

Distilling Fine-grained Sentiment Understanding from Large Language Models

Yice Zhang^{1,3*}, Guangyu Xie^{1,3*}, Hongling Xu^{1,3}, Kaiheng Hou¹,
Jianzhu Bao^{1,3}, Qianlong Wang^{1,3}, Shiwei Chen^{1,2}, and Ruifeng Xu^{1,2,3†}

¹ Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China

² Peng Cheng Laboratory, Shenzhen, China

³ Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Novel Security Intelligence Technologies
zhangyc_hit@163.com, guangyuxie2001@gmail.com, xurufeng@hit.edu.cn

Abstract

Fine-grained sentiment analysis (FSA) aims to extract and summarize user opinions from vast opinionated text. Recent studies demonstrate that large language models (LLMs) possess exceptional sentiment understanding capabilities. However, directly deploying LLMs for FSA applications incurs high inference costs. Therefore, this paper investigates the distillation of fine-grained sentiment understanding from LLMs into small language models (SLMs). We prompt LLMs to examine and interpret the sentiments of given reviews and then utilize the generated content to pretrain SLMs. Additionally, we develop a comprehensive FSA benchmark to evaluate both SLMs and LLMs. Extensive experiments on this benchmark reveal that: (1) distillation significantly enhances the performance of SLMs in FSA tasks, achieving a 6.00% improvement in F_1 -score, and the distilled model can outperform Llama-2-7b with only 220M parameters; (2) distillation equips SLMs with excellent zero-shot sentiment classification capabilities, enabling them to match or even exceed their teacher models. These results suggest that distillation from LLMs is a highly promising direction for FSA.¹

1 Introduction

Fine-grained sentiment analysis (FSA) aims to thoroughly mine and understand user opinions from vast opinionated texts. The two typical tasks of FSA are targeted sentiment analysis and aspect-level sentiment analysis, which organize and structure user opinions from the perspective of opinion

* The first two authors contribute equally to this work.

† Corresponding Authors

¹We will release our code, data, and pretrained model weights at <https://github.com/HITSZ-HLT/FSA-Distillation>.




Figure 1: Knowledge distillation from LLMs enhances SLMs' capabilities in handling complex sentiment contexts.

targets² and aspect categories, respectively. These tasks are illustrated in Figure 1.

Existing FSA methods generally finetune small language models (SLMs) on labeled data (Xu et al., 2019; Mao et al., 2021; Yan et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021b). Despite commendable results, these methods still face challenges when dealing with complex scenarios (Jiang et al., 2019; Li et al., 2021; Fei et al., 2023). For example, the review depicted in Figure 1 indirectly expresses negative feelings about the food through metaphorical language. However, methods relying on SLMs fail to recognize this negative sentiment as the context lacks explicit opinion words.

Recent studies have shown that large language models (LLMs) possess exceptional capabilities in natural language understanding (Qin et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2024). Our observations also indicate that LLMs excel in understanding sentiment, as they can perform comprehensive and accurate

²Following Pontiki et al. (2015, 2016); Li et al. (2018); Wan et al. (2020), we adopt the term 'opinion target' instead of 'aspect term' to denote the reviewed entity in the text.

sentiment analysis along with convincing interpretations. For example, in the case depicted in Figure 1, LLMs interpret the review as suggesting: “Comparing the taste of the chicken sandwich to high school cafeteria food typically implies poor quality and lack of flavor, which is generally viewed negatively.” However, directly deploying LLMs for FSA applications incurs high computational costs due to their extensive parameters. Additionally, it is a serious issue that LLMs often generate outputs that do not align with task-specific requirements.

This paper investigates the distillation of fine-grained sentiment understanding from LLMs into SLMs. The main advantage of this distillation process is that it allows us to leverage the exceptional capabilities of LLMs without incurring their high inference costs. Our research is structured around two core parts. **Firstly**, we present a formal definition of fine-grained sentiment understanding and, based on this definition, devise two types of prompts: an *analysis* prompt and a *rewriting* prompt. These prompts guide LLMs in generating content that embodies advanced sentiment understanding. Subsequently, we pretrain SLMs using this generated content to enhance their capabilities in sentiment analysis. **Secondly**, we develop a comprehensive FSA benchmark for LLMs and SLMs. For LLMs, we introduce a human evaluation framework that includes six dimensions, assessing both analysis results and reasoning processes. For SLMs, we refine existing FSA datasets to improve the effectiveness and reliability of the evaluations. Specifically, we identify ‘hard’ samples in the existing datasets and further augment the datasets by annotating additional hard samples.

We conduct extensive experiments on our FSA benchmark and primarily arrive at the following conclusions. (1) LLMs perform poorly in the FSA datasets with in-context learning but show exceptional improvement after finetuning, with an advantage of up to 8.31% in F_1 -score over SLMs. (2) Distillation significantly enhances the performance of SLMs, achieving a 6.00% F_1 -score improvement, and the distilled model outperforms Llama-2-7b with only 220M parameters. (3) Distillation enables SLMs to reach or even surpass their teacher models in zero-shot sentiment classification. (4) The quality of the teacher model and the quantity of distillation data are two important factors affecting the effectiveness of distillation, with the latter being more influential.




Figure 2: Illustration of our distillation process.

2 Distillation

2.1 Prompting

Building upon Pontiki et al. (2015, 2016), we define fine-grained sentiment understanding as a quadruple consisting of opinion target, aspect, sentiment, and reasoning. Specifically, (1) the opinion target refers to the reviewed entity within the text; (2) the aspect refers to the specific facets and dimensions of the opinion target being evaluated; (3) the sentiment indicates the strength of the sentiment toward the opinion target, ranging from very negative to very positive; and (4) reasoning refers to the process of inferring sentiment based on the context related to the opinion target. The component of reasoning is central to this definition, as we believe that explicitly inferring sentiment from sentiment expressions or other indirect languages is essential for demonstrating a model’s capability to understand sentiment.

Based on this definition, we develop two types of prompts: (1) the analysis prompt is designed to guide LLMs in analyzing the review, listing the opinion targets, along with their corresponding aspect, sentiment, and reasoning; (2) the rewriting prompt is intended to instruct LLMs to rewrite the review from a first-person perspective, expressing the user’s feelings more clearly and evidently. In the rewriting prompt, we require LLMs to incorpo-

Datasets	Yelp		Amazon	
	ANL	RW	ANL	RW
Llama-2-7b	500K	500K	500K	500K
Mixtral-8x7b	500K	500K	500K	500K
GPT-3.5	50K	50K	50K	50K

Table 1: Statistics of sentiment understanding corpus. ANL and RW denote the analysis and rewriting prompts. Due to budgetary constraints, we limit the usage of GPT-3.5 to 100K reviews, yielding 200K sentiment understanding texts.

rate the evaluated aspect, highlight the sentiment, and explicitly state the reasons for the sentiment in the rewritten review. The main difference between these two prompts is that the analysis prompt produces structured outputs, while the rewriting prompt outputs natural language text. As shown in Figure 2, these two prompts enable LLMs to examine and interpret the sentiments within the given review, generating clear and meaningful text from two distinct perspectives. Complete prompt templates are presented in Appendix A.1.

Using these two prompts, we construct a large-scale sentiment understanding corpus. Firstly, we collect one million reviews from the Yelp dataset³ and the Amazon laptop dataset⁴, each accompanied by user ratings. We observe that reviews with mid-range ratings tend to exhibit more diverse sentiments, which motivates us to increase the proportion of such reviews during collection. Secondly, we select three typical LLMs, including a proprietary GPT-3.5⁵ and two open-source models, Llama-2-7b (Touvron et al., 2023) and Mixtral-8x7b (Jiang et al., 2024). Thirdly, we leverage the two proposed prompts to guide these models in generating sentiment understanding texts for these reviews, thereby constructing a sentiment understanding corpus. The statistical information of this corpus is presented in Table 1.

2.2 Pretraining

We use T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) as the default SLM and continue to pretrain it using SEQ2SEQ objective on our sentiment understanding corpus. This corpus comprises reviews and corresponding sentiment understanding texts. During pretraining, these reviews serve as inputs, and the sentiment under-

standing texts serve as targets. The pretraining loss can be formulated as follows:

$$L = - \sum_t \log P(\mathbf{u}_t | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{<t}), \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} denote the input review and the sentiment understanding text, respectively. We claim that such pretraining can increase the sensitivity of SLMs toward sentiment elements and enhance their capabilities to understand the context within opinionated texts.

Our pretraining approach is similar to two existing methods. The first, domain-adaptive pretraining (Xu et al., 2019; Gururangan et al., 2020), continues to train models on domain-specific texts using language modeling objectives. This method is self-supervised, whereas our pretraining utilizes explicit supervisory signals from LLMs. The second, sentiment-enhanced pretraining (Tian et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2023b), enhances the pretraining process using sentiment knowledge such as sentiment lexicons and user ratings. A typical technique is rating prediction (Zhou et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021), which encourages models to learn sentiment-aware representations by predicting the rating scores of reviews. Our pretraining, in contrast, incorporates more fine-grained and comprehensive supervisory signals.

3 FSA Benchmark

During the distillation process, we encounter several critical questions: (a) how to measure the sentiment understanding capabilities of LLMs when selecting a teacher; (b) what is the gap between the student and the teacher?; and (c) how much is this gap reduced after distillation? The prerequisite for answering these questions is that we can conduct effective and reliable evaluations of different models. To this end, we develop a fine-grained sentiment analysis (FSA) benchmark.

Tasks. This benchmark includes two FSA tasks: targeted sentiment analysis and aspect-level sentiment analysis. Targeted sentiment analysis aims to extract opinion targets from the text and determine their sentiment polarities. Aspect-level sentiment analysis aims to detect aspect categories evaluated in the text and determine their sentiment polarities.

In these two tasks, we particularly concentrate on model performance in complex contexts. Our focus is directed toward implicit and multiple sentiments,

³<https://www.yelp.com/dataset>

⁴<https://nijianmo.github.io/amazon/index.html>

⁵Available at <https://chat.openai.com/>. The specific model used is gpt-3.5-turbo-0125.

Datasets	Split	#Sent	#Trg	#Asp	#Imp	#Mul
TSA-Rest14	Train	2432	2972	-	-	277
	Dev	609	721	-	-	78
	Test	800	1134	-	192	85
TSA-Laptop14	Train	2436	1922	-	-	148
	Dev	609	436	-	-	34
	Test	800	654	-	133	40
ASA-Rest16	Train	1600	1386	1823	-	114
	Dev	400	386	477	-	29
	Test	676	623	751	199	42
ASA-Laptop16	Train	2000	-	2349	-	126
	Dev	500	-	560	-	25
	Test	808	-	801	250	35
Rest-Hard	Test	340	383	504	285	104
Laptop-Hard	Test	237	290	382	212	59

Table 2: Statistics of FSA datasets, including two targeted sentiment analysis (TSA) datasets and two aspect-level sentiment analysis (ASA) datasets. #Sent, #Trg, and #Asp denote the number of sentences, targets, and aspects. #Imp and #Mul denote the number of samples with implicit and multiple sentiments.

where prior studies suggest that SLMs exhibit sub-par performance (Jiang et al., 2019; Li et al., 2021). Implicit sentiments are those not directly expressed through explicit opinion words but inferred indirectly through context, including factual statements, comparisons, metaphors, etc. Multiple sentiments occur when a sentence expresses different sentiment polarities toward different opinion targets or aspect categories.

Datasets. We derive base FSA datasets from SemEval Challenges (Pontiki et al., 2014, 2016) and make two key additions. Firstly, we identify ‘hard’ samples in the test set of these datasets, namely those containing implicit or multiple sentiments. Here, we use opinion words to determine whether a sample contains implicit sentiment. The opinion word annotations for SemEval-14 datasets are sourced from Fan et al. (2019). For SemEval-16 datasets, we annotate the opinion words for each opinion target and aspect category.

Secondly, we annotate additional hard samples. We observe that the original test sets contain too few hard samples, which reduces the reliability of the evaluations. Therefore, we view 300 reviews for each dataset and annotate those sentences containing implicit or multiple sentiments. The annotation process is described in Appendix B.1. We then supplement these samples into the original test sets. The statistics of these datasets are listed in Table 2.

Evaluation Framework for LLMs. Using the above FSA datasets to evaluate SLMs is effective, but they are inadequate and restrictive for evaluating LLMs. There are two main reasons. Firstly, these datasets do not assess the reasoning process, which is crucial to thoroughly evaluating the sentiment understanding capabilities of LLMs. Secondly, LLMs frequently generate outputs that deviate from the task-specific requirements, preventing them from fully demonstrating their capabilities. While finetuning can tackle this issue for open-source models, it is often impractical for proprietary models.

Therefore, we introduce an evaluation framework for LLMs. Initially, we leverage the analysis prompt outlined in Section 2.1 to guide LLMs in articulating their sentiment understanding in quadruple form. We then systematically evaluate each component of these quadruples: (1) **precision** and **recall** for target-aspect assess the correctness of identified target-aspects and check whether any mentioned in the review are omitted; (2) **accuracy** of sentiment quantifies the correctness of the assigned sentiment strengths; (3) **persuasiveness** and **exhaustiveness** of reasoning examine whether the reasoning processes convincingly support the sentiments and comprehensively enumerate relevant context; (4) **hallucination** in reasoning investigates whether LLMs refer to non-existent segments of the review or misattribute descriptions to wrong subjects. We formulate detailed annotation guidelines and have humans evaluate each dimension with scores of 0-2 points. The annotation guidelines and the evaluation process are presented in Appendix B.2.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Implementation Details. In the distillation process, we select T5-base as the student model and Llama-2-7b, Mixtral-8x7b, and GPT-3.5 as the teacher models. For each teacher model, we construct four datasets by applying the analysis and rewriting prompts on Yelp and Amazon data⁶, the statistics of which are presented in Table 1. During pretraining, we merge these four datasets into a sin-

⁶For GPT-3.5, we utilize OpenAI’s API to generate sentiment understanding texts. For Llama-2-7b, these texts are generated on a single 48G A6000 GPU using the vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023) framework. For Mixtral-8x7b, text generation is conducted on four A6000 GPUs, also utilizing the vLLM framework.

gle corpus to pretrain the T5 model. By default, our distillation process utilizes 100K reviews. We set the batch size to 100, the number of training epochs to 10, and the initial learning rate to $3e-3$. Additional hyperparameters are detailed in Appendix C.

After pretraining, we evaluate the distilled models on four FSA datasets, the statistics of which are provided in Table 2. During the evaluation, we merge the additionally annotated ‘hard’ samples into the original test set: Rest-Hard for TSA-Rest14 and ASA-Rest16, and Laptop-Hard for TSA-Laptop14 and ASA-Laptop16. To minimize the impact of randomness, we run all finetuning experiments 10 times and report the average results.

Baselines. We compare our method against three types of baselines. The first is a strong FSA method: INSTRUCTABSA (Scaria et al., 2024), which conducts instruction tuning using task definition and positive examples. We reproduce this method on our FSA datasets using the backbone of tk-instruct-base-def-pos (Wang et al., 2022). The second baseline consists of classic pretraining methods for sentiment analysis, including domain adaptation pretraining (DAPT) (Xu et al., 2019; Gururangan et al., 2020) and rating prediction (Zhou et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021). Finally, we compare our approach with a general distillation method. For this, we pretrain T5-base using a large instruction dataset (Wu et al., 2024), which contains 2.58 million diverse instruction samples generated using GPT-3.5. In addition, we also provide results of three LLMs using in-context learning and supervised fine-tuning for reference.

4.2 Evaluation of LLMs

We first evaluate the sentiment understanding capabilities of several LLMs and compare their performance against SLMs.

4.2.1 Human Evaluation

We conduct human evaluations of the three selected LLMs using the evaluation framework outlined in the *FSA Benchmark* section. The results are presented in Table 3. We make the following observations. Firstly, Llama-2-7b performs notably worse than the other two LLMs, especially with missing target-aspects, less persuasive reasoning, and more hallucinations. Secondly, the performance of Mixtral-8x7b and GPT-3.5 is comparable and generally good. Thirdly, in the LAPTOP domain, LLMs are more prone to produce incorrect target-aspects,

Methods	Target-Aspect Senti			Reasoning			Avg
	Prec	Rec	Accu	Pers	Exha	Hall	
RESTAURANT DOMAIN							
Llama-2-7b	1.35	0.80	1.09	1.34	0.68	1.27	1.09
Mixtral-8x7b	1.79	1.40	1.56	1.62	1.18	1.87	1.57
GPT-3.5	1.88	1.56	1.54	1.69	1.45	2.0	1.69
LAPTOP DOMAIN							
Llama-2-7b	1.21	1.48	0.69	1.41	1.70	1.91	1.40
Mixtral-8x7b	1.40	1.74	1.17	1.85	1.78	1.95	1.65
GPT-3.5	1.43	1.85	1.15	1.87	1.83	1.97	1.69

Table 3: Human scores of LLMs for fine-grained sentiment understanding (scoring range 0-2 points). ‘Senti’ refers to sentiments. Pers, Exha, and Hall denote persuasiveness, exhaustiveness, and hallucination.




Figure 3: The trend of LLMs’ human evaluation scores with varying review lengths (scoring range 0-2 points).

which can be attributed to the greater diversity of target-aspects in this domain. For example, in the FSA datasets, the number of aspect categories for RESTAURANT is 12, whereas for LAPTOP, it exceeds 80. In addition, we examine the performance of LLMs on reviews of different lengths. As shown in Figure 3, the longer the review, the poorer the performance. This trend is particularly pronounced with Llama-2-7b, indicating its weak capability in handling long reviews.

4.2.2 Performance on FSA Datasets

We also finetune the two open-source LLMs on our FSA datasets for a more objective evaluation. As shown in Table 4, LLMs significantly outperform SLMs, achieving average F_1 -score improvements of 5.92% for Llama-2-7b and 8.31% for Mixtral-8x7b. These results indicate that LLMs have a substantial advantage over SLMs in FSA tasks.

4.3 Evaluation of Distilled Models

Next, we conduct experiments to evaluate how the distilled models perform in fully-supervised and zero-shot settings.

Methods	TSA-Rest14			TSA-Laptop14			ASA-Rest16			ASA-Laptop16			Avg
	All	Imp	Mu1	All	Imp	Mu1	All	Imp	Mu1	All	Imp	Mu1	
T5-base	67.33	51.73	57.23	60.78	50.40	53.08	68.70	62.11	63.66	49.36	43.32	46.70	56.20
INSTRUCTABSA	67.88	52.11	55.89	62.94	51.61	54.09	71.49	66.17	63.10	49.77	42.76	49.39	+1.05
DAPT	68.31	52.77	58.80	61.42	51.00	53.77	71.31	66.01	65.28	50.23	44.06	46.03	+1.22
RATING PREDICTION	69.35	54.65	59.77	61.09	50.06	51.31	70.53	64.41	65.04	50.56	44.19	45.29	+0.99
GENERAL DISTILLATION	66.91	51.65	57.45	59.54	48.20	52.29	67.15	60.34	61.22	46.91	39.86	45.35	-1.46
Llama-2-7b													
IN-CONTEXT LEARNING	40.02	34.81	34.11	19.35	19.52	21.69	41.68	38.43	28.05	18.81	19.89	10.13	-28.99
SUPERVISED FINETUNING	70.72	58.47	61.81	63.39	54.16	55.94	75.44	70.03	71.03	57.55	51.60	55.25	+5.92
DISTIL (ANL w/o R)	68.17	52.94	60.14	62.08	51.56	54.33	70.24	64.82	64.79	50.47	44.65	48.73	+1.54
DISTIL (ANL w/o L)	68.74	53.98	60.26	62.71	52.61	54.34	70.72	64.55	63.62	51.21	44.87	47.51	+1.73
DISTIL (ANL)	68.89	53.86	60.33	62.72	52.50	54.61	70.85	64.71	65.24	51.16	45.37	50.31	+2.18
DISTIL (RW)	69.20	53.69	59.93	62.74	53.28	55.19	71.86	66.15	66.97	52.14	46.28	50.40	+2.79
DISTIL (ANL&RW)	68.85	54.44	60.64	63.21	53.16	55.10	72.27	66.38	66.13	51.81	45.75	50.30	+2.80
DISTIL (ANL&RW, 1M)	69.96	56.17	61.15	63.93	54.25	57.16	74.17	68.47	70.00	54.70	49.14	53.43	+4.84
Mixtral-8x7b													
IN-CONTEXT LEARNING	51.15	43.15	45.42	30.74	32.00	39.29	54.87	49.83	50.91	28.68	26.52	29.48	-16.03
SUPERVISED FINETUNING	72.59	59.97	64.21	64.40	55.34	55.95	78.35	74.03	73.46	60.25	55.45	60.18	+8.31
DISTIL (ANL w/o R)	68.12	53.04	59.49	62.92	52.66	56.82	69.21	63.05	64.18	50.90	45.14	50.54	+1.81
DISTIL (ANL w/o L)	69.29	54.63	61.76	62.97	53.02	55.81	71.21	65.45	64.90	51.25	45.03	47.92	+2.48
DISTIL (ANL)	69.21	54.34	61.16	63.07	53.60	54.93	71.51	65.66	66.32	51.68	46.19	50.36	+2.80
DISTIL (RW)	68.95	54.00	60.22	62.21	51.27	53.40	71.96	66.02	65.92	52.16	46.42	50.45	+2.38
DISTIL (ANL&RW)	69.69	54.96	61.82	63.77	53.63	57.43	72.13	66.60	66.92	52.94	47.30	51.91	+3.73
DISTIL (ANL&RW, 1M)	71.21	58.08	62.48	65.04	55.01	59.07	75.33	70.07	71.34	55.30	49.05	54.42	+6.00
GPT-3.5													
IN-CONTEXT LEARNING	51.28	43.11	48.35	28.69	30.73	35.07	56.63	52.75	52.23	28.90	29.25	32.54	-15.41
DISTIL (ANL w/o R)	68.86	53.81	59.70	62.45	51.65	54.85	71.29	65.76	65.97	51.28	45.30	47.68	+2.02
DISTIL (ANL w/o L)	68.99	54.20	60.54	62.34	52.30	55.10	71.84	65.48	66.93	51.79	45.80	50.36	+2.61
DISTIL (ANL)	69.23	55.06	60.19	62.84	52.74	55.00	71.21	65.51	65.22	51.63	45.39	49.95	+2.46
DISTIL (RW)	69.35	54.64	60.60	62.30	51.92	53.13	71.60	65.71	66.91	51.95	45.84	49.17	+2.39
DISTIL (ANL&RW)	69.45	55.28	61.03	62.96	52.96	56.66	72.80	67.06	68.11	53.11	47.49	52.19	+3.73

Table 4: Experimental results on four FSA datasets in fully-supervised settings (F_1 -score, %). The results on the origin test sets are presented in Appendix D.1. Imp and Mu1 denote implicit and multiple sentiments. ANL and RW denote the analysis and rewriting prompts. ANL w/o R and w/o L indicate the removal of reasoning and labels (*i.e.*, target, aspect, and sentiment) from the ANL corpus. 1M indicates distillation using 1 million reviews, while other results are based on 100K reviews.

4.3.1 Fully-supervised Setting

Table 4 lists the comparison results on the FSA datasets. According to these results, distillation significantly enhances the performance of SLMs, achieving up to a 6.00% improvement in F_1 -score. With Mixtral-8x7b as the teacher model, the distilled model outperforms Llama-2-7b with only 220M parameters. In addition, our approach significantly outperforms baseline methods, *i.e.*, INSTRUCTABSA, DAPT, RATING PREDICTION, and GENERAL DISTILLATION. These findings demonstrate the effectiveness and substantial potential of our distillation approach.

Furthermore, we make the following observations. (1) The distilled models achieve greater performance gains on implicit and multiple sentiments. (2) The quality of the teacher model has a signifi-

cant impact: better teachers produce better students. (3) The analysis and rewriting prompts are both effective for distillation, showing similar effects. Their combination yields the best results. (4) The reasoning process in the analysis prompt is crucial, as removing the reasoning process significantly reduces the performance of the distilled models. (5) Increasing the number of reviews for distillation from 100K to 1 million notably improves the performance of the distilled models, with an average F_1 -score increase of over 2%.

During data collection, we increase the proportion of reviews with mid-range ratings, hypothesizing that these reviews generally exhibit more diverse sentiments and could enhance the model’s capability to handle samples with multiple sentiments. We conduct experiments with different sam-

Methods	TSA-Rest14			TSA-Laptop14			ASA-Rest16			ASA-Laptop16			Avg
	All	Imp	Mul	All	Imp	Mul	All	Imp	Mul	All	Imp	Mul	
T5-base	66.58	55.92	46.78	65.25	58.13	46.85	70.60	66.46	49.85	72.53	67.56	50.45	59.75
Llama-2-7b	74.36	63.20	50.78	71.08	62.40	48.20	77.77	75.80	48.00	80.56	77.62	47.75	64.79
DISTIL (ANL&RW, 1M)	78.11	67.76	58.54	76.48	70.73	62.16	67.41	59.11	44.62	73.54	69.69	51.35	64.96
Mixtral-8x7b	83.85	76.18	70.51	79.13	73.78	64.41	85.58	82.70	64.31	85.71	82.01	65.32	76.12
DISTIL (ANL&RW, 1M)	83.45	74.75	70.07	81.04	75.61	70.72	84.14	80.86	67.38	85.55	81.73	71.62	77.24
GPT-3.5	78.97	67.33	60.98	77.22	71.54	57.21	79.76	76.57	55.69	81.32	77.48	52.70	69.73
DISTIL (ANL&RW, 100K)	79.96	69.04	64.30	77.54	70.12	60.36	79.60	75.04	54.15	80.64	76.06	58.11	70.41

Table 5: Experimental results of zero-shot sentiment classification on four FSA datasets (accuracy, %). The prompts are presented in Appendix A.3. Imp and Mul denote implicit and multiple sentiments. ANL and RW denote the analysis and rewriting prompts.

Methods	Rest14	Laptop14	Rest16	Laptop16	Avg
T5-base	57.23	53.08	63.66	46.70	55.17
R11111	60.38	55.41	67.22	52.58	+3.73
R00100	60.87	53.11	68.35	51.91	+3.39
R12421	61.82	57.43	66.92	51.91	+4.35

Table 6: Effect of sampling schemes on samples with multiple sentiments (F_1 -score, %): (1) R11111 represents sampling reviews according to their original proportions; (2) R00100 indicates exclusively sampling 3-star reviews. (3) R12421 denotes oversampling 2-star and 4-star reviews by a factor of 2, and 3-star reviews by a factor of 4. The teacher model for this experiment is Mixtral-8x7b.

pling schemes. The results in Table 6 show that the oversampling scheme (*i.e.*, R12421) achieves the best overall performance, confirming our hypothesis.

4.3.2 Zero-shot Setting

Existing works indicate that LLMs excel in zero-shot sentiment classification, approaching the performance of finetuned SLMs (Zhang et al., 2023a; Wang et al., 2024). We expect that distillation could endow SLMs with similar capabilities. Surprisingly, the results in Table 5 reveal that distillation not only significantly improves the zero-shot sentiment classification performance of SLMs but also enables them to reach and even surpass their teacher models. This superior performance can be attributed to the fact that teacher models are generally designed for broader tasks, while student models are specifically trained on a large-scale sentiment-specific corpus, equipping them with stronger sentiment classification capabilities. This finding suggests that distillation from LLMs is a highly promising approach in scenarios where




Figure 4: Scaling trends of review quantity and model size (average F_1 -score on FSA datasets, %).

training data is unavailable.

4.4 Further Analysis

4.4.1 Scaling Trends

The results in Table 4 demonstrate that increasing the number of reviews notably improves the effectiveness of distillation. We further investigate the impact of review quantity. Figure 4 illustrates that the performance of the distilled models steadily improves as the number of reviews increases, highlighting the potential benefits of further data expansion. Moreover, we find that the quantity of reviews has a greater impact than the quality of the teacher model. Even though Llama-2-7b is markedly inferior to Mixtral-8x7b and GPT-3.5, when distilled with 1 million reviews, its student model can outperform those of the latter two distilled with 100K reviews.

Besides, we investigate the impact of the student model’s size. Figure 4 illustrates that as the number of model parameters increases, the benefits of our distillation process exhibit a diminishing

Methods	TSA-Rest14			TSA-Laptop14			ASA-Rest16			ASA-Laptop16		
	Type1	Type2	Type3	Type1	Type2	Type3	Type1	Type2	Type3	Type1	Type2	Type3
T5-base	14.94	3.08	18.03	11.40	1.04	21.76	15.46	8.37	19.96	13.18	7.32	34.40
Mixtral-8x7b (FINETUNING)	20.40	2.85	11.86	13.64	0.86	15.89	19.10	6.65	6.01	19.40	6.59	23.79
DISTIL (ANL&RW,1M)	19.45	4.03	13.52	11.40	1.55	19.17	15.46	6.87	12.45	21.59	8.42	21.96

Table 7: The proportion of three types of errors in the predictions.




Figure 5: Performance on data-scarce scenarios (average F_1 -score on FSA datasets, %). Here, the teacher model is Mixtral-8x7b, and the number of reviews for distillation is 1 million.

trend. We attribute this trend to the decreasing gap in model size between the student and teacher, which narrows their gap in FSA capabilities and, consequently, reduces the potential gains from distillation.

4.4.2 Results on Data-scarce Scenarios

A major challenge of FSA is the relatively high cost of data annotation, which often leads to a scarcity of labeled data. We explore the feasibility of using distillation to mitigate this issue. Figure 5 indicates that the distilled model requires less than 25% of the finetuning data to achieve the same results that the original SLM attains with full data. Furthermore, we observe that the less finetuning data, the more significant the advantage of the distilled model over the original SLM, with improvements increasing from 6.00% to 11.37%. These findings suggest that distilling sentiment understanding from LLMs is a promising solution to the data scarcity challenge.

4.5 Error Analysis

Wang et al. (2024) note that LLMs tend to produce plausible but not entirely accurate results. Inspired by this observation, we conduct an analysis of the wrong predictions. We first formulate three types of errors. **Type 1 errors** occur when labels and predictions differ, but both are generally reasonable. For example, consider the review “very

hard to clean the dust off as there are multiple in-between segments, from metal to plastic to speakers.” In this case, categorizing the user opinion as either concerning LAPTOP#USABILITY or LAPTOP#DESIGN_FEATURES is acceptable. **Type 2 errors** arise when insufficient context prevents the model from making accurate predictions. A typical example is “I went through the settings and there isn’t a way to fix it.” Without specific information about what ‘it’ refers to, accurately inferring the appropriate aspect category becomes impossible. **Type 3 errors** refer to errors other than the above two types, more fundamentally reflecting model inadequacy.

We sample about 100 wrong predictions and manually categorize them into these three types of errors, as shown in Table 7. We make the following observations. (1) We observe a notably high proportion of Type 1 errors, suggesting that the predictions are far more reasonable than exact-match metrics might indicate. This finding implies that as a subjective task, FSA requires evaluation metrics beyond exact matching, and relying solely on single labels could potentially hinder the model’s optimization. (2) The proportion of Type 2 errors is also considerable, largely due to FSA annotations being at the sentence level. Conducting FSA at the review level could alleviate this issue. (3) In Type 3 errors, LLMs significantly outperform SLMs, and distillation enhances the performance of SLMs. In contrast, the first two types of errors cannot be reduced simply by enhancing the models. We look forward to future efforts to solve these issues through innovations in task formulations and metrics.

5 Related Work

5.1 Pretraining for Sentiment Analysis

Early studies (Xu et al., 2019; Gururangan et al., 2020) show that pretraining on sentiment-specific corpora can significantly improve model performance in downstream sentiment analysis tasks. Subsequent works (Tian et al., 2020; Ke et al.,

2020; Zhou et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021; Fan et al., 2022; Yong et al., 2023) further integrate sentiment knowledge into the pretraining phase to encourage the model to learn sentiment-aware representations. This sentiment knowledge includes aspect words, sentiment words, review ratings, and emoticons. Additionally, some studies (Ke et al., 2020; Yin et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2023b) also incorporate syntactic knowledge during pretraining.

5.2 Knowledge Distillation from LLMs

Knowledge distillation (Hinton et al., 2015) is the technique used to transfer knowledge from the teacher model to the student model. It is most commonly applied in natural language processing for model compression (Sun et al., 2019; Sanh et al., 2020; Jiao et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2020; Hou et al., 2020). With the advent of LLMs, many works explore transferring knowledge from large language models to existing SLMs to enhance their capabilities. This research can be categorized into two main approaches. The first leverages LLMs to generate pseudo-labels (Gilardi et al., 2023; Ding et al., 2023; He et al., 2024) or synthesize data (Meng et al., 2022; Ye et al., 2022; He et al., 2023) and then use this data to train SLMs to equip them with the capabilities for specific tasks. The second approach employs knowledge distillation to enable SLMs to enhance their reasoning capabilities (Ho et al., 2023; Kang et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023) or to generate rationales (Li et al., 2023).

6 Conclusions

This paper explores the distillation from large language models (LLMs) for fine-grained sentiment analysis (FSA). We leverage the analysis and rewriting prompts to guide LLMs in generating sentiment understanding texts and then utilize these texts to pretrain small language models (SLMs). Additionally, we develop a comprehensive FSA benchmark to evaluate both SLMs and LLMs. Experimental results on this benchmark indicate that distillation significantly enhances the sentiment analysis capabilities of SLMs, yielding notable enhancements in both fully-supervised and zero-shot settings. This finding suggests that distillation is a highly promising direction for FSA. Moreover, our error analysis reveals that a considerable proportion of errors are not attributable to the model’s capability, highlighting the need for innovative task formulations and metrics.

Limitations

We list the potential limitations of this paper:

- While our distillation can reduce the inference cost of large language models (LLMs), it requires a large substantial of data and incurs high training costs. Exploiting logits, attention scores, and hidden states from LLMs may enhance distillation effectiveness and reduce data requirements.
- Our error analysis in §4.5 highlights the inadequacies of current exact-match metrics for subjective tasks such as fine-grained sentiment analysis. However, this paper does not offer a specific solution.

We believe that these limitations offer promising directions for future research.

References

- Hongjie Cai, Rui Xia, and Jianfei Yu. 2021. [Aspect-category-opinion-sentiment quadruple extraction with implicit aspects and opinions](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 340–350, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bosheng Ding, Chengwei Qin, Linlin Liu, Yew Ken Chia, Boyang Li, Shafiq Joty, and Lidong Bing. 2023. [Is GPT-3 a good data annotator?](#) In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11173–11195, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shuai Fan, Chen Lin, Haonan Li, Zhenghao Lin, Jinsong Su, Hang Zhang, Yeyun Gong, Jian Guo, and Nan Duan. 2022. [Sentiment-aware word and sentence level pre-training for sentiment analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4984–4994, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhifang Fan, Zhen Wu, Xin-Yu Dai, Shujian Huang, and Jiajun Chen. 2019. [Target-oriented opinion words extraction with target-fused neural sequence labeling](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2509–2518, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hao Fei, Bobo Li, Qian Liu, Lidong Bing, Fei Li, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2023. [Reasoning implicit sentiment with chain-of-thought prompting](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 1171–1182, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fabrizio Gilardi, Meysam Alizadeh, and Maël Kubli. 2023. [Chatgpt outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(30):e2305016120.
- Suchin Gururangan, Ana Marasović, Swabha Swayamdipta, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Noah A. Smith. 2020. [Don't stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8342–8360, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xingwei He, Zhenghao Lin, Yeyun Gong, A-Long Jin, Hang Zhang, Chen Lin, Jian Jiao, Siu Ming Yiu, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2024. [Annollm: Making large language models to be better crowdsourced annotators](#).
- Zexue He, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, and Fereshte Khani. 2023. [Targeted data generation: Finding and fixing model weaknesses](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8506–8520, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. 2015. [Distilling the knowledge in a neural network](#).
- Namgyu Ho, Laura Schmid, and Se-Young Yun. 2023. [Large language models are reasoning teachers](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14852–14882, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lu Hou, Zhiqi Huang, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, and Qun Liu. 2020. [Dynabert: Dynamic bert with adaptive width and depth](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9782–9793. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L lio Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th ophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. [Mixtral of experts](#).
- Qingnan Jiang, Lei Chen, Ruifeng Xu, Xiang Ao, and Min Yang. 2019. [A challenge dataset and effective models for aspect-based sentiment analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 6280–6285, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaoqi Jiao, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, Linlin Li, Fang Wang, and Qun Liu. 2020. [TinyBERT: Distilling BERT for natural language understanding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4163–4174, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Minki Kang, Seanie Lee, Jinheon Baek, Kenji Kawaguchi, and Sung Ju Hwang. 2023. [Knowledge-augmented reasoning distillation for small language models in knowledge-intensive tasks](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 48573–48602. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Pei Ke, Haozhe Ji, Siyang Liu, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Minlie Huang. 2020. [SentiLARE: Sentiment-aware language representation learning with linguistic knowledge](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on*

- Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6975–6988, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP '23*, page 611–626, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Jiazheng Li, Lin Gui, Yuxiang Zhou, David West, Cesare Aloisi, and Yulan He. 2023. [Distilling ChatGPT for explainable automated student answer assessment](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 6007–6026, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xin Li, Lidong Bing, Wai Lam, and Bei Shi. 2018. [Transformation networks for target-oriented sentiment classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 946–956, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhengyan Li, Yicheng Zou, Chong Zhang, Qi Zhang, and Zhongyu Wei. 2021. [Learning implicit sentiment in aspect-based sentiment analysis with supervised contrastive pre-training](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 246–256, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yue Mao, Yi Shen, Chao Yu, and Longjun Cai. 2021. [A joint training dual-mrc framework for aspect based sentiment analysis](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(15):13543–13551.
- Yu Meng, Jiaxin Huang, Yu Zhang, and Jiawei Han. 2022. [Generating training data with language models: Towards zero-shot language understanding](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 462–477. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Piotr Nawrot. 2023. [nanot5: A pytorch framework for pre-training and fine-tuning t5-style models with limited resources](#).
- Jianmo Ni, Jiacheng Li, and Julian McAuley. 2019. [Justifying recommendations using distantly-labeled reviews and fine-grained aspects](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 188–197, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maria Pontiki, Dimitris Galanis, Haris Papageorgiou, Ion Androutsopoulos, Suresh Manandhar, Mohammad AL-Smadi, Mahmoud Al-Ayyoub, Yanyan Zhao, Bing Qin, Orphée De Clercq, Véronique Hoste, Marianna Apidianaki, Xavier Tannier, Natalia Loukachevitch, Evgeniy Kotelnikov, Nuria Bel, Salud María Jiménez-Zafra, and Gülşen Eryiğit. 2016. [SemEval-2016 task 5: Aspect based sentiment analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2016)*, pages 19–30, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maria Pontiki, Dimitris Galanis, Haris Papageorgiou, Suresh Manandhar, and Ion Androutsopoulos. 2015. [SemEval-2015 task 12: Aspect based sentiment analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 9th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2015)*, pages 486–495, Denver, Colorado. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maria Pontiki, Dimitris Galanis, John Pavlopoulos, Haris Papageorgiou, Ion Androutsopoulos, and Suresh Manandhar. 2014. [SemEval-2014 task 4: Aspect based sentiment analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2014)*, pages 27–35, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chengwei Qin, Aston Zhang, Zhuosheng Zhang, Jiaao Chen, Michihiro Yasunaga, and Diyi Yang. 2023. [Is ChatGPT a general-purpose natural language processing task solver?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1339–1384, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. [Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2020. [Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter](#).
- Kevin Scaria, Himanshu Gupta, Siddharth Goyal, Saurabh Sawant, Swaroop Mishra, and Chitta Baral. 2024. [InstructABSA: Instruction learning for aspect based sentiment analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 720–736, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Siqi Sun, Yu Cheng, Zhe Gan, and Jingjing Liu. 2019. [Patient knowledge distillation for BERT model compression](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4323–4332, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhiqing Sun, Hongkun Yu, Xiaodan Song, Renjie Liu, Yiming Yang, and Denny Zhou. 2020. [MobileBERT](#):

- a compact task-agnostic BERT for resource-limited devices. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2158–2170, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hao Tian, Can Gao, Xinyan Xiao, Hao Liu, Bolei He, Hua Wu, Haifeng Wang, and Feng Wu. 2020. **SKEP: Sentiment knowledge enhanced pre-training for sentiment analysis**. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4067–4076, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. **Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models**.
- Hai Wan, Yufei Yang, Jianfeng Du, Yanan Liu, Kunxun Qi, and Jeff Z. Pan. 2020. **Target-aspect-sentiment joint detection for aspect-based sentiment analysis**. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(05):9122–9129.
- Peifeng Wang, Zhengyang Wang, Zheng Li, Yifan Gao, Bing Yin, and Xiang Ren. 2023. **SCOTT: Self-consistent chain-of-thought distillation**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5546–5558, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Atharva Naik, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Anjana Arunkumar, David Stap, Eshaan Pathak, Giannis Karamanolakis, Haizhi Lai, Ishan Purohit, Ishani Mondal, Jacob Anderson, Kirby Kuznia, Krma Doshi, Kuntal Kumar Pal, Maitreya Patel, Mehrad Moradshahi, Mihir Parmar, Mirali Purohit, Neeraj Varshney, Phani Rohitha Kaza, Pulkit Verma, Ravsehaj Singh Puri, Rushang Karia, Savan Doshi, Shailaja Keyur Sampat, Siddhartha Mishra, Sujan Reddy A, Sumanta Patro, Tanay Dixit, and Xudong Shen. 2022. **Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ NLP tasks**. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5085–5109, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zengzhi Wang, Qiming Xie, Yi Feng, Zixiang Ding, Zinong Yang, and Rui Xia. 2024. **Is chatgpt a good sentiment analyzer? a preliminary study**.
- Minghao Wu, Abdul Waheed, Chiyu Zhang, Muhammad Abdul-Mageed, and Alham Fikri Aji. 2024. **LaMini-LM: A diverse herd of distilled models from large-scale instructions**. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 944–964, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hu Xu, Bing Liu, Lei Shu, and Philip Yu. 2019. **BERT post-training for review reading comprehension and aspect-based sentiment analysis**. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2324–2335, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hang Yan, Junqi Dai, Tuo Ji, Xipeng Qiu, and Zheng Zhang. 2021. **A unified generative framework for aspect-based sentiment analysis**. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2416–2429, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiacheng Ye, Jiahui Gao, Qintong Li, Hang Xu, Jiangtao Feng, Zhiyong Wu, Tao Yu, and Lingpeng Kong. 2022. **ZeroGen: Efficient zero-shot learning via dataset generation**. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11653–11669, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Da Yin, Tao Meng, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2020. **SentiBERT: A transferable transformer-based architecture for compositional sentiment semantics**. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3695–3706, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qian Yong, Chen Chen, Zhongqing Wang, Rong Xiao, and Haihong Tang. 2023. **Sgpt: Semantic graphs based pre-training for aspect-based sentiment analysis**. *World Wide Web*, 26(4):2201–2214.
- Wenxuan Zhang, Yang Deng, Xin Li, Yifei Yuan, Lidong Bing, and Wai Lam. 2021a. **Aspect sentiment quad prediction as paraphrase generation**. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9209–9219, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Wenxuan Zhang, Yue Deng, Bing Liu, Sinno Jialin Pan, and Lidong Bing. 2023a. [Sentiment analysis in the era of large language models: A reality check.](#)

Wenxuan Zhang, Xin Li, Yang Deng, Lidong Bing, and Wai Lam. 2021b. [Towards generative aspect-based sentiment analysis.](#) In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 504–510, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Yice Zhang, Yifan Yang, Bin Liang, Shiwei Chen, Bing Qin, and Ruifeng Xu. 2023b. [An empirical study of sentiment-enhanced pre-training for aspect-based sentiment analysis.](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 9633–9651, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Jie Zhou, Junfeng Tian, Rui Wang, Yuanbin Wu, Wenming Xiao, and Liang He. 2020. [SentiX: A sentiment-aware pre-trained model for cross-domain sentiment analysis.](#) In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 568–579, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.

Analysis Prompt

Analyze the fine-grained sentiment of a user review, listing both the opinion targets and the corresponding sentiments.

Requirements:

- Opinion Target: Identify and locate the explicit mention of the reviewed entity within the review.
- Aspect: Specify possible aspects mentioned on the opinion target, including entity types and attribute labels.
- Sentiment: Assess the sentiment intensity on the opinion target, selecting from very negative, negative, mild sentiment, positive, and very positive.
- Reasoning: Highlight the specific expressions of sentiment found within the review that are directed toward the opinion target. When sentiment is conveyed implicitly, explain how the sentiment is inferred from the context. An implicit sentiment does not utilize clear sentiment words or phrases (e.g., "happy," "disappointed," "love," or "hate") but rather is implied through context, including factual statements, comparisons, metaphors, or other indirect language.

Example:

{demo}

Your Task:

Review: {input review}

Rewriting Prompt

Rewrite a user review to express the feelings more clearly and evidently. Incorporate descriptions of the evaluated aspects and highlight the corresponding sentiments. When sentiments are expressed implicitly, clarify them with direct assessments and explicitly state the feelings.

Example:

{demo}

Your Task:

Review: {input review}

Table 8: The analysis and rewriting prompts.

Targeted Sentiment Analysis

Please perform targeted sentiment analysis task. Given the sentence, tag all (target, sentiment) pairs. Target should be substring of the sentence, and sentiment should be selected from ['negative', 'neutral', 'positive', 'conflict']. If there are no target-sentiment pairs, return an empty list. Otherwise return a python list of tuples containing two strings in double quotes. Please return python list only, without any other comments or texts.

Sentence: I've been several times and am totally smitten.

Label: []

Sentence: The wine list is also really nice.

Label: [('wine list', 'positive')]

Sentence: I have to say they have one of the fastest delivery times in the city.

Label:

Aspect-level Sentiment Analysis

Please perform aspect-level sentiment analysis task. Given the sentence, tag all (aspect category, sentiment) pairs. Aspect category should be selected from {category space}, and sentiment should be selected from ['negative', 'neutral', 'positive']. If there are no target-sentiment pairs, return an empty list. Otherwise return a python list of tuples containing two strings in double quotes. Please return python list only, without any other comments or texts.

Sentence: so delicious!!!!!!

Label: [('food quality', 'positive')]

Sentence: The food arrived 20 minutes after I called, cold and soggy.

Label: [('food quality', 'negative'), ('service general', 'negative')]

Sentence: Serves really good sushi.

Label:

Table 9: The prompts for in-context learning FSA.

Organization of Appendices

We structure the appendix into four sections:

- Appendix A presents the complete prompts utilized in our paper;
- Appendix B describes detailed annotations of fine-grained sentiment analysis (FSA) datasets and human evaluations;
- Appendix C provides detailed hyperparameters for pretraining; and
- Appendix D lists additional experimental results.

A Prompt Details

A.1 Analysis and Rewriting Prompts

We develop two prompts that guide large language models (LLMs) in generating content that embod-

ies advanced sentiment understanding. The first, the analysis prompt, aims to instruct LLMs to analyze the given review, listing the opinion targets and their corresponding aspects, sentiments, and reasonings. The second, the rewriting prompt, aims to instruct LLMs to rewrite the given review from a first-person perspective, expressing the user's feelings more clearly and evidently. Table 8 presents the complete analysis and rewriting prompts.

A.2 In-context Learning Prompt

We examine the performance of LLMs on FSA datasets via in-context learning and fine-tuning. Our in-context learning prompts follow Zhang et al. (2023a), with the complete prompts provided in Table 9. The demonstration examples within the prompt are randomly sampled from the training set. We experimentally determine the number of demonstration examples: for TSA-Laptop14, it is




Figure 6: The screenshot of the annotation platform for FSA annotations.

set to 4; for other datasets, it is 8.

A.3 Zero-shot Sentiment Classification Prompt

Targeted Sentiment Classification (GPT-3.5)

Please perform the targeted sentiment classification task. Given the sentence, assign a sentiment label towards the opinion target from ['negative', 'neutral', 'positive', 'conflict'].
Sentence: {sentence}
Opinion target: {target}
Label:

Aspect-level Sentiment Classification (GPT-3.5)

Please perform the aspect-level sentiment classification task. Given the sentence, assign a sentiment label towards the aspect category from ['negative', 'neutral', 'positive'].
Sentence: {sentence}
Aspect category: {target}
Label:

Targeted Sentiment Classification (T5, Llama, Mixtral)

Sentence: {sentence}
Opinion target: {target}
Label:

Aspect-level Sentiment Classification (T5, Llama, Mixtral)

Sentence: {sentence}
Aspect category: {target}
Label:

Table 10: The prompts for zero-shot sentiment classification.

We also compare LLMs and small language mod-

els (SLMs) in zero-shot sentiment classification. The prompts are presented in Table 10. For SLMs and open-source LLMs, Llama-2-7b and Mixtral-8x7b, we use simple prompts and determine the predictions by comparing the conditional probabilities of label words. For proprietary LLMs, GPT-3.5, we include an additional instruction.

B Annotation Details

B.1 FSA Annotation

The test sets of original FSA datasets contain two few 'hard samples', reducing the reliability of the evaluations. Therefore, we annotate additional hard samples. We provide the annotation details as follows.

Annotators. The annotators comprise two well-educated students. One is a Ph.D. student specializing in sentiment analysis, with prior experience in annotating two FSA projects and extensive research in this field. The other is a master's student researcher in fine-grained sentiment analysis. Both are well-versed in the concepts and annotation guidelines of FSA.

Annotation Guidelines. To ensure consistency, we provide annotators with well-developed and authoritative annotation guidelines (Pontiki et al., 2016), which are available at <https://alt.>




Figure 7: The screenshot of the annotation platform for human evaluation.

qcri.org/semeval2016/task5/data/uploads/absa2016_annotationguidelines.pdf.

Annotation Platform. We use Label Studio⁷ to build our annotation platform, as shown in Figure 6. We begin by annotating the opinion targets and corresponding aspect categories within sentences. If aspect categories are inferred from the context without explicit text segments, the opinion targets are marked as ‘NULL’. Subsequently, we annotate the opinion words linked to each opinion target. Finally, we assess the corresponding sentiment.

Annotation Process. We collect 300 reviews each from the Yelp dataset⁸ and the Amazon laptop dataset⁹ (Ni et al., 2019). The entire annotation process is divided into multiple batches, with each batch containing approximately 40 reviews. To ensure the quality of the annotations, each review is independently annotated by two annotators. At the end of each batch, the annotators will meet to discuss any inconsistencies based on the provided annotation guidelines. Data that cannot be reconciled will be removed.

⁷<https://labelstud.io/>

⁸<https://www.yelp.com/dataset>

⁹<https://nijianmo.github.io/amazon/index.html>

B.2 Human Evaluation for LLMs

We develop an evaluation framework to assess the sentiment understanding capabilities of LLMs. We provide the annotation details as follows.

Annotators. The annotation team consists of four well-educated students, including one Ph.D. student, two master’s students, and one undergraduate student. All of them are well-versed in the provided annotation guidelines.

Annotation Guidelines. Our evaluation framework includes six metrics. Each metric is scored from 0 to 2. We develop detailed annotation guidelines for each metric to ensure consistency. They are presented as follows.

Precision of Target and Aspects:

- 2 points: All targets and aspects are completely accurate.
- 1 point: One target or aspect is inaccurate.
- 0 points: More than one target or aspect is inaccurate.

Recall of Targets and Aspects:

- 2 points: The analysis comprehensively covers all relevant targets and aspects mentioned in the review, with no omissions.
- 1 point: The analysis omits one aspect.
- 0 points: The analysis omits more than one aspect or omits a target.

Accuracy of Sentiments:

- 1) If a target or aspect is inaccurate, the sentiment is considered inaccurate, i.e., the sentiment score will not exceed the score for accuracy of targets and aspects. 2) Sentiments are categorized into five levels: very negative/negative/neutral (including slightly negative, positive)/positive/very positive. 3) A one-level sentiment error is a minor error, and a two-level error is a severe error.
- 2 points: The sentiment assessment is completely accurate and fully aligns with the reviewer’s sentiment.
 - 1 point: There is one minor error.
 - 0 points: There is more than one minor error or a severe error.

Persuasiveness of Reasoning:

- 2 points: All reasoning processes are sufficiently and persuasively supportive of the sentiment analysis results.
- 1 point: There is one instance of insufficient, unconvincing reasoning.
- 0 points: There are more than one instance of insufficient, unconvincing reasoning, or there is one instance of completely insufficient, unconvincing reasoning.

Exhaustiveness of Reasoning:

- 2 points: All reasoning comprehensively lists all relevant sentiment segments, with no omissions.
- 1 point: One sentiment segment is omitted.
- 0 points: More than one sentiment segment is omitted.

Hallucination Issues in Reasoning:

- 2 points: All reasoning does not use segments that do not exist in the original text, or uses irrelevant segments as evidence.
- 1 point: One instance.
- 0 points: More than one instance.

Annotation Platform. We use Label Studio to build our annotation platform, as shown in Figure 7. To ensure the quality of the annotations, we

Hyper-parameter	Value
Batch Size	100
Learning Rate	3e-3
Learning Rate Decay	Cosine (fine_cosine=1e-5)
Training Epoch	10
Warmup Step	0
Weight Decay	0
Adam β_1	0.9
Adam β_2	0.999
Gradient Clipping	1.0
Max Seq Length (Input)	128
Max Seq Length (Output)	400

Table 11: Hyper-parameters for pretraining.

require annotators to identify the relevant segments before assigning scores.

Annotation Process. We collect 100 reviews each from the Yelp dataset and the Amazon laptop dataset. Then, we leverage the analysis prompt to guide three large language models in generating sentiment understanding texts. Each data is independently annotated by two annotators. We use the average of their scores as the final score.

C Implementation Details of Pretraining

We continue to pretrain T5 on our sentiment understanding corpus. Following [Nawrot \(2023\)](#)¹⁰, we employ AdamW with RMS scaling as the optimization algorithm. The detailed hyperparameters are listed in Table 11. Below, we describe how we determine the values of these hyperparameters.

- The batch size is set to 100 based on our experience.
- Learning rate and training epochs are determined experimentally. We try numerous combinations and find that the current combination (learning rate = 3e-3, training epochs = 10) achieves optimal performance.
- Maximum seq lengths are decided by analyzing the length distribution of the pretraining data.
- Other hyperparameters are adopted from [Nawrot \(2023\)](#), which reproduces the pretraining of T5 in the PyTorch framework.

Methods	Rest14	Laptop14	Rest16	Laptop16
T5-base	75.77	68.35	74.70	51.63
DAPT	76.46	69.31	76.85	51.95
Rating Prediction	77.52	68.46	75.78	52.77
Llama-2-7b				
IN-CONTEXT LEARNING	43.07	18.44	46.42	19.14
SUPERVISED FINETUNING	78.74	71.23	79.59	60.13
DISTIL (ANL&RW)	77.15	71.09	77.99	53.48
DISTIL (ANL&RW, 1M)	78.06	71.73	79.06	55.98
Mixtral-8x7b				
IN-CONTEXT LEARNING	53.54	29.74	60.56	29.53
SUPERVISED FINETUNING	80.40	72.44	82.91	62.54
DISTIL (ANL&RW)	77.83	72.61	77.64	54.21
DISTIL (ANL&RW, 1M)	79.05	73.48	79.41	56.89
GPT-3.5				
IN-CONTEXT LEARNING	55.36	27.08	61.56	27.99
DISTIL (ANL&RW)	77.68	71.03	78.14	54.33

Table 12: Experimental results on the original test sets (F_1 -score, %).

Methods	ACOS		ASQP		Avg
	Laptop16	Rest16	Rest15	Rest16	
T5-base	44.35	59.77	48.23	59.17	52.88
DISTIL (Llama)	44.68	62.00	51.78	62.97	+2.48
DISTIL (Mixtral)	45.44	62.41	52.99	62.87	+3.05
DISTIL (GPT-3.5)	45.21	63.09	50.38	61.95	+2.28

Table 13: Experimental results on four ASQP datasets (F_1 -score, %). Distillation for Llama-2-7b and Mixtral-8x7b leverage 1 million reviews, whereas GPT-3.5 leverages 100K reviews.

D Additional Results

D.1 Results on Original Test Sets

To facilitate comparisons for future work, we also publish the performance on the original FSA test sets in Table 12.

D.2 Results on the ASQP Task

Aspect sentiment quad prediction (ASQP) (Cai et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021a) is a comprehensive task in FSA that has received widespread attention. We also conduct experiments on this task, and the results are displayed in Table 13. We can see that our distillation also significantly enhances the performance of SLMs on this task.

¹⁰<https://github.com/PiotrNawrot/nanoT5>