. Yuan et al. (2024b) propose COIECD (Contextual Information-Entropy Constraint Decoding), an adaptive decoding strategy to mitigate knowledge conflicts between an LLM’s parametric knowledge and contextual knowledge appended to the input text. The method applies an *information-entropy constraint*, based on the *stable entropy hypothesis* (Arora et al., 2023), to identify and adjust *non-compliant tokens* with relatively high or low entropy, improving generation by dampening the model’s parametric knowledge. For improving safety, Zhong et al. (2024) propose ROSE (Reverse prOmpT contraStive dECoding), which contrasts outputs with *a positive prompt and a negative prompt* during decoding.

3.3 Retrieval-based

Retrieval-based methods obtain information from existing corpora or construct a retrieval datastore. Khandelwal et al. (2020) propose k NN-LM, which uses the hidden state as a query for token retrieval in a constructed key-value datastore, and then combines the probability distribution with the probability distribution of the aggregated retrieved neighbor similarity. To improve speculative decoding, Li et al. (2024a) propose NEST (Nearest Neighbor Speculative Decoding), which extends k NN-LM by adding a passage retrieval step to minimize token storage and search. Similarly, He et al. (2024) propose REST (Retrieval-Based Speculative Decoding), which replaces the draft model with a retrieval datastore for speculative decoding, using previous tokens to find exact matches and organizing candidates in a Trie to select the most frequent

nodes as draft tokens. To improve decoding trustworthiness, Luohe et al. (2024) propose RTD (Reference Trustable Decoding), a method that retrieves the top- k references from a constructed reference datastore, normalizes and aggregates them into a reference probability distribution, and combines them with the original LLM distribution. (Zhao et al., 2024) propose MULTI-INPUT CD (Multi-Input Contrastive Decoding), where the model combines the logits of its parametric knowledge with contrastive predictions from both relevant contexts (top retrieved texts from an external knowledge base) and irrelevant contexts (adversarially crafted or low-ranked texts).

4 Model-Aided Self-Improvement

Model-Aided Self-Improvement enhances performance with an external (often small) model, such as an (Anti-)Expert model (§4.1), draft model (§4.2), small amateur model (§4.3), reward model (§4.4) and tool/APIs (§4.5).

4.1 Expert and/or Anti-Expert

Expert and/or Anti-Expert models – *specialized or not* in a particular task – provide logits or probability distributions, which are then contrasted or incorporated during decoding, or for otherwise guiding the decoding process via scoring.

Toxicity. Liu et al. (2021) propose DEXPERTS (Decoding-Time Experts), wherein they combine a neutral model, expert model, and anti-expert model via their logits. Zhang and Wan (2023) propose MIL-DECODING (Multiple Instance Learning Decoding) via an MIL network which assigns toxicity probabilities to tokens, and then combines them with the LLM probability distribution to form detoxified text.

Machine Translation. Wang et al. (2023b) propose PSGD (Prefix-Suffix Guided Decoding) – for machine translation suggestion. By using special prefix and suffix tokens and modifying the decoding objective, the model only generates for marked spans. Zeng et al. (2024) propose CODEC (Cooperative Decoding), which treats an initial translation from a traditional Neural Machine Translation model as a draft, and then uses another LLM-based Machine Translation model to verify and correct (via decoding that segment itself) the translation. Yang et al. (2024) propose LIBS (Language-informed Beam Search), a method for ensuring machine translation occurs in the correct output

language. The method incorporates a language identification model into the beam search process via ranking the candidate beams. Le et al. (2024) propose CODEC (Constraint Decoding for Cross-lingual Label Projection), which translates high-resource data. First, the translation occurs *without markers*, then *with markers* on a second decoding pass. The two translations are then compared via their log-probability distributions. Then, the top- k hypotheses are re-ranked, and decoding time is optimized with a depth-first search and branch-and-bound approach.

Alignment. To improve the model alignment, Shi et al. (2024a) propose MOD (Multi-Objective Decoding), which merges the predictive distributions of n models trained for individual objectives (e.g. *helpfulness, safety*) to align the n language models for multi-task settings via a closed-form solution inspired by the Legendre transform. Chakraborty et al. (2024) propose TRANSFER Q^* , an indirect transfer approach that computes the optimal value function for a target reward by leveraging a baseline *aligned model*, which is aligned with a potentially different baseline reward.

Others. For other tasks, Xu et al. (2024) propose SAFEDECODING, a safety-aware decoding strategy, which mitigates jailbreak attacks by constructing a probability distribution from both the original LLM and a safety expert model. Huang et al. (2023) propose GD (Grounded Decoding), which solves robotic tasks by combining the probability distributions of an LLM and multiple *Grounded Models*, and then selecting high-probability tokens from this combined distribution. Shen et al. (2024) propose SUPERPOSED DECODING, which generates k drafts in one autoregressive pass. It combines them with the top- k tokens to create k^2 options, caching the k most likely tokens and using n -gram models to filter incoherent generations. Jacob et al. (2024) propose EQUILIBRIUM-RANKING, a game-theoretic method for consensus planning that combines generative and discriminative decoding by modeling it as a signaling game and adjusting only signaling policies to approximate equilibria.

4.2 Draft Model

We focus on the draft model used in SPECULATIVE DECODING (Leviathan et al., 2023), a method which accelerates LLM inference. The smaller draft model proposes multiple completions, and then leverages the target LLM to verify them in

parallel. These off-the-shelf small LMs require no additional training or modifications to their architectures, enabling rapid adoption.

Sun et al. (2023) propose SPECTR, which uses an *optimal transport-based* draft selection algorithm to achieve faster draft verification. To improve the acceptance rate of draft tokens, Gong et al. (2024) propose GSD (Graph-structured Speculative Decoding), which uses a directed acyclic graph to generate multiple hypotheses, giving the model more options to select the longest valid sequence. Svirschevski et al. (2024) propose SPECEXEC (Speculative Execution), which constructs a large draft “cache” tree of likely prefix continuations using parallel search, which is then validated in a single pass using the target model. Similarly, Chen et al. (2024b) propose SEQUOIA, which leverages dynamic programming to create optimal tree structures for speculated tokens. This method enhances scalability and refines SpecInfer (Miao et al., 2024) with replacement-free sampling from the draft model to boost robustness. Yin et al. (2024) provide a theoretical exploration of Speculative Decoding through Markov chain abstraction. Yuan et al. (2024a) propose SCD (Speculative Contrastive Decoding), which integrates the contrastive distribution to validate token accuracy.

Several works focus on refining the draft model itself for increased performance. Liu et al. (2024b) propose ONLINE SPECULATIVE DECODING, which dynamically updates draft models based on user query data. This adaptation reduces distribution mismatches, improving the draft model’s predictions. Complementarily, Du et al. (2024) propose two improvements to vanilla speculative decoding to enhance decoding speed: GLIDE (Glimpse Draft Model) and CAPE (Confidence-aware Proposal Expansion). GLIDE improves the draft model by reusing cached keys and values from the target LLM, while CAPE leverages confidence scores from the draft model to verify additional candidate tokens.³

4.3 Small LM/Amateur LM

In addition to the Draft Model used in Speculative Decoding, other Small LMs – also referred to as Amateur LMs – are used to guide LLM generation.

Classification Model. Various types of classification models are employed to guide generation, such as those used for evaluation, probability ad-

justment, and token replacement. Miyano et al. (2023) propose NEUROLOGIC-A* (P) (a version of NeuroLogic-A* with positive constraints). This method joins high-quality fragments from the N-best hypothesis generations via a token-level binary classification model (for token quality estimation) which is used to formulate *constraints* for input to NeuroLogic-A*. Lango and Dusek (2023) propose CRITIC-DRIVEN DECODING, via a *text critic classifier*. The output of the classifier is combined with the LM probability distribution via a scaling factor. Similarly, Choi et al. (2023) propose KCTS (Knowledge-Constrained Tree Search), which steers LLM-generated outputs to align with reference knowledge by integrating a knowledge classifier score with Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS). The candidate generation is formulated as the root of the tree, and other generations are sampled and incorporated via leaf nodes, where the factuality is evaluated via a token-level knowledge groundedness metric. Zhang et al. (2024a) propose ENDEC (Enforced Decoding), a method to attack LLMs with a conditionally-activated decoding objective, which activates: (i) *affirmative prefixes*, i.e., the insertion of a positive prefix (“Sure, here is”), and (ii) *negation reversing*, i.e., the replacement of negative words with positive words (via sentiment classification).

Generative Model. Li et al. (2023) propose CD (Contrastive Decoding), which contrasts the probability distributions of a large expert model and a small amateur model, penalizing next-tokens where the amateur model is highly confident. This decoding objective is active only when the expert language model does not obtain high confidence scores, via an *adaptive plausibility constraint* also incorporated into the decoding objective. Kim et al. (2023) propose BILD (Big Little Decoder), a framework that learns a policy to use two models of different sizes to generate text through fallback and rollback strategies collaboratively. The small model generates text autoregressively with low inference cost, while the large model occasionally refines its errors non-autoregressively. Fisher et al. (2024) propose JAMDEC (JAMbalaya DECODing), an authorship obfuscation method using small language models. It involves (i) keyword extraction, (ii) over-generation via *Constrained Diverse Beam Search*, which integrates lexical constraints – the keywords – and a diversity with a similarity-based penalty into the decoding objective, and (iii)

³See Xia et al. (2024) for more on speculative decoding.

filtering by quality and content overlap thresholds to select the most stylistically distinct candidate.

4.4 Reward Model

The reward model is a fine-tuned LM that evaluates generated responses and assigns scores to guide the decoding process. [Deng and Raffel \(2023\)](#) propose RAD (Reward-Augmented Decoding). This method uses an external reward model to reweight the logits with a *steering factor* hyperparameter to control the reweighting strength. To improve the alignment, [Khanov et al. \(2024\)](#) propose ARGS (Alignment as Reward-Guided Search), which integrates alignment into the decoding process. A reward mechanism is used to adjust the model’s probability distribution at each step, and token selection happens via either greedy or stochastic sampling at each step. [Wan et al. \(2024\)](#) propose TS-LLM (Tree-Search enhanced LLM), which extends prior work by integrating an AlphaZero-like deep *tree-search* with a learned LLM-based value function, conditioned on state and a learned outcome reward model. In addition, multiple scorers can be combined at inference to tackle multi-objective RL without extra training: [Mudgal et al. \(2024\)](#) propose CD (Controlled Decoding), which uses a trained prefix scorer to guide generation from a fixed model, solving KL-regularized RL objectives.

4.5 Tool Use/APIs

Interaction with external models also includes tool use – such as parsers, static analysis tools, and API calls. For example, [Geng et al. \(2023\)](#) propose GCD (Grammar Constrained Decoding), which uses specific context-free grammars for various highly-structured tasks to enforce constraints via an incremental parser, pruning non-compliant tokens – *forbidden tokens* – from the probability distribution at each decoding timestep, and keeping only *allowed tokens* with respect to the task-specific formal grammar. [Bastan et al. \(2023\)](#) propose NEUROSTRUCTURAL DECODING, which applies structural lexical and syntactic constraints to preserve subject-verb-object relationships. It extends NEUROLOGIC DECODING ([Lu et al., 2021](#)) by incorporating constraints in conjunctive normal form, and scoring candidate generations – modifying the beam search process – considering the probability distribution and the quantity of clauses satisfied. In code generation, [Agrawal et al. \(2023\)](#) propose MGD (Monitor-Guided Decoding), wherein a *monitor* is integrated into the LM decoding process,

which queries a static analysis tool; the output is then incorporated via a mask on the logits. [Roy et al. \(2024\)](#) propose FLAP (Flow-Adhering Planning) for dialogue systems. The planning steps (“*flow*”) and corresponding API calls are converted into two dependency graphs, which are used as constraints during decoding with a lookahead heuristic added to the probability distribution.

5 Discussion

Inference-time self-improvement methods excel in reasoning (§2.5, §3.1), enable faithful generation (§2.2, §3.3), increase speed via parallelism (§2.4), and more without updating model parameters or additional training. Despite these advancements, several challenges remain. In this section, we discuss considerations for method selection, and outline potential directions for future research:

Maintenance: Methods with dependence on an external datastore (§3) or model (§4) require ongoing maintenance, as they need to be updated over time. In contrast, independent methods (§2) do not require this level of maintenance, as they solely operate based on the decoding process.

Amount of Model Access: For example, the OpenAI Chat API returns a partial probability distribution – i.e. *not* over the entire token vocabulary – therefore methods which operate on the full probability distribution are not a suitable option.

Trade-Offs in Inference Costs: Methods scaling up inference time such as sampling with multiple generations (§2.5) generally take more time at inference than methods directly manipulating the decoding process.

Generalizability: External models used to guide the generation process are typically specialized for specific domains or tasks. Adapting these models to new contexts or unseen data often necessitates creating new expert models or additional fine-tuning. Moreover, the overall performance is closely tied to the quality of auxiliary models.

Generation Quality: Methods manipulating the decoding process offer significant flexibility, enabling real-time adjustments to the generation process to satisfy specific control conditions (§2.1). However, these control conditions are competing constraints with the LLM’s inherent language generation tendencies towards fluency and coherence. Hence, there can be a trade-off between enforcing constraints and maintaining generation quality.

Explainability and Interpretability: Only a few works (Kojima et al., 2024; Halawi et al., 2024) analyze the LLM decoding process from the perspective of neurons and attention heads, or provide a theoretical analysis (Yin et al., 2024) of the decoding process. This is an opportunity for future work to develop more robust methods for understanding the decision-making processes of LLMs (Bismay et al., 2024; Singh et al., 2024), particularly for complex tasks like reasoning (Wei Jie et al., 2024).

Limitations

Due to space limitations, we cannot present all methods with exhaustive technical details. Our focus is primarily on methods from key sources such as ACL, EMNLP, NAACL, NeurIPS, ICLR, ICML, and arXiv in recent years. We plan to continuously follow these sources and incorporate new methods and datasets in our online resource (see §1).

Ethical Considerations

This paper reviews the challenges, methods, and limitations of LLM self-improvement in the existing literature, bringing up some important ethical issues.

Social Bias. LLMs have long been known to exhibit bias with respect to social groups – i.e. based on race, gender, and more (Caliskan et al., 2017; May et al., 2019; Blodgett et al., 2020; Meade et al., 2022; Teleki et al., 2025). Similarly to the need for bias analysis and corresponding debiasing methods for (i) base LLMs (Sun et al., 2019; Zmigrod et al., 2019; Dong et al., 2024), and (ii) parameter-efficient methods (Xie and Lukaszewicz, 2023; Dong et al., 2023), bias analysis and corresponding debiasing methods will be needed for self-improvement methods. For example, Shaikh et al. (2023) find that Zero-shot CoT significantly increases the likelihood of harmful outputs. An effective strategy for reducing these biases may be including explicit mitigation instructions in the prompt (Si et al., 2023). An additional consideration is that methods which incorporate external data or models may introduce biases in this way as well.

Economic Equity. LLMs are cost-prohibitive – consider the colloquial expression: “GPU poor.” Lightweight, inference-time methods such as via self-improvement have the potential to decrease the cost of LLM access in Model-as-a-Service settings

and in locally-hosted settings, potentially increasing economic equity.

Environmental Sustainability. Efficient methods beget environmental benefits,¹ decreasing the total carbon footprint of LLM-associated activities.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Lakshya Agrawal, Aditya Kanade, Navin Goyal, Shuvendu K Lahiri, and Sriram Rajamani. 2023. [Monitor-guided decoding of code LMs with static analysis of repository context](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Kushal Arora, Timothy J O’Donnell, Doina Precup, Jason Weston, and Jackie CK Cheung. 2023. The stable entropy hypothesis and entropy-aware decoding: An analysis and algorithm for robust natural language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06784*.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. 2022a. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*.
- Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Sandipan Kundu, Amanda Askell, Jackson Kernion, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Cameron McKinnon, et al. 2022b. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*.
- Mohaddeseh Bastan, Mihai Surdeanu, and Niranjana Balasubramanian. 2023. [NEUROSTRUCTURAL DECODING: Neural text generation with structural constraints](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9496–9510, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Millennium Bismay, Xiangjue Dong, and James Caverlee. 2024. Reasoningrec: Bridging personalized recommendations and human-interpretable explanations through llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23180*.
- Su Lin Blodgett, Solon Barocas, Hal Daumé III, and Hanna Wallach. 2020. [Language \(technology\) is power: A critical survey of “bias” in NLP](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5454–5476, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Bradley Brown, Jordan Juravsky, Ryan Ehrlich, Ronald Clark, Quoc V Le, Christopher Ré, and Azalia Mirhoseini. 2024. Large language monkeys: Scaling inference compute with repeated sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21787*.
- Aylin Caliskan, Joanna J Bryson, and Arvind Narayanan. 2017. Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science*, 356(6334):183–186.
- Souradip Chakraborty, Soumya Suvra Ghosal, Ming Yin, Dinesh Manocha, Mengdi Wang, Amrit Bedi, and Furong Huang. 2024. **Transfer q-star : Principled decoding for LLM alignment**. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Jinghong Chen, Weizhe Lin, Jingbiao Mei, and Bill Byrne. 2024a. **Control-DAG: Constrained decoding for non-autoregressive directed acyclic t5 using weighted finite state automata**. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 508–518, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhuoming Chen, Avner May, Ruslan Svirschevski, Yu-Hsun Huang, Max Ryabinin, Zhihao Jia, and Beidi Chen. 2024b. **Sequoia: Scalable and robust speculative decoding**. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Julius Cheng and Andreas Vlachos. 2023. **Faster minimum Bayes risk decoding with confidence-based pruning**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12473–12480, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sehyun Choi, Tianqing Fang, Zhaowei Wang, and Yangqiu Song. 2023. **KCTS: Knowledge-constrained tree search decoding with token-level hallucination detection**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14035–14053, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yung-Sung Chuang, Yujia Xie, Hongyin Luo, Yoon Kim, James R. Glass, and Pengcheng He. 2024. **Dola: Decoding by contrasting layers improves factuality in large language models**. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hiroiyuki Deguchi, Yusuke Sakai, Hidetaka Kamigaito, Taro Watanabe, Hideki Tanaka, and Masao Utiyama. 2024. **Centroid-based efficient minimum Bayes risk decoding**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 11009–11018, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haikang Deng and Colin Raffel. 2023. **Reward-augmented decoding: Efficient controlled text generation with a unidirectional reward model**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11781–11791, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiangjue Dong, Yibo Wang, Philip S Yu, and James Caverlee. 2024. **Disclosure and mitigation of gender bias in llms**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11190*.
- Xiangjue Dong, Ziwei Zhu, Zhuoer Wang, Maria Teleki, and James Caverlee. 2023. **Co²PT: Mitigating bias in pre-trained language models through counterfactual contrastive prompt tuning**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5859–5871, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Cunxiao Du, Jing Jiang, Xu Yuanchen, Jiawei Wu, Sicheng Yu, Yongqi Li, Shenggui Li, Kai Xu, Liqiang Nie, Zhaopeng Tu, and Yang You. 2024. **Glide with a caPE: A low-hassle method to accelerate speculative decoding**. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Matthew Finlayson, John Hewitt, Alexander Koller, Swabha Swayamdipta, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2024. **Closing the curious case of neural text degeneration**. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jillian Fisher, Ximing Lu, Jaehun Jung, Liwei Jiang, Zaid Harchaoui, and Yejin Choi. 2024. **JAMDEC: Unsupervised authorship obfuscation using constrained decoding over small language models**. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1552–1581, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Great Speculations Frank Holmes. 2024. **Why Tech Giants Are Betting Big On Nuclear Power**.
- Yichao Fu, Peter Bailis, Ion Stoica, and Hao Zhang. 2024. **Break the sequential dependency of LLM inference using lookahead decoding**. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Saibo Geng, Martin Josifoski, Maxime Peyrard, and Robert West. 2023. **Grammar-constrained decoding for structured NLP tasks without finetuning**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10932–10952, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ariel Gera, Roni Friedman, Ofir Arviv, Chulaka Gunasekara, Benjamin Sznajder, Noam Slonim, and Eyal Shnarch. 2023. **The benefits of bad advice: Autocontrastive decoding across model layers**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10406–10420, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Zhuocheng Gong, Jiahao Liu, Ziyue Wang, Pengfei Wu, Jingang Wang, Xunliang Cai, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2024. [Graph-structured speculative decoding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 11404–11415, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Danny Halawi, Jean-Stanislas Denain, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2024. [Overthinking the truth: Understanding how language models process false demonstrations](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Shibo Hao, Yi Gu, Haodi Ma, Joshua Hong, Zhen Wang, Daisy Wang, and Zhiting Hu. 2023. [Reasoning with language model is planning with world model](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8154–8173, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhenyu He, Zexuan Zhong, Tianle Cai, Jason Lee, and Di He. 2024. [REST: Retrieval-based speculative decoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1582–1595, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Dhruv Shah, Danny Driess, Andy Zeng, Yao Lu, Pete Florence, Igor Mordatch, Sergey Levine, Karol Hausman, and brian ichter. 2023. [Grounded decoding: Guiding text generation with grounded models for embodied agents](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Yangsibo Huang, Samyak Gupta, Mengzhou Xia, Kai Li, and Danqi Chen. 2024. [Catastrophic jailbreak of open-source LLMs via exploiting generation](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Daphne Ippolito, Reno Kriz, João Sedoc, Maria Kustikova, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2019. [Comparison of diverse decoding methods from conditional language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3752–3762, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Athul Paul Jacob, Yikang Shen, Gabriele Farina, and Jacob Andreas. 2024. [The consensus game: Language model generation via equilibrium search](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Haozhe Ji, Pei Ke, Hongning Wang, and Minlie Huang. 2024. [Language model decoding as direct metrics optimization](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yuu Jinnai and Kaito Ariu. 2024. [Hyperparameter-free approach for faster minimum Bayes risk decoding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 8547–8566, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yuu Jinnai, Ukyo Honda, Tetsuro Morimura, and Peinan Zhang. 2024a. [Generating diverse and high-quality texts by minimum Bayes risk decoding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 8494–8525, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yuu Jinnai, Tetsuro Morimura, Ukyo Honda, Kaito Ariu, and Kenshi Abe. 2024b. [Model-based minimum bayes risk decoding for text generation](#). In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Scaling laws for neural language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2001.08361.
- Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2020. [Generalization through memorization: Nearest neighbor language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Maxim Khanov, Jirayu Burapachee, and Yixuan Li. 2024. [ARGS: Alignment as reward-guided search](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Sehoon Kim, Karttikeya Mangalam, Suhong Moon, Jitendra Malik, Michael W. Mahoney, Amir Gholami, and Kurt Keutzer. 2023. [Speculative decoding with big little decoder](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Taehyeon Kim, Joonkee Kim, Gihun Lee, and Se-Young Yun. 2024. [Instructive decoding: Instruction-tuned large language models are self-refiner from noisy instructions](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. [Large language models are zero-shot reasoners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Takeshi Kojima, Itsuki Okimura, Yusuke Iwasawa, Hitomi Yanaka, and Yutaka Matsuo. 2024. [On the multilingual ability of decoder-based pre-trained language models: Finding and controlling language-specific neurons](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6919–6971, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Shankar Kumar and William Byrne. 2004. [Minimum Bayes-risk decoding for statistical machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Human Language Technology Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: HLT-NAACL 2004*, pages 169–176, Boston, Massachusetts, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mateusz Lango and Ondrej Dusek. 2023. [Critic-driven decoding for mitigating hallucinations in data-to-text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2853–2862, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Duong Minh Le, Yang Chen, Alan Ritter, and Wei Xu. 2024. [Constrained decoding for cross-lingual label projection](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yaniv Leviathan, Matan Kalman, and Yossi Matias. 2023. [Fast inference from transformers via speculative decoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 19274–19286. PMLR.
- Minghan Li, Xilun Chen, Ari Holtzman, Beidi Chen, Jimmy Lin, Wen tau Yih, and Xi Victoria Lin. 2024a. [Nearest neighbor speculative decoding for LLM generation and attribution](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Xiang Lisa Li, Ari Holtzman, Daniel Fried, Percy Liang, Jason Eisner, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2023. [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)*, pages 12286–12312, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yiwei Li, Peiwen Yuan, Shaoxiong Feng, Boyuan Pan, Xinglin Wang, Bin Sun, Heda Wang, and Kan Li. 2024b. [Escape sky-high cost: Early-stopping self-consistency for multi-step reasoning](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Bill Yuchen Lin, Abhilasha Ravichander, Ximing Lu, Nouha Dziri, Melanie Sclar, Khyathi Chandu, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2024. [The unlocking spell on base LLMs: Rethinking alignment via in-context learning](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Alisa Liu, Maarten Sap, Ximing Lu, Swabha Swayamdipta, Chandra Bhagavatula, Noah A. Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2021. [DExperts: Decoding-time controlled text generation with experts and anti-experts](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6691–6706, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2023. [Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(9).
- Shih-Yang Liu, Chien-Yi Wang, Hongxu Yin, Pavlo Molchanov, Yu-Chiang Frank Wang, Kwang-Ting Cheng, and Min-Hung Chen. 2024a. [Dora: Weight-decomposed low-rank adaptation](#). *ICML*.
- Xiaoxuan Liu, Lanxiang Hu, Peter Bailis, Alvin Cheng, Zhijie Deng, Ion Stoica, and Hao Zhang. 2024b. [Online speculative decoding](#). In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Ximing Lu, Sean Welleck, Peter West, Liwei Jiang, Jungo Kasai, Daniel Khashabi, Ronan Le Bras, Lianhui Qin, Youngjae Yu, Rowan Zellers, Noah A. Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2022. [NeuroLogic a*esque decoding: Constrained text generation with lookahead heuristics](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 780–799, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ximing Lu, Peter West, Rowan Zellers, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. [NeuroLogic decoding: \(un\)supervised neural text generation with predicate logic constraints](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4288–4299, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shi Luohe, Yao Yao, Zuchao Li, Lefei Zhang, and hai zhao. 2024. [Reference trustable decoding: A training-free augmentation paradigm for large language models](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Avshalom Manevich and Reut Tsarfaty. 2024. [Mitigating hallucinations in large vision-language models \(LVLMs\) via language-contrastive decoding \(LCD\)](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 6008–6022, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chandler May, Alex Wang, Shikha Bordia, Samuel R. Bowman, and Rachel Rudinger. 2019. [On measuring social biases in sentence encoders](#). 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 622–628, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nicholas Meade, Elinor Poole-Dayana, and Siva Reddy. 2022. [An empirical survey of the effectiveness of debiasing techniques for pre-trained language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume*

- I: Long Papers*), pages 1878–1898, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Raja Sekhar Reddy Mekala, Yasaman Razeghi, and Sameer Singh. 2024. [EchoPrompt: Instructing the model to rephrase queries for improved in-context learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 399–432, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xupeng Miao, Gabriele Oliaro, Zhihao Zhang, Xinhao Cheng, Zeyu Wang, Zhengxin Zhang, Rae Ying Yee Wong, Alan Zhu, Lijie Yang, Xiaoxiang Shi, Chun-an Shi, Zhuoming Chen, Daiyaan Arfeen, Reyna Abhyankar, and Zhihao Jia. 2024. [Specinfer: Accelerating large language model serving with tree-based speculative inference and verification](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 3, ASPLOS '24*, page 932–949, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Ryota Miyano, Tomoyuki Kajiwara, and Yuki Arase. 2023. [Self-ensemble of \$n\$ -best generation hypotheses by lexically constrained decoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14653–14661, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sidharth Mudgal, Jong Lee, Harish Ganapathy, YaGuang Li, Tao Wang, Yanping Huang, Zhifeng Chen, Heng-Tze Cheng, Michael Collins, Trevor Strohman, Jilin Chen, Alex Beutel, and Ahmad Beirami. 2024. [Controlled decoding from language models](#). In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Yatin Nandwani, Vineet Kumar, Dinesh Raghu, Sachindra Joshi, and Luis Lastras. 2023. [Pointwise mutual information based metric and decoding strategy for faithful generation in document grounded dialogs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10335–10347, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuefei Ning, Zinan Lin, Zixuan Zhou, Zifu Wang, Huazhong Yang, and Yu Wang. 2024. [Skeleton-of-thought: Prompting LLMs for efficient parallel generation](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- OpenAI. 2024. [Learning to reason with llms](#).
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Kanghee Park, Jiayu Wang, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, Nadia Polikarpova, and Loris D’Antoni. 2024. [Grammar-aligned decoding](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Shamik Roy, Sailik Sengupta, Daniele Bonadiman, Saab Mansour, and Arshit Gupta. 2024. [FLAP: Flow-adhering planning with constrained decoding in LLMs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 517–539, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrea Santilli, Silvio Severino, Emilian Postolache, Valentino Maiorca, Michele Mancusi, Riccardo Marin, and Emanuele Rodola. 2023. [Accelerating transformer inference for translation via parallel decoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12336–12355, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Omar Shaikh, Hongxin Zhang, William Held, Michael Bernstein, and Diyi Yang. 2023. [On second thought, let’s not think step by step! bias and toxicity in zero-shot reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4454–4470, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ethan Shen, Alan Fan, Sarah M Pratt, Jae Sung Park, Matthew Wallingford, Sham M. Kakade, Ari Holtzman, Ranjay Krishna, Ali Farhadi, and Aditya Kusupati. 2024. [Superposed decoding: Multiple generations from a single autoregressive inference pass](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Ruizhe Shi, Yifang Chen, Yushi Hu, Alisa Liu, Hananeh Hajishirzi, Noah A. Smith, and Simon Shaolei Du. 2024a. [Decoding-time language model alignment with multiple objectives](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Weijia Shi, Xiaochuang Han, Mike Lewis, Yulia Tsvetkov, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen-tau Yih. 2024b. [Trusting your evidence: Hallucinate less with context-aware decoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 783–791, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Chenglei Si, Zhe Gan, Zhengyuan Yang, Shuohang Wang, Jianfeng Wang, Jordan Lee Boyd-Graber, and Lijuan Wang. 2023. [Prompting GPT-3 to be reliable](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Suzanna Sia, Alexandra DeLucia, and Kevin Duh. 2024. [Anti-LM decoding for zero-shot in-context machine translation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 3403–3420, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chandan Singh, Jeevana Priya Inala, Michel Galley, Rich Caruana, and Jianfeng Gao. 2024. [Rethinking interpretability in the era of large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01761*.
- Charlie Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, and Aviral Kumar. 2024. [Scaling llm test-time compute optimally can be more effective than scaling model parameters](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03314*.
- Yuda Song, Hanlin Zhang, Carson Eisenach, Sham Kakade, Dean Foster, and Udaya Ghai. 2024. [Mind the gap: Examining the self-improvement capabilities of large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.02674*.
- Tony Sun, Andrew Gaut, Shirlyn Tang, Yuxin Huang, Mai ElSherief, Jieyu Zhao, Diba Mirza, Elizabeth Belding, Kai-Wei Chang, and William Yang Wang. 2019. [Mitigating gender bias in natural language processing: Literature review](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1630–1640, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ziteng Sun, Ananda Theertha Suresh, Jae Hun Ro, Ahmad Beirami, Himanshu Jain, and Felix Yu. 2023. [Spectr: Fast speculative decoding via optimal transport](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Ruslan Svirschevski, Avner May, Zhuoming Chen, Beidi Chen, Zhihao Jia, and Max Ryabinin. 2024. [Specexec: Massively parallel speculative decoding for interactive LLM inference on consumer devices](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, et al. 2023. [Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*.
- Maria Teleki, Xiangjue Dong, Haoran Liu, and James Caverlee. 2025. [Masculine defaults via gendered discourse in podcasts and large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- Firas Trabelsi, David Vilar, Mara Finkelstein, and Markus Freitag. 2024. [Efficient minimum bayes risk decoding using low-rank matrix completion algorithms](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Luke Vilnis, Yury Zemlyanskiy, Patrick Murray, Alexandre Tachard Passos, and Sumit Sanghai. 2023. [Arithmetic sampling: Parallel diverse decoding for large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 35120–35136. PMLR.
- Ziyu Wan, Xidong Feng, Muning Wen, Stephen Marcus McAleer, Ying Wen, Weinan Zhang, and Jun Wang. 2024. [Alphazero-like tree-search can guide large language model decoding and training](#). In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Boxin Wang, Weixin Chen, Hengzhi Pei, Chulin Xie, Mintong Kang, Chenhui Zhang, Chejian Xu, Zidi Xiong, Ritik Dutta, Rylan Schaeffer, Sang T. Truong, Simran Arora, Mantas Mazeika, Dan Hendrycks, Zinan Lin, Yu Cheng, Sanmi Koyejo, Dawn Song, and Bo Li. 2023a. [Decodingtrust: A comprehensive assessment of trustworthiness in GPT models](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Ke Wang, Xin Ge, Jiayi Wang, Yuqi Zhang, and Yu Zhao. 2023b. [Easy guided decoding in providing suggestions for interactive machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7840–7852, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sheng Wang, Boyang Xue, Jiacheng Ye, Jiyue Jiang, Liheng Chen, Lingpeng Kong, and Chuan Wu. 2024a. [PRoLoRA: Partial rotation empowers more parameter-efficient LoRA](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2829–2841, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xintong Wang, Jingheng Pan, Liang Ding, and Chris Biemann. 2024b. [Mitigating hallucinations in large vision-language models with instruction contrastive decoding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 15840–15853, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023c. [Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. [Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

- Yeo Wei Jie, Ranjan Satapathy, Rick Goh, and Erik Cambria. 2024. [How interpretable are reasoning explanations from prompting large language models?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 2148–2164, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sean Welleck, Amanda Bertsch, Matthew Finlayson, Hailey Schoelkopf, Alex Xie, Graham Neubig, Ilya Kulikov, and Zaid Harchaoui. 2024. From decoding to meta-generation: Inference-time algorithms for large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Heming Xia, Zhe Yang, Qingxiu Dong, Peiyi Wang, Yongqi Li, Tao Ge, Tianyu Liu, Wenjie Li, and Zhifang Sui. 2024. [Unlocking efficiency in large language model inference: A comprehensive survey of speculative decoding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 7655–7671, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhongbin Xie and Thomas Lukasiewicz. 2023. [An empirical analysis of parameter-efficient methods for debiasing pre-trained language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15730–15745, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nan Xu, Chunting Zhou, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Xuezhe Ma. 2023. [Look-back decoding for open-ended text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1039–1050, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhangchen Xu, Fengqing Jiang, Luyao Niu, Jinyuan Jia, Bill Yuchen Lin, and Radha Poovendran. 2024. [SafeDecoding: Defending against jailbreak attacks via safety-aware decoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5587–5605, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yilin Yang, Stefan Lee, and Prasad Tadepalli. 2024. [Language-informed beam search decoding for multilingual machine translation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 15761–15772, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and William W Cohen. 2017. Breaking the softmax bottleneck: A high-rank rnn language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.03953*.
- Yuxuan Yao, Han Wu, Qiling Xu, and Linqi Song. 2023. [Fine-grained conversational decoding via isotropic and proximal search](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 58–70, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ming Yin, Minshuo Chen, Kaixuan Huang, and Mengdi Wang. 2024. [A theoretical perspective for speculative decoding algorithm](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Xiao Yu, Maximillian Chen, and Zhou Yu. 2023. [Prompt-based Monte-Carlo tree search for goal-oriented dialogue policy planning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7101–7125, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hongyi Yuan, Keming Lu, Fei Huang, Zheng Yuan, and Chang Zhou. 2024a. [Speculative contrastive decoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 56–64, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaowei Yuan, Zhao Yang, Yequan Wang, Shengping Liu, Jun Zhao, and Kang Liu. 2024b. [Discerning and resolving knowledge conflicts through adaptive decoding with contextual information-entropy constraint](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 3903–3922, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiali Zeng, Fandong Meng, Yongjing Yin, and Jie Zhou. 2024. [Improving machine translation with large language models: A preliminary study with cooperative decoding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 13275–13288, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hangfan Zhang, Zhimeng Guo, Huaisheng Zhu, Bochuan Cao, Lu Lin, Jinyuan Jia, Jinghui Chen, and Dinghao Wu. 2024a. [Jailbreak open-sourced large language models via enforced decoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5475–5493, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jianyi Zhang, Da-Cheng Juan, Cyrus Rashtchian, Chun-Sung Ferng, Heinrich Jiang, and Yiran Chen. 2024b. [SLED: Self logits evolution decoding for improving factuality in large language models](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Jun Zhang, Jue Wang, Huan Li, Lidan Shou, Ke Chen, Gang Chen, and Sharad Mehrotra. 2024c. [Draft& verify: Lossless large language model acceleration via self-speculative decoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11263–11282, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shun Zhang, Zhenfang Chen, Yikang Shen, Mingyu Ding, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Chuang Gan. 2023.

- Planning with large language models for code generation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Xu Zhang and Xiaojun Wan. 2023. MIL-decoding: Detoxifying language models at token-level via multiple instance learning. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 190–202, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zheng Zhao, Emilio Monti, Jens Lehmann, and Haytham Assem. 2024. Enhancing contextual understanding in large language models through contrastive decoding. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4225–4237, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qihuang Zhong, Liang Ding, Juhua Liu, Bo Du, and Dacheng Tao. 2024. ROSE doesn't do that: Boosting the safety of instruction-tuned large language models with reverse prompt contrastive decoding. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 13721–13736, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenhong Zhu, Hongkun Hao, Zhiwei He, Yiming Ai, and Rui Wang. 2024. Improving open-ended text generation via adaptive decoding. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Wenhong Zhu, Hongkun Hao, and Rui Wang. 2023. Penalty decoding: Well suppress the self-reinforcement effect in open-ended text generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1218–1228, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ran Zmigrod, Sabrina J. Mielke, Hanna Wallach, and Ryan Cotterell. 2019. Counterfactual data augmentation for mitigating gender stereotypes in languages with rich morphology. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1651–1661, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Appendix

A Definitions

We provide a brief overview of related definitions,⁴ following Ippolito et al. (2019); Sia et al. (2024); Yuan et al. (2024b). We assume an autoregressive formulation (i.e., depending on $y_{<t}$, the previously generated tokens at each timestep, t).

Decoding Objective refers to the algorithm for next-token selection via selecting the token with the maximum log-likelihood from the next-token probability distribution. We present *deterministic greedy decoding*:

$$y_t = \underset{T}{\operatorname{argmax}} \log \mathcal{P}(y_t | y_{<t}, x, p_u, p_{sys})$$

where y_t is the selected next-token, $\mathcal{P}(y_t | y_{<t}, x, p_u, p_{sys})$ is the probability distribution over all tokens in the vocabulary, V of size $|V|$, conditioned on $y_{<t}$, the previously generated tokens, x , the input, p_u , the user prompt, and p_{sys} , the system prompt. In *beam search decoding*, the top k tokens are selected in a process which forms multiple generation hypotheses, and eventually the highest-scoring hypothesis (based on log-likelihood) is kept. In *stochastic methods*, the next token is selected with probability \mathcal{P} , which can be reshaped using a temperature hyperparameter, τ , to control the uniformity of \mathcal{P} : $\tau > 1$ flattens the distribution, meaning that the next token selection will be more uniform, vice-versa $\tau < 1$ sharpens the distribution, and $\tau = 1$ corresponds to the original, unmodified distribution \mathcal{P} .

Probability Distribution or Likelihood refers to the next token $w_i \in V$, distribution, obtained via the *softmax* normalization function – i.e., $z_i \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for token vocabulary, V :

$$\mathcal{P}(y_t = w_i | y_{<t}, x, p_u, p_{sys}) = \frac{e^{z_{t,i}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{|V|} e^{z_{t,j}}}$$

Logits refers to the raw outputs of the model, \mathcal{F} , before the *softmax* function is applied:

$$z_t = \mathcal{F}(y_{<t}, x, p_u, p_{sys})$$

Entropy refers to the overall confidence of the language model in predicting the next token y_t

⁴For a more detailed overview of fundamental definitions, we refer readers to Ippolito et al. (2019).

given the already generated tokens $y_{<t}$ and the input x (we omit p_u and p_{sys} for simplicity):

$$\mathcal{H}(y_t | y_{<t}, x) = \underset{y_t \sim \mathcal{P}(\cdot | y_{<t})}{\mathbb{E}} - \log \mathcal{P}(y_t | y_{<t}, x)$$

Where \mathbb{E} is the *expectation* of \mathcal{P} – i.e., a weighted average of all possible outcomes. Hence, for high values of \mathbb{E} , the interpretation is that the model has high confidence in the generation (indicated by the overall high values of \mathcal{P}), and vice versa for low values of \mathbb{E} .

B Comparison with PEFT Methods

Parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) methods include LoRA (Hu et al., 2022), ProLoRA (Wang et al., 2024a), DoRA (Liu et al., 2024a), and others. These methods involve using a low-rank matrix to approximate the model weights for fine-tuning purposes, hence reducing computational complexity.

Need for Dataset. PEFT methods are still *fine-tuning methods*, meaning they still rely on datasets. There are situations where it may be easier to access a model (§4) than a dataset – hence inference-time self-improvement methods are a better fit in many situations.

Need for Model Parameters. PEFT methods require access to the original model parameters – however, many inference-time self-improvement methods do *not* require this type of access. Hence, inference-time self-improvement methods are a better fit in many situations.

C Applications

We present some tasks with representative methods mentioned in this paper in Table 1.

Table 1: Tasks with representative methods.

Tasks	Representative Method(s)
Jailbreak and Defense	(Huang et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024a; Xu et al., 2024)
Stereotype and Toxicity Benchmarks	(Shaikh et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023a)
Code Generation	(Zhang et al., 2024c, 2023)
Dialogue	(Yao et al., 2023; Nandwani et al., 2023; Roy et al., 2024; He et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024a)
Open-Ended Generation	(Li et al., 2023; Ji et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024b; Zhu et al., 2024)
Question-Answering	(Yuan et al., 2024b; Chuang et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024; Jacob et al., 2024)
Alignment	(Khanov et al., 2024; Lin et al., 2024; Shi et al., 2024a; Chakraborty et al., 2024)
Hallucinations and factuality	(Manevich and Tsarfaty, 2024; Wang et al., 2024b; Chuang et al., 2024)
Reasoning	(Wang et al., 2023c; Mekala et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024b; Wei et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023c; Wan et al., 2024; Hao et al., 2023)
Machine Translation	(Deguchi et al., 2024; Zeng et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2024; Sia et al., 2024; Vilnis et al., 2023; Trabelsi et al., 2024)