

Efficient Response Generation Method Selection for Fine-Tuning Large Language Models

Xuan Ren*
University of Adelaide
xuan.ren@adelaide.edu.au

Qi Chen*
University of Adelaide

Lingqiao Liu^{1†}
University of Adelaide
lingqiao.liu@adelaide.edu.au

Abstract

The training data for fine-tuning large language models (LLMs) is typically structured as input-output pairs. However, for many tasks, there can be multiple equally valid output variations for the same input. Recent studies have observed that the choice of output variation used in training can affect the model’s performance. This raises an important question: how can we generate the most effective output from the many possible response generation strategy options? Rather than relying on the traditional but resource-intensive train-and-evaluate approach, this paper proposes a scalable, approximate method for estimating the quality of a small subset of generated training data derived from the same input. We then evaluate how well this small subset of generated output fits the target model we are trying to train. We present a large-scale benchmark covering diverse reasoning-based datasets to support our study.

The central idea is that a good output should closely resemble the output generated by the target LLM. We formalize this ‘closeness’ as the expected alignment score between a candidate output and the output sampled from the target LLM. We connect this measurement to the perplexity metric used in previous literature and demonstrate that leveraging an alignment-based metric can provide better predictions of model performance. Using this strategy, we can evaluate a small subset of the generated output from each response generation strategy option, then select the most effective strategy. We show that an LLM trained on data generated by the selected strategy could lead to a significant performance gain in many cases.

1 Introduction

When instruction-tuning an LLM, training data consists of question-response pairs, where multiple

valid responses can be generated for the same input. Previous studies (Ren et al., 2024) show that datasets with identical input questions but different responses can lead to varied learning outcomes, even when responses contain similar levels of detail. This raises a key question: *how can we construct responses that are most effective for the target LLM?*

Prior research has explored improving responses by adding details or rationales, such as structuring ground truth step by step (Hsieh et al., 2023; Ranaldi and Freitas, 2024), incorporating rationales, or enriching responses with additional information (Zhang et al., 2024; Kang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2022). However, recent studies (Ren et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2024) suggest that more details or converting responses to step by step style do not always improve performance and that alignment with the LLM’s linguistic style is crucial.

From our experiment, we observe that, no single response generation strategy works universally across tasks. Thus, we need to creating a method to find out the most effective way to generate response for each task, rather than use a single method for all of the tasks.

Some concurrent works (Xu et al., 2024; Kim et al., 2024) attempt to predict the effectiveness of response generation methods by evaluating the entire training dataset. They generate full training datasets using each method and then estimate training effectiveness based on scores computed via algorithms or reward models. However, these approaches are computationally expensive and not scalable.

However, can we predict the effectiveness of each data generation methods efficiently? We observe an interesting phenomenon that each response generation method produces responses with a consistent style, meaning that a small subset of generated examples can effectively represent the entire dataset. Based on this assumption, we propose an efficient ranking pipeline that evaluates a

*Equal contribution.

[†]Corresponding author.

limited number of samples (e.g., 10) to assess the performance of each response generation strategy. This approach uses a similarity function to assign scores to each strategy, enabling us to identify the best-performing method without the need for a full-dataset evaluation.

Inspired by previous studies (Yang et al., 2024; Ren et al., 2024), we use the alignment between the answers generated by the target LLM and the candidate question-answer pairs as a surrogate indicator for evaluating the effectiveness of answer generation strategies. Specifically, we define the alignment score as the expected value of a similarity function between the answer generated by the target LLM and the answer provided by the chosen strategy.

Mathematically, this alignment score generalizes the perplexity-based familiarity score from prior work and serves as a flexible framework for defining various evaluation criteria depending on the similarity function used. In our implementation, we find that using an ensemble of multiple similarity scores produces a reliable indicator for selecting answer generation strategies.

In our experiments, we observe a strong correlation between the proposed indicator and the ranking of training dataset performance. Furthermore, we construct a pool of answer generation strategies and demonstrate that applying our selection criterion leads to significant performance gains compared to the baselines.

2 Related Works

There has been extensive research into what types of data yield the best training outcomes for large language models (LLMs). Previous studies have identified several factors that positively influence model training, such as adding complexity (Xu et al., 2023), adding details (Zhang et al., 2024; Kang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2022), adding diversity (Luo et al., 2023), augmenting ground-truth answers in a step-by-step manner (Hsieh et al., 2023; Ho et al., 2022; Magister et al., 2023; Fu et al., 2023; Ranaldi and Freitas, 2024), and ensuring correctness (Trinh et al., 2024; Ranaldi and Freitas, 2024). However, in practice, these metrics are challenging to measure for a given dataset, making it difficult to determine the quality of training data based on these criteria. (Ren et al., 2024) found that familiarity significantly impacts model training. They argue that language models are more

familiar with content generated by other language models, which explains why synthetic data is often more effective for training compared to human-generated data for educating LLMs.

Metrics such as perplexity and cosine similarity have been widely used for different purposes in prior research. Perplexity has been used to select prompts (Gonen et al., 2022), showing that prompts with lower perplexity generally lead to better performance in question-answering tasks. It has also been used for selecting pretraining datasets (De la Rosa et al., 2022), detecting AI-generated content (Xu and Sheng, 2024; Hu et al., 2020), and selecting instruction-tuning data from a database (Li et al., 2024; Mekala et al., 2024). Researchers hypothesized that higher perplexity reflects more challenging data, which can be beneficial for teaching LLMs new knowledge. Unlike these studies, our focus is on improving the target responses (y) for a given training set of (x,y) pairs, thereby generating better data for training LLMs.

Semantic similarity, on the other hand, has been extensively studied in the NLP field for various purposes, including matching document similarity. For instance, many research works have used cosine similarity in movie recommendation systems (Singh et al., 2020; Khatter et al., 2021). Others have used it to calculate text relevance between documents (Gunawan et al., 2018) or for text classification (Li and Han, 2013).

There are two concurrent works closely related to our study. (Xu et al., 2024) evaluate the response generation ability of five teacher models and twenty student models, introducing Compatibility-Adjusted Reward (CAR) as a metric for response generation effectiveness. However, their focus is on general instruction-following datasets (Magpie-100K and Mix-100K), and they assess overall response quality across teachers. In contrast, we evaluate response generation on specific tasks and explore meta-prompting scenarios. Furthermore, while their approach analyzes quality indicators across entire datasets, we focus on evaluating a small subset of the training data. (Kim et al., 2024) examine language models as synthetic data generators across coding, math, and general instruction-following tasks, using PCA to identify key performance indicators. Unlike their work, we emphasize prediction rather than post-hoc analysis and evaluate response generation across a broader range of tasks. Moreover, while they assume their selected meta-prompt is optimal, we use a method

to select the best meta-prompt. Additionally, our approach introduces an efficient pipeline for training effectiveness prediction without generating full datasets, whereas they analyze quality indicators across entire datasets.

3 Method

This paper focuses on efficiently selecting the most effective answer generation strategy to achieve optimal performance when training a target LLM. Formally, we define the program as follows:

3.1 Problem Definition

Considering a series of candidate answer generation strategies $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n\}$. Each strategy can be applied to the question (and optionally an initial answer) to produce answer \hat{y} , *i.e.*, $\hat{y}^k = S_k(x)$ or $S_k(x, y)$. We seek to select an optimal strategy to construct a training dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(x, \hat{y}^k)\}$ for better learning our model M . The selection process often needs help with a subset \mathcal{D}_s with K pairs from the whole dataset \mathcal{D} ($K \ll |\mathcal{D}|$), consisting of paired questions and responses $\{(x, S_k(x))\}$. Formally, we can define the whole process by

$$S_\iota \leftarrow \text{Select}(\mathcal{S}), \text{ where } \iota = \arg \min_k \pi(S_k, M, \mathcal{D}_s). \quad (1)$$

Here, `Select` refers to the selection process and S_ι is the selected strategy. π is a selection criterion, which should be able to assess the quality of each data generation strategy $S_j \in \mathcal{S}$ based on sample pairs in the subset $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}_s$ and the base language model M we want to tune.

3.2 Selection Criterion π Design

The crux of addressing this issue lies in developing an appropriate selection process. As noted in (Ren et al., 2024), fine-tuning large language models (LLMs) with responses generated by other LLMs often yields better results than using human-generated responses, particularly in reasoning tasks, which is attributed to the inherent ‘‘familiarity’’ of LLMs with machine-generated content. Inspired by these findings, we propose to use the alignment between the answer generated from the target LLM M and a candidate answer generation strategy S_k as the criterion. Formally, the definition of this alignment score is as follows:

$$\pi := \mathbb{E}_{x, \hat{y} \sim \mathcal{S}(x)} [\varphi(M(x), \hat{y})], \quad (2)$$

where φ is a similarity measure that quantifies the closeness between the LLM-generated answer $M(x)$ and \hat{y} .

The intuition behind this definition is that if the training target \hat{y} is close to the target LLM’s output space, the LLM should be able to learn \hat{y} more easily, leading to improved prediction performance.

Note that the choice of φ in the above definition is flexible. Different φ functions can be used to define various selection criteria. In this paper, we explore several cases of φ , although many other options are possible and could be investigated further.

3.2.1 Implementation of Alignment Score

3.2.2 Case 1: Perplexity

One special case of φ is defining it as a δ function, namely

$$\varphi(M(x), \hat{y}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } M(x) = \hat{y} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

It can be shown that under this definition of φ , Eq. 2 reduces to the following

$$\pi = \mathbb{E}_{x, \hat{y} \sim \mathcal{S}(x)} = \mathbb{E}_x [P_M(\hat{y}|x)], \quad (4)$$

where $P_M(\hat{y}|x)$ measures the likelihood of the target output \hat{y} being generated by the LLM M . This measurement is equivalent to the perplexity, as used in (Ren et al., 2024). In other words, our analysis shows that perplexity measure is a special case of the criterion defined in this paper.

In our implementation, we follow the definition of perplexity and use the following equivalent form as selection criterion (the lower the better as oppose to the higher the better in Eq. 2):

$$\varphi_{\text{PPL}}(x_i, \hat{y}_i^k) := e^{-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \log p(\hat{y}_{ij}^k | x_i, \hat{y}_{i(<j)}^k)}, \quad (5)$$

$$\pi_{\text{PPL}}(S_k) := \min \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \varphi_{\text{PPL}}(x_i, \hat{y}_i^k), \tau \right), \quad (6)$$

where N is the length of the response \hat{y}_i^k . The $\log p(\hat{y}_{ij}^k | x_i, \hat{y}_{i(<j)}^k)$ represents the log probability assigned by the language model M to each token \hat{y}_{ij}^k in the response \hat{y}_i^k . To avoid the impact of the extreme value, we limit the maximum value of PPL for each strategy S_k under a certain threshold τ . In this paper, we set $\tau = 10$ in all our experiments.

3.2.3 Case 2: Semantic Similarity

In Case 1, the definition of φ essentially considers \hat{y} as the only correct response, ignoring responses

that are semantically close to \hat{y} . To address this, we propose using the embedding similarity between \hat{y} and $M(x)$ as a similarity score for measuring semantic similarity. Specifically, we utilize the cosine similarity between the sentence embeddings of \hat{y} and $M(x)$:

$$\varphi_{\cos}(M(x), \hat{y}) := \text{Cosine}(e(M(x)), e(\hat{y})), \quad (7)$$

where e is the embedding extracted to represent $M(x)$ and \hat{y} . In our implementation, we feed the output text together with the input question x into the LLM and average the latents across all layers corresponding to the response tokens to obtain the sentence embedding.

To make the criterion compatible with the perplexity (the smaller the better), we use an inverse cosine similarity $\pi_{\cos}(S_k) = 1 - \varphi_{\cos}(M(x), \hat{y})$ as the criterion¹.

Besides evaluating response generation strategies through either perplexity or semantic similarity individually, we propose a combined criterion that uses both metrics to select the most effective strategy. This mixed approach aims to capitalize on the strengths of both perplexity and semantic similarity to provide a more robust assessment of response alignment with the language model’s capabilities.

The mixed criterion π_{mix} integrates both perplexity and semantic similarity measures to evaluate the quality of responses generated by each strategy S_k . The criterion is defined as follows:

$$\pi_{\text{mix}}(S_k) = \text{Norm}(\pi_{\text{PPL}}(S_k)) + \text{Norm}(\pi_{\cos}(S_k)), \quad (8)$$

where Norm is the min-max normalization across various strategies, which scales the values of both $\pi_{\text{PPL}}(S_k)$ and $\pi_{\cos}(S_k)$ into $[0, 1]$.

The rationale behind this approach is that while perplexity provides a measure of how naturally a response could be predicted by the model, reflecting syntactic and linguistic consistency, semantic similarity measures the conceptual closeness of the responses to what the model would ideally generate. By combining these metrics, π_{mix} aims to ensure that selected strategies not only produce linguistically coherent responses but also maintain alignment with the semantic intents of the original model outputs.

¹ $M(x)$ may generate incorrect responses, making cosine similarity calculations between $M(x)$ and \hat{y} unreliable. To alleviate this, we use a filtering mechanism to filter out the incorrect $M(x)$. Please refer more details in Appendix A.3.

4 Benchmark Construction

In the experiments, we employ various strategies (prompts) to guide different teacher LLMs in generating the desired high-quality responses.

4.1 Models and APIs

Following (Ren et al., 2024), we use Llama3-instruct (Dubey and Abhinav Jauhri, 2024) and Mistral-7B-instruct-V2 (Jiang et al., 2023) as the target language models M , with Qwen-2.5-7B-Instruct as an additional, stronger model M . In this paper, we refer to Llama3-instruct, Mistral-7B-instruct-V2, and Qwen-2.5-7B-Instruct as Mistral, Llama3, and Qwen, respectively. We use GPT-4o, MiniGPT-4, and Claude 3.5 APIs as teacher models for response generation. Specifically, we use gpt-4o-mini-2024-07-18 and gpt-4o-2024-08-06 (OpenAI, 2023) from OpenAI, and claude-3-5-sonnet-20240620 (Anthropic, 2023) from Anthropic.

4.2 Datasets

We collect all the training (if included) and testing datasets referenced in the technical reports of LLaMA3, Mistral-7B-V2, and Qwen-2.5, which are also the three target models M used in our experiments. We specifically select datasets that are relevant to reasoning tasks(English only), contain more than 700 data points, and can be evaluated using accuracy metrics. If the dataset lacks training data, we reconstruct the testing data to ensure it contains at least 500 training data points and 200 testing data points.

For datasets with subcategories, such as MATH, we focus our experiments on specific subcategories to ensure consistency and relevance. Specifically, following (Ren et al., 2024), we use the algebra category from the MATH dataset. Among these datasets, those that include human-annotated ground truth with Chain of Thought (CoT) reasoning processes are GSM8K, MATH, ECQA, while the remaining datasets only include gold labels.

We follow the settings from (Ren et al., 2024) that for each dataset, we train and evaluate models or strategies on the first 1,000 training and testing examples. For each task, we generate 1,000 training examples per data generation strategy. For instance, if we apply seven different data generation strategies (Section 4.3 in Appendix), the GSM8K task will yield 7,000 target responses ($7 \times 1,000$).

In total, we select the following datasets:

- Mathematics: GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) and MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021).
- Commonsense reasoning: PIQA (Bisk et al., 2020), WinoGrande (Sakaguchi et al., 2021) and ECQA (Aggarwal et al., 2021).
- Reading comprehension: BoolQ (Clark et al., 2019) and SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016).
- Aggregated benchmarks: MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2020), MMLU_PRO (Wang et al., 2024), and AGIEval (Zhong et al., 2023).
- Coding: MBPP (Austin et al., 2021).
- Reasoning: DROP (Dua et al., 2019) and ARC-Challenge (Clark et al., 2018).
- Tool-using: API-BANK (Li et al., 2023)

For more details about the datasets and the selection criteria for datasets from the Mistral, LLaMA3, or Qwen benchmarks, please refer to Section A.2 and Table 14 in Appendix.

4.3 Data Generation Strategies

Given 1,000 samples, we use different strategies (prompts) to generate target responses. For a fair comparison, we use the same prompts from (Ren et al., 2024) to generate responses, including GPT-4o Answer Directly, Claude 3.5 Answer Directly, Mini-GPT4 Answer Directly, Rewrite Groundtruth, and Step by Step. Besides, we design two new prompts named Provide GPT-4o Examples and Human-Written Examples on our own.

We provide the ground truth to the teacher models and run the synthetic data generation process up to three times to ensure correctness. If the first evaluation reveals any issues, we regenerate the data; otherwise, the process stops. The evaluation script used for this process is the same as the one used during testing.

Ground Truth: This strategy uses the original ground-truth responses from the datasets as target outputs. Since our focus is on selecting effective chain-of-thought (CoT) target responses, we apply this method to datasets that include human-annotated CoT reasoning steps, such as GSM8K, MATH, ECQA, MBPP.

GPT-4o Answer Directly, Claude Answer Directly, and MiniGPT-4o Answer Directly generate responses based on questions and the ground truth using GPT-4o, Claude 3.5 and Mini-GPT4, respectively. **Rewrite Ground Truth:** Direct GPT-4o to restyle the ground truth in its own language. This method is only applicable to GSM8K, MATH Algebra, ECQA. The other tasks’s ground truth consists of target labels without any human-annotated

chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning, making rewriting infeasible. **Step-by-Step:** instructs GPT-4o to generate step-by-step responses based on questions and ground truth. **GPT4o Examples:** To facilitate problem-solving, we provide GPT-4o with two high-quality, expert-selected in-context examples of its own responses. GPT-4o is then tasked with generating new responses based on these examples. **Human Examples:** To aid GPT-4o in understanding problem-solving for these datasets, we provide two carefully chosen human-written examples as context. GPT-4o then uses these examples to generate new responses. We put more details in Section A.4.1 in Appendix.

5 Experiment

In this section, we regard the single data generation methods or other response selection methods as baselines, generating all training data using one of the strategies from Section 4.3. We then compare the training outcomes of each strategies on 13 tasks.

In all our experiments in this section, each data generation method produces target responses for only a subset of training sample. To measure the variance from choosing these subsets, we repeat the choice three times and create three evaluation subsets. (*i.e.*, $K = 10$ in Section 3.1).

5.1 Hyperparameters

We utilize the identical hyperparameter settings as referenced in (Ren et al., 2024). Specifically, for model fine-tuning, a learning rate of $2e-5$, a batch size of 32, and a warm-up phase encompassing 10% of the total training iterations are applied. A cosine annealing schedule is implemented for the learning rate, and only the Q and V matrices of the LoRA parameters are fine-tuned with a rank of 8. All models undergo training and evaluation using half-precision arithmetic.

5.2 Our Method vs. Baselines

In this experiment, we compare our method to baselines. As shown in Figure 1, our method outperforms when using a single data generation method. On average, it surpasses the best data generation method (provide GPT4 examples) by 0.64%. The average performance of all methods is 65.59%, which is 1.28% lower than ours (66.87%).

We also compare our method to other response ranking methods, as shown in Figure 2. “Perplexity” refers to selecting the data generation strategy




Figure 1: Our method Vs. Baselines(all data)




Figure 2: Comparison between different ranking method. The upper 4 plots recording the average accuracy. The bottom 4 plots records the average spearman correlation.

that minimizes perplexity. “Semantic Similarity” selects the method with the lowest cosine similarity, while “length” chooses the shortest response. “CAR” is from (Xu et al., 2024), skywork is the reward model from (Liu et al., 2024), which is also used in “CAR” calculation.

Figure 2 shows that, on average, our method achieves 66.87%. Other methods only reach up to 66.05%, 0.82% lower than ours. Since the performance diversity for different tasks are very different, we use Spearman correlation to account for the importance of ranking in each task. Our method also show good spearman correlation compared to the other methods. On average, our method achieves 0.2408, which is much higher than other methods except perplexity, but we are better in terms of selecting the most effect data generation method.

5.3 When does the choice of data generation methods matters?

When analyzing the detailed performance record (n = 1000) (Table 7 in Appendix), we notice that there is substantial performance variation between methods for some tasks, while for others, the variation is minimal. For example, when training the Qwen model on API-BANK, the best method achieves 43.9%, while GPT4o-generated data reaches only 24.9%. In contrast, for tasks like GSM8K and MATH Algebra, the performance gap between the best and worst methods is under 2%.

We observe that the performance variation between methods is minimal when training with 1000 samples (data from Table 7 in Appendix) yields only negligible improvement over training with 100 samples (data from Table 10 in Appendix).

To investigate this relationship, we created Figure 3, where the X-axis represents the performance gain ratio (PGR) on a logarithmic scale, and the Y-axis measures the diversity in training effectiveness




Figure 3: This figure demonstrates that the higher PGR, the more diversity of the training effectiveness between using the data generated by different data generation methods. For more details, please read this 5.3 section




Figure 4: Our method Vs. Baselines(all data)

across methods. The PGR is defined as:

$$PGR = \left(\frac{Acc_{1000}}{Acc_{100}} - 1 \right)$$

This metric quantifies the improvement in accuracy when increasing the training data from 100 to 1000 examples.

While the right plot demonstrates that when the PGR exceeds 5%, the diversity across generation methods increases significantly, the left plot shows a strong positive correlation between $\log(PGR)$ and $\log(Diversity)$.

These two subplots show that the variation in training effectiveness increases as PGR increases. The greater the divergence between the training outcomes, the more important it becomes to select the best response generation strategy.

5.4 Our method vs. baselines on data with PGR above 5%

We observed that when PGR is below 5%, the performance divergence across different data generation methods is less pronounced. However, we wanted to investigate whether our method is more effective on data with a PGR greater than 5%. To explore this, we re-ran the experiment using only the data where PGR exceeds 5%.

As shown in Figure 4, when testing on data where PGR exceeds 5%, our method, on average, outperforms the second-best data generation method by 1.42% in terms of accuracy. According to Figure 5, when compared to other ranking methods, our method outperforms the second-best ranking method by 1.22% in terms of accuracy and 0.0491 in terms of Spearman correlation. Notably, the variation among each method becomes larger when PGR exceeds 5%, as expected.

5.5 Can we get performance gain if we simply put all of the response variants together?

Selecting the optimal data generation strategy remains essential, even when resources or funding are unlimited. As shown in Table 1, if we simply combine six types of synthetic data ($n_{train} = 6000$) or group the top three synthetic data sources together, the trained accuracy would be comparable to training on the data generated with the best strategy. In some cases, combining all of the synthetic data can even degrade the results compared to training on the data generated by the best strategy. This underscores the importance of carefully selecting data generation strategies to maximize training effectiveness.

Method	Model	DROP	MMLU Pro	API-Bank
Best $n_{\text{train}} = 1000$	Mistral	0.746	0.304	0.433
Total $n_{\text{train}} = 6000$		0.74	0.254	0.404
Mixture of good $n_{\text{train}} = 3000$		0.77	0.258	0.404
Mixture of good $n_{\text{train}} = 1000$		0.744	0.298	0.375
Average of all $n_{\text{train}} = 1000$		0.711	0.246	0.351
Best $n_{\text{train}} = 1000$	Llama	0.808	0.385	0.408
Total $n_{\text{train}} = 6000$		0.810	0.374	0.449
Mixture of good $n_{\text{train}} = 3000$		0.812	0.371	0.347
Mixture of good $n_{\text{train}} = 1000$		0.804	0.381	0.285
Average of all $n_{\text{train}} = 1000$		0.771	0.344	0.243
Best $n_{\text{train}} = 1000$	Qwen	0.818	0.605	0.445
Total $n_{\text{train}} = 6000$		0.798	0.592	0.359
Mixture of good $n_{\text{train}} = 3000$		0.824	0.622	0.4
Mixture of good $n_{\text{train}} = 1000$		0.818	0.579	0.365
Average of all $n_{\text{train}} = 1000$		0.778	0.532	0.237

Table 1: **Best** represents the best data generation strategy for the task with the target model. **Total** combines all strategies, yielding $n_{\text{train}} = 6000$. **Mixture of good** ($n_{\text{train}} = 3000$) includes the top three strategies with 1000 samples each, while **Mixture of good** ($n_{\text{train}} = 1000$) has about 333 samples per strategy.

6 Ablation Study

6.1 Stability of Our Methods

As shown in Table 2, our method demonstrates consistent average accuracy regardless of which subsets we select or the size of the subsets. On the Table, 0-10, 10-20, and 20-30 means that we take the first second and third 10 examples from training dataset for calculating the ranking result. 0-50 and 0-100 represent the evaluation sets we pick contains 50 and 100 samples, respectively. In Table 13, we use an example to demonstrate that the ranking results tend to remain consistent regardless of which subsets are selected.

6.2 The Role of Perplexity and Cosine Similarity in Alignment Scoring

Previous work (Ren et al., 2024) shows that models trained on responses with lower perplexity tend to perform better because such responses align with the style the model is familiar with. Our experiment results from the Figure 2 also confirm the helpfulness of perplexity, however, it has limitations as a sole metric.

6.3 Groundtruth vs. Synthetic Data

As shown in Table 7 of Appendix, when ground truth is provided in natural language (e.g., GSM8K, MATH, ECQA, MBPP), training on ground truth is less effective than training on synthetic data. This is because LLMs are more familiar with LLM-generated data, as demonstrated by (Ren et al., 2024). However, when the ground truth is written as a gold label without a natural language inference process or explanation, training on ground

truth can sometimes outperform training on CoT synthetic data within the same domain. However, as shown in Table 4 of Appendix, training on gold labels harms cross-domain performance more than training on synthetic data. Additionally, in real-life scenarios, training on natural language data is crucial, as users expect to see the rationale behind the final prediction made by LLMs.

7 Conclusions

In this work, we introduce an innovative and scalable method for selecting the best response generation strategy for training large language models. Our method focuses on the closeness of a small subset of the candidate outputs to those generated by the target LLM. By defining and utilizing the expected alignment score, which we link to perplexity and semantic similarity metrics, our approach bypasses traditional ranking or data selection methods. The use of an ensemble of alignment functions enhances our method’s ability to accurately forecast the performance of LLMs. Our results confirm that selecting the output generation strategy through this method can significantly improve model performance across diverse tasks. This demonstrates the potential of our approach to streamline the training process and achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness in model training. We hope this work spurs further research into efficient training data optimization methods and advances the performance of large language models.

8 Limitations

While our proposed method for training data optimization offers significant improvements, it does have some limitations.

Firstly, due to cost constraints, the training datasets in most of our experiments are limited to a size of up to 1000. Whether our method is applicable to larger datasets, such as those with 10,000 examples, remains to be validated.

Secondly, some companies have recently released open-source models capable of generating O1-type chain-of-thought (COT) small models. However, whether our method is applicable to O1-type small models still needs to be verified. We believe that the principles behind LLM training are transferable, so our approach and alignment score should be applicable to O1-type small models. However, since these models were only recently released and our experiments are large in scale, with

Method	Model Type	Accuracy				
		0-10	10-20	20-30	0-50	0-100
Ours all data	Mistral7B	0.616	0.616	0.616	0.619	0.619
Ours all data	Llama3	0.655	0.656	0.654	0.655	0.656
Ours all data	Qwen	0.741	0.726	0.739	0.726	0.726
Ours PGR > 5%	Mistral7B	0.616	0.616	0.616	0.619	0.619
Ours PGR > 5%	Llama3	0.674	0.677	0.674	0.672	0.677
Ours PGR > 5%	Qwen	0.662	0.628	0.660	0.662	0.662

Table 2: Performance Stability of Our Methods. The subsets 0-10, 10-20, and 20-30 each contain 10 samples, while 0-50 and 0-100 represent evaluation sets with 50 and 100 samples, respectively. Please note that the data for Mistral are the same for all sets and for tasks with PGR > 5%. This is because the Mistral model reaches PGR > 5% on all tasks.

Generated Response	Model	Perplexity	Semantic Similarity Score (lower is similar)
GPT4	Mistral	5.75	0.065
Redundant Data Generation		5.126	0.199
Declaration of Independence		1.34	0.465

Table 3: Example of a failure case for perplexity, tested on ECQA. For perplexity, lower values are better. For the semantic similarity score, a lower score indicates more similarity, and thus a better result.

the associated high costs of O1 models, we have not yet conducted experiments in this area.

The last limitation of this work is that, our method are not helpful for comparing CoT responses and single label ground-truth, such as True/False classification groundtruth or multiple choice groundtruth. The basic assumption of our method is “a good output should closely resemble the output generated by the target LLM”, It works when the output contains a paragraph, e.g., a reasoning step. It is not applicable for the case when the answer only contains a single word. For example, how do we compute the semantic similarity between a CoT initial prediction from a target LLM and a ‘True/False’ label? However, as discussed in the section 6.3, training on CoT are desired in many scenarios because training only on gold label can damage the cross-domain performance and sometimes people wish to see the rationale.

References

Shourya Aggarwal, Divyanshu Mandowara, Vishwajeet Agrawal, Dinesh Khandelwal, Parag Singla, and Dinesh Garg. 2021. Explanations for commonsenseqa: New dataset and models. 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 3050–3065.

Anthropic. 2023. Claude 3.5 api. <https://docs.anthropic.com/claude>. Accessed: Month Day, Year.

Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten

Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*.

Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Jianfeng Gao, Yejin Choi, et al. 2020. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7432–7439.

Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Boolq: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10044*.

Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.

Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.

Javier De la Rosa, Eduardo G Ponferrada, Paulo Villegas, Pablo Gonzalez de Prado Salas, Manu Romero, and Maria Grandury. 2022. Bertin: Efficient pre-training of a spanish language model using perplexity sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.06814*.

Dheeru Dua, Yizhong Wang, Pradeep Dasigi, Gabriel Stanovsky, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. 2019. [Drop: A reading comprehension benchmark requiring discrete reasoning over paragraphs](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1903.00161.

Abhimanyu Dubey and etc. Abhinav Jauhri. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.

Yao Fu, Hao Peng, Litu Ou, Ashish Sabharwal, and Tushar Khot. 2023. Specializing smaller language models towards multi-step reasoning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10421–10430. PMLR.

Hila Gonen, Srinu Iyer, Terra Blevins, Noah A Smith, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Demystifying prompts

- in language models via perplexity estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04037*.
- Dani Gunawan, CA Sembiring, and Mohammad Andri Budiman. 2018. The implementation of cosine similarity to calculate text relevance between two documents. In *Journal of physics: conference series*, volume 978, page 012120. IOP Publishing.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*.
- Namgyu Ho, Laura Schmid, and Se-Young Yun. 2022. Large language models are reasoning teachers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10071*.
- Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Chun-Liang Li, Chih-Kuan Yeh, Hootan Nakhost, Yasuhisa Fujii, Alexander Ratner, Ranjay Krishna, Chen-Yu Lee, and Tomas Pfister. 2023. [Distilling step-by-step! outperforming larger language models with less training data and smaller model sizes](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.02301.
- Jennifer Hu, Jon Gauthier, Peng Qian, Ethan Wilcox, and Roger P Levy. 2020. A systematic assessment of syntactic generalization in neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03692*.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- 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](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.18395.
- Harsh Khatter, Nishtha Goel, Naina Gupta, and Muskan Gulati. 2021. Movie recommendation system using cosine similarity with sentiment analysis. In *2021 Third International Conference on Inventive Research in Computing Applications (ICIRCA)*, pages 597–603. IEEE.
- Seungone Kim, Juyoung Suk, Xiang Yue, Vijay Viswanathan, Seongyun Lee, Yizhong Wang, Kiril Gashteovski, Carolin Lawrence, Sean Welleck, and Graham Neubig. 2024. [Evaluating language models as synthetic data generators](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.03679.
- Baoli Li and Liping Han. 2013. Distance weighted cosine similarity measure for text classification. In *Intelligent Data Engineering and Automated Learning–IDEAL 2013: 14th International Conference, IDEAL 2013, Hefei, China, October 20–23, 2013. Proceedings 14*, pages 611–618. Springer.
- Ming Li, Yong Zhang, Zhitao Li, Jiuhai Chen, Lichang Chen, Ning Cheng, Jianzong Wang, Tianyi Zhou, and Jing Xiao. 2024. [From quantity to quality: Boosting LLM performance with self-guided data selection for instruction tuning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7602–7635, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Minghao Li, Yingxiu Zhao, Bowen Yu, Feifan Song, Hangyu Li, Haiyang Yu, Zhoujun Li, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2023. [Api-bank: A comprehensive benchmark for tool-augmented llms](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08244*.
- Shiyang Li, Jianshu Chen, Yelong Shen, Zhiyu Chen, Xinlu Zhang, Zekun Li, Hong Wang, Jing Qian, Baolin Peng, Yi Mao, Wenhui Chen, and Xifeng Yan. 2022. [Explanations from large language models make small reasoners better](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2210.06726.
- Chris Yuhao Liu, Liang Zeng, Jiakai Liu, Rui Yan, Jujie He, Chaojie Wang, Shuicheng Yan, Yang Liu, and Yahui Zhou. 2024. [Skywork-reward: Bag of tricks for reward modeling in llms](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.18451.
- Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xiyu Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. [Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evolve-instruct](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.08568.
- Lucie Charlotte Magister, Jonathan Mallinson, Jakob Adamek, Eric Malmi, and Aliaksei Severyn. 2023. [Teaching small language models to reason](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 1773–1781, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dheeraj Mekala, Alex Nguyen, and Jingbo Shang. 2024. [Smaller language models are capable of selecting instruction-tuning training data for larger language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10430*.
- OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 api. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4>. Accessed: Month Day, Year.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. [SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Leonardo Ranaldi and Andre Freitas. 2024. [Aligning large and small language models via chain-of-thought reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of*

the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 1812–1827, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Xuan Ren, Biao Wu, and Lingqiao Liu. 2024. I learn better if you speak my language: Enhancing large language model fine-tuning with style-aligned response adjustments.

Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106.

Ramni Harbir Singh, Sargam Maurya, Tanisha Tripathi, Tushar Narula, and Gaurav Srivastav. 2020. Movie recommendation system using cosine similarity and knn. *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 9(5):556–559.

Trieu H Trinh, Yuhuai Wu, Quoc V Le, He He, and Thang Luong. 2024. Solving olympiad geometry without human demonstrations. *Nature*, 625(7995):476–482.

Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhranil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyang Jiang, et al. 2024. Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01574*.

Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *Preprint*, arXiv:2304.12244.

Zhangchen Xu, Fengqing Jiang, Luyao Niu, Bill Yuchen Lin, and Radha Poovendran. 2024. Stronger models are not stronger teachers for instruction tuning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2411.07133.

Zhenyu Xu and Victor S Sheng. 2024. Detecting ai-generated code assignments using perplexity of large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 23155–23162.

Zhaorui Yang, Tianyu Pang, Haozhe Feng, Han Wang, Wei Chen, Minfeng Zhu, and Qian Liu. 2024. Self-distillation bridges distribution gap in language model fine-tuning. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1028–1043, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Hanyu Zhang, Xiting Wang, Xiang Ao, and Qing He. 2024. Distillation with explanations from large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 5018–5028.

Wanjun Zhong, Ruixiang Cui, Yiduo Guo, Yaobo Liang, Shuai Lu, Yanlin Wang, Amin Saied, Weizhu Chen, and Nan Duan. 2023. Agieval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06364*.

A Example Appendix

A.1 Spearman’s Rank Correlation Coefficient

Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient (Spearman’s ρ) is a non-parametric measure of rank correlation. Unlike Pearson’s correlation, which assesses the strength of a linear relationship between two continuous variables, Spearman’s ρ focuses on the monotonic ordering of items. This makes it robust to outliers and suitable for evaluating ranking tasks where exact values matter less than the relative order in which items appear.

Formally, given two sets of ranks R_1 and R_2 for the same set of n items, Spearman’s ρ is defined as:

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n (R_{1,i} - R_{2,i})^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

Here, $R_{1,i}$ and $R_{2,i}$ represent the rank of the i -th item in each respective ranking. The numerator captures the sum of squared rank differences. If ρ approaches 1, the two rankings are highly positively correlated; if ρ nears 0, there is no monotonic relationship; and if ρ approaches -1, the two rankings are inversely related.

In our experiments, we use the gold-standard orderings provided by the datasets as R_1 and the predicted rankings generated by our model and the train-then-test baseline as R_2 . By comparing these rankings via Spearman’s ρ , we directly evaluate how faithfully each method captures the underlying ordering of items, providing a valuable complement to other accuracy-based metrics.

A.2 Dataset Details

Guided by (Ren et al., 2024), we select two mathematical data sets, GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) and MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021), and one commonsense reasoning dataset, Commonsense Reasoning ECQA (Aggarwal et al., 2021). Notably, they only use the algebra questions from the MATH dataset for training and response generation. For API-Bank, we construct synthetic data using the Level 3 questions. They also has Lv 2 and Lv 1 questions, but Lv 3 question is the most challenging type of questions, thus we choose it for data generation and evaluation.

For MMLU, AGI-EVAL, we choose the category with most data. Specifically, we only generate and evaluate data for professional law subcategory. For agi-eval, we choose law category.

Here’s the proofread and edited version:

A.3 The Effectiveness of the Correctness Filter for Initial Predictions from the Target LLM

Before computing the semantic similarity between the initial prediction of the target LLM and the response from the teacher model, we apply a correctness filter(made by Qwen2.5. For more details, you can read the Appendix A.8) to remove incorrect predictions from the target LLM. In other words, we only compare the semantic similarity between correct initial predictions from the target LLM and responses from the teacher model. For details about how we make the

How effective is the correctness filter?

According to Figure ??, the average accuracy of our method with or without using the correctness filter is very similar. Using the correctness filter helps our method improve the Spearman correlation. In other words, while the implementation of the correctness filter is helpful, its impact is not significant. When analyzing the ranking results, we notice that the implementation of the correctness filter does not change the ranking of tasks that the target model has been intensively trained on, such as GSM8K and MATH. It has a larger influence on tasks that the target model is less familiar with, such as API-Bank. Without the correctness filter, many of the unfiltered initial predictions would be problematic. For example, in API-BANK, the Llama3 model tends to misunderstand questions and respond in completely incorrect ways. In these scenarios (which don’t occur frequently in most tasks), comparing semantic similarity between the initial prediction from the target LLM and the response from the teacher model would be meaningless.

A.4 Our Method vs. Train-Then-Select

A simple, but computationally expensive method for selecting a data generation strategy involves generating a small set of data (*e.g.*, 100 samples) using each strategy, training the target model on this data, and evaluating its performance. By iterating through all strategies with this method, we can identify the one that yields the best performance after training on the 100 samples, and then use this

strategy to generate the rest of the dataset. We call this method “Train-Then-Select”.

We use the same learning rate and number of epochs as in our method. After training on 100 samples for each data generation strategy, we record the performance for each strategy in Table 10.

After ranking the data generation strategies using “Train-Then-Select”, we compare it to our method. As shown in Table 5, despite generating only one-tenth of the data used in Train-Then-Select (*i.e.*, 10 samples), our method outperforms it in terms of accuracy and Spearman correlation score.

Redundant Prompt

We construct redundant prompts to demonstrate that the perplexity of the redundant target responses is lower than that of GPT-4’s answers. Perplexity primarily reflects how fluent the language is and how well the language style aligns with the model, but it places less emphasis on semantic meaning.

```
f"""We have the question and the
groundtruth. Given on the
groundtruth, please reformat the
groundtruth so that it answer the
question in a step by step redundant
manner. Be as repetitive and step
by step and redundant as possible.
```

```
Question: {question}
Groundtruth: {groundtruth}
```

1. We wish you to reformat a new groundtruth. The new groundtruth are reformated a new groundtruth which solve the problem as steo by step and redundant as possible.
2. You will pretend as you do not know the groundtruth, because we will use your step by step redundant answer as target responses to train our model.
3. (important format) You must generate the groundtruth with the step by step redundant inference process directly. Please not saying anything like 'sure I can help you with' or 'sure, i will not mention the gold label'
4. (important format) You will inference first then put the Final Answer: {gold_label}

at the end like this

```
INFERENCE HERE
Final Answer: {gold_label}
"""
```

Declaration of Independence

This is the part of Declaration of Independence that we use in the experiment in Table 4.

```
f""The Unanimous Declaration of the
Thirteen United States of America .
When, in the course of human events,
it becomes necessary for one people
to dissolve the political bonds
which have connected them with
another, and to assume among the
powers of the earth, the separate
and equal station to which the laws
of nature and of nature\'s God
entitle them, a decent respect to
the opinions of mankind requires
that they should declare the causes
which impel them to the separation

# We hold these truths to be self-
evident, that all men are created
equal, that they are endowed by
their Creator with certain
unalienable rights, that among these
are life, liberty and the pursuit
of happiness. That to secure these
rights, governments are instituted
among men, deriving their just
powers from the consent of the
governed. That whenever any form of
government becomes destructive to
these ends, it is the right of the
people to alter or to abolish it,
and to institute new government,
laying its foundation on such
principles and organizing its powers
in such form, as to them shall seem
most likely to effect their safety
and happiness.

"""
```

A.4.1 Data Generation Strategies

We instruct GPT-4, Claude 3.5, Mini-GPT4 to generate different of target responses using different target reponse generation strategies.

GPT-4/Claude 3.5/Mini-GPT4 Answer Directly: This prompt is from (Ren et al., 2024). For tasks involving mathematics and coding, we submit the problems from our training dataset directly to GPT-4 or Claude 3.5 to obtain their solutions. In the case of classification tasks, we provide these models with the input questions alongside the correct labels (excluding any human-generated explanations) and utilize their outputs. These generated answers are then paired with the original questions to form the GPT-4/Claude 3.5 Direct Answer Training Dataset.

To ensure that the models develop their own problem-solving and analytical capabilities, we deliberately exclude any solutions or rationales related to math, coding, or classification tasks. This

approach prevents the models from simply mimicking the ground truth processes, which could otherwise result in some of GPT-4’s predictions lacking its unique reasoning style. Such mimicry would undermine the reliability of our perplexity measurements, which are designed to evaluate how effectively a language model handles outputs from other models.

The prompt below is designed to guide GPT-4/Claude 3.5 in generating responses without relying on the ground truth solutions:

```
""We have the {question}

1. We wish you to answer the question.
2. You must answer the question (with
inference process) directly without
say anything else. Please not saying
anything 'like sure I can help you
with' or 'sure, i will not mention
the gold label'
3. You will inference first then put the
Final Answer (NUMBER_HERE) at the
end of the prediction like this

INFERENCE HERE
Final Answer: NUMBER_HERE""
```

Rewrite Ground Truth: This prompt is from (Ren et al., 2024). This prompt is adapted from (Ren et al., 2024). In this approach, we provide GPT-4 and Claude 3.5 with the ground truth data, which includes human-annotated rationales and detailed problem-solving steps. The goal is to have GPT-4 and Claude 3.5 rephrase the ground truth content using their own linguistic styles.

The subsequent prompt guides GPT-4 and Claude 3.5 to generate the GPT-4/Claude 3.5 Response (Rewrite GT) output.

```
""Given the question: {question}
and the groundtruth: {groundtruth}

Please states the prediction in your own
words. The groundtruth is 100%
correct. You should not change the
problem solving logic of the
groundtruth. just restates it in
your own words.

1. You will pretend as you do not know
the groundtruth, because we will use
your prediction as target labels to
train our model.
2. (important format) You must generate
the groundtruth directly. Please not
saying anything like 'sure I can
help you with' or 'sure, i will not
mention the gold label'
3. (important format) Please make sure
the Final Answer: {gold_label} is
placed at the end of the modified
prediction.""
```

Step-by-step: This prompt is from (Ren et al., 2024). We instruct GPT-4 and Claude 3.5 to methodically address each problem by breaking it down into sequential steps. For tasks involving mathematics and coding, we present the problems directly from our training dataset to these models to obtain their solutions. In classification tasks, we provide GPT-4 and Claude 3.5 with the correct labels (excluding any human-generated explanations) along with the input questions, and then utilize their detailed, step-by-step responses. These generated answers are subsequently paired with the original questions to form the GPT-4/Claude 3.5 Step-by-Step Response (No GT) Dataset.

To ensure that the models develop their own unique problem-solving and analytical approaches, we intentionally exclude the solutions or rationales for the mathematics, coding, or classification tasks. This prevents the models from simply mimicking the problem-solving and analytical methods found in the ground truth data. Including such processes could result in some of GPT-4's and Claude 3.5's outputs not reflecting their inherent reasoning styles, thereby compromising the accuracy of our perplexity measurements. These measurements are designed to assess how effectively a language model can handle outputs generated by other language models.

The following prompt directs GPT-4 and Claude 3.5 to generate the GPT-4/Claude 3.5 Step-by-Step Response (No GT) responses.

```

"""
We have the question and the groundtruth
. Please reformat the groundtruth in
step by step manner with details.

Question: {question}
Groundtruth: {groundtruth}

1. We wish you to regenerate a new
groundtruth. The new groundtruth
solve the problem step by step. If
you believe the groundtruth is not
detail enough, you could add details
.
2. You will pretend as you do not know
the groundtruth, because we will use
your prediction as target labels to
train our model.
3. (important format) You must generate
the groundtruth with the step by
step inference process directly.
Please not saying anything like '
sure I can help you with' or 'sure,
i will not mention the gold label'
4. (important format) You will inference
first then put the Final Answer: {

```

```

gold_label}

at the end like this

INFERENCE HERE
Final Answer: {gold_label}
"""

```

GPT-4o with GPT-4o Examples: We developed this prompt specifically for the API-Bank and Plan-Bench datasets. This prompt utilizes GPT-4's own accurate generations as examples to help GPT-4 not only better understand the task but also demonstrate how to solve the problems effectively. The prompt below is an example that we used to generate target responses for the API-Bank dataset.

```

"""
We have the {question} and the
groundtruth {gold_label}

1. We wish you to answer the question.
We will use your answer to train our
model, thus you will answer and
pretend as not knowing the gold_
label.
2. You must answer the question (with
inference process) directly without
say anything else. Please not saying
anything 'like sure I can help you
with' or 'sure, i will not mention
the gold label'
3. You will inference first then put the
Final Answer ({gold_label}) at the
end of the prediction like this

INFERENCE HERE
Final Answer: {gold_label}

Example 1:

Question : {q1}

groundtruth: API-Request: [ToolSearcher(
keywords='healthcare provider
appointment availability checker')]

Inference: The user is requesting to
find a healthcare provider (
specifically a cardiologist) in Los
Angeles for a check-up appointment.
The available API description
indicates that the ToolSearcher API
can be used to search for relevant
tools based on the provided keywords
. Therefore, the first step is to
search for a tool that can help find
a healthcare provider appointment
availability checker.

Final Answer: API-Request: [ToolSearcher
(keywords='healthcare provider
appointment availability checker')]

Example 2:

```

question: {q2}

```
groundtruth: API-Request: [  
  HealthcareProviderAppointmentChecker  
  (specialty='cardiologist', location  
  ='Los Angeles')]
```

Inference: The first API request was successfully made to find a tool for checking healthcare provider appointment availability. The HealthcareProviderAppointmentChecker API was identified, which requires specialty and location as input parameters to search for available appointment slots. Based on the user's request to find a cardiologist in Los Angeles for a check-up appointment, the next API call should use this information.

```
Final Answer: API-Request: [  
  HealthcareProviderAppointmentChecker  
  (specialty='cardiologist', location  
  ='Los Angeles')]
```

Example 3:

question: {q3}

```
groundtruth: API-Request: [ToolSearcher(  
  keywords='healthcare provider  
  appointment scheduler')]
```

Inference: The user initially searched for an availability checker and found available appointment slots for a cardiologist in Los Angeles. Now, the user needs to schedule an appointment, so the next step is to find a tool for scheduling healthcare provider appointments using the ToolSearcher API with relevant keywords.

```
Final Answer: API-Request: [ToolSearcher  
  (keywords='healthcare provider  
  appointment scheduler')]
```

We have the {question} and the
groundtruth {gold_label}

1. We wish you to answer the question. We will use your answer to train our model, thus you will answer and pretend as not knowing the gold_label.
2. You must answer the question (with inference process) directly without say anything else. Please not saying anything 'like sure I can help you with' or 'sure, i will not mention the gold label'
3. You will inference first then put the Final Answer ({gold_label}) at the end of the prediction like this

INFERENCE HERE

Final Answer: {gold_label}

"""

GPT-4 with Human Written Examples: We developed this prompt specifically for the API-Bank and Plan-Bench datasets. This prompt utilizes human written examples to help GPT-4 not only better understand the task but also demonstrate how to solve the problems effectively. The prompt below is an example that we used to generate target responses for the API-Bank dataset.

"""

We have the {question} and the
groundtruth {gold_label}

1. We wish you to answer the question. We will use your answer to train our model, thus you will answer and pretend as not knowing the gold_label.
2. You must answer the question (with inference process) directly without say anything else. Please not saying anything 'like sure I can help you with' or 'sure, i will not mention the gold label'
3. You will inference first then put the Final Answer ({gold_label}) at the end of the prediction like this

INFERENCE HERE

Final Answer: {gold_label}

Example 1:

Question : {q1}

```
groundtruth: API-Request: [ToolSearcher(  
  keywords='healthcare provider  
  appointment availability checker')]
```

Inference: The user is requesting to find a healthcare provider (specifically a cardiologist) in Los Angeles for a check-up appointment. The first step should be to search for a tool that can help find a healthcare provider appointment availability checker. To accomplish this, we choose the ToolSearcher API from the available APIs. The ToolSearcher API is used to search for relevant tools based on the provided keywords according to the description. We need to fill out the keywords according to the description. The keywords could be 'healthcare provider appointment availability checker.' Therefore, the next step (which is also the first step) is:

```
Final Answer: API-Request: [ToolSearcher  
  (keywords='healthcare provider  
  appointment availability checker')]
```

Example 2:

```
question: {q2}
```

```
groundtruth: API-Request: [  
  HealthcareProviderAppointmentChecker  
  (specialty='cardiologist', location  
  ='Los Angeles')]
```

Inference: According to the API call history, the user has called the ToolSearcher API and found the HealthcareProviderAppointmentChecker API. The next step is to fill out the input parameters for HealthcareProviderAppointmentChecker and use it to find healthcare provider appointment availability. The input parameters are specialty and location. The user wants to find a cardiologist in Los Angeles for a check-up appointment. Therefore, the next API request should be:

```
Final Answer: API-Request: [  
  HealthcareProviderAppointmentChecker  
  (specialty='cardiologist', location  
  ='Los Angeles')]
```

Example 3:

```
question: {q3}
```

```
groundtruth: API-Request: [ToolSearcher(  
  keywords='healthcare provider  
  appointment scheduler')]
```

Inference: The user previously called the HealthcareProviderAppointmentChecker API and found three appointment times, which are '2034-04-18 14:30:00', '2034-04-19 11:00:00', and '2034-04-20 09:45:00'. The next step is to find the scheduler for the appointment. Since there is no available tool, the user needs to search for a tool that can schedule healthcare provider appointments. The ToolSearcher API can be used to search for relevant tools based on the keywords according to the description. The keywords should be 'healthcare provider appointment scheduler'. Therefore, the answer is:

```
Final Answer: API-Request: [ToolSearcher  
  (keywords='healthcare provider  
  appointment scheduler')]
```

We have a question and a groundtruth

```
question: {question}
```

```
groundtruth: {gold_label}
```

1. We wish you to answer the question. We will use your answer to train our model, thus you will answer and pretend as not knowing the gold_label.
2. You must answer the question (with inference process) directly without say anything else. Please not saying anything 'like sure I can help you with' or 'sure, i will not mention the gold label'
3. You will inference first then put the Final Answer ({gold_label}) at the end of the prediction like this

INFERENCE HERE

```
Final Answer: {gold_label}
```

"""

A.5 Prompt Used to Extract Labels from Predictions

The code below shows how we use Qwen-2.5-Instruct to extract the predicted labels from the predictions.

```
if 'arc_challenge' in task_name or 'mmlu'  
  ' in task_name or 'agieval' in  
  task_name:  
    gold_label_type = 'A/B/C/D'  
  elif 'piqa' in task_name or '  
    winogrande' in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = '1/2'  
  elif 'squad' in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = 'text_span'  
  elif 'gsm8k' in task_name or 'math'  
    in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = 'number'  
  elif 'ecqa' in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = '1/2/3/4/5'  
  elif 'esnli' in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = 'Entailment/  
    Neutral/Contradiction'  
  elif 'boolq' in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = 'True/False'  
  elif 'mmlu_pro' in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = 'A/B/C/D/E/F/G  
    /H/I/J'  
  elif 'hellaswag' in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = '1/2/3/4'  
  elif 'drop' in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = '  
    number_or_text_span'  
  elif 'api_bank' in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = 'API-request'  
  elif 'plan_bench' in task_name:  
    gold_label_type = '[PLAN]  
    SOME_PLAN_HERE[PLAN END]'  
  else:  
    a = 1  
  
for i in range(len(question_list)):
```



```

question = \
f"""Given the prediction, what is the
final answer by the prediction?

The prediction is "{predict_list[i]}"

Directly output {gold_label_type}
without saying anything else.
"""

```

A.6 The Impact of Accuracy of the Synthetic Data on Training Outcomes

In our experiment, we aim to ensure the correctness of generated answers by validating them against ground truth answers. Our research seeks to identify the best strategy for generating the optimal version of an answer. In other words, we can adjust data generation strategies to ensure correctness.

In our experiments, we use ground truth answers to guide the generated answers for nearly all datasets, with the only exceptions being mathematical problems. This follows the setting of the paper to maintain consistency with previous work (Ren et al., 2024). This approach might be acceptable since closed-source APIs tend to generate accurate answers. For GSM8K and Math Algebra, GPT-4o, Claude, and MiniGPT-4o achieve accuracies of 90% or above.

To evaluate the impact of accuracy on training outcomes, we conducted the following experiment. As shown in Table 6, we tested three approaches: training on the full dataset, using only correct predictions, and replacing incorrect predictions with rewritten ground truth. These approaches showed less than a 2% improvement overall. Note that in this experiment, GPT-4 refers to the gpt-4-1106-preview API, rather than the gpt-4o-2024-08-06 API, which was used in all other experiments in the paper. The mathematical capabilities of GPT-4o, GPT-4-Mini, and Claude are similar on Math Algebra tasks. Therefore, we used the gpt-4-1106-preview API, which has a weaker ability to solve Math Algebra problems. The benefit of using it is that it makes more mistakes on GSM8K so that we can better evaluate the influence of accuracy. We used this API once to generate the data and train the model from there.

According to the table, the overall benefit of replacing incorrect examples with rewritten ground truth or removing incorrect examples has minimal impact on the overall training outcomes.

A.7 Data Selection Rationale for the Benchmark

The datasets included in our benchmark, drawn from the Mistral, Llama, and Qwen benchmarks, were selected according to a specific set of rules designed to ensure relevance and suitability. These rules are as follows:

1. **Sufficient Dataset Size:** We only included datasets where the combined size of the training, validation, and testing sets exceeded 700 samples. This threshold was chosen to ensure sufficient data for robust model evaluation.
2. **Accuracy as Evaluation Metric:** A key requirement was that the dataset could be evaluated using accuracy as the primary metric. This allows for a clear and quantifiable assessment of model performance.
3. **English Question-Answering Format:** All selected datasets are in an English question-and-answer format to maintain consistency and focus on English language reasoning abilities.
4. **Focus on Reasoning Tasks:** The underlying task presented by each dataset must involve reasoning skills. This ensures that the benchmark effectively assesses the models' ability to reason and infer.

A detailed justification for the inclusion or exclusion of each dataset can be found in Table 14.

A.8 Correctness Filter

Without supervised fine-tuning (SFT), $M(x)$ may generate incorrect responses, making cosine similarity calculations between $M(x)$ and \hat{y} unreliable. To alleviate this, we introduce a filtering mechanism to filter out the incorrect $M(x)$. We notice that for mathematical problems, the correct final answer typically appears as the last number in $M(x)$. Therefore, for Math-related tasks, we use regular expressions (regex) to extract the last number from the prediction and compare it directly with the ground truth. For other types of problem, we use the Qwen2.5-Instruct 7b model to extract the predicted label from the model output. We then compare this extracted label with the true gold label; if they match, we consider the prediction correct by default. The code we used to extract labels are detailed in Appendix A.5

A.9 AI writing assistant

We use GPT4O for writing assistant.

Method	Model Type, training task	GSM8K	Math Algebra	ECQA	SQUAD	DROP	WINOGRANDE
Gold Label	Mistral, ECQA	0.383	0.181	0.722	0.251	0.084	0.562
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.484	0.218	0.707	0.175	0.016	0.638
Gold Label	Mistral, SQUAD	0.082	0.0931	0.633	0.74	0.208	0.566
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.512	0.234	0.594	0.748	0.268	0.628
Gold Label	Mistral, DROP	0.076	0.097	0.621	0.561	0.628	0.578
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.542	0.241	0.602	0.546	0.736	0.638
Gold Label	Mistral, WINOGRANDE	0.381	0.172	0.625	0.166	0.042	0.742
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.477	0.219	0.569	0.106	0.016	0.713
Gold Label	LLAMA3, ECQA	0.798	0.416	0.734	0.193	0.1	0.637
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.778	0.469	0.723	0.389	0.284	0.638
Gold Label	LLAMA3, SQUAD	0.584	0.366	0.712	0.758	0.49	0.639
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.791	0.457	0.726	0.759	0.368	0.651
Gold Label	LLAMA3, DROP	0.144	0.169	0.674	0.574	0.738	0.582
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.776	0.507	0.703	0.555	0.786	0.626
Gold Label	LLAMA3, WINOGRANDE	0.776	0.445	0.717	0.226	0.162	0.766
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.775	0.485	0.721	0.305	0.238	0.695
Gold Label	Qwen, ECQA	0.914	0.903	0.814	0.662	0.008	0.675
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.903	0.888	0.793	0.668	0.016	0.716
Gold Label	Qwen, SQUAD	0.899	0.892	0.784	0.768	0.056	0.693
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.896	0.911	0.789	0.756	0.074	0.712
Gold Label	Qwen, DROP	0.788	0.904	0.799	0.701	0.664	0.711
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.911	0.903	0.792	0.741	0.806	0.701
Gold Label	Qwen, WINOGRANDE	0.893	0.904	0.78	0.651	0.004	0.725
GPT-4o Answer Directly		0.902	0.896	0.798	0.68	0.022	0.721

Table 4: The training data size is 1000. This table compares the in-domain and cross-domain performance when training on gold-label vs. GPT-4 generated synthetic data. As can be seen from the table, the in-domain performance of the model is typically higher when training with gold-label data. However, the cross-domain performance when training on GPT-4 generated data is significantly higher than when training with only gold-label data. The grey area represents the in-domain performance.




Figure 5: Comparison between different ranking method(experiment on the data PGR > 0.5%). The upper 3 recording the average accuracy. The bottom 3 records the average spearman correlation.

Method	Model Type	Accuracy	Spearman's ρ
Ours	Mistral7B	0.6203	0.4154
Train-then-test	Mistral7B	0.617	0.187
Ours	Llama3	0.6722	0.1563
Train-then-test	Llama3	0.668	0.128
Ours	Qwen	0.6393	0.3071
Train-then-test	Qwen	0.619	0.209

Table 5: Spearman Correlations Comparison—Our Method (average of 3 subsets) vs. Train-then-test (1 seed, $lr = 2e-5$). We compare with Train-then-test when $PGR > 5\%$

Dataset	Method	Accuracy and N train	Mistral	Llama3-8B-Chat
MATH Algebra	GPT4	82.5%, 1000	0.301	0.504
MATH Algebra	GPT4 only correct	100%, 825	0.293	0.501
MATH Algebra	GPT4 only correct + rewritten ground truth	100%, 1000	0.293	0.500
MATH Algebra	Claude	90.1%, 1000	0.265	0.508
MATH Algebra	Claude only correct	100%, 901	0.277	0.487
MATH Algebra	Claude only correct + rewritten ground truth	100%, 1000	0.286	0.492
MATH Algebra	Mini GPT4	91.6% , 1000	0.313	0.523
MATH Algebra	Mini GPT4 only correct	100%, 916	0.311	0.523
MATH Algebra	Mini GPT4 only correct + rewritten ground truth	100%, 1000	0.326	0.539
GSM8K	GPT4	92.1%, 1000	0.597	0.799
GSM8K	GPT4 only correct	100%, 921	0.587	0.791
GSM8K	GPT4 only correct + rewritten ground truth	100%, 1000	0.588	0.808
GSM8K	Claude	95.6%, 1000	0.578	0.796
GSM8K	Claude only correct	100%, 956	0.580	0.797
GSM8K	Claude only correct + rewritten ground truth	100%, 1000	0.588	0.798
GSM8K	Mini GPT4	89.8% , 1000	0.623	0.795
GSM8K	Mini GPT4 only correct	100%, 898	0.606	0.793
GSM8K	Mini GPT4 only correct + rewritten ground truth	100%, 1000	0.607	0.790

Table 6: The table shows that the accuracy of the generated data has a marginal effect on the training outcome. In this table, we use the API with different math abilities. The rank of their math problem-solving abilities is: Claude > MiniGPT-4 > GPT-4. GPT-4 represents the data generated using the GPT-4 preview model, rather than the GPT-4o model.

Data Generation Strategy	Model Type	gsm8k	math algebra	ecqa	boolq	mmlu	winogrande	piqa	agieval	squad	mmlu pro	arc challenge	drop	mbpp	api bank
gold label	mistral			0.722	0.996	0.434	0.742	0.852	0.440	0.748	0.344	0.759	0.628		0.273
groundtruth		0.440	0.201	0.672										0.370	
gpt4		0.625	0.319	0.700	0.867	0.422	0.713	0.869	0.400	0.732	0.261	0.611	0.746	0.397	0.192
claude		0.583	0.279	0.720	0.886	0.438	0.709	0.849	0.425	0.728	0.304	0.732	0.726	0.400	0.433
mini gpt4		0.627	0.291	0.710	0.873	0.456	0.688	0.877	0.420	0.740	0.294	0.775	0.726	0.353	0.310
step by step		0.639	0.323	0.705	0.885	0.442	0.687	0.861	0.445	0.752	0.204	0.708	0.676	0.343	0.155
openai human written examples		0.604	0.306	0.709	0.897	0.440	0.718	0.869	0.420	0.756	0.174	0.685	0.742	0.350	0.400
gpt4 style in context examples		0.619	0.231	0.725	0.887	0.434	0.732	0.879	0.430	0.764	0.244	0.678	0.732	0.373	0.433
rewrite groundtruth in own words	0.511	0.231	0.709										0.323		
gold label	llama 3 instruct			0.734	0.978	0.517	0.766	0.855	0.435	0.761	0.408	0.764	0.738	0.450	0.392
groundtruth		0.681	0.396	0.691										0.477	0.355
gpt4		0.814	0.562	0.723	0.880	0.489	0.695	0.865	0.435	0.752	0.355	0.801	0.796	0.483	0.408
claude		0.816	0.493	0.748	0.879	0.454	0.728	0.864	0.455	0.763	0.371	0.808	0.746	0.483	0.408
mini gpt4		0.795	0.557	0.725	0.867	0.448	0.702	0.863	0.450	0.739	0.358	0.826	0.730	0.490	0.331
step by step		0.798	0.564	0.728	0.874	0.426	0.718	0.866	0.460	0.783	0.385	0.792	0.780	0.463	0.371
openai human written examples		0.811	0.547	0.736	0.891	0.446	0.719	0.864	0.450	0.770	0.361	0.809	0.808	0.457	0.355
gpt4 style in context examples		0.792	0.515	0.742	0.875	0.440	0.717	0.854	0.460	0.755	0.378	0.809	0.798	0.483	0.273
rewrite groundtruth in own words	0.729	0.443	0.715										0.417		
gold label	qwen			0.814	0.880	0.473	0.725	0.868	0.500	0.769	0.344	0.856	0.652		0.302
groundtruth		0.906	0.898	0.784										0.610	
gpt4		0.889	0.916	0.793	0.865	0.509	0.721	0.879	0.545	0.762	0.599	0.890	0.794	0.630	0.249
claude		0.884	0.906	0.796	0.873	0.487	0.716	0.885	0.550	0.767	0.562	0.867	0.798	0.637	0.294
mini gpt4		0.905	0.904	0.782	0.865	0.509	0.704	0.881	0.535	0.760	0.605	0.891	0.818	0.600	0.249
step by step		0.899	0.908	0.795	0.846	0.513	0.703	0.874	0.545	0.752	0.565	0.882	0.766	0.603	0.229
openai human written examples		0.907	0.910	0.790	0.876	0.493	0.699	0.884	0.540	0.808	0.602	0.881	0.816	0.617	0.445
gpt4 style in context examples		0.896	0.902	0.799	0.883	0.515	0.734	0.871	0.540	0.782	0.585	0.863	0.800	0.607	0.339
rewrite groundtruth in own words	0.911	0.899	0.791										0.587		

Table 7: seed 0 train datasize 1000 lr 2e-05 epoch num 20

Data Generation Strategy	Model Type	gsm8k	math algebra	ecqa	boolq	mmlu	winogrande	piqa	agieval	squad	mmlu pro	arc challenge	drop	mbpp	api bank
gold label	mistral			0.714	0.997	0.456	0.733	0.855		0.738	0.355	0.741	0.654		0.445
groundtruth		0.443	0.191	0.690										0.303	
gpt4		0.617	0.327	0.704	0.872	0.485	0.719	0.861	0.415	0.732	0.261	0.641	0.712	0.370	
claude		0.581	0.277	0.742	0.885	0.468	0.731	0.847	0.455	0.740	0.331	0.764	0.730	0.370	0.437
mini gpt4		0.615	0.314	0.707	0.886	0.409	0.698	0.863	0.430	0.728	0.291	0.771	0.740	0.347	0.335
step by step		0.619	0.309	0.707	0.868	0.458	0.696	0.862	0.445	0.748	0.227	0.711	0.706	0.370	0.167
openai human written examples		0.630	0.302	0.707	0.888	0.436	0.723	0.854	0.410	0.762	0.258	0.695	0.740	0.343	0.416
gpt4 style in context examples		0.605	0.265	0.726	0.882	0.452	0.724	0.862	0.445	0.760	0.251	0.706	0.736	0.380	0.408
rewrite groundtruth in own words		0.497	0.241	0.700										0.297	
gold label		llama 3 instruct		0.408		0.979		0.759	0.850		0.754	0.411	0.767	0.744	0.443
groundtruth			0.557		0.865		0.698	0.866		0.762	0.398	0.808	0.792	0.487	0.306
gpt4			0.504		0.858		0.716	0.858		0.766	0.368	0.797	0.762	0.480	0.367
claude			0.548		0.863		0.664	0.871		0.751	0.338	0.811	0.810	0.487	0.322
mini gpt4			0.561		0.867		0.721	0.846		0.777	0.388	0.792	0.780	0.533	0.208
step by step			0.547		0.894		0.716	0.868		0.764	0.385	0.801	0.806	0.487	0.343
openai human written examples			0.484		0.890		0.720	0.878		0.751	0.391	0.812	0.792	0.463	0.416
gpt4 style in context examples			0.445											0.447	
rewrite groundtruth in own words															
gold label	qwen										0.771	0.338		0.668	0.580
groundtruth														0.623	0.224
gpt4										0.759	0.599		0.800	0.623	0.278
claude										0.765	0.582		0.822	0.570	0.245
mini gpt4										0.765	0.595		0.826	0.640	0.229
step by step										0.775	0.572		0.822	0.633	0.465
openai human written examples										0.787	0.585		0.814	0.643	0.294
gpt4 style in context examples										0.787	0.572			0.590	
rewrite groundtruth in own words															

Table 8: Seed 1, training data size 1000, learning rate $2e-05$, number of epochs 20. In this table, we only record data where $PGR > 5\%$. We did not run the experiment for data where $PGR < 5\%$ because they are not included in our calculation in section 5.4. Additionally, as explained in section 5.3, the variation in those data is minimal, so running the experiment multiple times is deemed unnecessary.

Data Generation Strategy	Model Type	gsm8k	math algebra	ecqa	boolq	mmlu	winogrande	piqa	agieval	squad	mmlu pro	arc challenge	drop	mbpp	api bank
gold label	mistral			0.681	0.996	0.462	0.743	0.838	0.450	0.741	0.338	0.734	0.656		0.449
groundtruth		0.441	0.211	0.679										0.350	
gpt4		0.617	0.315	0.708	0.868	0.464	0.700	0.870	0.415	0.739	0.247	0.661	0.720	0.407	0.278
claude		0.612	0.277	0.742	0.883	0.483	0.716	0.856	0.410	0.744	0.318	0.743	0.726	0.377	0.445
mini gpt4		0.622	0.320	0.703	0.865	0.440	0.688	0.855	0.435	0.740	0.291	0.768	0.708	0.347	0.298
step by step		0.622	0.322	0.709	0.866	0.448	0.697	0.843	0.430	0.763	0.224	0.700	0.714	0.370	0.176
openai human written examples		0.614	0.323	0.701	0.900	0.448	0.718	0.855	0.405	0.754	0.244	0.663	0.748	0.363	0.408
gpt4 style in context examples		0.606	0.251	0.712	0.884	0.432	0.724	0.860	0.420	0.771	0.221	0.711	0.748	0.373	0.449
rewrite groundtruth in own words		0.506	0.222	0.703										0.327	
gold label		llama 3 instruct		0.415		0.980		0.760	0.865		0.757	0.428	0.762	0.740	0.413
groundtruth			0.553		0.864		0.697	0.865		0.742	0.388	0.824	0.748	0.507	0.314
gpt4			0.489		0.866		0.685	0.846		0.759	0.368	0.800	0.770	0.507	0.384
claude			0.536		0.866		0.690	0.869		0.754	0.378	0.796	0.686	0.483	0.306
mini gpt4			0.551		0.884		0.707	0.865		0.767	0.411	0.782	0.792	0.470	0.212
step by step			0.529		0.884		0.714	0.863		0.757	0.378	0.808	0.800	0.460	0.367
openai human written examples			0.500		0.876		0.709	0.856		0.767	0.401	0.809	0.816	0.480	0.433
gpt4 style in context examples			0.431											0.457	
rewrite groundtruth in own words															
gold label	qwen										0.774	0.344		0.652	0.623
groundtruth														0.620	0.253
gpt4										0.777	0.582		0.788	0.597	0.294
claude										0.762	0.582		0.798	0.610	0.233
mini gpt4										0.760	0.602		0.792	0.603	0.233
step by step										0.767	0.575		0.804	0.603	0.449
openai human written examples										0.802	0.595		0.824	0.577	0.318
gpt4 style in context examples										0.790	0.569			0.600	
rewrite groundtruth in own words															

Table 9: Seed 2, training data size 1000, learning rate $2e-05$, number of epochs 20. In this table, we only record data where $PGR > 5\%$. We did not run the experiment for data where $PGR < 5\%$ because they are not included in our calculation in section 5.4. Additionally, as explained in section 5.3, the variation in those data is minimal, so running the experiment multiple times is deemed unnecessary.

Data Generation Strategy	Model Type	gsm8k	math algebra	ecqa	boolq	mmlu	winogrande	piqa	agieval	squad	mmlu pro	arc challenge	drop	mbpp	api bank	
gold label	mistral	0.420	0.205	0.627	0.869	0.287	0.608	0.814	0.430	0.582	0.214	0.704	0.482	0.267	0.176	
groundtruth		0.513	0.231	0.591	0.837	0.401	0.636	0.790	0.345	0.333	0.167	0.624	0.244	0.340	0.188	
gpt4		0.505	0.215	0.634	0.837	0.399	0.627	0.804	0.400	0.290	0.171	0.630	0.250	0.330	0.110	
claude		0.511	0.223	0.619	0.845	0.407	0.644	0.782	0.360	0.404	0.120	0.633	0.210	0.337	0.086	
mini gpt4		0.494	0.247	0.593	0.845	0.405	0.636	0.765	0.355	0.314		0.618	0.092	0.323	0.167	
step by step		0.504	0.230	0.611	0.853	0.411	0.639	0.811	0.355	0.467	0.174	0.578	0.280	0.317	0.257	
openai human written examples		0.500	0.245	0.560	0.845	0.373	0.649	0.789	0.340	0.312	0.124	0.611	0.124	0.337	0.208	
gpt4 style in context examples		0.450	0.214	0.603										0.317		
rewrite groundtruth in own words																
gold label		llama 3 instruct	0.794	0.460	0.710	0.852	0.379	0.636	0.789	0.395	0.680	0.271	0.764	0.620	0.407	0.020
groundtruth	0.791		0.491	0.686	0.802	0.460	0.634	0.801	0.430	0.504	0.231	0.760	0.410	0.497	0.037	
gpt4	0.804		0.492	0.699	0.806	0.487	0.640	0.821	0.450	0.495	0.274	0.739	0.420	0.493	0.065	
claude	0.797		0.477	0.710	0.800	0.462	0.621	0.823	0.425	0.509	0.234	0.751	0.400	0.497	0.061	
mini gpt4	0.808		0.496	0.702	0.818	0.466	0.626	0.799	0.435	0.565	0.258	0.743	0.488	0.480	0.184	
step by step	0.809		0.472	0.720	0.810	0.481	0.630	0.815	0.440	0.564	0.214	0.747	0.414	0.500	0.078	
openai human written examples	0.800		0.434	0.695	0.793	0.468	0.638	0.808	0.455	0.429	0.207	0.762	0.344	0.497	0.090	
gpt4 style in context examples	0.813		0.480	0.718										0.447		
rewrite groundtruth in own words																
gold label	qwen		0.913	0.918	0.791	0.843	0.462	0.677	0.875	0.465	0.703	0.562	0.877	0.334	0.603	0.229
groundtruth		0.908	0.898	0.802	0.831	0.493	0.711	0.863	0.560	0.661	0.615	0.891	0.092	0.620	0.229	
gpt4		0.911	0.912	0.788	0.837	0.525	0.718	0.876	0.550	0.652	0.602	0.894	0.114	0.623	0.216	
claude		0.902	0.914	0.791	0.852	0.523	0.720	0.884	0.550	0.660	0.595	0.891	0.068	0.600	0.229	
mini gpt4		0.909	0.909	0.802	0.848	0.485	0.708	0.870	0.545	0.682	0.599	0.879	0.062	0.637	0.212	
step by step		0.900	0.918	0.789	0.842	0.515	0.718	0.864	0.545	0.681	0.609	0.887	0.090	0.597	0.237	
openai human written examples		0.918	0.914	0.798	0.836	0.530	0.710	0.865	0.535	0.678		0.888	0.050	0.627	0.196	
gpt4 style in context examples		0.910	0.916	0.782										0.590		
rewrite groundtruth in own words																

Table 10: seed 0 train datasize 100 lr 2e-05 epoch num 20

Data Generation Strategy	Model Type	api bank	drop	mmlu pro	squad
gold label	mistral	0.486	0.620	0.254	0.730
groundtruth					
gpt4		0.208	0.670	0.204	0.649
claude		0.331	0.662	0.274	0.690
mini gpt4		0.249	0.666	0.237	0.670
step by step		0.200	0.646	0.244	0.691
openai human written examples		0.302	0.698	0.241	0.700
gpt4 style in context examples		0.343	0.650	0.268	0.676
gold label	llama 3 instruct	0.494	0.684	0.371	0.727
groundtruth					
gpt4		0.233	0.734	0.361	0.729
claude			0.742	0.365	0.744
mini gpt4		0.322	0.744	0.361	0.746
step by step		0.188	0.708	0.331	0.736
openai human written examples		0.302	0.772	0.355	0.726
gpt4 style in context examples		0.380	0.754	0.334	0.729
gold label	qwen	0.457	0.642	0.355	0.747
groundtruth					
gpt4		0.269	0.808	0.599	0.743
claude		0.310	0.810	0.565	0.766
mini gpt4		0.253	0.772	0.579	0.750
step by step		0.253	0.788	0.569	0.737
openai human written examples		0.392	0.824	0.599	0.776
gpt4 style in context examples		0.335	0.832	0.585	0.764

Table 11: seed 0 train datasize 100 lr 0.0002 epoch num 40

Table 12: All Model Rankings (Shortened Method Names)

Model	Interval	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Rank 4	Rank 5	Rank 6
Qwen	0-10	claude	humanstyle	minigpt4	gpt4example	gpt4	stepbystep
Qwen	10-20	claude	gpt4example	humanstyle	minigpt4	gpt4	stepbystep
Qwen	20-30	minigpt4	claude	gpt4	humanstyle	gpt4example	stepbystep
Qwen	0-50	claude	humanstyle	minigpt4	gpt4example	gpt4	stepbystep
Qwen	0-100	claude	humanstyle	minigpt4	gpt4example	gpt4	stepbystep
Mistral	0-10	humanstyle	claude	minigpt4	gpt4example	gpt4	stepbystep
Mistral	10-20	humanstyle	claude	gpt4example	minigpt4	gpt4	stepbystep
Mistral	20-30	humanstyle	minigpt4	claude	gpt4	gpt4example	stepbystep
Mistral	0-50	humanstyle	claude	minigpt4	gpt4example	gpt4	stepbystep
Mistral	0-100	humanstyle	claude	minigpt4	gpt4example	gpt4	stepbystep
Llama	0-10	humanstyle	claude	minigpt4	gpt4	gpt4example	stepbystep
Llama	10-20	humanstyle	gpt4example	claude	gpt4	stepbystep	minigpt4
Llama	20-30	humanstyle	claude	gpt4	gpt4example	minigpt4	stepbystep
Llama	0-50	humanstyle	claude	gpt4example	gpt4	minigpt4	stepbystep
Llama	0-100	humanstyle	claude	gpt4example	gpt4	minigpt4	stepbystep

Table 13: This example demonstrates the ranking consistency on DROP. The rankings of the methods are relatively stable as the intervals change.

Benchmark Name	Data Name	Chosen/Not Chosen	Why not chosen
Mistral 7B	Hellaswag	×	not a reasoning task not a reasoning task not a reasoning task We already choose ARC Challenge It evaluates world knowledge instead of reasoning ability It evaluates world knowledge instead of reasoning ability this is a multiturn, muti context qa dataset. evaluation is too hard In github, it says this dataset can never used in training.
	Winogrande	✓	
	PIQA	✓	
	SIQA	×	
	OpenbookQA	×	
	ARC Easy	×	
	ARC Challenge	✓	
	CommonsenseQA	×	
	NaturalQuestions	×	
	TriviaQA	×	
	BoolQ	✓	
	QuAC	×	
	GSM8K	✓	
	MATH	✓	
	MBPP	✓	
MMLU	✓		
BBH	×		
AGIEVAL	✓		
Llama 3	MMLU	✓	less than 700 data dataset size < 700
	GPQA	×	
	HumanEval	×	
	GSM8K	✓	
	MATH	✓	
	MMLU	✓	
	AGIEVAL	✓	
	ARC CHALLENGE	✓	
	DROP	✓	
	API-BANK	✓	
Qwen2.5	MMLU	✓	we already have MMLU and MMLU PRO In github, it says this dataset can never used in training. not reasoning task not reasoning task dataset size < 700 the data set is toooooo challenging for GPT4o. it does not have the ability to be a teacher for this task. we already have 2 MMLU dataset less than 700 data less than 700 data less than 700 data multilingual data set, thus not use
	MMLU Pro	✓	
	MMLU redux	×	
	BBH	×	
	ARC CHALLENGE	✓	
	TruthfulQA	×	
	WindoGrande	✓	
	HellaSwag	×	
	GPQA	×	
	TheoremQA	×	
	MATH	✓	
	MMLU stem	×	
	GSM8K	✓	
	HumanEval	×	
	HumanEval+	×	
	MBPP	✓	
	MBPP+	×	
MultiPL E	×		

Table 14: This table explains which data from the Mistral, LLaMA3, and Qwen benchmarks were chosen and why some data were not selected.