

MORTAR: Metamorphic Multi-turn Testing for LLM-based Dialogue Systems

GUOXIANG GUO, Faculty of Information Technology, Monash University, Australia

ALDEIDA ALETI*, Faculty of Information Technology, Monash University, Australia

NEELOFAR NEELOFAR, School of Computing Technologies, RMIT University, Australia

CHAKKRIT TANTITHAMTHAVORN, Faculty of Information Technology, Monash University, Australia

With the widespread application of LLM-based dialogue systems in daily life, quality assurance has become more important than ever. Recent research has successfully introduced methods to identify unexpected behaviour in single-turn scenarios. However, multi-turn dialogue testing remains underexplored, with the Oracle problem in multi-turn testing posing a persistent challenge for dialogue system developers and researchers. In this paper, we propose MORTAR, a MetamORphic multi-TuRn diAlOgue testing appRoach, which mitigates the test oracle problem in the assessment of LLM-based dialogue systems. MORTAR automates the generation of follow-up question-answer (QA) dialogue test cases with multiple dialogue-level perturbations and metamorphic relations. MORTAR employs a novel knowledge graph-based dialogue information model which effectively generates perturbed dialogue test datasets and detects bugs of multi-turn dialogue systems in a low-cost manner. The proposed approach does not require an LLM as a judge, eliminating potential of any biases in the evaluation step. According to the experiment results on multiple LLM-based dialogue systems and comparisons with single-turn metamorphic testing approaches, MORTAR explores more unique bugs in LLM-based dialogue systems, especially for severe bugs that MORTAR detects up to four times more unique bugs than the most effective existing metamorphic testing approach.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Software testing and debugging**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: metamorphic testing, generative AI testing, dialogue system testing

1 INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of large language models (LLMs) has led to substantial capability improvements in downstream applications, particularly in dialogue systems [Algherairy and Ahmed 2024]. From a system developer’s perspective, comprehensive testing is essential to ensure the service quality of dialogue systems. However, testing such AI systems inevitably encounters the oracle problem [Aleti 2023]. In software testing, the test oracle is crucial, as it determines whether the system under test (SUT) behaves as expected. Traditionally, the implementation of test oracles relies on the experience and design of test cases from system testers. Crowd source workers also play an important role in producing dialogue datasets as test cases. Several evaluation datasets and methods, e.g. HotpotQA [Yang et al. 2018], DecodingTrust [Wang et al. 2023a], etc., can be used to simulate user input and evaluate if the generated content matches common sense and human values. Some datasets, e.g. MMLU [Hendrycks et al. 2020], GPQA [Rein et al. 2023], etc., offer high-quality test cases that require expert knowledge to answer. These datasets have successfully revealed defects in dialogue systems during single-turn conversations with simulated users.

It is worth noting that most existing testing datasets and approaches only provide single-turn testing capability [Chang et al. 2024]. According to real-world usage, however, over 63% of dialogues contain more than 2 rounds [ShareGPT 2023]. This gap between system testing and development

*Corresponding author.

Authors’ addresses: Guoxiang Guo, guoxiang.guo@monash.edu, Faculty of Information Technology, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; Aldeida Aleti, aldeida.aleti@monash.edu, Faculty of Information Technology, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; Neelofar Neelofar, neelofar.eme@gmail.com, School of Computing Technologies, RMIT University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, chakkrit@monash.edu, Faculty of Information Technology, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

leads to several critical issues. One of the most harmful effects is that existing dialogue systems can be easily jailbroken, leading to a higher likelihood of generating improper content in multi-turn dialogues compared to single-turn interactions [Li et al. 2024a].

Despite an increasing number of testing approaches aimed at mitigating this gap in multi-turn dialogue testing, most either depend heavily on human annotators or rely on large language models to generate test cases or act as a judge [Bai et al. 2024]. The former is inevitably expensive and inaccessible to most dialogue system developers. The latter could reduce the cost of testing and realise human-like evaluation, but LLM judges are generally biased and could harm the reliability of evaluation [Huang et al. 2024b]. Considering the gap between existing approaches, which primarily focus on single-turn interactions, and the multi-turn nature of real-world systems, this research aims to propose a new approach for multi-turn dialogue testing.

Metamorphic testing (MT), a well-established software testing method, has shown potential to alleviate the oracle problem in the testing of generative AI (GenAI) systems [Aleti 2023]. Several MT-based approaches have been introduced to support single-turn testing for question-answering (QA) systems and large language models (LLMs) [Chen et al. 2021; Hyun et al. 2024; Shen et al. 2022a]. Metamorphic relations such as perturbations in character level, word level, and sentence level have been shown to be effective in some testing scenarios. However, relying solely on single-turn and lower-level perturbations in multi-turn dialogue testing fails to account for the essential differences between single-turn and multi-turn interactions, as these basic perturbations are insufficient to verify the context dependence intrinsic to multi-turn dialogues.

In this paper, we propose MORTAR, a MetamORphic multi-Turn diAlOgue testing appRoaCh, which mitigates the test oracle problem in the assessment of LLM-based dialogue systems. MORTAR automates the generation of follow-up question-answer (QA) dialogue test cases with multiple dialogue-level perturbations and metamorphic relations. MORTAR employs a novel knowledge graph-based dialogue information model which effectively generates perturbed dialogue test datasets and detects bugs of multi-turn dialogue systems in a low-cost manner. The proposed approach does not require an LLM as a judge, eliminating potential of any biases in the evaluation step. According to the experiment results on multiple LLM-based dialogue systems and comparisons with single-turn metamorphic testing approaches, MORTAR explores more unique bugs in LLM-based dialogue systems, especially for severe bugs that MORTAR detects up to four times more unique bugs than the most effective existing metamorphic testing approach.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- (1) We propose MORTAR, a metamorphic testing approach aimed at uncovering bugs in dialogue systems and addressing the test oracle problem in multi-turn dialogue system testing.
- (2) We introduce a series of novel metamorphic relations, perturbation, and corresponding automation schemes for dialogue test case generation.
- (3) We develop a novel ontology-based answerability check procedure to detect MR conflicts.
- (4) We conduct a set of experiments where MORTAR successfully explores bugs in different dialogue systems through MR conflict detection, which is a bias-free approach. Experiments show that MORTAR can detect more unique bugs when compared with state-of-the-art single-turn MT approaches.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the background and motivation. Section 3 elaborates on the details of MORTAR. Section 4 describes the setting and configuration of our experiments. Section 5 presents the experiment results analysis and discussion, and Section 6 reports threats to validity. Finally, Section 7 introduces related works and Section 8 concludes and discusses potential future works.

2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

2.1 Testing and evaluation of LLM-based dialogue systems

Dialogue systems are now broadly applied in many domains, especially after the recent rapid development of LLMs [Fan and Luo 2020; Guo et al. 2023]. To ensure the quality of the natural language generation applications, multiple datasets and evaluation methods emerged to test the dialogue system from many different aspects [Hendrycks et al. 2020; Li et al. 2024b; Mehri et al. 2020; Wang et al. 2023a]. These testing and evaluations are generally based on human-annotated datasets and are conducted in reference-based scheme [Deriu et al. 2021]. However, most existing approaches are conducted in a single-turn way, i.e., feed dialogue system with a single input and examine if the output meets expectations. Besides, the acquisition of testing datasets remains difficult and expensive [Chen et al. 2021]. Another concerning phenomenon is that existing LLM training datasets are suspicious to have been contaminated, and the testing based on them might not effective as before [Mirzadeh et al. 2024].

On multi-turn testing, problems mentioned in single-turn testing are more serious. Multi-turn dialogue testing are not as abundant as single-turn ones [Sun et al. 2024]. According to recent survey [Chang et al. 2024], only 2 out of 46 evaluation datasets are multi-turn oriented. Oracle problem constantly troubles multi-turn dialogue system testers.

To mitigate the oracle problem, generating datasets through prompting LLMs become recent trend. Latest multi-turn testing focus on using LLM to generate test cases or invite LLMs function as judges to score the output of SUT [Bai et al. 2024; Duan et al. 2024; Kwan et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2023c; Zheng et al. 2023]. The disturbing point of using LLMs to generate test cases for LLM-based dialogue system testing is that LLMs are trained on massive datasets to converge and act normally, but testing requires test cases to be abnormal and diversified. Besides, the usage of LLM in testing and other software engineering tasks faces issues such as hallucination in test case generation, lack of diversity of test cases, non-deterministic threats, privacy leaks and bias in evaluation [Huang et al. 2024b; Ouyang et al. 2024]. These factors lead to the incomplete testing of LLM-based dialogue systems. As multi-turn testing tends to explore more defects than single turn testing [Li et al. 2024a; Yu et al. 2024], there exists a notable gap between current testing approaches and expectations to LLM-based dialogue systems.

2.2 Metamorphic testing

MT is first proposed by Chen et al in 1998 [Chen et al. 2020]. Over past development, MT has been widely used to solve the Oracle problem in software testing, especially for those low resource testing scenarios with limited availability of testing datasets [Segura et al. 2016]. The fundamental idea of MT is to build metamorphic relations (MRs) and generate follow-up test cases, then validate if the output of SUT with metamorphic test cases conflicts with expectation. The conflict shall be regarded as a bug of SUT.

According to recent researches, MT has been widely used in both testing traditional software systems and machine learning software systems [Chen et al. 2018; Zhang et al. 2020]. On testing dialogue systems, MT is promising in exploring more unique bugs with limited testing seeds [Chen et al. 2021; Hyun et al. 2024; Shen et al. 2022b]. However, there lacks best practice of applying MRs in multi-turn dialogue testing. Previous testing generally run in a single-turn manner. Few applied perturbations to dialogue data and run MT on dialogue system [Božić 2022; Liu et al. 2021; Tu et al. 2021], but the perturbations used are limited to lower-level including character-level, word-level, and sentence level. Dialogue-level perturbation has not been proposed for its intrinsic difficulty in modelling and implementation.

In summary, realising metamorphic testing for multi-turn dialogue system remains challenging for the following reasons:

- Relatively limited availability of multi-turn dialogue datasets
- Lack of well-designed context data model for dialogue-level perturbation
- Challenge of metamorphic relation building in multi-turn scenarios
- Difficulty in automation of test case generation and bug detection

To our knowledge, we are the first to systematically introduce dialogue-level metamorphic relations with implementation of effective metamorphic test case generation pipelines and metamorphic relation conflict detection in multi-turn dialogue testing.

3 APPROACH

Different from single-turn testing, having multi-turn dialogue requires higher level abilities, especially seeking information in context.

3.1 Problem formulation: dialogue as a test case

Given a dialogue data D_R with R rounds of question q and answer a :

$$D_R = \{q_r, a_r | r = 1, 2, \dots, R\}$$

where q and a be within natural language space \mathbb{N} . There, all questions form a question set $Q_R = \{q_1, \dots, q_R\}$, all answers form an answer set $A_R = \{a_1, \dots, a_R\}$, then dialogue data can also be represented as a union of Q_R and A_R :

$$D_R = \{Q_R, A_R\}$$

When having dialogues, human response H can be modelled as:

$$H(D_{r-1}, q_r) \rightarrow a_r$$

where q_r is the target question at round r ; D_{r-1} is the dialogue history of all previous rounds before round r , which contains context information. Specially, D_{r-1} will be empty when having the first round dialogue.

A dialogue system $DS(\cdot)$ generates response o when given context information and target question:

$$DS(D_{r-1}, q_r) \rightarrow o_r$$

With every question in Q_R and dialogue history feed into dialogue system, the output of dialogue system form a collection $O_R = \{o_1, \dots, o_R\}$. The target of dialogue system is to have human-like conversation with user, i.e. minimize the difference between $H(\cdot)$ and $DS(\cdot)$. Thus the quality evaluation task is implemented through measuring the difference of each output in O_R and human response in A_R . The smaller difference indicates better generation quality of dialogue system. In practice, if the difference exceed a preset threshold ϵ , an output o_* would be regarded unsatisfying and a bug is revealed.

The foregoing describes how a dialogue data can be used as test cases. In a more practical scenario, to comprehensively evaluate the dialogue system, the system tester would prepare a large testing dataset \mathbb{D} composed of M different dialogues:

$$\mathbb{D} = \{D_{R_1}^1, D_{R_2}^2, \dots, D_{R_M}^M\} = \{\{Q_{R_1}, A_{R_1}\}, \{Q_{R_2}, A_{R_2}\}, \dots, \{Q_{R_M}, A_{R_M}\}, \}$$

Each dialogue in \mathbb{D} can be used as a test case. Some well-designed dialogue datasets could measure the performance on specific ability-attribute of dialogue system.




Fig. 1. The workflow of MORTAR

3.2 Overview of MORTAR

As is shown in Fig. 1, given the original dialogue dataset, MORTAR first generates the question sequence of MT dataset questions with 5 dialogue-level perturbations (Section 3.3). Second, an answerability check on each round will verify the answerability of the question in each round and assign expected answers accordingly (Section 3.4) with LLM-based pipelines (Section 3.5). Finally, after running follow-up tests on LLM-based dialogue systems, MORTAR detects MR conflicts in generated outputs, which would be regarded as bugs of SUT.

3.3 Dialogue-level perturbations and metamorphic relations

Unlike previous perturbation from character-level, word-level and sentence-level [Božić 2022; Hyun et al. 2024; Liu et al. 2021], in MORTAR, dialogue-level perturbations are adopted. The crucial difference between single-turn testing and multi-turn testing lies in strong context reliance of multi-turn testing scenarios.

When testing with dialogue datasets, we expect the dialogue system to understand what the question in each round is asking about and generate the correct answer to the question. As ellipsis and anaphora phenomena widely exist in dialogues [Sun et al. 2024], it is necessary for the dialogue system to refer to information from context to resolve the current question. From the tester side, answer to all questions are clearly label in dataset. To ensure contextual consistency and solidity in reference resolution, questions in dialogue testing datasets are usually well-designed to remain answerable when incorrect answer exists in previous rounds if the ellipsis information in the current round question is resolved.

Given a multi-turn QA dialogue testing dataset, for each questions in it, we have following expectations to the SUT:

- A question in a dialogue should be correctly answered if the question itself or context contains sufficient information to resolve it.
- A questions in a dialogue should be answered with "Unknown" if insufficient information is provided to resolve it.

To ensure contextual consistency and solidity in reference resolution, questions in dialogue testing datasets are usually well-designed to remain answerable when incorrect answer exists in previous rounds if the ellipsis information in current round question is resolved. Humans answer multi-turn questions in a similar way of self-correction and context resolution. This brings

feasibility to dialogue-level perturbations. Unlike existing character-level, word-level and sentence-level perturbations, in the research, we propose dialogue-level perturbations to create new dialogues questions from original question set Q_R as follows:

- **Perturbation DS:** Dialogue round shuffle:

$$Q'_R = Shuffle(Q_R) = \{q_{r'} | r' = P_S(r), r = 1, 2, \dots, R\}$$

where $P_S(r)$ is a bijective mapping from original round index to shuffled round index.

- **Perturbation DR:** Dialogue round reduction:

$$Q'_{R-J} = Reduce(Q_R) = \{q_r | P_R(r) = True, r = 1, 2, \dots, R\}$$

where $P_R(r) : \{1, 2, \dots, R\} \rightarrow \{True, False\}$, $P_R(\cdot)$ decides whether a round is reduced in new dialogue with a preset reduction ratio, J is the amount of reduced rounds.

- **Perturbation DD:** Dialogue round duplication:

$$Q'_{R+K} = Duplicate(Q_R) = \{q_{r'} | r' = P_D(r), 1, 2, \dots, R\}$$

where $P_D(r) : \{1, 2, \dots, R\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, R + K\}$ is a mapping from original round index to new round index, $P_D(\cdot)$ decides whether a question will be duplicated in another round with a preset duplication ratio, K is the amount of extra rounds.

- **Perturbation DSR:** Dialogue round shuffle and reduction:

$$Q''_{R-J} = Reduce(Shuffle(Q_R))$$

where J is the amount of reduced rounds, Q''_{R-J} can be generated through the combination of round shuffle and reduction.

- **Perturbation DSD:** Dialogue round shuffle and duplication:

$$Q''_{R+K} = Duplicate(Shuffle(Q_R))$$

where K is the amount of duplicated rounds, Q''_{R+K} can be generated through the combination of round shuffle and duplicate.

If these perturbations are applied to dialogue testing dataset, the order and amount of rounds will be significantly changed. As the context information of each round might change as well, some questions will be unanswerable in perturbed dataset. When the SUT is tested with these unanswerable questions, we expect it to answer "unknown" or different answer when compared with original answers. In this sense, with these dialogue-level perturbation, we bring new challenge to dialogue systems and propose following metamorphic relations:

- **MR1: In a perturbed dialogue, all questions shall be answered with similar answers in the original dialogue, unless they are unanswerable.** All perturbations mentioned above can be applied in generating follow-up test cases under this MR. Take **DD** for example, a target question in original dialogue and perturbed dialogue with same coverage of necessary information in context, indicating same answerability and shall be answered with semantically similar answers. With **DR**, some important ellipsis information might be explicitly declared in a previous round. If that critical round is reduced in perturbed dialogue, all following questions with reference to that information will become unanswerable. In practice, we expect "unknown" if a question under certain context is unanswerable.
- **MR2: In different perturbed dialogue testing, same question with same answerability shall be answered with similar answers.** Take **DD** for example, some questions are selected as duplication and will be asked in another round within the extended dialogue. If the same question in different rounds or in other perturbed dataset have same answerability,

i.e. have same necessary information coverage in context, they shall be answered with similar semantic answers.

- **MR3: In different perturbed dialogue testing, same question with different answerability shall be answered differently.** Take **DSD** for example, a target question is selected as duplication and used in different rounds. As the dialogue goes, necessary information for target question’s resolution might be completely covered in context information after a critical round. Before and after the critical round, the answerability of target question is different, thus different semantic answers are expected. The same question with different answerability in other perturbed dataset can also be used to detect the conflict to this MR.

3.4 Answerability check and expected answers in perturbed dialogue

Questions in a dialogue generally have reliance on context. Some information is missing in a question so that answering it independently is not feasible. Retrieving information in context and resolving the current question is a natural language processing problem: anaphora and coreference resolution. Anaphora is defined as *phenomenon of pointing back a previously mentioned item in the text*. [Mitkov 2022]. Coreference is a broader scope than anaphora that pay extra attention to more sophisticated scenarios. They are both crucial for full context understanding [Sukthanker et al. 2020]. In perturbed dialogues, the answerability check is based on solving the anaphora resolution problem.

To judge if a question in perturbed dialogue is answerable, we propose 2 answerability check methods: semantic-based resolution check and ontology-based resolution check. If one of the checks indicated positive, the question is regarded as answerable in that round, and the original answer will be expected.

Semantic-based resolution check: If a question contains implied information which explicitly declared in previous rounds, the question will become unanswerable if perturbation caused inaccessibility of the source information. Pronouns are typical anaphora in sentences. End-to-end models have shown good performance in pronoun resolution task [Mao et al. 2024]. Semantic-based resolution check aim to use coreference end-to-end models to extract pronoun-resolution information reliance within the dialogue, especially within the question sentence.




Fig. 2. Ontology-based answerability check procedure

Ontology-based resolution check: Semantic-based resolution check’s performance of handling domain-specific short sentence is not satisfying in our preliminary practice. To improve answerability check performance, we additionally use knowledge graph-based dialogue information model to realize ontology-based resolution check. We regard all entities and relation involved in the whole dialogue’s utterance to form a whole knowledge graph $G(V, E)$. Before the occurrence of first round, the context information graph $G_0(V_0, E_0)$ is empty. As shown in Fig. 2, as the dialogue

testing progresses, entities and relations in a round are extracted and added to context information graph, such that next round's context information graph will contain information extracted from previous rounds as reference.

In round r , the entities and relations in original question is $G_r(V_r, E_r)$. The question can be filled with information to become independently answerable, the entities and relations in this independently answerable question is $G_{\bar{r}}(V_{\bar{r}}, E_{\bar{r}})$. All entities and relations explicitly mentioned in previous rounds before round r is $G_r^{Context} = (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{r-1})$. If $G_r = G_{\bar{r}}$, the original question contains all information and can be answered independently, namely self-resolvable. If $G_r \subset G_{\bar{r}}$, the original question is not self-resolvable and need additional information for resolution. If the missed information appear in context information: $G_{\bar{r}} \setminus G_r \subseteq G_r^{Context}$, the original question remain answerable, namely context-resolved.




Fig. 3. Ontology-based answerability check procedure

The implementation of ontology-based answerability check is shown in Fig. 3. To judge whether target question "Which country grow it the most?", we use question decontextualization tool to form full question, and use information extraction (IE) tool to extract context graph, target question graph and full question graph. It can be observed that the word "it" in original question indicates the entity *Plant: Tea*, and this entity is the complement entity for full question. In the context graph, entity *Plant: Tea* has been explicitly mentioned, so that the word "it" in target question can be resolved, and the target question can be answerable, we generate expected answer "India" to it, which is the annotated answer in original dialogue dataset. For another sample question "When did he take it?", do question decontextualization in original dataset will get full question "When did Shen Nong take the tea?", the complement entities consists of the entity *Plant: Tea* and *Person: Shen Nong*. As the entity *Person: Shen Nong* does not exist in context graph, to resolve the word "he" in

this question is not feasible, thus this question is unanswerable. An expected answer of "Unknown" will be additionally filled in perturbed dialogue dataset.

Dataset-specified additional resolution check: for reading comprehension datasets, additional semantic-based resolution check will be added. Such that even if a pronoun has never been mentioned in context, as long as it is used in the story, this pronoun will be regarded resolvable, namely story-resolvable. For question in Fig. 3, although the entity *Person: Shen Nong* does not exist in current round's context information graph, if *Shen Nong* is referred as "he" in the story document, the question might remain answerable if this is the only missing information from context. This resolution check simulated a smart reader searching information from the story and give the most potential answer to a question.

Above answerability check guides the generation of expected answer. If a question can pass any resolution check, it is an answerable question, and the originally annotated answer will be filled as expected answer. If the question can not pass any resolution check, it will be tagged unanswerable, and "Unknown" will be additionally filled as an expected answer. In this way, the whole perturbed dialogue dataset can be generated. The metamorphic testing dataset generation is illustrated in Fig. 4.




Fig. 4. Diagram of metamorphic test dataset generation in MORTAR

3.5 Information Extraction and Multi-functional LLM-based Pipelines

Inspired by GraphRAG and EDC approach for knowledge graph construction[[Edge et al. 2024](#); [Zhang and Soh 2024](#)], a series of expert-designed prompts (see [Appendix](#)) are used to process dialogue data. With these prompt templates, we implemented a set of Multi-functional LLM-based pipelines with following functions:

- **Declarative information extraction:** input: dialogue data, output: declarative sentences, function: turn each round of dialogue into a declarative sentence.
- **Question Decontextualization:** input: dialogue data, output: filled dialogue data, function: turn each question and answer into an independently understandable sentence
- **Topic Extraction:** input: document, output: topic sentence, function: extract the topic of a document e.g., dialogue data.
- **Entity Type Extraction:** input: declarative sentences, topic sentence, output: List of entity types, function: extract a list of entity types from a document
- **Graph Extraction:** input: document topic, document, entity types, output: list of entities with description, list of relations with description, function: given document with its topic

and entity types, extract all entities from entity types, and relation between entities, each entity and relation will also be given a description

- **Dialogue Round Graph:** input: all entities, all relations, dialogue data, output: entities and relations in each question and answer, function: choose entities and relations involved in each question and answer from provided entities and relations.
- **Canonicalisation:** input: all entities, all entity types, name of target entity, output: group of entities, function: canonicalisation, determine whether target entity is a group of existing entities. If no matches, return the entity and most possible entity type.




Fig. 5. Information Extraction Procedure with Multi-functional LLM pipelines

As is shown in Fig. 5, declarative information is first extracted, then it is used to extract dialogue topic and entity types. With declarative information, dialogue topic and entity types, whole graph with all entities and relation mentioned in the dialogue is extracted. Later, with each round’s decontextualised sentences, we extract a subgraph of each round from the whole graph. Finally, canonicalisation will filter if an unexpected entity is an alias of an existing entity or a group of exist entities, and will update the whole graph if it is an omitted entity. Such process handles potential unexpected generation of LLM-based pipelines.

4 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we introduce the research questions (RQs), setting of experiments, including baseline methods, dataset, SUTs, and other implementation details.

4.1 Research Questions

Our experiments try to answer following research questions:

RQ 1: How effective is the ontology-based answerability check procedure of MORTAR? As this the core function of MORTAR which tags answerability for questions and guides the generation

of expected answers, it is crucial to investigate the function quality of it. In this RQ, we focus on the quality of generated test dataset, more specifically, investigate if questions are correctly tagged with answerability generated in MORTAR, and answers are correct in generated dialogue test cases. We report how much a human agrees with the (a) answerability check results and (b) generated answer in a sample of perturbed datasets.

RQ 2: Is MORTAR effective in detecting bugs in different dialogue systems? In this RQ, we investigate and compare the performance of MORTAR in detecting bugs in dialogue system based on LLMs with different source and parameter size to validate the effectiveness of MORTAR.

RQ 3: How does MORTAR compare against state of the art MT approaches in detecting bugs in dialogues systems? In this RQ, we compare the effectiveness of MORTAR in terms of detecting bugs compared to the baseline approach, to verify the performance advantage of MORTAR in dialogue system testing.

4.2 Detect Bugs in Dialogue Systems

Before testing starts, the description of requirements will be send to dialogue system. One special requirement is that if dialogue system find a question is ambiguous and unanswerable, answer with "Unknown". After feeding the question sequence and dialogue history to SUT, we get the output O . With another dialogue testing dataset, we obtain O' . For each (o, o') pair, we first get embedding vector respectively, then measure the similarity with cosine function. Besides, we additionally use exact match score, and F1 score as part of the comparison.

We calculate the dynamic average score among semantic similarity SS , exact match score EM and F1 score $F1$ as the mixed similarity score (MSS):

$$MSS = w_{SS} * SS + w_{EM} * EM + w_{F1} * F1$$

The weight is determined by their respective proportion in the total score, take w_{SS} for example: $w_{SS} = SS / (SS + EM + F1)$, and all weights sum up 1: $w_{SS} + w_{EM} + w_{F1} = 1$. MSS comprehensively consider the all metric member and add punishment to wordy answers, such that short and precise answers can be distinguished. To be short and precise is also a requirement described to SUTs during testing. When applied in detecting bugs with MR2 and MR3, MSS is capable of amplifying the difference between two utterances. During testing, if MSS is lower than a preset threshold ϵ , they will be regarded as different.

In MR1, after we assign expected answer to perturbed question sequence, for a question from original dialogue remain answerable in perturbed dialogue, the MSS between pre-annotated answer and generated answer shall be larger than ϵ_a , or the MR is conflicted. In MR2, if a question have same answerability in two or more perturbed dialogues, MSS of these generated answer below ϵ_b indicates conflict to MR2. For MR3, for the answers generated from same question with different answerability, any two different answerability question's generated answers' MSS being above ϵ_b indicates conflict to MR3. To test with MR1 requires for annotated answer; to test with MR2 and MR3 does not require annotated answer, it is conducted through analysing the results between perturbed dialogues.

Using the dialogue-level perturbations and answerability check procedure, MORTAR generates more follow-up dialogue test cases. The mechanism of MORTAR enables it to be capable of generating massive test cases based on original dataset. Through comprehensive testing in multi-turn scenario, the defects in SUT are expected to be revealed.

Table 1. Summary of MORTAR generated test datasets with the different perturbations described in Section 3.3

	DS	DR	DD	DSR	DSD
Total rounds	6423	4598	7625	4598	7625
Unanswerable rounds	108	59	77	88	152
Total dialogues	403	403	403	403	403
Dialogue with unanswerable questions	79	48	51	74	88
Ratio of dialogue with unanswerable questions	19.6%	11.9%	12.7%	18.4%	21.8%

4.3 Experiment Environment

The local machine is equipped with a 6-core processor, 64GB memory and an RTX 3090 GPU. The system runs Ubuntu 24.04 LTS and Python 3.9. Groq² is an LLM inference cloud service provider. Their API provides rapid LLM inference with model size up to 90 billion parameters. In MORTAR, the testing for open source LLM-based dialogue system is conducted locally, the model files are provided by Hugging Face³. Using the model files, we implemented a series dialogue systems powered by LLMs with different source and model size. The LLM-based pipelines are implemented with Groq inference API as the computing capacity of our local machine is insufficient for proposed tasks.

4.4 Baseline, Dataset and SUT

In METAL [Hyun et al. 2024], among the most effective perturbations, synonym-replacement (SYR), convert-to-leet-format (L33t), and introduce-typos (Typo) as chosen baselines. Synonym-replacement is the most effective perturbation in most tasks in METAL, similar effectiveness is also observed with DialTest [Liu et al. 2021]. Convert-to-leet-format is also one of the most effective perturbations and top-3 effective perturbation in most tasks in METAL. Introduce-typos is another top-3 effective perturbation in most tasks in METAL. These three perturbations are expected to bring no semantic interference to original sentence, but add noise to understanding. We intend to use the evaluation set of CoQA [Reddy et al. 2019] as testing seed. After validation the evaluation module of MORTAR on original dataset, 97 original dialogues are filtered out for misaligned extraction results or judgements, and the rest 403 dialogues are sent for later processing. After applying perturbations from MORTAR: DS, DR, DD, DSR, DSD, we obtained a series follow-up dialogue test cases. According to Table. 1, based on 403 rounds of original dialogues with 6423 rounds, MORTAR totally generated 2015 follow-up testing dialogues with 30869 rounds. There, all 30869 rounds can be used for bug detection with MR1, 6242 rounds can be used for bug detection with MR2, 181 rounds can be used for bug detection with MR3.

As reported before [Hyun et al. 2024], the baseline approach sometimes bring too much noise to the original sentence and cause poor readability. We filtered out the perturbed utterances whose semantic cosine similarity to original question is less than 0.8, similarity below this threshold indicates the question’s semantic has changed, thus we revert them to original utterances. Using perturbations from METAL: SYR, L33t and Typo, we obtain totally 1209 testing dialogues with 19269 rounds, there 4755 rounds are perturbed, result is shown in Table 2.

We choose six popular open-source LLMs as the core of dialogue systems: Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct [AI@Meta 2024], Gemma-2-9b-it [Team 2024], Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3 [Mistral 2024], Qwen2-7B-Instruct, Qwen2-1.5B-Instruct, Qwen2-0.5B-Instruct [Yang et al. 2024]. These models

²<https://groq.com/>

³<https://huggingface.co/models>

Table 2. Summary of METAL generated test datasets.

	SYR	L33t	Typo
Total Rounds	6423	6423	6423
Perturbed rounds	1459	2425	871
Total Dialogues	403	403	403
Dialogues with perturbation	385	343	307
Ratio of dialogues with perturbations	95.5%	76.2%	85.1%

are all instruct fine-tuned, their size ranged from 0.5 to 9 billion parameters. These models are divided into two groups: the first group is composed of Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct, Gemma-2-9b-it, Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3, and Qwen2-7B-Instruct. They are all popular and recently published language models with similar model size. The second group is composed of Qwen2-7B-Instruct, Qwen2-1.5B-Instruct, and Qwen2-0.5B-Instruct. They are same sourced models with different parameter size. With wrapping and pipeline accessories, we simulate user having multi-turn dialogue with LLM-based dialogue systems. We feed the SUTs with question sequence in the metamorphic test case along with dialogue history in previous rounds, then collect the generated answer to analyse response quality. The conflict to metamorphic relation indicates the dialogue system is potentially buggy in specific scenario, and further system development or patching is necessary for performance improvements.

4.5 Implementation Details

To implement semantic-based resolution check, we use Spacy⁴ and coreferee pipeline to analyse the anaphora resolution from question sentence and story. In Perturbation 2 and 4, 30% rounds are randomly chosen to be dropped. In Perturbation 3 and 5, 20% rounds are randomly chosen to be duplicated. The sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2⁵ model is used to calculate semantic vector. To measure conflict to MR, ϵ_a and ϵ_b are both setup to 0.6. The whole experiments used approximately 7 million tokens for LLM-based pipelines. According the pricing plan of Groq, the cost of test data generation is estimated to be under 5 dollars, which is likely to be affordable for the broad dialogue system testers.

5 RESULTS

5.1 Answer to RQ1

In this RQ, we evaluate whether the generated test cases are reasonable and correctly labelled with respect to answerability and answers. As no lower-level perturbation is used in MORTAR, the question sentences are naturally human generated, thus other verifications are not necessary. To verify the test case quality of MORTAR, we manually checked 326 questions answerability from generated datasets. Half of them are extracted from randomly chosen dialogues with unanswerable questions, the other half are extracted from randomly chosen dialogues without unanswerable questions. We also acted as the SUT and collected human performance in answering randomly selected 109 sample questions from original dataset and perturbed dataset.

Table. 3 summarises the result of answerability manual check. We calculate the Cohen’s Kappa and obtain 0.6, indicating good agreement between the answer of generated test case and manual check results. The LLM-based dialogue information processing pipelines managed to extract context

⁴<https://spacy.io/>

⁵<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2>

Table 3. Manual Answerability Check Results

		Manual Check	
		Answerable	Unanswerable
Annotation	Answerable	293	10
	Unanswerable	9	14

Table 4. Human Performance on Sampled Test Cases

	Original	Perturbed
MSS	0.839	0.811
Performance Drop	0.00%	-3.82%

Table 5. Bug Detection with MORTAR

	Qwen2-0.5B	Qwen2-1.5B	Qwen2-7B	Mistral-7B	Llama-3-8B	Gemma-2-9B
MR1	27219	23361	22331	21337	14703	11008
MR2	6152	6043	4817	4388	4344	3328
MR3	69	99	124	162	141	145

Table 6. Bug Detection with MR1 and Different Perturbations

	Original			DS			DR			DD			DSR			DSD		
	MSS	BugS	Rate	MSS	BugS	Rate	MSS	BugS	Rate	MSS	BugS	Rate	MSS	BugS	Rate	MSS	BugS	Rate
Qwen2-0.5B	0.317	0.244	0.874	0.298	0.235	0.894	0.325	0.242	0.858	0.312	0.237	0.875	0.310	0.237	0.876	0.294	0.233	0.896
Qwen2-1.5B	0.420	0.278	0.754	0.411	0.267	0.757	0.420	0.273	0.748	0.400	0.267	0.771	0.422	0.268	0.742	0.409	0.264	0.757
Qwen2-7B	0.476	0.314	0.701	0.446	0.295	0.731	0.480	0.312	0.692	0.462	0.306	0.718	0.461	0.289	0.702	0.430	0.294	0.755
Mistral-7B	0.473	0.311	0.693	0.473	0.304	0.689	0.460	0.308	0.711	0.483	0.311	0.678	0.455	0.302	0.709	0.473	0.303	0.684
Llama-3-8B	0.651	0.337	0.430	0.603	0.309	0.497	0.622	0.318	0.463	0.648	0.326	0.433	0.591	0.305	0.510	0.605	0.307	0.490
Gemma-2-9B	0.753	0.345	0.284	0.676	0.306	0.388	0.744	0.335	0.298	0.728	0.331	0.317	0.692	0.306	0.367	0.664	0.296	0.399

information and verify the answerability. In addition to measuring the agreement, we also manually measured human performance on sampled datasets. As is shown in Table 4, on original dataset, human reached MSS of 0.839 on original dataset sample and 0.811 on perturbed dataset sample. Human performance indicates the difficulty is increased after dialogue-level perturbations are applied. We expect dialogue system to be capable of answering perturbed dialogues as human could achieve.

Answer to RQ1: MORTAR can produce high quality yet challenging dialogue test cases.

5.2 Answer to RQ2

In this RQ, we study the bug reveal performance of MORTAR when testing different SUTs. The sensitivity of different SUTs to different perturbation will be reported. In dialogue testing, a bug is reported one generated answer in dialogue conflicts to any MR. If triggered by different data seed (original dialogue round), they will be regarded as different bugs.




Fig. 6. Bug detection rate of different MRs on different LLM-based dialogue systems

As shown in Table 5, MORTAR successfully detected a considerable amount of bugs of SUTs. The bug detection ratio (Bug Rate) is shown in Fig. 6. In group 1 with 4 similar sized LLMs with different source, dialogue system based on Gemma-2-9B reached least MR1 conflict. The MR2 conflict ratio of 4 SUTs are at the same level between 70% and 80%. In group 2 with 3 same sourced LLMs with different model size, bugs detected by MR1 and MR2 decreases with the increment of model size. All SUTs performance under MR1 is reported in Table 6. There, MSS is the average score of dialogue system output in specific dataset. BugS is the average score of buggy output. Column Rate shows bug detection rate with MR1. It can be observed that larger sized model has better robustness under noised situations. However, it is inspiring to find bug detected by MR3 increases as the model size increases.

Above result supports out answer to RQ2. First, for dialogue system with smaller LLMs, testing with MR1 and MR2 could reveal large amount of bugs. Second, for dialogue systems with larger models, testing with MR3 is more effective than others. This testing results confirm that larger LLMs contain more knowledge and have better information retrieval capability. The increased bug detection performance with MR3 drive us to anticipate the training data of these models are possibly contaminated by development set of CoQA, and LLM tend to retrieve from its knowledge space rather than reasoning from context. Nevertheless, MORTAR still successfully detected considerable bugs with limited data seeds. In general, MORTAR can realise substantial defect exploration performance in testing all SUTs in scope regardless of LLMs' source or size.

Answer to RQ2: MORTAR can effectively explore bugs on all SUTs in scope.

5.3 Answer to RQ3

In this RQ, we validate whether MORTAR reveals more unique defects. The latest MT approaches test LLM-based dialogue systems using miscellaneous lower-level perturbations. Some of them are regarded as effective in detecting SUT defects. We test different SUTs with MORTAR and approaches from METAL (SYR, L33t and Typo). As shown in Table 7, METAL is effective in most

scenarios. However, larger LLMs are likely to be slightly immune to perturbations introduced by METAL.

Besides, the MSS of detected bug is relatively higher than MORTAR detected. It indicates MORTAR might be able to find more severe bugs than METAL. Thus we analysed the top critical bugs whose MSS below 0.05 discovered by METAL and MORTAR. As shown in Figure 7, more unique severe bugs can be exposed with MORTAR. Besides, as model size increases, bugs detected by METAL decreases two times faster than MORTAR. Indicating MORTAR is potentially more effective when testing larger LLM-based dialogue systems. Considering the fact that METAL is the most effective LLM testing framework, MORTAR is capable of revealing more bugs in SUTs, especially for those severe bugs that might significantly affect user experience. Multi-turn perturbations are more effective than single-turn perturbations in revealing defects of LLM-based dialogue systems.

Table 7. Bug Detection with METAL Perturbations

	SYR			Typo			L33t		
	MSS	BugS	Rate	MSS	BugS	Rate	MSS	BugS	Rate
Qwen2-0.5B	0.317	0.241	0.875	0.315	0.240	0.872	0.318	0.241	0.868
Qwen2-1.5B	0.408	0.273	0.766	0.426	0.275	0.740	0.411	0.280	0.769
Qwen2-7B	0.454	0.312	0.732	0.486	0.315	0.684	0.464	0.314	0.719
Mistral-7B	0.458	0.307	0.709	0.474	0.313	0.69	0.464	0.312	0.707
Llama-3-8B	0.654	0.334	0.422	0.649	0.336	0.432	0.652	0.336	0.427
Gemma-2-9B	0.742	0.342	0.301	0.751	0.344	0.285	0.753	0.347	0.282




Fig. 7. Critical bugs found by MORTAR and METAL

Answer to RQ3: MORTAR has better defect exploratory performance than the most effective MT approach in dialogue testing.

6 THREATS TO VALIDITY

Internal Threats. As the inference process of LLMs might not be fully deterministic, although we set most temperature to zero in LLM-based pipelines, the SUTs and LLM-based pipelines might perform slightly different in replications. The data seed might originally contain mistakenly labelled answers.

External Threats. The perturbations MORTAR used might not be suitable for all datasets. Due to the limited computing power and time, we are unable to exhaustively test all LLM-based dialogue systems. In future work, we will design more complex dialogue testing schemes with MORTAR and explore more defects.

7 RELATED WORK

7.1 Test Dialogue Systems

Current dialogue test seeds are generally from human-generated datasets and LLM-generated datasets. SQuAD and SQuAD 2.0 are classic single-turn QA datasets that have been widely used

for training and testing of QA systems [Rajpurkar 2016; Rajpurkar et al. 2018]. CoQA dataset is a free-form multi-turn conversational QA dataset with unanswerable questions [Reddy et al. 2019]. MuTual is a multi-turn reasoning-based dialogue dataset in open-domain [Cui et al. 2020]. MT-Bench is a 2-turn open-end dialogue dataset that is used to evaluate chatbot’s conversation performance [Zheng et al. 2023]. The "LLM-as-a-judge" approach is reported as feasible when comparing strong LLM’s alignment with human preference. Later, using LLM to generate test cases become a recent trend [Bai et al. 2024; Kwan et al. 2024; Sun et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2023c]. However, it is worth noting that the "LLM-as-a-judge" approach comes with intrinsic shortcomings e.g., self-enhancement [Zheng et al. 2023], bias [Huang et al. 2024a]. Using LLM in SE also suffers from non-deterministic threat [Ouyang et al. 2024]. Besides, training data contamination is gathering increasing attention [Mirzadeh et al. 2024]. The area calls for more complete and reliable testing for dialogue systems.

7.2 Information Extraction

Information extraction (IE) is a classic task of natural language processing. Many downstream applications undertake IE before sophisticated pattern analysis. The extracted information can be used for dialogue management [Chen et al. 2023], test case generation [Li et al. 2024b], summarisation [Edge et al. 2024], and many other tasks. It is observed that LLM-based IE approaches are capable of more flexibility and better extraction performance [Wei et al. 2023; Zhang and Soh 2024]. In this paper, we use LLM-based IE approach along with semantic-guided anaphora resolution to extract dialogue question’s context reliance and tag the answerability of questions in perturbed dialogues.

7.3 Metamorphic Testing

To alleviate the oracle problem in software testing, MT was first introduced in 1998 [Chen et al. 2020]. Later and up to now, metamorphic test is commonly used in both traditional software systems [Zhuang et al. 2023] and machine learning systems [Chen et al. 2021; Wang et al. 2023b; Xie et al. 2011]. The value of metamorphic testing is that it could be used to handles low-resource testing scenarios [Chen et al. 2018], and is potential for testing GenAI systems [Aleti 2023]. Specifically, METAL framework using utterance perturbations to evaluate LLMs from attribute aspects [Hyun et al. 2024]. Ontology-based MT provides concrete test cases but failed to explore more unique defects in task-oriented dialogue systems [Božić 2022]. KGIT use knowledge graphs as test seeds and build a metamorphic testing-based scheme to implement large-scale inference tests [Wang et al. 2024]. Drowzee use metamorphic testing and constrain logic programming to detect hallucination in LLMs [Li et al. 2024b]. DialTest use a set of metamorphic relations to effectively generate test cases for dialogue systems [Liu et al. 2021]. Existing MT approaches lack systematically analysis and usage to dialogue-level perturbations and multi-turn dialogue test case generation. Multi-turn dialogue testing remains challenging.

8 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

In this research, a multi-turn dialogue system testing approach, MORTAR, is proposed to mitigate the oracle problem in dialogue system testing. The result shows MORTAR is capable of superior performance in revelling bugs in LLM-based dialogue systems. When exploring severe bugs with existing dialogue datasets, MORTAR detects up to 4 times more unique bugs than the most effective MT approach for LLMs. In the future, MORTAR is expected to inspire both dialogue system development of LLM training (dialogue data synthetic) and testing (especially for domain-specific dialogue systems with limited test dataset). There exists considerable space for performance improvement in information extraction and answerability check pipelines, and higher accuracy

is expected to be reached with more prompt tuning techniques. We also intend to design more MRs and integrate dialogue-level perturbation with others to realize better defect exploratory performance of dialogue systems.

APPENDIX

Prompt Templates Used in LLM-based Pipelines

Fig. 8 shows all prompt templates used in the LLM-based pipelines.

The figure displays eight distinct prompt templates arranged in a grid. Each template is enclosed in a box with a title and detailed instructions for the LLM. The templates are: Declarative Information Extraction, Entity Type Extraction, Canonicalisation, Question Decontextualization, Graph Extraction, Dialogue Round Graph, and Topic Extraction. Each prompt includes specific goals, steps, and examples to guide the model's output.

Fig. 8. All Prompts templates used in LLM-based pipeline

REFERENCES

AI@Meta. 2024. Llama 3 Model Card. (2024). https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md

Aldeida Aleti. 2023. Software Testing of Generative AI Systems: Challenges and Opportunities. In *2023 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering: Future of Software Engineering (ICSE-FoSE)*. 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE-FoSE59343.2023.00009>

- Atheer Algherairy and Moataz Ahmed. 2024. A review of dialogue systems: current trends and future directions. *Neural Computing and Applications* 36, 12 (2024), 6325–6351.
- Ge Bai, Jie Liu, Xingyuan Bu, Yancheng He, Jiaheng Liu, Zhanhui Zhou, Zhuoran Lin, Wenbo Su, Tiezheng Ge, Bo Zheng, and Wanli Ouyang. 2024. MT-Bench-101: A Fine-Grained Benchmark for Evaluating Large Language Models in Multi-Turn Dialogues. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 7421–7454. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.401>
- Josip Božić. 2022. Ontology-based metamorphic testing for chatbots. *Software Quality Journal* 30, 1 (2022), 227–251.
- Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. 2024. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* 15, 3 (2024), 1–45.
- Songqiang Chen, Shuo Jin, and Xiaoyuan Xie. 2021. Testing your question answering software via asking recursively. In *2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 104–116.
- Tsong Y Chen, Shing C Cheung, and Shiu Ming Yiu. 2020. Metamorphic testing: a new approach for generating next test cases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.12543* (2020).
- Tsong Yueh Chen, Fei-Ching Kuo, Huai Liu, Pak-Lok Poon, Dave Towey, TH Tse, and Zhi Quan Zhou. 2018. Metamorphic testing: A review of challenges and opportunities. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 51, 1 (2018), 1–27.
- Zhi Chen, Yuncong Liu, Lu Chen, Su Zhu, Mengyue Wu, and Kai Yu. 2023. Opal: Ontology-aware pretrained language model for end-to-end task-oriented dialogue. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 11 (2023), 68–84.
- Leyang Cui, Yu Wu, Shujie Liu, Yue Zhang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. MuTual: A Dataset for Multi-Turn Dialogue Reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 1406–1416.
- Jan Deriu, Alvaro Rodrigo, Arantxa Otegi, Guillermo Echegoyen, Sophie Rosset, Eneko Agirre, and Mark Cieliebak. 2021. Survey on evaluation methods for dialogue systems. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 54 (2021), 755–810.
- Haodong Duan, Jueqi Wei, Chonghua Wang, Hongwei Liu, Yixiao Fang, Songyang Zhang, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. 2024. BotChat: Evaluating LLMs’ Capabilities of Having Multi-Turn Dialogues. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Mexico City, Mexico, 3184–3200. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-naacl.201>
- Darren Edge, Ha Trinh, Newman Cheng, Joshua Bradley, Alex Chao, Apurva Mody, Steven Truitt, and Jonathan Larson. 2024. From local to global: A graph rag approach to query-focused summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16130* (2024).
- Yifan Fan and Xudong Luo. 2020. A survey of dialogue system evaluation. In *2020 IEEE 32nd International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI)*. IEEE, 1202–1209.
- Zishan Guo, Renren Jin, Chuang Liu, Yufei Huang, Dan Shi, Linhao Yu, Yan Liu, Jiaxuan Li, Bojian Xiong, Deyi Xiong, et al. 2023. Evaluating large language models: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19736* (2023).
- 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* (2020).
- Hui Huang, Yingqi Qu, Jing Liu, Muyun Yang, and Tiejun Zhao. 2024a. An empirical study of llm-as-a-judge for llm evaluation: Fine-tuned judge models are task-specific classifiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02839* (2024).
- Hui Huang, Yingqi Qu, Hongli Zhou, Jing Liu, Muyun Yang, Bing Xu, and Tiejun Zhao. 2024b. On the Limitations of Fine-tuned Judge Models for LLM Evaluation. *arXiv:2403.02839* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.02839>
- Sangwon Hyun, Mingyu Guo, and M Ali Babar. 2024. METAL: Metamorphic Testing Framework for Analyzing Large-Language Model Qualities. In *2024 IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST)*. IEEE, 117–128.
- Wai-Chung Kwan, Xingshan Zeng, Yuxin Jiang, Yufei Wang, Liangyou Li, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, and Kam-Fai Wong. 2024. MT-Eval: A Multi-Turn Capabilities Evaluation Benchmark for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16745* (2024).
- Nathaniel Li, Ziwen Han, Ian Steneker, Willow Primack, Riley Goodside, Hugh Zhang, Zifan Wang, Cristina Menghini, and Summer Yue. 2024a. Llm defenses are not robust to multi-turn human jailbreaks yet. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.15221* (2024).
- Ningke Li, Yuekang Li, Yi Liu, Ling Shi, Kailong Wang, and Haoyu Wang. 2024b. Drowzee: Metamorphic Testing for Fact-Conflicting Hallucination Detection in Large Language Models. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 8, OOPSLA2, Article 336 (Oct. 2024), 30 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3689776>
- Zixi Liu, Yang Feng, and Zhenyu Chen. 2021. DialTest: automated testing for recurrent-neural-network-driven dialogue systems. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 115–126.
- Rui Mao, Kai He, Xulang Zhang, Guanyi Chen, Jinjie Ni, Zonglin Yang, and Erik Cambria. 2024. A survey on semantic processing techniques. *Information Fusion* 101 (2024), 101988.
- Shikib Mehri, Mihail Eric, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. 2020. Dialoglue: A natural language understanding benchmark for task-oriented dialogue. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13570* (2020).

- Iman Mirzadeh, Keivan Alizadeh, Hooman Shahrokhi, Oncel Tuzel, Samy Bengio, and Mehrdad Farajtabar. 2024. Gsm-symbolic: Understanding the limitations of mathematical reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05229* (2024).
- Mistral. 2024. Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3 model. <https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3>
- Ruslan Mitkov. 2022. *The Oxford handbook of computational linguistics*. Oxford university press.
- Shuyin Ouyang, Jie M. Zhang, Mark Harman, and Meng Wang. 2024. An Empirical Study of the Non-determinism of ChatGPT in Code Generation. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.* (Sept. 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3697010> Just Accepted.
- P Rajpurkar. 2016. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05250* (2016).
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. 2018. Know What You Don't Know: Unanswerable Questions for SQuAD. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 784–789.
- Siva Reddy, Danqi Chen, and Christopher D Manning. 2019. Coqa: A conversational question answering challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 7 (2019), 249–266.
- David Rein, Betty Li Hou, Asa Cooper Stickland, Jackson Petty, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Julien Dirani, Julian Michael, and Samuel R Bowman. 2023. Gpqa: A graduate-level google-proof q&a benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12022* (2023).
- Sergio Segura, Gordon Fraser, Ana B Sanchez, and Antonio Ruiz-Cortés. 2016. A survey on metamorphic testing. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering* 42, 9 (2016), 805–824.
- ShareGPT. 2023. ShareGPT Data. https://huggingface.co/datasets/anon8231489123/ShareGPT_Vicuna_unfiltered Accessed: 2024-10-29.
- Qingchao Shen, Junjie Chen, Jie M Zhang, Haoyu Wang, Shuang Liu, and Menghan Tian. 2022a. Natural test generation for precise testing of question answering software. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 1–12.
- Qingchao Shen, Junjie Chen, Jie M Zhang, Haoyu Wang, Shuang Liu, and Menghan Tian. 2022b. Natural test generation for precise testing of question answering software. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 1–12.
- Rhea Sukthanker, Soujanya Poria, Erik Cambria, and Ramkumar Thirunavukarasu. 2020. Anaphora and coreference resolution: A review. *Information Fusion* 59 (2020), 139–162.
- Yuchong Sun, Che Liu, Kun Zhou, Jinwen Huang, Ruihua Song, Wayne Xin Zhao, Fuzheng Zhang, Di Zhang, and Kun Gai. 2024. Parrot: Enhancing multi-turn instruction following for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 9729–9750.
- Gemma Team. 2024. Gemma. (2024). <https://doi.org/10.34740/KAGGLE/M/3301>
- Kaiyi Tu, Mingyue Jiang, and Zuohua Ding. 2021. A metamorphic testing approach for assessing question answering systems. *Mathematics* 9, 7 (2021), 726.
- Boxin Wang, Weixin Chen, Hengzhi Pei, Chulin Xie, Mintong Kang, Chenhui Zhang, Chejian Xu, Zidi Xiong, Ritik Dutta, Rylan Schaeffer, et al. 2023a. DecodingTrust: A Comprehensive Assessment of Trustworthiness in GPT Models.. In *NeurIPS*.
- Jun Wang, Yanhui Li, Zhifei Chen, Lin Chen, Xiaofang Zhang, and Yuming Zhou. 2024. Knowledge Graph Driven Inference Testing for Question Answering Software. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–13.
- Wenxuan Wang, Jen-tse Huang, Weibin Wu, Jianping Zhang, Yizhan Huang, Shuqing Li, Pinjia He, and Michael R Lyu. 2023b. Mttm: Metamorphic testing for textual content moderation software. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2387–2399.
- Xingyao Wang, Zihan Wang, Jiateng Liu, Yangyi Chen, Lifan Yuan, Hao Peng, and Heng Ji. 2023c. Mint: Evaluating llms in multi-turn interaction with tools and language feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10691* (2023).
- Xiang Wei, Xingyu Cui, Ning Cheng, Xiaobin Wang, Xin Zhang, Shen Huang, Pengjun Xie, Jinan Xu, Yufeng Chen, Meishan Zhang, et al. 2023. Zero-shot information extraction via chatting with chatgpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10205* (2023).
- Xiaoyuan Xie, Joshua WK Ho, Christian Murphy, Gail Kaiser, Baowen Xu, and Tsong Yueh Chen. 2011. Testing and validating machine learning classifiers by metamorphic testing. *Journal of Systems and Software* 84, 4 (2011), 544–558.
- 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* (2024).
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A Dataset for Diverse, Explainable Multi-hop Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 2369–2380.
- Erxin Yu, Jing Li, Ming Liao, Siqi Wang, Zuchen Gao, Fei Mi, and Lanqing Hong. 2024. CoSafe: Evaluating Large Language Model Safety in Multi-Turn Dialogue Coreference. *arXiv:2406.17626* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.17626>
- Bowen Zhang and Harold Soh. 2024. Extract, Define, Canonicalize: An LLM-based Framework for Knowledge Graph Construction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03868* (2024).

- Jie M Zhang, Mark Harman, Lei Ma, and Yang Liu. 2020. Machine learning testing: Survey, landscapes and horizons. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 48, 1 (2020), 1–36.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2023. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 46595–46623.
- Zeyang Zhuang, Penghui Li, Pingchuan Ma, Wei Meng, and Shuai Wang. 2023. Testing Graph Database Systems via Graph-Aware Metamorphic Relations. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 17, 4 (2023), 836–848.