

Multi-Agent Sampling: Scaling Inference Compute for Data Synthesis with Tree Search-Based Agentic Collaboration

Hai Ye^{1,2} Mingbao Lin^{2*} Hwee Tou Ng¹ Shuicheng Yan²

¹National University of Singapore ²Skywork AI

yehai@comp.nus.edu.sg linmb001@outlook.com

nght@comp.nus.edu.sg shuicheng.yan@kunlun-inc.com

Abstract

Scaling laws for inference compute in multi-agent systems remain under-explored compared to single-agent scenarios. This work aims to bridge this gap by investigating the problem of data synthesis through multi-agent sampling, where synthetic responses are generated by sampling from multiple distinct language models. Effective model coordination is crucial for successful multi-agent collaboration. Unlike previous approaches that rely on fixed workflows, we treat model coordination as a multi-step decision-making process, optimizing generation structures dynamically for each input question. We introduce Tree Search-based Orchestrated Agents (TOA), where the workflow evolves iteratively during the sequential sampling process. To achieve this, we leverage Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS), integrating a reward model to provide real-time feedback and accelerate exploration. Our experiments on alignment, machine translation, and mathematical reasoning demonstrate that multi-agent sampling significantly outperforms single-agent sampling as inference compute scales. TOA is the most compute-efficient approach, achieving SOTA performance on WMT and a 71.8% LC win rate on AlpacaEval. Moreover, fine-tuning with our synthesized alignment data surpasses strong preference learning methods on challenging benchmarks such as Arena-Hard and AlpacaEval¹.

1 Introduction

Beyond scaling parameters and data during pre-training of large language models (Kaplan et al., 2020), recent research has increasingly focused on scaling compute at inference time (Brown et al., 2024; Snell et al., 2024). Unlike rapid problem solving, scaling inference compute generates more output tokens, allowing the model to address problems more deliberately, potentially engaging in




Figure 1: Illustration of multi-agent sampling: We scale the number of samples (compute) generated from a group of distinct language models for each question.

planning, reasoning, or refinement before finalizing an answer. Such an emerging scaling paradigm in inference significantly enhances the model’s problem solving and data synthesis abilities.

Scaling laws of inference compute have been widely studied in the single-agent scenarios (Brown et al., 2024; Bansal et al., 2024). However, scaling compute from multi-agent systems remains under-explored. We hypothesize that a multi-agent system offers a higher performance ceiling compared to a single-agent system. This is based on the observation that different language models exhibit varying strengths, and leveraging the unique advantages of each model can lead to enhanced overall capabilities. To address this gap, we propose to study multi-agent sampling that scales the number of generated samples (compute) from multiple distinct language models (see Figure 1).

To scale inference compute, we adopt the widely used best-of- N sampling method, which generates N outputs for each input prompt (Liu et al., 2024; Gülçehre et al., 2023). In multi-agent-based sampling, the primary challenge is effectively coordinating models to achieve compute-optimal generation. We begin by revisiting and formalizing previous methods for model fusion, such as mixture of agents (Wang et al., 2024b), within a unified framework. These methods typically rely on fixed workflows with a modular approach to model combination, where the responses of other models

*Corresponding Author.

¹Work done during Hai Ye was an intern at Skywork AI.

are encoded as input context to generate new outputs. However, fixed structures fail to account for question-specific variability, as the optimal structure varies across different questions. To overcome this limitation, we propose Tree Search-based Orchestrated Agents (TOA), which treat model coordination as a multi-step decision-making process, aiming to maximize the rewards of sequentially generated responses. TOA utilizes Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) (Browne et al., 2012) to dynamically optimize generation workflows for each input question. This process is enhanced by a reward model that provides real-time feedback, enabling more efficient exploration and adaptation.

In our experiments, we study alignment, machine translation, and mathematical reasoning with varying number of parameters. By scaling sample generation and recording FLOPs as a compute metric, we find that multi-agent compute scaling is more efficient than single-agent ones. Our method, TOA, achieves a 71.8% LC win rate on AlpacaEval and sets new SOTA performance on WMT test sets. Additionally, fine-tuning with our synthetic alignment data outperforms strong baselines like SimPO (Meng et al., 2024) on AlpacaEval and Arena-Hard². Our contributions are as follows:

- We study the under-explored problem of scaling inference compute with multi-agent systems.
- We propose a novel method TOA to coordinate multiple language models effectively.
- We conduct extensive experiments to reveal scaling laws of multi-agent systems and demonstrate the compute efficiency of our approach.

2 Related Work

Scaling Inference Compute. Recent studies explore the trade-off between compute and performance in scaling test-time inference. Brown et al. (2024) use repeated random sampling to enhance performance of large language models, relying on effective verifiers to identify correct answers. Snell et al. (2024) show that scaling inference computations is more effective than scaling pre-training. Similarly, Bansal et al. (2024) find that smaller models with increased inference computation generate better synthetic data than larger models. Wu et al. (2024) examine inference scaling laws in mathematical problem solving. Unlike these single-agent studies, our work uniquely investigates scaling laws in multi-agent systems.

²<https://github.com/lmarena/arena-hard-auto>

Multi-Agent Learning. Combining diverse agents for problem solving is challenging. Some studies assign distinct roles to language models to facilitate collaboration (Chen et al., 2024b). LLM debating and fusion are widely adopted, where the output of one model is passed to another for further refinement (Li et al., 2023a; Liang et al., 2024; Xiong et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024a). Jiang et al. (2023b) train models to fuse the outputs of multiple models, while Du et al. (2024) enable models to engage in debates with each other. Wang et al. (2024b) propose a fully connected network to fuse and refine model outputs. Optimizing generation structures is critical to reducing compute and enhancing performance. Lu et al. (2024) train routing models to predict the best model for a given input question. Similarly, Liu et al. (2023) perform task-level structure optimization, which requires retraining the structure for every new task. In contrast, we focus on instance-level structure optimization using MCTS, which enables efficient and dynamic tree buildup for any input question. More related work on synthetic data generation and MCTS is given in Appendix A.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Multi-Agent Sampling

As shown in Figure 1, we study multi-agent sampling which scales inference compute from multiple distinct language models. It uses best-of- N sampling, where for each question, it generates multiple output samples. Formally, we have K models for generation with different model parameters, each denoted by π_k . Given an input prompt \mathbf{x} , we sample N responses $\{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N\}$ from the K models. We aim to achieve compute-optimal sampling to maximize the sample rewards given a compute budget.

3.2 Module Structure for Combination

To combine multiple language models, we let the models *interact* with each other, that is, a language model will utilize the outputs of other models to generate new responses. This method establishes a modular structure capable of supporting diverse generative frameworks (see Figure 2).

Formally, to obtain N output samples in total, when generating the i -th response, we choose a model k from the pool and prepare the input context with the output responses of other models:

$$\mathbf{y}_i \sim \pi_k(\cdot | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_i), \quad (1)$$




Figure 2: Illustration of previous methods (a, b and c) and our method TOA for multi-agent sampling. The methods used to sample N responses per question share the same model structure but differ in coordination strategies. TOA casts the problem as multi-step decision making and uses Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) to decide which model and response to use to generate a new sample. Stages d.1 to d.4 display how a new sample is generated.

where z_i is a concatenation of certain outputs from the past $i - 1$ generated samples. This process is similar to iterative inference or refinement, which is expected to improve sample quality (Madaan et al., 2023). Since the context z_i contains responses from other models, the capabilities of other models can be combined and fused.

Depending on the specific design, z_i may encompass responses from one to K models out of all the K models, or it could potentially be devoid of any responses. In § 4, we revisit previous methods for combining language models, whose unit structure can be formalized using Eq. (1).

4 Prior Methods

In this section, we revisit previous methods for model combination (see Figure 2).

4.1 Parallel Ensemble

For each input, the simplest approach to sampling N responses from K models is to draw an equal number of responses from each model in parallel. Specifically, for each model k , we sample $\frac{N}{K}$ responses using the formula $\mathbf{y} \sim \pi_k(\cdot|\mathbf{x})$. Temperature sampling is employed in this process to generate diverse output samples.

4.2 Sequential Refinement

In this setup, to obtain the i -th response, the input context z_i only contains one already generated response from one specific model. Sequential Refinement studied in (Madaan et al., 2023; Snell et al., 2024) aligns well with this setup, where the model iteratively modifies the last generated response. In the multi-agent setting, a current model can refine the output of a different preceding model. Since we have K models, one complete sequential refinement will yield K samples. To generate N responses, we can perform $\frac{N}{K}$ parallel generation operations, with each thread executing the sequential refinement. To enhance diversity, each thread will randomize the model order.

4.3 Mixture of Agents

Model debating and fusion have been widely studied to coordinate multiple agents (Jiang et al., 2023b; Du et al., 2024), which train a fusion model to fuse responses of multiple models or stack multiple layers for iterative fusion and refinement. This line of work aims for one model to encode the outputs from all the models to generate new samples, where the input context \mathbf{z} comprises K responses, with each response from a different model.

A representative work is Mixture-of-Agents (MoA) (Wang et al., 2024b), which adopts a struc-

ture akin to a fully connected network, where each node represents an individual model. It consists of multiple layers and each layer contains K models, generating K outputs that feed into the subsequent layer. Within each layer, each model refines the outputs of the K models from the preceding layer, facilitating a progressive refinement. Suppose there are L layers in MoA, we can obtain $L * K$ samples by going through the full network for one pass. We repeat the iterations of flowing over the network until we obtain N samples.

The methods described above rely on fixed structures, either linear or graph-based, to integrate different models. These approaches utilize fixed structures for all input scenarios. It overlooks the variation in questions. Varying input prompts might benefit from different, potentially more optimal structure configurations.

5 Tree Search-Based Orchestrated Agents

We present Tree Search-based Orchestrated Agents (TOA), capable of optimizing the generation workflow for each input question.

We treat model coordination as a multi-step decision-making process, which generates a sequence of samples given the input question x . It sequentially selects a model k from K predefined models, and a response y_j from past generations. We formalize the process as a Markov decision process with (S, A, T, R) intending to maximize the cumulative reward:

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N R(s_i, a_i) \right], \quad (2)$$

and we define the Markov decision process below:

- **State Space (S):** The state in step i is $s_i = (x, Y)$, where x is the fixed input question and $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}\}$ is a set of samples generated in the first $i - 1$ steps.
- **Action Space (A):** In each step i , an action $a_i = (k, y_j)$ consists of selecting a model $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and a previously generated response $y_j \in Y$, where $1 \leq j \leq i - 1$. For $i = 1$, no prior responses exist, so y_j is empty.
- **Transition Function (T):** From state s_i to state s_{i+1} , the selected model k generates a new response $y_i = \pi_k(x, y_j)$. Then this new response y_i is added to Y .
- **Reward Function (R):** The reward function evaluates the quality of each generated response

as $R(s_i, a_i) = R(x, y_i)$, where y_i is the newly generated response in step i .

5.1 Reward-Guided MCTS

As shown in Figure 2, we use MCTS as our decision-making framework, where the tree starts at the root node and proceeds to alternate between model and response layers. The width of the model layer corresponds to the number of models K . Conversely, the width of the response layer w is contingent upon the configuration at hand. Generating the i -th response is a multi-stage process, comprising selection, expansion, simulation, and backpropagation.

(a) Selection. In generating the i -th response, we are tasked with determining the action $a_i = (k, y_j)$: the model k for generation and the response y_j from past generations. We traverse the tree to select the optimal model node associated with the model k , and the response y_j present in its *parent* node. The search process adapts operations to each node type encountered:

- **Model Nodes:** Upon reaching a model node, we selectively prune its child nodes (responses), retaining only those with the highest reward scores.
- **Response Nodes:** In contrast, when encountering a response node, we refrain from pruning its child nodes (models), allowing for a broader exploration of subsequent model options.

In the search tree, starting from the root, we keep choosing child nodes until we find one that has not yet been fully explored (i.e., not all possible actions have been tried). We use the Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) strategy to pick a child node, balancing exploration and exploitation. The UCB score is computed as:

$$\text{UCB} = \frac{v}{n} + \alpha \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln N}{n}}, \quad (3)$$

where v is the cumulative reward for a node, n is the visit count of the node, and α is a hyperparameter that controls exploration. N is the maximum number of responses.

When a response node expands to include K model nodes, which constitute a predetermined set, it is considered fully expanded. Upon completion of the selection process, we identify a model node designated for the generation task. Simultaneously, its parent response will be selected for refinement. **(b) Expansion.** Next, we expand the response and model nodes with distinct operations:




Figure 3: Scaling results for alignment on AlpacaEval with 4 small-scale models, varying the number of samples per prompt, i.e., 64, 128, 256, 384, 512, 640, and 768. **Left:** ArmoRM is used as the reward model for guidance and evaluation. **Right:** The best response is selected for GPT-4 evaluation to calculate the length-controlled win rate. We only present the best models for Rand and *PRS*. AlpacaEval is randomly down-sampled to 200 prompts.

- **Response Node:** From the response node, we directly expand to new nodes, one for each of the K models. Moreover, model nodes that are immediate children of the root are merged into the response node by inheriting their visit counts and reward values. This method allows us to conduct operations without additional refinement, important in scenarios where further refinement cannot bring improvement.
- **Model Node:** After a model node is selected, we expand this model node by generating a new response using:

$$\mathbf{y}_i \sim \pi_k(\cdot | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_j), \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{y}_j is the response from the parent response node. However, if the parent does not contain a response—in particular when the parent is a root node or the current model node is copied from the children of the root—then \mathbf{y}_j will be empty.

(c) Simulation. Then we determine the reward r_i for newly generated response by leveraging a reward model R :

$$r_i \leftarrow R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_i), \quad (5)$$

which can provide real-time feedback and speed up exploration.

(d) Backpropagation. Lastly, an update occurs along the path that extends to the leaf node, updating the visit counts and the cumulative rewards with the following adjustments:

$$v \leftarrow v + r_i, \quad (6)$$

$$n \leftarrow n + 1. \quad (7)$$

The above stages of a–d repeat until we have successfully collected N responses, present within all the response nodes in our decision tree.

6 Experiments

6.1 Setup

Language Models. We examine two groups of models, with small-scale and large-scale model parameters. Within each group, we expect comparable performance among the models. In the small-scale group, we combine four models: Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, Qwen2-7B-Instruct, Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, and Yi-1.5-9B-Chat-16K. In the large-scale group, we combine five models: Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct (Lla), Mistral-Large-Instruct-2407 (Mis), Qwen2-72B-Instruct (Qwen), Mixtral-8x22B-Instruct-v0.1 (Mix), and Wizardlm-2-8x22B (Wiz). Appendix B.1 provides their HuggingFace links.

Datasets. We study three practical tasks: alignment, machine translation (MT), and math reasoning. We evaluate alignment on AlpacaEval (Li et al., 2023b) and Arena-Hard (Li et al., 2024) datasets. For MT, WMT’21 and WMT’22 are used. We test math reasoning on MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021). Finally, we synthesize alignment data with the prompts from Ultrafeedback (Cui et al., 2024). Appendix B.2 provides more statistics.

Reward Models. We utilize a reward model to guide the search process. For alignment, we employ ArmoRM (Wang et al., 2024a) (RLHF1ow/ArmoRM-Llama3-8B-v0.1), as it has demonstrated superior performance on the Reward-Bench benchmark (Lambert et al., 2024). In the




Figure 4: Scaling results for machine translation (zh to en) on WMT’22 using 5 large-scale models. The number of translations varies among 80, 160, 320, 480, 640, 800, 960, 1120, and 1280. **Left:** KIWI is used as the reward model for guidance and evaluation. **Right:** The best translation is selected and re-evaluated by KIWI-XXL (Unbabel/wmt23-cometkiwi-da-xxl), where moving average is applied to smooth the curves. Only the best models for Rand and PRS are presented. The test set is randomly down-sampled to 200 test samples.




Figure 5: Scaling results for math where the 4 small-scale models are combined. We generate solutions iteratively until we obtain 128 samples, then analyze the results of the first N solutions. **Left:** A single solution is selected from the first N solutions, and we calculate the average accuracy of the top 5 solutions with the highest rewards to reduce the variance. **Right:** The final answer is determined using majority voting among the first N solutions and moving average is applied to smooth the curves. The number next to “_” indicates the number of models combined; for 2, we chose Llama-3.1-8B-Inst and Qwen2-7B-Inst.

MT domain, we rely on KIWI (Rei et al., 2022) (Unbabel/wmt22-cometkiwi-da), which is specifically designed for reference-free evaluation. For math reasoning, we adopt Qwen2.5-Math-RM-72B (Yang et al., 2024b) as the reward model, leveraging its advanced capabilities for this domain.

Baselines. For single-agent sampling, we use random sampling (Rand) and PRS (Ye and Ng, 2024). PRS employs a tree structure and iterative refinement for data sampling, which has proven to be superior to random sampling. For multi-agent sampling, we compare the baselines discussed in § 4. Note that MoA exemplifies the category of methods referred to as model debating and fusion (Du et al., 2024).

Inference Settings. We vary the number of sam-

ples generated for each question. We calculate FLOPs to measure the cost and record the model performance. We use the method from Hoffmann et al. (2022) to calculate FLOPs. Appendix B.3 provides more details about the settings, and Appendix B.4 provides the prompts used.

6.2 Results

We analyze compute efficiency across three tasks, explore best-of- N sampling for AlpacaEval and WMT datasets, and generate synthetic data to fine-tune models for alignment. We observe:

Multi-agent sampling generally outperforms sampling from a single model. Based on the scaling results in Figures 3, 4, and 5, the parallel ensemble method generally demonstrates superior

Model Name	LC WR	WR	ltoken
Qwen2 72B Instruct	38.1	29.9	-
Llama 3.1 70B Instruct	38.1	39.1	-
Llama-3.1-405B-Instruct	39.3	39.1	-
GPT-4 Turbo (04/09)	55.0	46.1	-
GPT-4 Omni (05/13)	57.5	51.3	-
Together MoA-Lite	59.1	56.6	-
Together MoA	65.4	59.9	-
OpenPipe MoA GPT-4 Turbo	68.4	63.2	-
<i>Best-of-160 Sampling</i>			
Rand (Llama-3.1-70B-Inst)	47.8	47.1	2004
Rand (Mistral-Large-Inst-2407)	62.5	55.1	1809
PRS (Llama-3.1-70B-Inst)	52.8	53.7	2094
PRS (Mistral-Large-Inst-2407)	67.9	59.5	1787
Par. Ensemble	58.6	59.1	2092
Seq. Refine	70.0	65.6	1943
MoA	64.1	73.0	2550
TOA (Ours)	71.8	68.7	1999

Table 1: AlpacaEval 2.0 results show length-controlled win rate (%) and win rate (%) with GPT-4-Preview-1106 as both baseline and annotator. Using 5 large-scale models, 160 outputs per prompt are sampled, with ArmoRM-Llama3-8B-v0.1 selecting the best for evaluation.

performance compared to random sampling from the best single model. This trend is observed across various tasks and both sets of model combination.

However, an effective strategy is essential to combine agents. Without a robust strategy, multi-agent sampling can underperform compared to advanced single-agent methods like *PRS*, which highlights the complexity of model coordination.

Sequential refinement and mixture-of-agents possess unique strengths. Seq. refinement shows superior compute efficiency over *PRS* for alignment on AlpacaEval, achieving a 70.0 LC win rate with best-of-160 sampling (Table 1) and outperforming strong baselines. For machine translation, MoA surpasses GPT-4 in the reference-free evaluation metric. However, MoA is computationally expensive, as it aggregates the responses of multiple models to generate new output samples, increasing the cost of processing the input context.

TOA is the most compute-optimal. Based on the scaling results in Figures 3, 4, and 5, TOA emerges as the most compute-optimal method across all three tasks and both sets of models. To analyze the scaling behavior of TOA, we fit its scaling curve in Figure 3 (left) using a function where the input is FLOPs (C) and the output is the avg. top-10 reward (R). The function takes the form $R = a \cdot \log_{10}(C)^2 + b \cdot \log_{10}(C) + c$. After fitting, the parameters are determined to be $a = -0.0031$, $b = 0.11$, and $c = -0.71$. This learned function provides a reliable means to predict the reward for

KIWI-XXL	de	cs	is	zh	ru	Avg.	FLOPs
Gold Reference	78.56	83.11	85.04	74.19	79.59	80.10	-
WMT Winners	83.59	82.53	85.60	73.28	80.97	81.19	-
GPT-4	84.58	83.55	85.90	77.65	81.34	82.60	-
CPO	83.97	83.75	85.73	77.17	81.54	82.43	-
<i>Best-of-160 Sampling</i>							
Rand (Lla-3.1-70b)	85.41	85.09	84.45	79.07	82.21	83.24	3.5
Rand (Mis-lg)	85.60	84.54	83.35	79.50	82.64	83.13	7.8
PRS (Lla-3.1-70b)	85.83	85.71	84.76	79.51	82.67	83.70	6.0
PRS (Mis-lg)	86.18	85.72	84.01	79.82	82.68	83.68	13
Par. Ensemble	85.82	85.35	83.58	79.47	82.53	83.35	3.9
Seq. Refine	86.14	85.81	83.86	79.39	82.68	83.58	8.2
MoA	86.20	86.13	84.87	79.87	82.80	83.97	12
TOA (Ours)	86.25	86.31	84.81	79.89	83.00	84.05	7.5

Table 2: Results on WMT’21 and ’22 with large-scale models. We use KIWI-XXL to evaluate the results. The results in the upper section are from Xu et al. (2024b). Total FLOPs ($\times 10^{18}$) for the entire eval set is presented. Results with reference-based evaluation are in Table 6

a given compute budget.

In terms of the MATH eval set, as presented in Figure 5, we observe that combining all four small-scale models does not outperform combining the top two models (i.e., Qwen2-7B-Inst and Llama-3.1-8B-Inst) (also see Figure 13), which suggests that successful multi-agent sampling requires the combined models to achieve relatively consistent performance.

Dynamic model coordination enables TOA. In Figure 6 and Figure 14 in the Appendix, we analyze the refinement paths with the highest rewards, examining their categories and proportions, as well as the frequency with which specific models follow one another along these optimal paths. Our findings reveal that the top 20 optimal paths represent only a small fraction of the total, highlighting the diversity of effective refinement strategies. Notably, the likelihood of a successor model being identical to its predecessor in optimal paths is quite low. This suggests that using diverse models for refinement typically yields better results.

In Figure 7, we analyze the rewards of the optimal child response node for each model node at any given layer. The results show that for the same model, as the depth increases, the reward of its optimal child response node tends to grow within a certain range. This indicates that the refinement process can effectively improve response. We also observe that the optimal responses often appear in deeper layers globally. We display some built tree examples in Figure 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Reward hacking exists in TOA. We use a learned reward model to guide TOA, optimizing output samples to the reward model but risking reward




Figure 6: For TOA with 5 large models, we identify the best refinement paths per prompt that maximize reward. Among the best paths, we present the top 20 most frequent paths, the number of models used for generation, and the successor proportions for each predecessor.




Figure 7: With the large-scale models, we report the average highest reward on each layer of each model (left), and the proportion of the best response over all samples existing in the layers of each model (right).

hacking. As shown in Figure 4, the left figure illustrates a steady improvement in the reward of generated translations with increased compute. However, the right figure reveals that when re-evaluated by an external model, the score initially improves but later declines, indicating reward hacking. However, TOA remains the best overall approach. Similarly, *PRS*, which also employs a reward model, encounters the same issue. These findings underscore more robust reward models.

TOA achieves competitive results on AlpacaEval and SOTA performance on WMT. With best-of- N sampling, TOA attains a 71.8% LC Win Rate on AlpacaEval (Table 1), surpassing all baselines. On WMT’21 and WMT’22 (Table 2), it sets a new SOTA benchmark, outperforming GPT-4 and CPO (Xu et al., 2024b). While MoA ranks second, it demands much higher computational resources.

	AlpacaEval		Arena-Hard	FLOPs
	LC	WR	WR	$\times 10^{15}$
<i>Llama-3-8B-Inst + Syn. Data</i>				
DPO [†]	48.2	47.5	35.2	-
SimPO [†]	53.7	47.5	36.5	-
Yi-1.5-9B-Chat-16K	23.3	25.8	28.4	-
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	17.1	14.7	12.6	-
Qwen2-7B-Instruct	21.2	19.5	23.6	-
Llama-3-8B-Instruct	24.8	23.6	19.7	-
<i>Llama-3-8B-Inst + Syn. Data + SFT</i>				
Rand (Lla-3.1-8B-Inst)	25.3	23.8	21.7	2.0
PRS (Lla-3.1-8B-Inst)	30.4	30.5	24.4	2.9
Par. Ensemble	28.6	26.9	24.9	2.0
Seq. Refine	34.0	30.4	21.9	3.3
MoA	29.8	32.1	24.4	7.5
TOA (Ours)	34.0	30.6	27.5	3.0
<i>Llama-3-8B-Inst + Syn. Data + DPO</i>				
TOA (Ours)	52.2	55.8	39.2	3.0

Table 3: Comparison of synthetic data generated by each baseline and fine-tuning Llama-3-8B-Inst. Using 4 small models, outputs are generated with Ultrafeedback (Cui et al., 2024) prompts, sampling 160 responses per prompt via ArmoRM, retaining the best. Avg. FLOPs per prompt are reported. [†] is taken from Meng et al. (2024). Fine-tuning results for Qwen2-7B-Instruct are detailed in Table 7.

Enhanced data synthesis is enabled using TOA.

We conduct practical tests to evaluate the effectiveness of synthetic data generated by various methods. In the alignment task, we use Ultrafeedback input prompts to produce synthetic outputs. 160 outputs are generated for each prompt, and the response with the highest reward, as determined by ArmoRM, is retained. The model is then fine-tuned using this generated data. As shown in Table 3, synthetic data generated by our method delivers the best results on AlpacaEval and Arena-Hard.

We further train the model using DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023), selecting the highest-reward response as the positive sample and the 30th-ranked one as the reject sample, based on optimal ranking experiments. Post-DPO training, our method sets a new SOTA, outperforming SimPO (Meng et al., 2024). More results are included in Appendix C.

7 Conclusion

We study scaling inference compute with multi-agent systems. We first formalize previous work on model combinations in a unified framework. We then propose TOA, a novel method to leverage MCTS for model coordination. Extensive experiments reveal multi-agent scaling laws, with our method achieving the best efficiency in synthetic data generation and scaling inference compute.

8 Limitations

Although multi-agent sampling is more compute-optimal than single-agent sampling, it requires a better design to reduce GPU memory usage when we need to load the model locally. Currently, we are using a straightforward approach, which involves loading different models simultaneously during the generation phase. This results in higher GPU memory consumption. However, if we directly call cloud-based API services, we do not need to host the models locally, and our method can significantly reduce the number of API calls while achieving the same level of performance.

Acknowledgements

This research is supported by the National Research Foundation, Singapore under its AI Singapore Programme (AISG Award No: AISG2-PhD-2021-08-016[T]).

References

- Mistral AI. 2024a. *Cheaper, better, faster, stronger*. Accessed: 2024-12-01.
- Mistral AI. 2024b. Mistral large 2. <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-large-2407/>. Accessed: 2024-12-01.
- Hritik Bansal, Arian Hosseini, Rishabh Agarwal, Vinh Q. Tran, and Mehran Kazemi. 2024. *Smaller, weaker, yet better: Training LLM reasoners via compute-optimal sampling*. *CoRR*, abs/2408.16737.
- Bradley C. A. Brown, Jordan Juravsky, Ryan Saul Ehrlich, Ronald Clark, Quoc V. Le, Christopher Ré, and Azalia Mirhoseini. 2024. *Large language monkeys: Scaling inference compute with repeated sampling*. *CoRR*, abs/2407.21787.
- Cameron Browne, Edward Jack Powley, Daniel Whitehouse, Simon M. Lucas, Peter I. Cowling, Philipp Rohlfshagen, Stephen Tavener, Diego Perez Liebana, Spyridon Samothrakis, and Simon Colton. 2012. *A survey of monte carlo tree search methods*. *IEEE Trans. Comput. Intell. AI Games*, 4(1):1–43.
- Xin Chan, Xiaoyang Wang, Dian Yu, Haitao Mi, and Dong Yu. 2024. *Scaling synthetic data creation with 1,000,000,000 personas*. *CoRR*, abs/2406.20094.
- Justin Chih-Yao Chen, Swarnadeep Saha, and Mohit Bansal. 2024a. *Reconcile: Round-table conference improves reasoning via consensus among diverse llms*. In *ACL*.
- Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Jingwei Zuo, Cheng Yang, Chenfei Yuan, Chi-Min Chan, Heyang Yu, Yaxi Lu, Yi-Hsin Hung, Chen Qian, Yujia Qin, Xin Cong, Ruobing Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Jie Zhou. 2024b. *Agentverse: Facilitating multi-agent collaboration and exploring emergent behaviors*. In *ICLR*.
- Ganqu Cui, Lifan Yuan, Ning Ding, Guanming Yao, Bingxiang He, Wei Zhu, Yuan Ni, Guotong Xie, Ruobing Xie, Yankai Lin, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024. *ULTRAFEEDBACK: boosting language models with scaled AI feedback*. In *ICML*.
- Elvis Dohmatob, Yunzhen Feng, Pu Yang, François Charton, and Julia Kempe. 2024. *A tale of tails: Model collapse as a change of scaling laws*. In *ICML*.
- Yilun Du, Shuang Li, Antonio Torralba, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Igor Mordatch. 2024. *Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multiagent debate*. In *ICML*.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurélien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Rozière, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloé Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Alonso, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Graeme Nail, Grégoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel M. Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, and et al. 2024. *The llama 3 herd of models*. *CoRR*, abs/2407.21783.
- Yunzhen Feng, Elvis Dohmatob, Pu Yang, François Charton, and Julia Kempe. 2024. *Beyond model collapse: Scaling up with synthesized data requires reinforcement*. *CoRR*, abs/2406.07515.
- Matthias Gerstgrasser, Rylan Schaeffer, Apratim Dey, Rafael Rafailov, Tomasz Korbak, Henry Sleight, Rajashree Agrawal, John Hughes, Dhruv Bhandarkar Pai, Andrey Gromov, Dan Roberts, Diyi Yang, David L. Donoho, and Sanmi Koyejo. 2024. *Is model collapse inevitable? breaking the curse of recursion by accumulating real and synthetic data*. In *COLM*.

- Çaglar Gülçehre, 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](#). *CoRR*, abs/2308.08998.
- Yanzhu Guo, Guokan Shang, Michalis Vazirgiannis, and Chloé Clavel. 2024. [The curious decline of linguistic diversity: Training language models on synthetic text](#). In *Findings of NAACL*.
- 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](#). In *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks*.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, Tom Hennigan, Eric Noland, Katie Millican, George van den Driessche, Bogdan Damoc, Aurelia Guy, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Erich Elsen, Jack W. Rae, Oriol Vinyals, and Laurent Sifre. 2022. [Training compute-optimal large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2203.15556.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Renard Lavau, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023a. [Mistral 7b](#).
- Dongfu Jiang, Xiang Ren, and Bill Yuchen Lin. 2023b. [Llm-blender: Ensembling large language models with pairwise ranking and generative fusion](#). In *ACL*.
- Juraj Juraska, Mara Finkelstein, Daniel Deutsch, Aditya Siddhant, Mehdi Mirzazadeh, and Markus Freitag. 2023. [MetricX-23: The Google submission to the WMT 2023 metrics shared task](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Scaling laws for neural language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2001.08361.
- Nathan Lambert, Valentina Pyatkin, Jacob Morrison, LJ Miranda, Bill Yuchen Lin, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Nouha Dziri, Sachin Kumar, Tom Zick, Yejin Choi, Noah A. Smith, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2024. [Rewardbench: Evaluating reward models for language modeling](#). *CoRR*, abs/2403.13787.
- Guohao Li, Hasan Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. 2023a. [CAMEL: communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large language model society](#). In *NeurIPS*.
- Tianle Li, Wei-Lin Chiang, Evan Frick, Lisa Dunlap, Tianhao Wu, Banghua Zhu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2024. [From crowdsourced data to high-quality benchmarks: Arena-hard and benchbuilder pipeline](#). *CoRR*, abs/2406.11939.
- Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023b. [AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models](#).
- Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Wenxiang Jiao, Xing Wang, Yan Wang, Rui Wang, Yujia Yang, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2024. [Encouraging divergent thinking in large language models through multi-agent debate](#). In *EMNLP*.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yuri Burda, Harrison Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. 2024. [Let's verify step by step](#). In *ICLR*.
- Tianqi Liu, Yao Zhao, Rishabh Joshi, Misha Khalman, Mohammad Saleh, Peter J. Liu, and Jialu Liu. 2024. [Statistical rejection sampling improves preference optimization](#). In *ICLR*.
- Zijun Liu, Yanzhe Zhang, Peng Li, Yang Liu, and Diyi Yang. 2023. [Dynamic llm-agent network: An llm-agent collaboration framework with agent team optimization](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.02170.
- Keming Lu, Hongyi Yuan, Runji Lin, Junyang Lin, Zheng Yuan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2024. [Routing to the expert: Efficient reward-guided ensemble of large language models](#). In *NAACL*.
- Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, Shashank Gupta, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Katherine Hermann, Sean Welleck, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, and Peter Clark. 2023. [Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback](#). In *NeurIPS*.
- Yu Meng, Mengzhou Xia, and Danqi Chen. 2024. [Simpo: Simple preference optimization with a reference-free reward](#). *CoRR*, abs/2405.14734.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D. Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model](#). In *NeurIPS*.
- Ricardo Rei, Marcos V. Treviso, Nuno Miguel Guerreiro, Chrysoula Zerva, Ana C. Farinha, Christine Maroti, José G. C. de Souza, Taisiya Glushkova, Duarte M. Alves, Luísa Coheur, Alon Lavie, and André F. T. Martins. 2022. [Cometkiwi: Ist-unbabel 2022 submission for the quality estimation shared task](#). In *WMT*.
- Charlie Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, and Aviral Kumar. 2024. [Scaling LLM test-time compute optimally can be more effective than scaling model parameters](#). *CoRR*, abs/2408.03314.

- Ye Tian, Baolin Peng, Linfeng Song, Lifeng Jin, Dian Yu, Haitao Mi, and Dong Yu. 2024. [Toward self-improvement of llms via imagination, searching, and criticizing](#). *CoRR*, abs/2404.12253.
- Ziyu Wan, Xidong Feng, Muning Wen, Stephen Marcus McAleer, Ying Wen, Weinan Zhang, and Jun Wang. 2024. [Alphazero-like tree-search can guide large language model decoding and training](#). In *ICML*.
- Haoxiang Wang, Wei Xiong, Tengyang Xie, Han Zhao, and Tong Zhang. 2024a. [Interpretable preferences via multi-objective reward modeling and mixture-of-experts](#). In *Findings of EMNLP*.
- Junlin Wang, Jue Wang, Ben Athiwaratkun, Ce Zhang, and James Zou. 2024b. [Mixture-of-agents enhances large language model capabilities](#). *CoRR*, abs/2406.04692.
- Yangzhen Wu, Zhiqing Sun, Shanda Li, Sean Welleck, and Yiming Yang. 2024. [An empirical analysis of compute-optimal inference for problem-solving with language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2408.00724.
- Kai Xiong, Xiao Ding, Yixin Cao, Ting Liu, and Bing Qin. 2023. [Examining inter-consistency of large language models collaboration: An in-depth analysis via debate](#). In *Findings EMNLP*.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. 2024a. [WizardLM: Empowering large pre-trained language models to follow complex instructions](#). In *ICLR*.
- Haoran Xu, Amr Sharaf, Yunmo Chen, Weiting Tan, Lingfeng Shen, Benjamin Van Durme, Kenton Murray, and Young Jin Kim. 2024b. [Contrastive preference optimization: Pushing the boundaries of LLM performance in machine translation](#). In *ICML*.
- Zhangchen Xu, Fengqing Jiang, Luyao Niu, Yuntian Deng, Radha Poovendran, Yejin Choi, and Bill Yuchen Lin. 2024c. [Magpie: Alignment data synthesis from scratch by prompting aligned llms with nothing](#). *CoRR*, abs/2406.08464.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jianxin Yang, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Xuejing Liu, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhifang Guo, and Zhihao Fan. 2024a. [Qwen2 technical report](#). *CoRR*, abs/2407.10671.
- An Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bofei Gao, Bowen Yu, Chengpeng Li, Dayiheng Liu, Jianhong Tu, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Keming Lu, Mingfeng Xue, Runji Lin, Tianyu Liu, Xingzhang Ren, and Zhenru Zhang. 2024b. [Qwen2.5-math technical report: Toward mathematical expert model via self-improvement](#). *CoRR*, abs/2409.12122.
- Hai Ye and Hwee Tou Ng. 2024. [Preference-guided reflective sampling for aligning language models](#). In *EMNLP*.
- Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, Kaidong Yu, Peng Liu, Qiang Liu, Shawn Yue, Senbin Yang, Shiming Yang, Tao Yu, Wen Xie, Wenhao Huang, Xiaohui Hu, Xiaoyi Ren, Xinyao Niu, Pengcheng Nie, Yuchi Xu, Yudong Liu, Yue Wang, Yuxuan Cai, Zhenyu Gu, Zhiyuan Liu, and Zonghong Dai. 2024. [Yi: Open foundation models by 01.ai](#). *CoRR*, abs/2403.04652.

A More Related Work

Monte Carlo Tree Search. Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) (Browne et al., 2012) has been effectively utilized for advancing large language models. Wan et al. (2024) leverage MCTS for token-level language model inference, while Tian et al. (2024) employ it to explore reasoning paths, facilitating self-improvement. In our work, we are the *first* to apply MCTS for model coordination, introducing a novel tree structure that alternates between model layers and response layers.

Synthetic Data Generation. Generating data to advance AI systems during both pre-training and post-training stages is increasingly important. Dohmatob et al. (2024) highlight a challenging scaling law, showing that excessive pre-training on synthetic data leads to performance decay. Guo et al. (2024) observe that continual training on self-generated data reduces linguistic diversity. Thus, optimizing the use of synthetic data has become a critical focus. Gerstgrasser et al. (2024) find that mixing synthetic data with real data enhances pre-training performance compared to using only real data. Feng et al. (2024) propose incorporating a verifier to prevent model collapse, while Chan et al. (2024) use personas to improve the diversity of generated synthetic data. Reject sampling or best-of- N sampling (Liu et al., 2024) employs increased inference computation to generate more output samples, thereby raising the likelihood of obtaining strong samples. Ye and Ng (2024) propose a preference-guided reflective mechanism to further improve best-of- N sampling.

B More Setup Details

B.1 Language Models

We combine models for evaluation. **Small-scale combination** has 4 models including:

- **Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct** (Dubey et al., 2024): <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct>;
- **Qwen2-7B-Instruct** (Yang et al., 2024a): <https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2-7B-Instruct>;
- **Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2** (Jiang et al., 2023a): <https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2>;
- **Yi-1.5-9B-Chat-16K** (Young et al., 2024): <https://huggingface.co/01-ai/Yi-1.5-9B-Chat-16K>.

Tasks	Datasets	Size	
NMT	WMT'21	is - en	1000
		zh - en	1875
	WMT'22	ru - en	2016
		de - en	1984
		cs - en	1448
Alignment	AlpacaEval	805	
	Arena-Hard	500	
Reasoning	MATH	100	
Data Synthesis	Ultrafeedback	59876	

Table 4: Statistics of tasks and datasets used in our work. AlpacaEval is from https://tatsu-lab.github.io/alpaca_eval/ and Arena-Hard is from <https://github.com/lmarena/arena-hard-auto>. We randomly sample 100 problems from MATH500 (Lightman et al., 2024). For Ultrafeedback, we use the version of princeton-nlp/llama3-ultrafeedback-armorm processed by Xu et al. (2024b).

Larg-scale combination comprises 5 models including:

- **Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct** (Dubey et al., 2024): <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct>;
- **Mistral-Large-Instruct-2407** (AI, 2024b): <https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-Large-Instruct-2407>;
- **Qwen2-72B-Instruct** (Yang et al., 2024a): <https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2-72B-Instruct>;
- **Mixtral-8x22B-Instruct-v0.1** (AI, 2024a): <https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mixtral-8x22B-Instruct-v0.1>;
- **WizardLM-2-8x22b** (Xu et al., 2024a): <https://huggingface.co/alpindale/WizardLM-2-8x22B>.

B.2 Statistics of Tasks and Datasets

Table 4 provides details of the tasks and datasets used in this paper.

B.3 Hyper-parameter Settings

We present the hyper-parameters used across different tasks for our TOA:

- **Alignment:** The maximum layer width is set to $\lfloor \frac{N}{3} \rfloor$, and α is set to 0.01.
- **Machine Translation:** The maximum layer width is also set to $\lfloor \frac{N}{3} \rfloor$, with α set to 0.05.
- **Math Reasoning** The maximum layer width is set to $\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$, and α is set to 0.01.

The temperature in sampling is set to 0.7, and top_p is set to 1. For MoA, we use the default

You are an expert editor tasked with refining a response to the latest user query. Your goal is to enhance the response’s accuracy, coherence, and reliability while aligning it with the user’s preferences. Ensure the highest standards of quality, focusing on conciseness and clarity in your revisions.

The latest user query is:
{question}

Here is the response you need to refine:
{answer}

Figure 8: The refinement prompt for alignment.

You are provided with a text originally written in a foreign language and its corresponding English translation. Your task is to revise this translation to improve its precision, natural flow, consistency, and completeness.

When refining the translation, ensure it:

- Faithfully conveys the intended meaning of the original text.
- Is grammatically correct and reads smoothly in English.
- Maintains consistent use of terminology and stylistic choices.
- Includes all crucial information from the original text.

****Original Text****
{source}

****Current Translation****
{translation}

Please provide only the revised translation.

Figure 9: The refinement prompt for machine translation.

prompt for generation when alignment is involved.

B.4 Prompts Used for Generation

Figures 8, 9, and 10 provide the refinement prompts that we use for the tasks of alignment, machine translation, and math reasoning, respectively.

C Further Analysis

Comparison with Magpie. To evaluate the performance of our method, we conduct a comparison with Magpie (Xu et al., 2024c), a recent approach for synthetic alignment data generation. For a fair comparison, we utilize the dataset provided by Magpie, specifically Magpie-Align/Magpie-Air-300K-Filtered. We randomly sample 80K prompts and employ a group of small-scale models to generate synthetic

You are a mathematics expert tasked with analyzing a proposed solution to a mathematical problem provided by another AI Agent.

The mathematical problem is:
{question}

The proposed answer from the AI Agent is:
{answer}

First, you must analyze the reasoning behind the proposed answer and evaluate its correctness. Then, you should provide your own solution to the question. Let’s think step by step.

In the last new line, put the final answer in `"\boxed{{}}"`.

Figure 10: The refinement prompt for math reasoning.

	AlpacaEval 2.0		
	Size	LC WR	WR
Llama-3-8B-Instruct	-	24.8	23.6
<i>Llama-3-8B-Base + Syn. Data + SFT</i>			
Magpie-Air-300K-Raw	300K	22.0	21.7
Magpie-Air-300K-Filtered	300K	22.7	24.0
TOA (Ours)	80K	24.7	27.0
<i>Llama-3-8B-Inst + Syn. Data + SFT</i>			
TOA (Ours)	80K	32.8	33.3

Table 5: Comparison with Magpie (Xu et al., 2024c) for alignment data synthesis. We use the prompts from Magpie (Magpie-Align/Magpie-Air-300K-Filtered), and then use TOA (with 4 small-scale models) to generate synthetic outputs. We sample 80 outputs per prompt and use ArmoRM to keep the best one. We randomly sample 80K prompts from Magpie.




Figure 11: Ablation of the number of models for combination in TOA. We use the small-scale sets for evaluation.




Figure 12: Effect of depth for TOA. We vary the maximum depth of the tree between 3, 5, 9, and 11. The top 10 average reward (using ArmoRM) is reported on AlpacaEval with 200 samples.

outputs, using ArmoRM-Llama3-8B-v0.1 as the reward model. Each prompt samples 80 outputs. For each prompt, only the highest-quality response is retained for training purposes. As shown in Table 5, our method consistently outperforms Magpie, showing our method’s enhanced effectiveness and robustness.

Effect of Number of Models. We investigate the impact of the number of models used for combination. In Figure 11, we reduce the number of models from 4 to 2 and evaluate in two different settings. Our results indicate that using 2 models does not provide greater computational efficiency compared to using 4 models.

Effect of Tree Depth for TOA. As illustrated in Figure 12, we analyze the impact of tree depth on the performance of our TOA method. Our findings reveal that with a larger total number of samples for generation, such as 640, greater tree depth results in improved performance. Conversely, when the sample size is limited, such as 64, a smaller tree depth proves to be more effective. This behavior arises because TOA requires a broader layer width to ensure sufficient exploration.

D Supplementary Experiments

We present additional experiments to complement the primary experiments detailed in § 6.2 of the main paper. Below is a concise overview of the supplementary tables and figures, with detailed analyses already provided in § 6.2.

Figure 13 presents the evaluation results on the MATH test set for different language models. Figure 14 is the counterpart of Figure 6 for machine translation, to dissect the optimal refinement paths




Figure 13: Performance of different language models on MATH.

per prompt. Table 6 demonstrates our state-of-the-art performance on the WMT benchmark. Table 7, in conjunction with Table 3, highlights our capability to enhance data synthesis. Lastly, Figure 15, 16, 17, and 18 show the construction of decision trees utilizing our methodology. The evaluation was conducted on the AlpacaEval dataset with five large-scale models. Each figure corresponds to a different question. The path leading to the highest reward (ArmoRM) is highlighted in red.

Methods	de		cs		is		zh		ru		Avg.	
	KXXL	MetricX	KXXL	MetricX	KXXL	MetricX	KXXL	MetricX	KXXL	MetricX	KXXL	MetricX
Gold Reference	78.56	-	83.11	-	85.04	-	74.19	-	79.59	-	80.10	-
WMT Winners	83.59	1.60	82.53	1.44	85.6	1.54	73.28	3.68	80.97	1.42	81.19	1.94
GPT-4	84.58	1.37	83.55	1.46	85.9	1.39	77.65	2.22	81.34	1.26	82.60	1.54
CPO	83.97	1.45	83.75	1.43	85.73	1.35	77.17	2.53	81.54	1.34	82.43	1.62
Rand (l1a-3.1-70b)	85.41	1.32	85.09	1.33	84.45	1.76	79.07	2.23	82.21	1.20	83.24	1.57
Rand (Mis-large-2407)	85.60	1.26	84.54	1.48	83.35	1.98	79.50	1.95	82.64	1.09	83.13	1.55
PRS (l1a-3.1-70b)	85.83	1.18	85.71	1.18	84.76	1.51	79.51	1.86	82.67	1.04	83.70	1.36
PRS (Mis-large-2407)	86.18	1.17	85.72	1.33	84.01	1.74	79.82	1.79	82.68	1.03	83.68	1.41
Par. Ensemble	85.82	1.26	85.35	1.34	83.58	1.91	79.47	2.03	82.53	1.13	83.35	1.53
Seq. Refine	86.14	1.14	85.81	1.19	83.86	1.63	79.39	1.79	82.68	0.99	83.58	1.35
MoA	86.20	1.14	86.13	1.19	84.87	1.60	79.87	1.79	82.80	1.00	83.97	1.34
TOA (Ours)	86.25	1.11	86.31	1.16	84.81	1.50	79.89	1.77	83.00	1.00	84.05	1.31

Table 6: Results of xx-to-en translation on WMT21 and WMT22. is-to-en is from WMT21 and the rest is from WMT22. The results of Gold Reference, WMT Winners, GPT-4, and CPO are taken from (Xu et al., 2024b). In our experiments, to scale inference compute, for each test sample, we sample 160 translations and use KIWI (Unbabel/wmt22-cometkiwi-da) to select the best one with the highest score. Then the selected samples will be re-evaluated by KIWI-XXL (or KXXL) (Unbabel/wmt23-cometkiwi-da-xx1) and MetricX (Juraska et al., 2023) (google/metricx-23-xx1-v2p0). For MetricX, the lower the better. Here, KIWI-22 and KIWI-XXL are reference-free evaluations and MetricX is a reference-based evaluation.




Figure 14: On the machine translation task, for TOA with 5 large models, we identify the best refinement paths per prompt, maximizing reward. We present the top 20 most frequent paths, the number of models used for generation, and the successor proportions for each predecessor.

	AlpacaEval	
	LC WR	WR
Qwen2-7B-Instruct	21.2	19.5
<i>Qwen2-7B-Inst + Syn. Data + SFT</i>		
Rand (Qwen2-7B-Inst)	25.0	23.4
PRS (Qwen2-7B-Inst)	27.1	22.6
Par. Ensemble	20.2	19.4
Seq. Refine	25.9	22.9
MoA	22.7	24.1
TOA (Ours)	28.3	25.6
<i>Qwen2-7B-Inst + Syn. Data + DPO</i>		
TOA (Ours)	34.4	50.5

Table 7: Qwen2-7B-Instruct fine-tuning results using different synthetic data.




Figure 15: Example (a) of a decision tree constructed using TOA. Best viewed with zooming in.




Figure 16: Example (b) of a decision tree constructed using TOA. Best viewed with zooming in.




Figure 17: Example (c) of a decision tree constructed using TOA. Best viewed with zooming in.




Figure 18: Example (d) of a decision tree constructed using TOA. Best viewed with zooming in.