

# Language Models as Continuous Self-Evolving Data Engineers

Peidong Wang<sup>1</sup>, Ming Wang<sup>1</sup>, Zhiming Ma<sup>2</sup>, Xiaocui Yang<sup>1</sup>, Shi Feng<sup>1†</sup>, Daling Wang<sup>1</sup>, Yifei Zhang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science and Engineering, Northeastern University, Shenyang, China

<sup>2</sup>China Mobile Internet Company Limited, Guangzhou, China

{pdongwang}@stumail.neu.edu.cn

{fengshi, wangdaling, zhangyifei, yangxiaocui}@cse.neu.edu.cn

sci.m.wang@gmail.com

mazhiming312@outlook.com

## Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities on various tasks, while the further evolution is limited to the lack of high-quality training data. In addition, traditional training approaches rely too much on expert-labeled data, setting an upper limit on the performance of LLMs. To address this issue, we propose a novel paradigm that enables LLMs to train itself by autonomously generating, cleaning, reviewing, and annotating data with preference information, named LANCE. Our approach demonstrates that LLMs can serve as continuous self-evolving data engineers, significantly reducing the time and cost of the post-training data construction process. Through iterative fine-tuning on different variants of the Qwen2, we validate the effectiveness of LANCE across various tasks, showing that it can continuously improve model performance and maintain high-quality data generation. Across eight benchmark dimensions, LANCE resulted in an average score enhancement of **3.36** for Qwen2-7B and **2.70** for Qwen2-7B-Instruct. This training paradigm with autonomous data construction not only reduces the reliance on human experts or external models but also ensures that the data aligns with human values and preferences, paving the way for the development of future superintelligent systems that can exceed human capabilities.

## 1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have exhibited extraordinary proficiency in tackling diverse tasks, spanning natural language understanding, logical reasoning, code generation, mathematical reasoning, etc (Dubey et al., 2024; Achiam et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024). These advancements are largely attributed to instruction tuning (Wei et al., 2021) and Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) (Stiennon et al., 2020), which have

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author.




Figure 1: **An illustration of our methodology.** Traditional ML focuses on the setting where humans supervise models that are weaker than humans. Our methodology delves into the scenario where models self-supervise, which may be a reliable path to superintelligence, enabling models to surpass the human level.

significantly improved the performance of LLMs using quality data. High-quality data not only enhances the precision and reliability of the models but also ensures that the outputs are more aligned with human values and preferences (Wang et al., 2023b).

However, with the rapid development of LLMs, the acquisition of high-quality data becomes more difficult (Penedo et al., 2023). On the one hand, as the volume of LLM training data increases, previous high-quality data are likely to have been used (Villalobos et al., 2024), making their reuse ineffective for further performance improvement. There is a constant need for new high-quality data to enhance LLMs’ intelligence. On the other hand, relying on human experts to get high-quality data is time-consuming and costly, limiting efficiencies and making it challenging to keep up with the rapid demands of LLMs (Villalobos et al., 2024). Additionally, for future superintelligence that exceeds the ability level of human experts, human supervisory signals may be of limited help, and the quality of human-generated data may be one of the bottle-

necks in the emergence of superintelligence (Burns et al., 2023). Some research (Lee et al., 2024; Dai et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024a) suggests leveraging synthetic data generated by teacher LLMs to train student LLMs, yet this approach hinges on supervised signals from external models. Conversely, other studies (Zelikman et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023a; Gulcehre et al., 2023) advocate for the use of LLM construction data to iteratively fine-tune the model itself. However, these methods do not comprehensively address the entire data construction lifecycle for the post-training of LLMs.

To address these challenges, we propose a novel training paradigm that enables LLMs to autonomously generate, clean, review, and annotate data with preference information, thereby using this data to train itself. Through the full cycle of LLM’s processing of the training data, we show that LLMs are thus decent data engineers. First, the existing seed dataset is reviewed. For the lower-quality data, the model generates instructions and responses that explore the same themes or forms to construct instruction data, compensating for the distributional deficiencies of the seed data. For the higher-quality data, the model generates new responses that appear correct but are expressively flawed and contain misleading information, constructing preference data to enhance model response quality and reduce hallucinations. For the newly generated data, the model reviews the new data after calling the tool for initial cleaning to ensure that the new instruction data are of high quality and that the preference pairs in the preference data are correct. Finally, this data is used to train the model itself, improving its performance. This process can be repeated multiple times to continuously enhance the model’s performance. LANCE enables the autonomous construction of the data required for the full cycle of model post-training, requiring no human involvement or reliance on external models, and significantly reducing the time and cost required in each data process compared to traditional methods.

To evaluate our method, we conducted iterative fine-tuning on different models and tested their performance in various areas such as scientific reasoning, commonsense reasoning, knowledge understanding, complex tasks, mathematics, and generative diversity. We found that even with iterative processing on a small dataset, the average performance of the model across various tasks continues to rise, and individual evaluation metrics either re-

main stable or show improvement. In contrast, continuous Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) on the same dataset either leads to no performance improvement or even degradation. This demonstrates that our method can consistently provide high-quality data, which is crucial for the continuous enhancement of model intelligence.

LANCE represents a valuable exploration towards the path of superintelligence by enabling LLMs to autonomously construct high-quality data. By enabling LLMs to autonomously generate, clean, review, and annotate data with preference information, our approach ensures that the data is not only of high quality but also produced quickly and at a lower cost, thereby significantly reducing the need for human or external models intervention. Ultimately, our approach not only enhances the performance of LLMs but also sets the stage for the development of systems that can exceed human capabilities, making significant strides towards the realization of superintelligence.

In summary, our contributions are: (1) We propose a **new training paradigm** that enables LLMs to autonomously generate, refine, evaluate, and annotate data, which is then used to further train themselves. This method substantially cuts down on the time and expense associated with the post-training data preparation phase. (2) We demonstrate that **Language Models as Continuous Self-Evolving Data Engineers (LANCE)**, capable of autonomously managing the entire post-training data construction process. This capability not only enhances the efficiency of data generation but also ensures high-quality data production. (3) We validate the **effectiveness** of LANCE **across a variety of tasks**, showing that it can continuously improve the performance of the model and maintain high-quality data generation.

## 2 Related Work

**Post-Training** After the pre-training phase, a Large Language Model (LLM) undergoes a post-training stage where it is fine-tuned to follow instructions, align with human preferences, and enhance specific capabilities (e.g., coding and reasoning) (Dubey et al., 2024). Common post-training methods include supervised fine-tuning (Wei et al., 2021) and preference learning (Stiennon et al., 2020; Rafailov et al., 2024). However, the success of these methods heavily relies on the availability and quality of human-annotated data.




Figure 2: **An overview of LANCE.** The cycle begins at  $t = 0$  with the pre-annotated and readily available seed dataset  $Seed_0$ . At each time step  $t$ , starting from the seed dataset  $Seed_t$ , the model  $M_t$  generates new instruction data and preference data based on seed data through **Post-training data construction full-cycle**. After fine-tuning  $M_t$  with instruction data using NLL to create  $M_t^S$ ,  $M_t^S$  is further fine-tuned with preference data using MLE to produce  $M_t^D$ . In the next iteration,  $M_t^D$  becomes  $M_{t+1}$ , and new samples are merged with the original seed data to form the new seed data.

**Data Augmentation for LLMs** Data augmentation techniques are used to enhance the training data for LLMs. For example, Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023) uses text-davinci-003 to generate data via self-instruct for fine-tuning a 7B LLaMA model. CoAnnotating (Li et al., 2023) employs a collaborative method between humans and LLMs to rapidly annotate data. Similarly, LLM2LLM (Lee et al., 2024) utilizes a teacher LLM to create new data based on errors made by a student LLM during reasoning, thereby generating targeted training data for the student LLM. ReST-MCTS\* (Zhang et al., 2024) integrates process reward guidance with MCTS\* to collect higher-quality reasoning traces and per-step values for training policy and reward models. However, this approach is limited to tasks that have ground-truth data, which restricts its applicability.

**Self-Evolving LLMs** Self-instruct (Wang et al., 2023a) harnesses the LLM itself to construct instruction data, iteratively enhancing the model’s instruction-following capability through Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT). Instruction backtranslation (Li et al., 2024) augments unlabeled data using an instruction prediction model, generating new instruction tuning data to refine the model. However, this method is heavily reliant on a large amount of unlabeled data. Self-rewarding (Yuan et al., 2024) employs the LLM itself as a reward model and iteratively trains the model with Direct Preference Optimization (DPO), improving both the policy

and reward models simultaneously. SPIN (Chen et al., 2024b) enhances alignment with human preferences through self-play by the LLM, but it is constrained by the distribution of specified data, which sets an inherent performance ceiling. Similarly, SPPO (Wu et al., 2024b) proposes an iterative self-play loss that approximates the Nash equilibrium through iterative policy updates. However, this method relies on an external, fixed reward model. Our approach autonomously constructs a targeted dataset using a small amount of seed data and its distributional characteristics. By leveraging the LLM itself as a dynamic reward model, our method can address the data deficiencies inherent in seed data, enabling more efficient data generation and model optimization. This process allows the model to self-evolve without the need for large-scale given data or external reward models.

### 3 Methodology

Figure 2 illustrates an overview of our approach, which begins with a small seed dataset. The model then generates instruction data and preference data through a data pipeline. These data are used to optimize the model via Negative Log-Likelihood (NLL) and Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE). The resulting model is then employed as the starting point for the next iteration. By repeating this cycle, the model’s overall performance is continuously improved.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Post-training data construction full-cycle

---

**Input:** Seed data in round  $t$ ,  $Seed_t$ ; language model in round  $t$ ,  $M_t$ ; branch threshold  $V$ ; number of sampling times  $K$ ; iteration rounds  $N - 1$

**Output:** Preference data  $D_t^p$ ; instruction data  $D_t^s$

```
1  $ReviewedSeed \leftarrow Review(M_t, Seed_t)$ ; // Review the seed data using the current model
2 for data in  $ReviewedSeed$  do
3   if data.review  $\geq V$  then
4     // Generate worse responses than original response
5      $worse\_responses \leftarrow generate\_worse\_responses(M_t, data, K)$ ;
6      $D_t^p \leftarrow D_t^p \cup \{Filter(data.instruction, data.response, worse\_responses)\}$ ;
7   else
8     // Generate better instructions than original instruction
9      $better\_instructions \leftarrow generate\_better\_instructions(M_t, data, K)$ ;
10    // Samples  $K$  responses for each new instruction
11     $generated\_response \leftarrow M_t(better\_instructions, K)$ ;
12     $D_t^s \leftarrow D_t^s \cup \{Filter(better\_instructions, generated\_response)\}$ ;
13  end
14 end
```

---

### 3.1 Preliminaries

**Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT)** Supervised Fine-Tuning, also known as instruction tuning, is typically applied to a pre-trained LLM to enhance its ability to understand and follow instructions, improving its performance on specific tasks. For a given model  $M_t$ , the training dataset  $D^s = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  consists of instruction-response pairs  $(x, y)$ . During SFT, the LLM is trained to minimize the NLL loss:

$$L_{SFT} = -\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim D^s} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^T \log(M_t(y_t | y_{<t}, x)) \right] \quad (1)$$

From Equation 1, when the distribution of  $M_t$  coincides with the conditional probability distribution  $p(y|x)$  of the responses in  $D^s$ ,  $L_{SFT}$  attains its minimum value.

**Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF)** As the name suggests, Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback is where the model learns human preferences from human feedback through reinforcement learning, enabling the model to generate responses that align more closely with human expectations. This approach not only helps the model generate more desirable outputs across a wide range of tasks but also plays a crucial role in building safe, high-performance, and controllable AI systems (Ouyang et al., 2022).

Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2024) eliminates the need for a reward

model and instead uses human preferences directly to optimize the model, making it a stable and computationally lightweight RLHF algorithm. Given the SFT model  $M_t^s$  and the model under optimization  $M_t^\theta$ , the preference dataset  $D^p = \{(x_i, y_i^w, y_i^l)\}_{i=1}^N$  is used for training. Here,  $y^w$  and  $y^l$  denote the preferred and dispreferred responses, respectively. The training objective is to minimize the MLE loss:

$$L_D = -\mathbb{E}_{(x,y^w,y^l) \sim D^p} [\log \sigma(\Delta \hat{r}(x, y^w, y^l))] \quad (2)$$

In this context,  $\Delta \hat{r}(x, y^w, y^l)$  represents the difference in reward between the preferred response  $y^w$  and the dispreferred response  $y^l$ , defined as:

$$\Delta \hat{r}(x, y) = \hat{r}(x, y^w) - \hat{r}(x, y^l) \quad (3)$$

More specifically, the rewards  $\hat{r}(x, y^w)$  and  $\hat{r}(x, y^l)$  correspond to the values assigned by the model under optimization,  $M_t^\theta$ , and the reference model,  $M_t^s$ , for the preferred and dispreferred responses, respectively. These rewards are computed as:

$$\hat{r}(x, y) = \beta \log \frac{M_t^\theta(y|x)}{M_t^s(y|x)} \quad (4)$$

where  $\beta$  is a parameter controlling the deviation from the base reference policy, namely the initial SFT model  $M_t^s$ .



### 3.2 Initialization

**Seed Data** Our seed data consists of two components:

1. A small labeled dataset, which serves as the initial foundation for the model to sample new data.
2. A review dataset, where the inputs are an instruction and a response integrated into a prompt template, and the outputs are the rationale for assigning a score and the final score. This dataset is designed to facilitate the model’s proficiency in scoring data, ensuring the seamless progression of the subsequent iteration process.

The data from these two components are randomly mixed together to form the seed data.

**Large Language Model** In the iterative loop, we use an LLM that has undergone SFT on the seed data as our initial model  $M_0$ . This SFT process equips the model with a foundational level of instruction-following and review capabilities. The model, starting from  $M_0$ , continues to improve through subsequent iterations, evolving into  $M_1, \dots, M_t, \dots, M_N$ , where  $t$  denotes the current iteration, with the process beginning at  $t = 0$  and concluding at  $t = N$ .

### 3.3 Post-training data construction

**Review Seed data** The distribution of data points in an instruction tuning dataset is often uneven, with some topics or tasks having lower-quality instruction data than others. When such data is used for training, it may result in a language model with potential deficiencies in certain capabilities. Zheng et al. (2023) demonstrated the potential of LLM as a judge, showing that a well-trained LLM can achieve high agreement with human evaluations. Based on these insights, we utilize the language model  $M_t$  to review the seed data, assessing its quality across different tasks and topics. This enables us to identify gaps in the original dataset and target the generation of new data to address these deficiencies.

Specifically, we design a template for additive evaluation prompts, scoring each data point on a scale of 0 to 10 across various criteria, including clarity, usefulness, challenge, safety, professionalism, and guidance. For each seed data point, the instruction and response are incorporated into the prompt template and input into the model  $M_t$ .  $M_t$  then generates a review, providing a detailed ratio-

---

### Algorithm 2: Language Models as Continuous Self-Evolving Data Engineers (LANCE)

---

**Input:** Initial seed data  $Seed_0$ , language model  $M$ , branch threshold  $V$ , number of sampling times  $K$ , iteration rounds  $N - 1$   
**Output:** A more powerful language model  $M_N$   
// Perform initial SFT using seed data  
1  $M_0 \leftarrow SFT(M, Seed_0)$ ;  
2 **for**  $t \leftarrow 0$  **to**  $N - 1$  **do**  
3      $D_t^p, D_t^s \leftarrow$   
        $Algorithm\ 1(Seed_0, M_t, V, K, N)$ ;  
4      $D^p \leftarrow D^p \cup D_t^p$ ;  
5      $D^s \leftarrow D^s \cup D_t^s$ ;  
       // Optimize using Formula 1  
6      $M_t^s \leftarrow SFT(M_t, D^s)$ ;  
       // Optimize using Formula 2  
7      $M_t^d \leftarrow DPO(M_t^s, D^p)$ ;  
8      $M_{t+1} \leftarrow M_t^d$ ;  
9 **end**

---

nale for the score along with the final score. This review serves as a key differentiator for how the data is referenced and used to generate new data in later stages of the process.

**Reward-Based Generation** For each seed data point, we compare the reward value generated in the previous step to a given threshold  $V$ . If the reward value is below  $V$ , it indicates that the dataset is poorly distributed across topics or tasks related to this data, potentially lacking high-quality examples. To mitigate the impact of data distribution deficiencies on model performance, we employ the few-shot learning (Brown, 2020) technique to prompt the model to generate new instructions based on the original data. These new instructions are then fed into  $M_t$  to generate new responses, exploring the same topics as the original instructions but with higher quality. The resulting data is used for instruction tuning after further processing.

If the reward value meets or exceeds  $V$ , it suggests that this data is effective at instructing the model to accomplish that corresponding task. To enhance this, we utilize the few-shot learning technique to prompt the model to generate new, intentionally flawed responses containing misleading information. These generated responses form preference pairs with the original ones, which can then be used for preference learning in subsequent steps.

**Data Filtering and Training Data Construction** In order to construct a high-quality training dataset, the data generated in the previous step must first be filtered. We begin with length filtering to remove data that is too short or too long. Next, we use

Backbone	Method	Average	Benchmarks							
			ARC	HellaSwag	MMLU	TruthfulQA	GSM8K	Winogrande	MATH	BBH
7B	SFT	61.42	<u>51.11</u>	78.63	68.71	55.15	60.96	<u>73.01</u>	41.74	<u>62.04</u>
	Self-Instruct	57.70 (-3.72)	<b>52.39</b>	78.34	69.19	50.30	65.20	72.53	11.98	61.63
	SPIN	61.74 (+0.32)	50.43	<b>78.98</b>	<b>69.68</b>	<u>55.35</u>	81.43	72.14	25.62	60.32
	I-SHEEP	62.35 (+0.93)	51.02	78.18	68.34	53.72	78.54	72.53	34.40	<b>62.05</b>
	LANCE	<b>64.78 (+3.36)</b>	50.68	<u>78.76</u>	<u>69.31</u>	<b>55.54</b>	<b>82.11</b>	<b>73.01</b>	<b>48.12</b>	60.74
7B-Instruct	SFT	64.04	53.07	78.32	68.10	53.96	79.83	<b>71.59</b>	42.68	64.80
	Self-Instruct	65.18 (+1.13)	<u>54.44</u>	79.63	<b>69.94</b>	52.67	81.05	69.93	48.86	<u>64.89</u>
	SPIN	65.88 (+1.83)	53.07	79.72	<u>69.80</u>	55.27	82.03	70.56	52.64	63.93
	I-SHEEP	66.65 (+2.61)	53.16	<b>79.95</b>	69.61	<b>57.13</b>	<u>82.34</u>	69.85	<b>56.14</b>	<b>64.99</b>
	LANCE	<b>66.74 (+2.70)</b>	<b>55.89</b>	<u>79.74</u>	69.58	<u>55.62</u>	<b>83.55</b>	<u>70.96</u>	<u>55.02</u>	63.59

Table 1: **Performance of multiple self-evolution methods at their optimal iteration rounds across various benchmarks on Qwen2.** SFT represents the initial model obtained through SFT on the seed dataset. **Bold** values denote the best results achieved, underlined values signify the second-best results, **red** / **green** values highlight the improvement / decrease over the base model. LANCE outperforms other baselines in terms of average performance across these benchmarks, often ranking as the top or second-best in most benchmarks.




Figure 3: **Various self-evolution methods exhibit their average scores across multiple benchmarks.** The performance variations of these methods over multiple iterations are depicted using lines of distinct colors and markers. The Self-Instruct method, which does not involve iterative processes, was employed to sample 50k data points for self-training purposes. Here, "iter  $t$ " denotes the  $t$ -th iteration. LANCE consistently shows performance gains across iterations, outperforming other baselines. Additionally, LANCE demonstrates strong performance both when applied to post-training on the pre-trained model (Qwen2-7B) and when further post-training is applied to the fully post-trained model (Qwen2-7B-Instruct).

ROUGE-L (Lin, 2004) to measure the similarity between old and new instructions, as well as old and new responses, removing data with high similarity to the existing entries. This helps mitigate the issue of reduced model diversity, as discussed by Wu et al. (2024a).

After these computationally inexpensive filters, we utilize  $M_t$  to reward all newly generated data. For data intended for instruction tuning, those with a reward greater than  $V$  are added to the instruction dataset. For data intended for preference training, we compare the rewards of each of the two items and those with large reward values are used as preference responses, otherwise they are used as dis-preferred responses. These preference pairs, along with their corresponding instructions, are added to

the preference data. Not only choosing the highest and lowest rewarded responses to construct the preference data is beneficial for the model to capture more fine-grained human preferences and further improve the performance.

Algorithm 1 provides a concise overview of the full-cycle for post-training data construction.

### 3.4 Self post-training full-cycle

The end-to-end algorithm for LANCE is presented in Algorithm 2. The process iteratively optimizes the language model over multiple rounds. Initially, the algorithm uses the initial seed data  $Seed_0$  and the language model  $M$  to perform SFT, resulting in the initial model  $M_0$ . In each iteration  $t$  (from 0 to  $N-1$ ), it calls Algorithm 1 to generate two datasets  $D_t^p$  and  $D_t^s$ , which are used for the preference dataset




Figure 4: **Performance evolution across multiple benchmarks over iterations:** LANCE enhances performance on most benchmarks. Notably, the enhancement in mathematical proficiency is particularly pronounced.

$D^p$  and the supervised dataset  $D^s$ , respectively. Next, the supervised dataset  $D^s$  is then used to fine-tune  $M_t$  through SFT, producing the model  $M_t^s$ . Then, the preference dataset  $D^p$  is used for DPO on  $M_t^s$ , yielding the model  $M_t^d$ . This model  $M_t^d$  is then directly used as the model for the next iteration, denoted  $M_{t+1}$ . After  $N - 1$  rounds of iteration, the final model  $M_N$  obtained is a more powerful language model.

In Section 4, we evaluated our training framework, and the results revealed a significant improvement in model performance. Theoretically, as the number of iterations  $N - 1$  increases, the model’s performance should continue to improve until it reaches the intelligence limit of the framework. Our experiments demonstrated that even when  $N - 1$  reached 4, the model’s performance was still improving. This process began with an initial set of over 3,000 seed data points and expanded to include hundreds of thousands of instruction and preference data points. Due to computational resource limitations, our experiments were conducted up to  $N = 4$ , but we are confident that this training framework has substantial potential for further advancements.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Models** We used Qwen2-7B and Qwen2-7B-Instruct (Yang et al., 2024) as the backbone models

Model	Full	w/o dpo	w/o sft
LANCE iter1	62.19	62.96	59.67
LANCE iter2	62.80	62.76	59.16
LANCE iter3	64.39	63.66	57.64
LANCE iter4	64.78	63.50	61.32

Table 2: LANCE without certain steps shows the average performance scores. "w/o dpo" refers to the exclusion of both the DPO-related data generation and training processes, while "w/o sft" indicates the removal of both the SFT-related data generation and training processes. The results highlight that a complete data generation and training pipeline is necessary, as omitting these steps leads to slow and unstable improvements.

to assess the effectiveness of our training paradigm across different model sizes and alignment phases. **Datasets** We sampled 3,184 data points from UltraChat (Ding et al., 2023), which formed the first part of the seed dataset. Additionally, we sampled 5,632 data points from OpenAssistant Conversations (Köpf et al., 2024) and used the Llama3-70B (Dubey et al., 2024) model to generate reward rationales and corresponding scores. Only those reward rationales and scores that were consistent with the human-labeled scores were retained. These, together with the original instructions and responses, made up the second part of the seed dataset.

**Benchmarks** In our experiment, we employed a diverse set of benchmarks to evaluate the model’s performance across various capabilities, demon-




Figure 5: LANCE results after multiple epochs of SFT on the seed dataset. Even when training to the point of overfitting, the performance did not reach the level of LANCE iter3. This demonstrates the efficiency of LANCE under limited supervisory signals.

strating the significant improvements brought by our training algorithm. The HellaSwag (Zellers et al., 2019) and Winogrande (Sakaguchi et al., 2019) datasets assess commonsense reasoning and contextual understanding. The MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2020) dataset evaluates multi-domain knowledge comprehension and application. To ensure the accuracy and reliability of the information generated by the model, we incorporated the TruthfulQA (Lin et al., 2022) dataset. In the realm of mathematical problem-solving, we employed the GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) and MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021) datasets to assess the model’s mathematical reasoning abilities, covering both foundational and advanced problem-solving skills. The ARC-Challenge (Clark et al., 2018) dataset evaluates scientific reasoning and complex problem-solving. Additionally, the BBH (Suzgun et al., 2022) dataset assesses the model’s performance in real-world, challenging scenarios. The comprehensive use of these benchmarks allowed us to systematically evaluate the performance of large language models across various tasks and domains. We provide further implementation details and the specific evaluation settings used in our experiments in Appendix B.

#### 4.2 LANCE Effectively Improves Benchmark Performance

Table 1 presents the results of LANCE and other iterative self-evolution methods across multiple benchmarks on Qwen2, showing the performance at their optimal iteration rounds. The "Average" column displays the mean scores of the models across these benchmarks. Figure 3 illustrates the average performance of these methods across each iteration




Figure 6: **Comparison of LANCE’s Average Performance with Equivalent Training Data from SFT.** Under the same training data volume, models trained using LANCE consistently outperform those trained with SFT.

round. Notably, our approach proves effective not only in post-training pre-trained models but also in further post-training fully trained models.

For the average scores, LANCE showed an improvement of 2.97 on Qwen2-7B over the initial model (SFT), and 2.70 on Qwen2-7B-Instruct. The most notable improvement was in mathematical abilities. On GSM8K, Qwen2-7B improved by 19.18, while Qwen2-7B-Instruct improved by 3.72. On MATH, Qwen2-7B improved by 5.48, and Qwen2-7B-Instruct by 12.34. For MMLU, a benchmark covering a wide range of domains and significant challenges, our method also yielded improvements: Qwen2-7B improved by 0.53, and Qwen2-7B-Instruct by 1.48. Other abilities either improved or remained largely unchanged.

Regarding iterative self-evolution, it is clear that our method enables continuous iterative improvements, both for pre-trained models and fully post-trained models, as indicated by the trend in the line graph. In contrast, SPIN showed improvements only in the first round, with performance declining in subsequent rounds. I-SHEEP showed improvement in the first iteration on Qwen2-7B-Instruct, but performance degraded in later iterations, while on Qwen2-7B, improvements were slow and unstable. Limited by computational resources, we conducted only four rounds of iterative experiments. However, based on the previous iterations, we speculate that additional iteration steps would yield better results.

#### 4.3 Ablation Studies

In this subsection, we have investigated the impact of various stages on the effectiveness of LANCE. Furthermore, we compared our method with the base model across multiple epochs of SFT on the seed



dataset, thereby confirming that the performance improvement of our method is not due to overfitting on the seed dataset. By conducting SFT on equivalent amounts of data and comparing it with our method, we demonstrated that our approach does not rely solely on expanding the dataset to enhance performance. Instead, it generates more targeted and higher-quality data to improve the model’s capabilities.

**Process Ablation** Table 2 illustrates the impact of omitting SFT-related or DPO-related components on the model’s average performance. When the DPO-related components are removed, the model’s performance can still improve iteratively in the first three iterations, but at a slower rate compared to the complete pipeline, and performance starts to decline after the fourth iteration. When the SFT-related components are removed, the performance improvement becomes highly unstable: after a performance gain in iter1, performance deteriorates in iter2 and iter3, and then improves again in iter4. These results highlight the necessity of a complete data generation and training pipeline for achieving fast and stable iterative self-evolution.

**Comparison with SFT** Figures 5 and 6 respectively present the comparison between our iterative self-evolution approach and multi-round SFT, as well as SFT with equivalent training data. Multi-round SFT refers to the initial model undergoing multiple epochs of SFT on the seed dataset, while equivalent data refers to sampling an equal amount of data from UltraChat and performing SFT on the initial model. The comparison with multi-round SFT demonstrates that our method does not merely involve crude repetition of the seed dataset, the performance improvement is not solely due to repeated learning of the seed data but rather the generation of new, valuable data. The comparison with SFT using equivalent training data clearly indicate that, under the same training data volume, models trained with LANCE consistently outperform those trained with SFT. This significant performance gap underscores the superior quality of the synthetic data generated by LANCE, which not only matches but exceeds the quality of commonly used high-quality instruction-tuning datasets. Moreover, the results highlight a crucial aspect of LANCE’s effectiveness: its ability to achieve superior performance with minimal external supervision. Unlike traditional methods that heavily rely on extensive external supervision, LANCE leverages a small seed dataset as the initial external signal to generate a

vast amount of high-quality training data. This self-augmentation capability allows LANCE to reduce the dependency on external supervision, thereby demonstrating a more efficient and scalable approach to model training.

## 5 Conclusion

We introduce a novel training paradigm that empowers LLMs to autonomously generate, clean, review, and annotate data with preference information, significantly reducing the time and cost of post-training data construction. Our method, validated across various tasks, demonstrates continuous improvements in model performance, outperforming traditional supervised fine-tuning and other self-evolution methods. By ensuring that the generated data aligns with human values and preferences while greatly reducing the resource requirements for high-quality data creation, we take a step toward addressing a key bottleneck in the emergence of superintelligence, laying the groundwork for future systems that can exceed human capabilities.

## 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*.
- Tom B Brown. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*.
- Collin Burns, Pavel Izmailov, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Bowen Baker, Leo Gao, Leopold Aschenbrenner, Yining Chen, Adrien Ecoffet, Manas Joglekar, Jan Leike, et al. 2023. Weak-to-strong generalization: Eliciting strong capabilities with weak supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.09390*.
- Lichang Chen, Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Kalpa Gunaratna, Vikas Yadav, Zheng Tang, Vijay Srivasan, Tianyi Zhou, Heng Huang, and Hongxia Jin. 2024a. [AlpaGasus: Training A Better Alpaca with Fewer Data](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2307.08701 [cs].
- Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, and Quanquan Gu. 2024b. [Self-Play Fine-Tuning Converts Weak Language Models to Strong Language Models](#). *arXiv preprint*.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *ArXiv*, abs/1803.05457.

- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. [Training verifiers to solve math word problems](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2110.14168.
- Haixing Dai, Zhengliang Liu, Wenxiong Liao, Xiaoke Huang, Yihan Cao, Zihao Wu, Lin Zhao, Shaochen Xu, Wei Liu, Ninghao Liu, Sheng Li, Dajiang Zhu, Hongmin Cai, Lichao Sun, Quanzheng Li, Dinggang Shen, Tianming Liu, and Xiang Li. 2023. [AugGPT: Leveraging ChatGPT for Text Data Augmentation](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2302.13007 [cs].
- Ning Ding, Yulin Chen, Bokai Xu, Yujia Qin, Zhi Zheng, Shengding Hu, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Bowen Zhou. 2023. Enhancing chat language models by scaling high-quality instructional conversations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14233*.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Caglar Gulcehre, Tom Le Paine, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Ksenia Konyushkova, Lotte Weerts, Abhishek Sharma, Aditya Siddhant, Alex Ahern, Miaosen Wang, Chenjie Gu, Wolfgang Macherey, Arnaud Doucet, Orhan Firat, and Nando de Freitas. 2023. [Reinforced Self-Training \(ReST\) for Language Modeling](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2308.08998 [cs].
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*.
- Andreas Köpf, Yannic Kilcher, Dimitri von Rütte, Sotiris Anagnostidis, Zhi Rui Tam, Keith Stevens, Abdullah Barhoum, Duc Nguyen, Oliver Stanley, Richárd Nagyfi, et al. 2024. Openassistant conversations-democratizing large language model alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Aditya Kusupati, Gantavya Bhatt, Aniket Rege, Matthew Wallingford, Aditya Sinha, Vivek Ramanujan, William Howard-Snyder, Kaifeng Chen, Sham Kakade, Prateek Jain, and Ali Farhadi. 2024. [Matryoshka representation learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2205.13147.
- Nicholas Lee, Thanakul Wattanawong, Sehoon Kim, Karttikeya Mangalam, Sheng Shen, Gopala Anumanchipali, Michael W. Mahoney, Kurt Keutzer, and Amir Gholami. 2024. [LLM2LLM: Boosting LLMs with Novel Iterative Data Enhancement](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2403.15042 [cs].
- Minzhi Li, Taiwei Shi, Caleb Ziems, Min-Yen Kan, Nancy F Chen, Zhengyuan Liu, and Diyi Yang. 2023. Coannotating: Uncertainty-guided work allocation between human and large language models for data annotation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15638*.
- Xian Li, Ping Yu, Chunting Zhou, Timo Schick, Omer Levy, Luke Zettlemoyer, Jason Weston, and Mike Lewis. 2024. [Self-Alignment with Instruction Back-translation](#). *arXiv preprint*.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022. [TruthfulQA: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bin Wang, Bingxuan Wang, Bo Liu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, et al. 2024. Deepseek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04434*.
- 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.
- Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. 2023. The refinedweb dataset for falcon llm: outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01116*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.10641*.
- Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Daniel Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul F Christiano. 2020. Learning to summarize with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3008–3021.
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Denny

- Zhou, et al. 2022. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09261*.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. [https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca).
- Qwen Team. 2024. **Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models**.
- Pablo Villalobos, Anson Ho, Jaime Sevilla, Tamay Besiroglu, Lennart Heim, and Marius Hobbhahn. 2024. **Will we run out of data? limits of llm scaling based on human-generated data**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2211.04325.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023a. **Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13484–13508, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zige Wang, Wanjun Zhong, Yufei Wang, Qi Zhu, Fei Mi, Baojun Wang, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, and Qun Liu. 2023b. Data management for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01700*.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*.
- Ting Wu, Xuefeng Li, and Pengfei Liu. 2024a. Progress or regress? self-improvement reversal in post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05013*.
- Yue Wu, Zhiqing Sun, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, Yiming Yang, and Quanquan Gu. 2024b. **Self-Play Preference Optimization for Language Model Alignment**. *arXiv preprint*.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, et al. 2024. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*.
- Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. 2024. **Self-Rewarding Language Models**. *arXiv preprint*.
- Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah Goodman. 2022. Star: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:15476–15488.
- Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Dan Zhang, Sining Zhoubian, Ziniu Hu, Yisong Yue, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2024. **ReST-MCTS\*: LLM Self-Training via Process Reward Guided Tree Search**. *arXiv preprint*.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2023. **Judging LLM-as-a-Judge with MT-Bench and Chatbot Arena**. In *Thirty-Seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.

## Appendix

### A Data Distribution Visualization




Figure 7: Visualization of the distribution of seed data and synthetic data generated by LANCE

We sampled 1000 data points each from the seed dataset, the synthetic SFT dataset, and the DPO dataset. Using the `stella_en_400M_v5` model (Kusupati et al., 2024), we extracted embeddings for each data point. Subsequently, we applied t-SNE dimensionality reduction to these embeddings and plotted the resulting feature vectors in Figure 7. The visualization reveals that the synthetic data generated by LANCE not only encompasses the distribution range of the original seed data but also explores new regions. This indicates that LANCE can produce data that aligns with a broader distribution, effectively expanding the original data distribution. Notably, the SFT dataset exhibits the most extensive distribution range, attributed to the generation of new instructions during its construction.

### B Evaluation Setting

Benchmarks	num shots	version	eval tools
ARC-C	0	1.0	LM Evaluation Harness
HellaSwag	0	1.0	LM Evaluation Harness
MMLU	0	1.0	LM Evaluation Harness
TruthfulQA	6	2.0	LM Evaluation Harness
Winogrande	0	1.0	LM Evaluation Harness
GSM8k	4	1d7fe4	OpenCompass
MATH	0	393424	OpenCompass
BBH	3	5b92b0	OpenCompass

Table 3: Details of the evaluation settings for all benchmarks in this study.

Figure 3 provides an overview of the evaluation details for all benchmarks included in this study.

The 'num shots' column indicates the number of examples provided when using few-shot prompts, 'version' denotes the version of the evaluation configuration file utilized, and 'eval tools' specifies the evaluation tools employed for assessing each benchmark.

### C Small-Scale Validation

To explore the boundaries of our method, we conducted experiments on models of varying scales. Generally, larger models tend to produce higher quality data and exhibit stronger filtering capabilities, facilitating easier self-evolution. Consequently, we performed preliminary exploration experiments using models of smaller scales compared to those in the main text. Specifically, we conducted four iterations of experiments on Qwen 2.5-1.5B (Team, 2024), with the results presented in Table 4. It was observed that the model's performance began to decline starting from the fourth iteration. This decline may be attributed to the weaker capabilities of the base model in generating, filtering, and annotating data, resulting in the inability to produce high-quality data and leading to the collapse of iterative training. However, on the whole, even on smaller-scale models, our method can still enhance the performance of the models to some extent. This demonstrates the versatility of our approach.

### D Iteration details

Figure 5 illustrates the detailed scores of LANCE and baseline methods across each benchmark during the iterative process. The average performance changes between iterations reveal that LANCE consistently delivers iterative improvements when applied to both the pre-trained and fully fine-tuned models (indicated by red values for average changes). In contrast, SPIN only shows improvement in the first iteration and subsequently leads to a decline in model performance on both models. I-SHEEP demonstrates a similar pattern, with only the first iteration showing improvement on Qwen2-7B-Instruct, followed by performance degradation in subsequent iterations, while on Qwen2-7B, it only offers slow and unstable enhancements. These observations highlight the robustness of LANCE.

### E Case Study

Figure 8 illustrates the comparison between the SFT data generated from reference seed data and



Base	Model	Average	Benchmarks							
			ARC	HellaSwag	MMLU	TruthfulQA	GSM8K	Winogrande	MATH	BBH
Qwen2.5-1.5B	SFT	52.22	46.42	<b>67.81</b>	60.03	46.38	64.67	63.06	34.18	35.23
	LANCE Iter1	52.39 (+0.17)	45.90	67.74	60.05	46.22	65.96	63.38	34.12	35.77
	LANCE Iter2	53.12 (+0.73)	<b>46.64</b>	67.57	<b>60.06</b>	<b>46.62</b>	67.48	63.22	64.40	38.97
	LANCE Iter3	<b>53.74 (+0.62)</b>	45.73	67.60	59.88	46.14	<b>67.48</b>	<b>63.54</b>	<u>36.00</u>	<b>43.53</b>
	LANCE Iter4	<u>53.65 (-0.09)</u>	45.22	67.52	59.75	46.13	67.02	63.06	<b>37.16</b>	<u>43.33</u>

Table 4: **Experimental results of LANCE after four iterations on Qwen2.5-1.5B.** The model’s performance began to decline after the fourth iteration, possibly due to limitations in the model’s capabilities.

Base	Model	Average	Benchmarks							
			ARC	HellaSwag	MMLU	TruthfulQA	GSM8K	Winogrande	MATH	BBH
Qwen2-7B	SFT	61.42	51.11	78.63	68.71	55.15	60.96	<u>73.01</u>	41.74	62.04
	Self-Instruct 50k	57.70 (-3.72)	<b>52.39</b>	78.34	69.19	50.30	65.20	72.53	11.98	61.63
	SPIN Iter1	61.74 (+0.32)	50.43	78.98	69.68	55.35	81.43	72.14	25.62	60.32
	SPIN Iter2	61.68 (-0.06)	49.83	79.13	<b>69.73</b>	55.38	<u>81.96</u>	71.11	26.00	60.32
	SPIN Iter3	60.86 (-0.83)	48.12	79.31	69.71	54.99	81.58	70.32	26.44	56.38
	SPIN Iter4	58.50 (-2.36)	46.16	<b>79.38</b>	69.66	55.66	80.74	70.17	17.80	48.40
	I-SHEEP Iter1	61.74 (+0.32)	50.85	78.32	68.45	53.60	73.09	72.69	34.50	<u>62.40</u>
	I-SHEEP Iter2	62.11 (+0.37)	<u>51.45</u>	78.27	68.49	53.76	74.37	71.67	36.38	<b>62.46</b>
	I-SHEEP Iter3	62.06 (-0.05)	51.11	78.09	68.29	53.85	70.96	72.22	39.80	62.13
	I-SHEEP Iter4	62.35 (+0.29)	51.02	78.18	68.34	53.72	78.54	72.53	34.40	62.05
	LANCE Iter1	62.19 (+0.77)	50.85	78.45	68.96	55.53	67.32	72.38	41.90	62.14
	LANCE Iter2	62.80 (+0.61)	50.51	78.94	69.41	<b>55.97</b>	66.64	72.45	46.54	61.92
	LANCE Iter3	64.39 (+1.59)	50.77	79.12	69.24	<u>55.78</u>	80.14	72.45	<u>47.22</u>	60.37
	LANCE Iter4	<b>64.78 (+0.39)</b>	50.68	78.76	69.31	55.54	<b>82.11</b>	<b>73.01</b>	<b>48.12</b>	60.74
Qwen2-7B-Instruct	SFT	64.04	53.07	78.32	68.10	53.96	79.83	<b>71.59</b>	42.68	64.80
	Self-Instruct 50k	65.18 (+1.13)	54.44	79.63	<b>69.94</b>	52.67	81.05	69.93	48.86	<u>64.89</u>
	SPIN Iter1	65.88 (+1.83)	53.07	79.72	<u>69.80</u>	55.27	82.03	70.56	52.64	63.93
	SPIN Iter2	65.16 (-0.71)	51.79	79.66	69.65	56.46	81.58	69.69	50.14	62.33
	SPIN Iter3	65.06 (-0.10)	51.19	79.99	69.49	56.42	82.11	69.46	50.30	61.52
	SPIN Iter4	64.20 (-0.86)	50.77	<b>80.04</b>	69.59	56.07	81.05	68.19	47.02	60.88
	I-SHEEP Iter1	66.65 (+2.60)	53.16	79.95	69.61	<b>57.13</b>	82.34	69.85	<b>56.14</b>	<b>64.99</b>
	I-SHEEP Iter2	65.51 (-1.13)	54.10	79.92	69.56	<u>56.53</u>	81.96	69.85	51.90	60.29
	I-SHEEP Iter3	65.31 (-0.21)	53.33	79.96	69.38	<u>55.80</u>	82.56	69.30	53.06	59.05
	I-SHEEP Iter4	64.56 (-0.75)	53.50	79.61	69.37	55.43	<u>82.71</u>	69.46	51.62	54.76
	LANCE Iter1	65.78(+1.73)	<u>55.38</u>	79.53	69.34	55.85	81.73	70.48	49.34	64.55
	LANCE Iter2	65.90(+0.12)	55.12	79.76	69.55	55.98	80.14	69.61	52.44	64.57
	LANCE Iter3	66.13(+0.24)	55.03	79.92	69.56	55.69	80.59	<u>71.03</u>	53.68	63.56
	LANCE Iter4	<b>66.74(+0.61)</b>	<b>55.89</b>	79.74	69.58	55.62	<b>83.55</b>	70.96	<u>55.02</u>	63.59

Table 5: **Experimental results of multiple self-evolution methods across various benchmarks.** Red / Green values indicate improvements / decreases compared to the previous iteration. LANCE consistently shows performance gains across iterations, outperforming other baselines.

the original seed data. The original seed data exhibits a disorganized structure in its instructions, with the cooking steps and wine recommendations lacking logical coherence. Specifically, the descriptions of wine choices are disconnected from the cooking procedures, creating an abrupt and disjointed flow. In contrast, the SFT data generated by LANCE clearly defines the task objective: recommending wine pairings for dishes featuring Parmesan cheese. It systematically outlines the factors to consider, such as the cheese’s texture, depth, and saltiness. This structured approach enhances the clarity and conciseness of the instructions, sig-

nificantly improving their practicality and usability. Furthermore, while the original seed data’s response mentions a pairing between Quarts Sauvignon Selection and Parmesan cheese, it provides only a limited number of alternative options and lacks detailed explanations of the characteristics of each wine and their compatibility with the dish. This results in a response that appears haphazard and lacks depth. On the other hand, the SFT data’s response offers a well-organized list of wine pairings, with detailed descriptions of each wine’s attributes and how they complement the Parmesan cheese dish. For instance, Chardonnay’s creamy




Figure 8: An example of SFT data generation based on seed data using LANCE.

texture harmonizes with the cheese's rich flavor, while Pinot Noir's fruity and earthy notes balance the cheese's saltiness. This level of detail not only enhances the response's practicality but also aids readers in understanding the rationale behind each pairing. Overall, the SFT data demonstrates superior clarity, logical coherence, and practicality in both instructions and responses compared to the original seed data, providing readers with more insightful and actionable guidance.

Figure 9 presents an example of generating a suboptimal response from high-quality seed data to construct DPO data. Notably, this suboptimal re-

sponse is also generated by LANCE, but its purpose is to intentionally simplify content, omit details, and reduce logical coherence, thereby creating a prototypical Disreferred Response. Specifically, the Disreferred Response lacks detailed procedural guidance, such as precise measurements, cutting, folding, and securing techniques for wrapping paper, making it difficult for readers to follow accurately. Additionally, it fails to emphasize professional presentation aspects, such as checking and trimming details, resulting in a potentially less polished outcome. Moreover, its language is informal and ambiguous, lacking the precision and profes-




Figure 9: An example of DPO data generation based on seed data using LANCE. The Preferred Response and Dispreferred Response represent  $y^w$  and  $y^l$  in Equation 2, respectively.

signalism evident in the Preferred Response. This deliberate design makes it an ideal candidate for DPO training, effectively highlighting the model’s potential for generating high-quality responses.

## F Model Evolution Steps

Table 6 illustrates the impact of each step on model performance during the implementation of LANCE. On Qwen2-7B-Instruct, model performance consistently improved after each step. However, on Qwen2-7B, the DPO step within the first two iterations occasionally resulted in performance degradation. Without DPO and solely implementing the SFT step, the average performance after the second iteration was only 62.76, as shown in Table 2. Although the performance of LANCE DPO iter1 was lower than that of LANCE SFT iter1, the average performance of LANCE SFT iter2, fine-tuned using data generated from LANCE DPO iter1, reached 64.21, significantly higher than the 62.76 achieved by LANCE w/o DPO iter2. This demonstrates the role of the DPO step in enhancing the model’s ability to generate data, laying a foundation for subsequent iterative improvements.

Base	Model	Average	Benchmarks							
			ARC	HellaSwag	MMLU	TruthfulQA	GSM8K	Winogrande	MATH	BBH
Qwen2-7B	SFT	61.42	51.11	78.63	68.71	55.15	60.96	73.01	41.74	62.04
	LANCE SFT Iter1	62.96	50.85	78.36	68.90	54.80	75.74	72.69	40.38	61.95
	LANCE DPO Iter1	62.19	50.85	78.45	68.96	55.53	67.32	72.38	41.90	62.14
	LANCE SFT Iter2	64.21	50.85	78.77	69.01	55.07	81.35	72.61	43.62	62.38
	LANCE DPO Iter2	62.80	50.51	78.94	69.41	55.97	66.64	72.45	46.54	61.92
	LANCE SFT Iter3	64.08	50.43	78.78	69.42	55.23	81.80	72.85	42.32	61.81
	LANCE DPO Iter3	64.39	50.77	79.12	69.24	55.78	80.14	72.45	47.22	60.37
	LANCE SFT Iter4	64.58	50.94	78.64	69.41	55.41	81.96	72.85	46.30	61.12
LANCE DPO Iter4	64.78	50.68	78.76	69.31	55.54	82.11	73.01	48.12	60.74	
Qwen2-7B-Instruct	SFT	64.04	53.07	78.32	68.10	53.96	79.83	71.59	42.68	64.80
	LANCE SFT Iter1	65.52	54.98	79.42	69.44	55.09	81.58	69.85	49.02	64.83
	LANCE DPO Iter1	65.78	55.38	79.53	69.34	55.85	81.73	70.48	49.34	64.55
	LANCE SFT Iter2	65.41	54.01	79.64	69.61	55.00	81.12	69.46	50.08	64.35
	LANCE DPO Iter2	65.90	55.12	79.76	69.55	55.98	80.14	69.61	52.44	64.57
	LANCE SFT Iter3	65.65	54.01	79.52	69.71	54.76	81.27	70.17	51.38	64.35
	LANCE DPO Iter3	66.13	55.03	79.92	69.56	55.69	80.59	71.03	53.68	63.56
	LANCE SFT Iter4	66.03	54.61	79.49	69.53	55.41	83.17	71.11	50.88	64.05
LANCE DPO Iter4	66.74	55.89	79.74	69.58	55.62	83.55	70.96	55.02	63.59	

Table 6: **Evolution of Model Performance During the Implementation of LANCE.** LANCE SFT Iter $t$  Denotes the Model Fine-tuned with SFT Data After the  $t$ -th Iteration, and LANCE DPO Iter $t$  Represents the Model Fine-tuned with DPO Data After the  $t$ -th Iteration.