

Why language models collapse when trained on recursively generated text

Lecheng Wang¹, Xianjie Shi¹, Ge Li^{1*}, Jia Li ¹, Yihong Dong¹,
Xuanming Zhang¹, Wenpin Jiao¹, Hong Mei¹

^{1*} Key Laboratory of High Confidence Software Technologies (Peking University), Ministry of Education; School of Computer Science, Peking University, Beijing, China .

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): lige@pku.edu.cn;

Contributing authors: wanglecheng@stu.pku.edu.cn;

2100013180@stu.pku.edu.cn; lijia@stu.pku.edu.cn;

dongyh@stu.pku.edu.cn; xuemuqiang@gmail.com; jwp@sei.pku.edu.cn;

meih@pku.edu.cn;

Abstract

Language models (LMs) have been widely used to generate text on the Internet. The generated text is often collected into the training corpus of the next generations of LMs. Previous work has experimentally found that LMs collapse when trained on recursively generated text. This paper contributes to existing knowledge from two aspects. ❶ We present a theoretical proof of LM collapse. Our proof reveals the cause of LM collapse and proves that all auto-regressive LMs will definitely collapse. ❷ We present a new finding: the performance of LMs gradually declines when trained on recursively generated text until they perform no better than a randomly initialized LM. The trained LMs produce large amounts of repetitive text and perform poorly across a wide range of natural language tasks. The above proof and new findings deepen our understanding of LM collapse and offer valuable insights that may inspire new training techniques to mitigate this threat.

1 Introduction

Auto-regressive language models (LMs) (*e.g.*, ChatGPT) [1–3] are widely used to generate text on the Internet, such as articles and computer source code. Meanwhile, practitioners collect large quantities of text from the Internet to train the next generations of LMs. Thus, the collected training corpus will inevitably include text generated by existing LMs. In this paper, the text generated by LMs is referred to as generated text.

Researchers [4] have found that LMs collapse when trained on recursively generated text. Researchers trained generation 1 using an initial corpus and then trained generation n using the text generated by generation $n - 1$. They found that LMs collapse when n is large enough, where LMs forget the distribution of the initial corpus. In other words, LMs converge to a distribution irrelevant to the initial training corpus. Existing work [4] has experimentally found that LM collapses in a representative auto-regressive LM (*i.e.*, OPT-125M [5]). However, it remains unclear whether LM collapse occurs consistently across different LMs, as well as the underlying causes of LM collapse.

Recognizing the above research gap, this paper presents theoretical proof which explains why LM collapse occurs and proves its inevitability. Our proof yields two key findings. ❶ We identify the cause of LM collapse: training on recursively generated text introduces non-negative errors, which accumulate over generations, eventually leading to LM collapse. ❷ We demonstrate that LM collapse is inevitable across all auto-regressive LMs. Details of the proof are in [section 2](#). These findings contribute to a deeper understanding of LM collapse and offer insights that can inspire new training techniques to mitigate the problem.

Besides, this paper presents a crucial new finding: the performance of LMs gradually declines when trained on recursively generated text until they perform no better than a randomly initialized LM. We trained multiple generations of LMs on recursively generated text. We evaluated their performance across various natural language processing tasks (*e.g.*, language modeling, text generation, and text classification). Our experiments reveal four key findings. ❸ Training on recursively generated text results in a monotonous increase in the perplexity of LMs on the initial corpus, indicating that the output of LMs is drifting away from the distribution of the initial corpus. This phenomenon aligns with the findings of our theoretical proof. ❹ Training on recursively generated text leads to generating a large amount of repetitive text. These repetitions are usually high-frequency tokens from the initial corpus. ❺ Training on recursively generated text reduces the LM’s capabilities to generate text that is grammatically correct and consistent with human instructions. ❻ Training on recursively generated text significantly harms the performance of LMs on downstream tasks—that after fine-tuning on real data, they perform no better than a randomly initialized LM directly finetuned on real data. Our experiments and findings are described in [section 3](#).

2 Proof: Why language models collapse

Following previous work [4], we assume that auto-regressive LMs are trained on *recursively generated text*. Specifically, we train the first LM (abbr. generation 1) on an

initial corpus and train the n -th LM (abbr. generation n) on the text generated by the $(n - 1)$ -th LM for each $n > 1$. The formal definition of this recursive process is in the section ‘Methods’ (subsubsection 5.1.1).

In this section, we present theoretical proof of auto-regressive LM collapse. Our proof explains the cause of LM collapse and proves the inevitability of LM collapse. To achieve the above goal, our proof consists of the following three steps:

- **Modeling the errors in training generation 1 (Section 2.1)**. We prove that there are non-negative errors between the output distribution of generation 1 and the distribution of the initial corpus.
- **Modeling the errors in training generation n (Section 2.2)**. We prove that errors continually accumulate during training subsequent generation n .
- **Error accumulation leads to LM collapse (Section 2.3)**. We prove that the output distribution of generation n deviates from or is irrelevant to the initial corpus when n is large enough.

2.1 Modeling the errors in generation 1

This section aims to model the errors arising from training generation 1 on an initial corpus. These errors cause the output distribution of generation 1 to differ from the distribution of the corpus.

The output distribution of generation 1. Tokens are the basic units in LMs, often words or meaningful subwords. Common tokens are collected as a vocabulary V . A text corpus is split into a single contiguous sequence of tokens and then used to train an auto-regressive LM. A trained LM takes a sequence of tokens \mathbf{x} (often called ‘context’ or ‘prompt’) as input and outputs a vector $(\hat{p}(v_1|\mathbf{x}), \hat{p}(v_2|\mathbf{x}), \dots)$, a probability distribution representing its prediction of the next token v_i on the vocabulary V , where $\hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x})$ is the maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) of $p(v_i|\mathbf{x})$ for any sequence of tokens \mathbf{x} in its training corpus. $p(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \frac{N_{\mathbf{x};v_i}}{N_{\mathbf{x}}}$ is the ground-truth distribution of the training corpus, where $N_{\mathbf{x}}$ denotes the number of occurrences of \mathbf{x} , $N_{\mathbf{x};v_i}$ denotes the number of occurrences of the concatenation of \mathbf{x} and v_i in the corpus, subjected to $N_{\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{v_i \in V} N_{\mathbf{x};v_i}$.

Assume $\forall \mathbf{x} \forall v_i \hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$. This assumption is plausible because the output probability of an auto-regressive LM is usually calculated by a logistic function whose range is $(0, 1)$.

Errors in generation 1. In proposition 1, we use non-negative numbers $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i}$ to model the errors between $\hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x})$ and $p(v_i|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{N_{\mathbf{x};v_i}}{N_{\mathbf{x}}}$.

Proposition 1. $\forall \mathbf{x} \quad \forall v_i \quad \exists \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i}$, a corresponding non-negative real number *s.t.*

$$\hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{N_{\mathbf{x};v_i} + \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i}}{N_{\mathbf{x}} + \alpha_{\mathbf{x}}}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{x}} \triangleq \sum_{v_i \in V} \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i}.$$

Proof. Declare a real number S . Let

$$\forall v_i \quad \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i} \triangleq \hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \cdot S + \hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \cdot N_{\mathbf{x}} - N_{\mathbf{x};v_i},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} S &\geq \frac{N_{\mathbf{x};v_i} - \hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \cdot N_{\mathbf{x}}}{\hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x})} \implies \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i} \geq 0, \\ S &\geq \max_{v_i \in V} \frac{N_{\mathbf{x};v_i} - \hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \cdot N_{\mathbf{x}}}{\hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x})} \implies \forall v_i \quad \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that,

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{v_i \in V} \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i} = \sum_{v_i \in V} (\hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \cdot S + \hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \cdot N_{\mathbf{x}} - N_{\mathbf{x};v_i}) = S.$$

Thus, $\forall v_i \quad \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i} = \hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \cdot \alpha_{\mathbf{x}} + \hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \cdot N_{\mathbf{x}} - N_{\mathbf{x};v_i} \geq 0$, which further implies

$$\hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{N_{\mathbf{x};v_i} + \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i}}{N_{\mathbf{x}} + \alpha_{\mathbf{x}}},$$

and $\alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i}$ is non-negative. □

Remark 1. For any particular \mathbf{x} ,

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}^* \triangleq \max_{v_i \in V} \frac{N_{\mathbf{x};v_i} - \hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \cdot N_{\mathbf{x}}}{\hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x})},$$

is the minimum $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}$ that satisfies the above proposition. $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}}^* = 0$ if and only if the output distribution of the LM is the same as the distribution of the training corpus given \mathbf{x} , that is

$$\forall v_i \quad \hat{p}(v_i|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{N_{\mathbf{x};v_i}}{N_{\mathbf{x}}}.$$

Furthermore, in this situation, $\forall v_i \quad \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i}^* = 0$. *This property further illustrates that we can use non-negative numbers to model the errors between the output distribution of an auto-regressive LM and the distribution of its training corpus.*

2.2 Modeling the errors in generation n ($n > 1$)

Based on generation 1, we train the subsequent n LMs on recursively generated text. In this subsection, we model the errors in training generation n .

Errors in training generation n . We use the terms $\alpha[n]$ and $\alpha_i[n]$ to denote the errors, which are still specific to \mathbf{x} and v_i . We omit all subscripts \mathbf{x} and rewrite all subscripts $\mathbf{x};v_i$ to i for clarity. For $n = 1$, $\alpha[1] \triangleq \alpha_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\alpha_i[1] \triangleq \alpha_{\mathbf{x};v_i}$.

The output distribution of generation n on the vocabulary can be modeled as

$$\forall v_i \quad \hat{p}_n(v_i|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{y_i[n-1] + \alpha_i[n]}{y[n-1] + \alpha[n]}, \tag{2}$$

where $y[n-1]$ and $y_i[n-1]$ are arbitrary positive real numbers that satisfy $\frac{y_i[n-1]}{y[n-1]} = \hat{p}_{n-1}(v_i|\mathbf{x})$.

We can always find non-negative numbers $\alpha[n]$ and $\alpha_i[n]$ that satisfy the above equation for all v_i given \mathbf{x} . The proof is the same as in [proposition 1](#).

2.3 Error accumulation leads to LM collapse

In this subsection, we show that the errors (modeled by non-negative numbers) will accumulate when LMs are trained on recursively generated text. The ultimate effect of error accumulation is LM collapse.

How errors get accumulated. We model the errors in training generation 1 and generation n in equation (1) and (2), respectively. After combining both equations with notations $\hat{p}_0(v_i|\mathbf{x}) \triangleq p(v_i|\mathbf{x})$, $y[0] \triangleq N_{\mathbf{x}}$, and $y_i[0] \triangleq N_{\mathbf{x};v_i}$, we directly derive the following recursive equation:

$$\hat{p}_n(v_i|\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \frac{N_{\mathbf{x};v_i}}{N_{\mathbf{x}}}, & n = 0, \\ \frac{y_i[n-1] + \alpha_i[n]}{y[n-1] + \alpha[n]}, & n \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

The solution is

$$\hat{p}_n(v_i|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{N_{\mathbf{x};v_i} + \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i[j]}{N_{\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha[j]}. \quad (3)$$

We can see the errors become positive series $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha[j]$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i[j]$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Next, we will show that LMs can collapse in two ways, distinguished by whether, for some i , the series $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i[j]$ converges. In the divergent way, the output of generation n is unaffected by the distribution of the initial corpus. In the convergent way, the output of generation n also deviates from the distribution of the initial corpus.

2.3.1 Divergent way of LM collapse

If $\exists i \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i[j]$ diverge, then $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha[j]$ diverge. Terms in equation (3) that relate to the distribution of the initial corpus, $N_{\mathbf{x};v_i}$ and $N_{\mathbf{x}}$, are bounded so do not affect the value of \hat{p}_{∞} . Thus, we show that the distribution of the initial corpus does not affect the output of generation n as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, generation n loses everything it knows about the initial corpus as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that the distribution of the LM's prediction of the next token may or may not converge to a fixed distribution. That is, $\hat{p}_n(v_i|\mathbf{x})$ may still change as n increases, regardless of how large n is. Nonetheless, **we prove that the output distribution of generation n is unaffected by the distribution of the initial corpus for a sufficiently large n , regardless of whether the distribution converges.**

2.3.2 Convergent way of LM collapse

We perceive $\forall i \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i[j]$ converge as a rare case because this implies $\forall i \alpha_i[j] = o(\frac{1}{j})$ since $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i[j]$ are positive series. With $\alpha_i[j]$ modeling the errors, if the training

hyperparameters are the same for every LMs, rarely the error factors will not exist in the later LMs, making $\alpha_i[j]$ tend to zero.

For the sake of rigor, it is helpful to classify the conclusions of this case. The output of generation n when $n \rightarrow \infty$ is of two parts: one relates to the distribution of the initial corpus, and the other relates to the errors, like in equation (3). **The output of generation n then deviates from the distribution of the initial corpus.**

3 Experiments: Training on recursively generated text leads to degradation of LM performance

In this section, we further explore the impact of training on recursively generated text on LM performance. We find that LMs performed well at the first few generations but then much worse at subsequent generations, eventually reaching a performance level below that of a baseline LM whose parameters are randomly initialized and not trained on any text.

3.1 Experimental setup

Following the training setting in section 2, we first train generation 1 on an initial corpus and the subsequent generations on recursively generated text. Then, we measure the performance of different generations of LMs on multiple natural language tasks. In this subsection, we review the training corpus, LM architecture, and tasks. Extended Data Fig. A1 is a schematic of our setup.

3.1.1 Training corpus

For generation 1, we select a popular corpus named TinyStories [6] as its training corpus. TinyStories consists of 2.12×10^6 short English stories. The stories contain only words that most 3 to 4-year-old children would typically understand. They are so simple that they can be used to train and evaluate small language models (SLMs) that are much smaller than the state-of-the-art models yet still enable them to produce a diverse set of fluent and consistent stories. The training of SLMs on TinyStories can typically be done in less than a day on a single GPU from scratch. Therefore, corpora like TinyStories facilitate our experiments.

For generation n ($n > 1$), we use generation $n - 1$ to generate stories as the training corpus. Each story is freely generated, *i.e.*, starting from an empty prompt. Tokens of the story are repeatedly sampled from the output distribution of the LM. The scale of the corpus generated is the same as TinyStories. Details are listed in the section ‘Methods’ (subsection 5.1.2).

3.1.2 LM architecture

Our LMs employ a classic architecture—GPT-Neo [7]. We train two sets of LMs on recursively generated text. In one set, LMs are of 1 million (1M) parameters. In the other set, LMs are of 33 million (33M) parameters. That is, we train the 1M LMs on the text generated by the previous 1M LMs and the 33M LMs on the text generated

by the previous 33M LMs. We want to inspect if LMs with more parameters are more resilient to performance degradation during the recursive training.

A 1M LM has 8 layers and a hidden size 64, with 16 attention heads. It supports a maximum position embedding of 2048 and has a vocabulary size of 50257, utilizing global and local attention mechanisms.

In contrast, a 33M LM features 4 layers and a larger hidden size of 768 with 16 attention heads. It shares the same maximum position embedding of 2048 and vocabulary size of 50257, incorporating the same attention mechanisms as a 1M LM.

Statements of availability of these configurations are in [subsection 5.5](#).

3.1.3 Evaluation tasks

We evaluate the performance of trained LMs on multiple natural language tasks. Their details are shown as follows.

Language modeling. We first test how well trained LMs model English corpora through model perplexity. We calculate their perplexity on the validation set of TinyStories.

Text generation. This task has two different settings: unconditional and conditional. In the unconditional setting, we calculate the information entropy and the number of out-of-vocabulary (OOV) words of the corpus freely generated by each generation. (The freely generated corpus is the training corpus of the next generation. Please refer to [subsubsection 3.1.1](#) about how the corpus is generated.) In the conditional setting, we prompt the LMs with the beginning of a short story. We measure the performance of an LM by the quality of its completion of the story. This method was originally developed by Ronen Eldan et al., called GPT-Eval [\[6\]](#).

Text classification. Trained LMs are often discriminatively finetuned on specific tasks. An important aspect of the performance of a trained LM is the accuracy of a downstream task after being finetuned on the task. We compare the accuracy of our recursively trained LMs with baseline LMs that are randomly initialized and directly finetuned. Both our recursively trained LMs and baseline LMs go through the same finetuning process, so if the recursively trained LMs perform better than LMs finetuned from scratch, then there is a benefit owing to training on recursively generated text, and if they perform no better, then training on recursively generated text hardly help the LM understand language. Classical downstream tasks for LMs are text classification tasks, such as sentiment analysis (IMDB, SST-2, Yelp), paraphrase detection (QQP), and question-answer matching (QNLI). An introduction to each classification task we used in our experiment is in [subsection 5.5](#). For example, in the sentiment analysis task, a finetuned LM should output ‘1’ (positive) for the sentence ‘that loves its characters and communicates something rather beautiful about human nature’ and ‘0’ (negative) for the sentence ‘saw how bad this movie was’.

3.2 Experimental results

3.2.1 Language modeling

As shown in [Fig. 1](#), the perplexity of LMs consistently increases over all 40 generations. The 33M model maintains a consistently lower perplexity than the 1M model




Fig. 1 Perplexity of LMs with 1M and 33M parameters over 40 generations evaluated on the validation set of the TinyStories dataset, highlighting performance degradation. LM collapse is a degenerative process whereby, over generations, LMs forget the underlying text distribution of the initial training corpus. Our experiment starts with an initial corpus used to train the LM at generation 1. Then, generation 2 is trained using the text generated by generation 1, generation 3 using the text generated by generation 2, and so on. The figure illustrates that model perplexity on the initial corpus increases over generations for 1M and 33M LMs, which aligns with the findings of our theoretical proof that the output of LMs is drifting away from the text distribution of the initial corpus.

across generations, indicating better performance in predicting the next token on the validation set. We also notice that 1M LMs have a sharper increase than 33M LMs. A potential reason is that LMs with more parameters are more resilient to this degradation. However, they are not immune to long-term effects.

Finding 1: Training on recursively generated text results in a monotonous increase in the perplexity of LMs on the initial corpus, indicating that the output of LMs is drifting away from the distribution of the initial corpus since perplexity directly measures the ‘distance’ between the two distributions. This phenomenon aligns with the findings of our theoretical proof.

3.2.2 Text generation

Unconditional (free) text generation. Fig. 2 is about different generations of freely generated texts. Their information entropy exhibits a clear increasing trend from generation 1 to 25. However, starting from generation 25, the entropy sharply declines. The number of OOV words continues to increase even after the information entropy decreases. After manually examining the generated tokens, we found that the sharp decrease in information entropy is due to the generationally growing repetition for tokens. The repetition of common non-word tokens (*e.g.*, single-alphabet tokens ‘e’ and ‘z’) increases the number of OOV words. We listed some samples in Extended




Fig. 2 Entropy and the number of OOV words regarding freely generated texts of different generations of 33M LMs. On the one hand, the line corresponds to the left y-axis, which indicates that entropy rises from generation 1 to 25 before decreasing. The initial rise in entropy suggests greater text diversity generated by the LM. The subsequent decline is probably due to an increasing repetition of tokens. On the other hand, the bars correspond to the right y-axis, indicating that the number of OOV words increases from generation 1 to 39, highlighting the negative impact of training on recursively generated text on LM performance.

Data [Table A1](#). The training corpora of LMs with 1M parameters exhibit the same trend (Extended Data [Fig. A2](#)).

Finding 2: Training on recursively generated text leads to the generation of a large amount of repetitive text. These repetitions are often concentrated around high-frequency tokens from the initial corpus.

Conditional (prompted) text generation. In [Fig. 3](#), grammar scores represent the grammatical correctness of generated text of different generations, and consistency scores represent whether the generated text is consistent with the input prompt. Both scores of 33M LMs tend to decline generationally. The decrease in the score is even sharper when the examination is not whether the internal grammar of the generated text is correct but whether it is related to the external text. It may be because grammatical knowledge is more localized and involves a smaller span of tokens. Thus, it is relatively easy for an LM to learn (*i.e.*, to recognize the pattern statistically).

We also test an untrained 33M LM as a baseline. The result is counterintuitive. Although the randomly initialized LM weights cause the baseline to generate random token sequences for any input prompt, expecting such sequences to receive the lowest scores, this is not the case with the scores given by GPT-3.5 (see Extended Data [Table A2](#)). A long sequence of random tokens may have interfered with the work of GPT-3.5.




Fig. 3 Performance of 33M LMs of different generations evaluated by GPT-3.5. On the left is the grammar score, indicating the grammatical correctness of the generated text across different generations. On the right is the consistency score, representing how well the generated text aligns with the input prompt. The scores demonstrate a sharper decline when evaluating the consistency of generated text to external prompts, highlighting the challenge of maintaining relevance to external context compared to grammatical accuracy.

Finding ③: Training on recursively generated text reduces the LM’s capabilities to generate text that is grammatically correct and consistent with human instructions.

3.2.3 Text classification

These tasks involve the finetuning of LMs. We use pre-training to refer to the training process before finetuning. While accuracies on all tasks are non-increasing generationally, more scrutiny of the results reveals the following:

- Fig. 4 suggests that the LM’s ability to classify sentiments (IMDB, SST-2, and Yelp), identify paraphrased questions (QQP) and question-answer matching (QNLI) deteriorates generationally. In some tasks, the performance of later generations of LM deteriorates significantly and falls below the baseline.
- Fig. 4 further suggests that because LMs’ performance are no better than a randomly initialized baseline LM after finetuning on COLA, the effect of pre-training on recursively generated text is probably negligible compared to the effect of finetuning on these two datasets.
- Different from COLA, the accuracy of each generation on RTE is around 50%, suggesting that finetuning (plus pre-training) can not let the LM outperform random guessing.
- As for MRPC, this is due to the class imbalance of the dataset. That is, only 32% of training and testing samples in MRPC are labeled as negative. To provide a comprehensive understanding, we have included the F_1 score metrics for each dataset in the Extended Data Fig. A4 and Fig. A5.

The experimental results for LMs of 1M parameters are provided in Extended Data Fig. A3.




Fig. 4 Generational decline in the accuracy of 33M LMs after finetuning on eight downstream tasks. The figures illustrate that model accuracy consistently decreases across generations for tasks like sentiment analysis (IMDB, SST-2, Yelp), paraphrase detection (QQP), and question-answer matching (QNLI). We compare the accuracy with a baseline 33M LM, randomly initialized and directly finetuned (as outlined in the experimental setup). Both recursively trained LMs and baseline LMs undergo the same finetuning process. While recursively trained LMs initially surpass baseline accuracy, their performance declines over time, occasionally falling below baseline levels, highlighting the potential limitations of training on recursively generated text.

Finding 4: Training on recursively generated text significantly harms the performance of LMs on downstream tasks—that after finetuning on real data, they perform no better than a randomly initialized LM directly finetuned on real data.

4 Discussion

In our work, we demonstrate that training on recursively generated text can lead to an overall decline in the capability of LMs. Furthermore, we observe that the entropy of generated text initially increases and then decreases generationally (Fig. 2 and Extended Data Fig. A2). This observation suggests that in the earlier generations, the LMs produced more diverse text. However, in later generations, the decrease in entropy is likely due to the increasing number of repeating tokens generated (Extended Data Table A1), which decreases uncertainty and increases predictability. This bears a striking resemblance with how ‘genetic drift’ reduces genetic diversity [8]. In a finite population without other processes of change (such as natural selection or mutation), the more common an allele in the initial population, the more chance of it ultimately

becoming the only allele present in the population [9]. This is due to genetic sampling error, where rare alleles have a higher chance of being lost from the population than common alleles. Back to our scenario, if a token sequence with low likelihood is not generated by an LM, the training corpora of its descendant will not contain this sequence. Therefore, the descendant is not likely to generate it. Instead, it only generates common tokens, so we can observe that the information entropy of the generated text is low.

We also observe in various downstream tasks that sometimes LMs outperform their predecessors and even the first-generation LM. How can LMs that have accumulated errors over several generations achieve this? It’s important to note that a very small or nonexistent error indicates overfitting to a training set. Common sense in machine learning tells us that an overfitted model is unlikely to perform well on the test set. A certain amount of errors enhances a model’s ability to generalize. However, the danger of the recursive use of generated text is reflected in the unlimited accumulation of errors as we train more LMs. LMs eventually underfit real text due to the accumulated errors. It aligns with the machine learning principle to avoid both overfitting and underfitting.

Approaches that filter or clean generated text may alleviate the negative impact of the recursive use of generated text. However, there are still false facts or ‘illusions’ in generated text that are hard to remove automatically. Therefore, it is crucial to train LMs using authentic data from reliable sources and to keep a proper proportion of generated data to total training data.

5 Methods

5.1 Recursive training

We train the LM at generation n exclusively on text generated by generation $n - 1$. In this section, we begin by introducing the formal definition of this recursive process. Then, we elaborate on the details, including hyperparameters used in our training.

5.1.1 Formal definition

We define our recursive training process by a first-order Markov process:

$$D \rightarrow \theta[1] \rightarrow \theta[2] \rightarrow \theta[3] \dots,$$

where $\theta[n]$ is the vector of all weights of generation n , subject to the first-order Markov assumption: given the values of all weights of generation n , then the probability of the weights of generation $n + 1$ gets a certain set of values, is conditionally independent of the weights of generation $n - 1$ and before, including the initial text corpus, D , that is

$$P(\theta[n + 1] \mid \theta[n], \theta[n - 1], \dots, \theta[1], D) = P(\theta[n + 1] \mid \theta[n]).$$

5.1.2 Details and hyperparameters

The transition from $\theta[n]$ to $\theta[n + 1]$ is defined by the following stochastic algorithm:

Randomly initializes the weights of generation $n + 1$; Update the weights by generative pre-training the LM, that is, gradient descent of the cross entropy loss between the target token and the LM’s prediction given a preceding token sequence; The target token is generated by the generation n by faithfully (*i.e.*, with `temperature=1`) sampling from its output distribution given that preceding token sequence. [Algorithm 1](#) is the pseudocode of this algorithm.

With some hyperparameters placed at their proper place, a minimized pseudocode snippet that can be used to reproduce the state transition in the above Markov process is [Algorithm 1](#). The values of hyperparameters follow what Ronen Eldan et al. used to train their 33M LM (<https://huggingface.co/roneneldan/TinyStories-33M>) unless specified. We provide detailed comment for each operation in the pseudocode. We use function and class names resembling those in the *Transformers* library [10].

Algorithm 1 State transition from $\theta[n]$ to $\theta[n + 1]$ in the Markov process

Require: `m`, an instance of `CAUSALLANGUAGEMODEL`. $\theta[n]$ is the vector of its weights before executing this algorithm.

Require: `NUM-TRAINING-TOKENS`, a hyperparameter. We set this to 600,000,000.

Require: `MAX-CONTEXT-LENGTH`, a hyperparameter. We set this to 512.

Ensure: `m'`, a new instance of `CAUSALLANGUAGEMODEL`. $\theta[n + 1]$ is the vector of its weights after executing this algorithm.

```

1: ▷ Get the old LM’s config to ensure that the new LM’s architecture, parameter
   size, and vocabulary are the same as the old LM. The new LM’s weights are
   randomly initialized. ◁
2: m' ← CAUSALLANGUAGEMODEL.FROM-CONFIG(m.CONFIG)
3: optimizer ← ADAMW(m'.PARAMETERS, LEARNING-RATE=5 × 10-4,
   BETAS=(0.9,0.95), WEIGHT-DECAY=0.1)
4: context ← a queue of tokens, initially empty
5: for i = 1, …, NUM-TRAINING-TOKENS do
6:   p ← m(context)
7:   q ← m'(context)
8:   x ← SAMPLE(p) ▷ Sample a single token from p.
9:   loss ← CROSS-ENTROPY(ONE-HOT(x), q) ▷ ONE-HOT(x) is a distribution on
   the LM’s vocabulary, with x as the only token with non-zero probability.
10:  loss.BACKWARD() ▷ Use backpropagation, calculate the gradient. . .
11:  optimizer.STEP() ▷ . . . to update the weights of the new LM.
12:  context.ENQUEUE(x)
13:  if context.LENGTH > MAX-CONTEXT-LENGTH then
14:    context.DEQUEUE()

```

In our practice, we batch the tokens and accumulate the gradients for several update steps before performing a backward/update pass to speed up training. The total effective training batch size is 320. We enabled fp16 16-bit (mixed) precision training instead of 32-bit training. Lines 6, 8, and 12 of [Algorithm 1](#) are executed separately to generate a training corpus before we train a new LM. We generate

the corpus in parallel, with 200 as the batch size. Therefore, it contains 1,000,000 independent sequences. The length per sequence is 600 tokens. The new LM is then trained on this corpus for 3 epochs. We hold out 5% of text from TinyStories as a validation set to determine the number of epochs by early stopping during the training of the first LM. We reuse this number of epochs in subsequent training.

5.2 Language modeling

We calculate the model perplexity to evaluate how well an LM predicts the next token in the sequence, with lower perplexity indicating better performance. To calculate the model perplexity, we must calculate the **token loss** and then the **validation loss**.

Token loss of a token in the validation set. The validation set of TinyStories consist of short stories. Each story is a sequence of tokens \mathbf{x} . Let x_t denote the t -th token of \mathbf{x} . Let $context(x_t)$ denote the tokens before x_t within the same sequence. Specifically, we accommodate context window constraints to align with the model’s architectural limits. When $t \leq 512$, the context is $\mathbf{x}_{<t}$; however, when $t > 512$, the model only considers the previous 512 tokens due to its context window limitation, which adjusts the context to $\mathbf{x}_{t-512:t}$. We define $\hat{p}(x_t|context(x_t))$ as given $context(x_t)$, the LM predict that the next token is x_t with probability $\hat{p}(x_t|context(x_t))$. For each sequence \mathbf{x} in the validation set, the token loss of its t -th token is $-\log \hat{p}(x_t|context(x_t))$.

Validation loss L is the arithmetic average of the token losses of all tokens in the validation set.

Finally, we calculate the model perplexity by e^L .

5.3 Text generation

5.3.1 Information entropy of generated text

We calculate the information entropy by counting the relative frequency of each token in the text (used to train the next generation) generated by each LM. The formula is as follows:

LMs of GPT-Neo architecture have a vocabulary size of 50257. Let N_{v_i} denotes the number of occurrence of token v_i ($i \in \{0, 1, \dots, 50256\}$) in the corpus, then

$$p(v_i) \triangleq \frac{N_{v_i}}{6 \times 10^8}, \quad H \triangleq - \sum_{i=0}^{50256} p(v_i) \log p(v_i).$$

5.3.2 Out-of-vocabulary words in generated text

When two or more consecutive tokens fail to form a word in the lexicon, it is considered an out-of-vocabulary (OOV) word. The number of such non-word errors [11] in the generated text indicates the extent to which the LM has lost the knowledge of ‘which characters can form meaningful words.’ We use the Python library spaCy [12] to identify words not in the lexicon.

5.3.3 GPT-Eval of generated text

Evaluating the quality of an LM's completion is a two-step process. Firstly, we prompt the LM with the beginning of a short story. Secondly, we upload the beginning and the LM's continuation to GPT-3.5, OpenAI's LLM. We ask the LLM to return the grammar and consistency score for the continuation versus the beginning. The average score of all responses an LM receives is the grammar score and consistency score of the LM.

Step 1

The beginning of a story is given to our LM as the input prompt to the LM. In the following example, the LM is the first generation of our 33M LMs. The LM then generate completions of `max_new_tokens=210`, `do_sample=True`, and `num_return_sequences=10`. That is, to generate 10 different completions. This is because we want to know the average quality of LM-generated completions.

For example, the beginning of the story is:

Once upon a time, there lived a bunny in a field. Her name was Lucy. Lucy loved to have feasts and parties with her bunny friends. One day, when Lucy was about to leave for a feast at a friend's house, she realized she's starting to feel sick. She was so weak she could

The first completion is:

barely calm down.

Just then, a wise old owl saw her. The owl said, "Good news! Exercise helps your body start to increase." "Oh wow!" said Lucy. She was very happy about this.

The next week, Lucy felt much better. She gave herself a big hug and said to her friend, "Thank you for helping me increase!" She hopped around the field, feeling much better. From then on, Lucy made sure to go around her sick holiday with exercise. The lessons got better and she started to be healthier!

And that's how Lucy became so happy. She would still visit her friend whenever she visited her in the field - even though she was feeling weak and unhealthy. She would always understand the importance of getting stronger.

The end!

Moral of the story: Exercise is important! With a little bit of exercise, it can make you feel better and have great experiences results. So remember, exercise often makes you feel better so you can have more energy!

And the second completion is:

barely move!

So Lucy called her friends. She said, "Hello friends, I'm so hot, I'm so weak!" Her friends all looked down at her for comfort, then they all asked her what was wrong.

Lucy said, "My favorite radish life is making me feel better, so you don't have to eat it! The best way is to find a bigger change to eat!" Her friends thought about it, and very soon that Lucy felt better.

The friends decided to move a bit further into the woods, but this time when they passed by a big patch of healthy salad. Lucy was so happy and delighted to see it! She was the happiest bunny in the world!

The moral of this story is that no matter how weak you may feel, we can always find a way to make things better! There's no need to be tired and bad, because patience and relaxation will always help us get through our journey. So always keep bouncing! Don't be weak as

Step 2

The first completion is organized into the prompt below and uploaded to GPT-3.5. After GPT-3.5 has responded, the second completion, in place of the first, is uploaded to GPT-3.5. The other completions are also uploaded this way.

the following exercise, the student is given a beginning of a story. The student needs to complete it into a full story. The exercise tests the student's language abilities and creativity. The symbol *** marks the separator between the prescribed beginning and the student's completion:

Once upon a time, there lived a bunny in a field. Her name was Lucy. Lucy loved to have feasts and parties with her bunny friends. One day, when Lucy was about to leave for a feast at a friend's house, she realized she's starting to feel sick. She was so weak she could *** barely calm down.

Just then, a wise old owl saw her. The owl said, "Good news! Exercise helps your body start to increase." "Oh wow!" said Lucy. She was very happy about this.

The next week, Lucy felt much better. She gave herself a big hug and said to her friend, "Thank you for helping me increase!" She hopped around the field, feeling much better. From then on, Lucy made sure to go around her sick holiday with exercise. The lessons got better and she started to be healthier!

And that's how Lucy became so happy. She would still visit her friend whenever she visited her in the field - even though she was feeling weak and unhealthy. She would always understand the importance of getting stronger.

The end!

Moral of the story: Exercise is important! With a little bit of exercise, it can make you feel better and have great experiences results. So remember, exercise often makes you feel better so you can have more energy!

Please grade the student's completion (the one after the *** symbol) in terms of grammar, creativity, and consistency. Is it grammatically correct? Is it consistent with the beginning of the story? Pay special attention to whether the student manages to complete the sentence which is split in the middle by the separator ***. Return your response in a JSON format, with a variable 'grammar', a variable 'creativity', and a variable 'consistency', each containing an integer grade between 0 and 9, where 0 is the worst and 9 is the best. For example: {"grammar": 5, "creativity": 5, "consistency": 5}

The response of GPT-3.5 to the above prompt is:

```
{"grammar": 8, "creativity": 7, "consistency": 8}
```

Generation 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, and 36 of the 33M LMs and the baseline 33M LM performed this task. Samples of their completions are shown in Extended Data Table A2. We test each LM on 44 different inputs. The inputs are made available by Ronen Eldan et al. through Hugging Face (<https://huggingface.co/datasets/roneneldan/TinyStories/blob/main/Evaluation%20prompts.yaml>). For each input, each LM generates 10 different completions. Therefore, each LM can receive 440 different responses from GPT-3.5. The average grammar score from these 440 responses is the grammar score of this generation, as is the creativity score and the consistency score. Because we focus on grammatical knowledge, we do not average the creativity scores. We keep the original scores in Extended Data Table A2 in case they are of interest to some researchers.

5.4 Text classification

We discriminatively finetune copies of each LM on eight different datasets. Statements of availability of these datasets are in subsection 5.5. Hyperparameters are listed below:

- Learning rate: 5×10^{-5}
- Train batch size: 8
- Eval batch size: 32
- Epoch: All datasets except ‘Yelp’ - 1; ‘Yelp’ - 0.1

We evaluate the accuracies and weighted average F_1 scores [13] of the finetuned LMs.

5.5 Data availability

We use the configurations of TinyStories-1M and TinyStories-33M. These two models are made available by Ronen Eldan through Hugging Face [6].

Datasets used for downstream tasks are as follows:

IMDB (Large Movie Review Dataset) [14] contains 50,000 movie reviews, evenly split between positive and negative sentiments. It is widely used for binary sentiment analysis, where the task is to determine whether a given review expresses a positive or negative sentiment.

SST-2 (The Stanford Sentiment Treebank) [15] used in the experiments consists of nearly 70,000 input-output pairs, with inputs being sentences excerpted from movie reviews and outputs being sentiment labels indicating whether the sentiment is positive or negative.

Yelp [16] is utilized for sentiment analysis. It comprises reviews from the Yelp platform. Each review is labeled with sentiment categories, typically positive or negative. This dataset helps in training models to classify the sentiment expressed in the reviews.

QQP (The Quora Question Pairs) [17] features over 400,000 question pairs from Quora, similarly labeled for semantic equivalence, with about 63% being negative examples (marked as unequal).

QNLI (Question-answering Natural Language Inference) [18] involves around 100,000 pairs of sentences derived from the Stanford Question Answering Dataset (SQuAD). The task is to determine whether the context sentence contains the answer to the question.

MRPC (Microsoft Research Paraphrase Corpus) [19] consists of approximately 3,000 manually annotated sentence pairs sourced from online news, where about 68% are positive examples (deemed equivalent).

RTE (The Recognizing Textual Entailment datasets) [20, 21] contains about 2,500 sentence pairs. The task is to determine whether one sentence entails, contradicts, or is neutral concerning another. This dataset is used for textual entailment recognition.

CoLA (The Corpus of Linguistic Acceptability) [22] includes over 10,000 sentences labeled for linguistic acceptability. The task is to determine whether a given sentence is grammatically acceptable.

5.6 Code availability


Source codes for the training and evaluation results are available at the online data warehouse: <https://github.com/wanglc02/generated-data>.

Author contributions. H.M., G.L., and L.W. conceived the project. L.W. and X.S. explored and devised the methodology. L.W. wrote the paper. J.L. revised the abstract and introduction. J.L. and Y.D. revised the theoretical proof. X.Z. researched related work and revised figure captions. G.L. and W.J. approved the submission and provided the research environment.

Competing interests. The authors declare no competing interests.

Correspondence and requests for materials. Should be addressed to Lecheng Wang.


Appendix A Extended Data




Extended Data Fig. A1 Schematic of all LMs we trained. There are three types of links in this flowchart: thin link, thick link, and dotted link. Models linked with thin links are the same model before/after training. For example, an untrained model is pre-trained on `TinyStories` to become the generative model of the first generation, then further finetuned to task-specific models. Models linked with thick links are generative models of different generations. The generative model of the second generation is pre-trained from scratch on text generated by the generative model of the first generation. We test every generation the same way as in the n -th generation, with a dotted link pointing from a model to the results of a test conducted on that model. The baseline of these tests is given by a randomly initialized LM, which is directly finetuned to do specific tests.

Extended Data Table A1 Excerpts from generated texts of different generations of 33M LMs. Texts generated by generation n form the training corpus of generation $n + 1$.


| Generation | Sample |
|------------|---|
| 1 | there was a little boy called Sam. He was three years old and loved playing outside. |
| 1 | there lived a big boy. His name was Joe. Joe was very proud of his cool cap. He kept it close and never wanted anyone else to touch it. |
| 6 | Mary and Charlie were best friends. They played together and were always so excited to go for a ride. |
| 6 | It was going on a special day. A boy was walking at a shop. He was excited because he had never seen a big bag of treats on this menu. |
| 11 | Ellie Ellie was feeling excited. She was ready to go on an adventure. |
| 11 | Mom side, a little girl wanted to go and see around the house. She asked her mother if she could go. |
| 16 | did day one day, something went by her pocket. She put on a ribbon and decided to let her pass in the garden. |
| 16 | "What do you see, Mommy?" she asked asked, pointing to the fancy dishes. |
| 21 | Mia in the garden and an modest dog named Tim, who always looked for his might. He liked to play with his owner, and who went off the house. |
| 21 | All the animals were happy in the squ sure together. So one day, the animals played and chased especially another friend. |
| 26 | Ellie herea and her mom decided to play together. They drove in the car. Dad said they are been friends. |
| 26 | bar |
| 31 | did day one day, something very green-f anyone could always know becausealia at action was before |
| 31 | Lib after touch wherever looked troubled, kind much fun they both both weighed bright butterfly faces nurses zipping z z z z z z |
| 36 | frog |
| 36 | P Pink Spring Spring Spring Spring Spring spring Ada, mun-of squ sure up spring. Every morning he was made fun- leaping especially another spring morning p guilty. |




Extended Data Fig. A2 Entropy and the number of out-of-vocabulary (OOV) words regarding freely generated texts of different generations of 1M LMs. On the one hand, the bars correspond to the right y-axis, highlighting an increasing trend in the number of OOV words in the generated text over 40 generations, indicating a degradation in model performance as errors accumulate. On the other hand, the line corresponds to the left y-axis, which shows that the entropy of generated text initially rises, suggesting increased text diversity in the early generations. However, entropy generally declines in later generations, attributed to the generating of a large amount of repetitive text by LMs.



Extended Data Fig. A3 Generational decline in the accuracy of 1M LMs after finetuning on eight downstream tasks. The figure shows that the 1M LMs’ accuracy on tasks like sentiment analysis (IMDB, SST-2, Yelp), paraphrase detection (QQP), and question-answer matching (QNLI) consistently declines with each generation. We compare the accuracy with a baseline 1M LM, randomly initialized and directly finetuned (as outlined in the experimental setup). Initially, some LMs outperform the baseline, but their performance diminishes significantly over time, often falling below baseline levels. The results on MRPC are influenced by class imbalance since only 32% of training and testing samples in MRPC are labeled as negative (see Extended Data Fig. A4 and Fig. A5).



Extended Data Fig. A4 F_1 score metrics of LMs with 33M parameters on eight downstream tasks. The F_1 scores for tasks like sentiment analysis (IMDB, SST-2, Yelp), paraphrase detection (QQP), and question-answer matching (QNLI) are showing a generational decline. The initial scores may surpass the baseline, but they deteriorate over time. The performance decline of LMs on MRPC is evident in the decline of the F_1 scores but not accuracy scores (Fig. 4), suggesting an interplay between the class imbalance of MRPC and the learning mechanism of LMs on binary classification tasks.



Extended Data Fig. A5 F_1 score metrics of LMs with 1M parameters on eight downstream tasks. This F_1 scores for sentiment analysis (IMDB, SST-2, Yelp), paraphrase detection (QQP), and question-answer matching (QNLI) over multiple generations demonstrate a consistent decline. The performance decline of LMs on MRPC is evident in the decline of the F_1 scores but not accuracy scores (Extended Data Fig. A3), suggesting an interplay between the class imbalance of MRPC and the learning mechanism of LMs on binary classification tasks.

Extended Data Table A2 Cases of GPT-Eval. We ask different generations of 33M LMs to finish the example story in [section 5.3.3](#). We ask GPT-3.5 to grade their completions in terms of grammar, creativity, and consistency. We ask GPT-3.5 to pay special attention to whether our LMs manage to complete the last given sentence split in the middle. In this example, this is ‘She was so weak she could’. Completions of this sentence are shown below.

| Generation | Completion | Grammar | Creativity | Consistency |
|-----------------------|--|---------|------------|-------------|
| 1 | barely calm down. ¹ | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | barely move! ² | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| 6 | not fill up the meal. | 4 | 6 | 7 |
| 6 | only strongest and harder at a time. | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 11 | not get farther away. | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 11 | not reach his paw. | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| 16 | not go for a wrapped breakfast | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| 16 | not helpitty first. | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 21 | not go. | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 21 | not help but catch the patch through chair and restore her cane. | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 26 | only see something shiny, adventurous someday. | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| 26 | not help control as the birds were ready to play together. | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 31 | not help eat memorable free from her guardian. | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 31 | 't find the clay. | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 36 | not rest of the day. | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 36 | not have yelled pets. | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Baseline ³ | bourgeoisie Achievement accommodating Consulting jointlyesome | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Baseline ³ | freeing expressive CCTV sly whisph-Flashroximately BlairargeAlso | 7 | 8 | 7 |

¹For the full completion, please see the first completion in [section 5.3.3](#).

²For the full completion, please see the second completion in [section 5.3.3](#).

³The randomly initialized baseline LM generates random token sequences as completions. About half of these sequences receive surprisingly high score from GPT-3.5.

References

- [1] OpenAI *et al.* Gpt-4 technical report. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774> (2024).
- [2] Dubey, A. *et al.* The Llama 3 herd of models. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783> (2024).
- [3] DeepSeek-AI *et al.* DeepSeek LLM: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.02954> (2024).
- [4] Shumailov, I. *et al.* AI models collapse when trained on recursively generated data. *Nature* **631**, 755–759 (2024). URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07566-y>.
- [5] Zhang, S. *et al.* OPT: Open pre-trained transformer language models. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.01068> (2022).
- [6] Eldan, R. & Li, Y. TinyStories: How small can language models be and still speak coherent english? Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.07759> (2023).
- [7] Black, S., Leo, G., Wang, P., Leahy, C. & Biderman, S. GPT-Neo: Large scale autoregressive language modeling with mesh-tensorflow, 1.0 (2021). URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5297715>.
- [8] Stange, M., Barrett, R. D. H. & Hendry, A. P. The importance of genomic variation for biodiversity, ecosystems and people. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **22**, 89–105 (2021). URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-020-00288-7>.
- [9] Kimura, M. On the probability of fixation of mutant genes in a population. *Genetics* **47**, 713–719 (1962). URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/47.6.713>.
- [10] Wolf, T. *et al.* Liu, Q. & Schlangen, D. (eds) *Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing*. (eds Liu, Q. & Schlangen, D.) *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, 38–45 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 2020). URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-demos.6>.
- [11] Choudhury, M., Thomas, M., Mukherjee, A., Basu, A. & Ganguly, N. Biemann, C., Matveeva, I., Mihalcea, R. & Radev, D. (eds) *How difficult is it to develop a perfect spell-checker? a cross-linguistic analysis through complex network approach*. (eds Biemann, C., Matveeva, I., Mihalcea, R. & Radev, D.) *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on TextGraphs: Graph-Based Algorithms for Natural Language Processing*, 81–88 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Rochester, NY, USA, 2007). URL <https://aclanthology.org/W07-0212>.
- [12] Honnibal, M., Montani, I., Van Landeghem, S. & Boyd, A. spaCy: Industrial-strength natural language processing in Python, v3.7.2 (2023). URL <https://doi.org/10.26434/chemrxiv-2023-11>.

[org/10.5281/zenodo.1212303](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1212303).

- [13] Pedregosa, F. *et al.* Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **12**, 2825–2830 (2011). URL https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.metrics.classification_report.html.
- [14] Maas, A. L. *et al.* Lin, D., Matsumoto, Y. & Mihalcea, R. (eds) *Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis*. (eds Lin, D., Matsumoto, Y. & Mihalcea, R.) *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 142–150 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Portland, Oregon, USA, 2011). URL <https://aclanthology.org/P11-1015>.
- [15] Socher, R. *et al.* Yarowsky, D., Baldwin, T., Korhonen, A., Livescu, K. & Bethard, S. (eds) *Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank*. (eds Yarowsky, D., Baldwin, T., Korhonen, A., Livescu, K. & Bethard, S.) *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 1631–1642 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, Washington, USA, 2013). URL <https://aclanthology.org/D13-1170>.
- [16] Zhang, X., Zhao, J. & LeCun, Y. Cortes, C., Lee, D. D., Sugiyama, M. & Garnett, R. (eds) *Character-level convolutional networks for text classification*. (eds Cortes, C., Lee, D. D., Sugiyama, M. & Garnett, R.) *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 1*, NIPS’15, 649–657 (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2015). URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/2969239.2969312>.
- [17] Wang, A. *et al.* Linzen, T., Chrupała, G. & Alishahi, A. (eds) *GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding*. (eds Linzen, T., Chrupała, G. & Alishahi, A.) *Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, 353–355 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium, 2018). URL <https://aclanthology.org/W18-5446>.
- [18] Rajpurkar, P., Zhang, J., Lopyrev, K. & Liang, P. Su, J., Duh, K. & Carreras, X. (eds) *SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text*. (eds Su, J., Duh, K. & Carreras, X.) *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2383–2392 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Austin, Texas, 2016). URL <https://aclanthology.org/D16-1264>.
- [19] Dolan, W. B. & Brockett, C. Dras, M. & Yamamoto, K. (eds) *Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases*. (eds Dras, M. & Yamamoto, K.) *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Paraphrasing (IWP2005)*, 9–16 (Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing, Jeju Island, Korea, 2005). URL <https://aclanthology.org/I05-5002>.

- [20] Dagan, I., Glickman, O. & Magnini, B. Quiñero Candela, J., Dagan, I., Magnini, B. & d’Alché Buc, F. (eds) *The PASCAL recognising textual entailment challenge*. (eds Quiñero Candela, J., Dagan, I., Magnini, B. & d’Alché Buc, F.) *Machine Learning Challenges. Evaluating Predictive Uncertainty, Visual Object Classification, and Recognising Tectual Entailment*, 177–190 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/11736790_9.
- [21] Bentivogli, L., Dagan, I. & Magnini, B. *The Recognizing Textual Entailment Challenges: Datasets and Methodologies*, 1119–1147 (Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 2017). URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-0881-2_42.
- [22] Warstadt, A., Singh, A. & Bowman, S. R. Neural network acceptability judgments. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **7**, 625–641 (2019). URL <https://aclanthology.org/Q19-1040>.