

---

# ENSEMBLE TOT OF LLMs AND ITS APPLICATION TO AUTOMATIC GRADING SYSTEM FOR SUPPORTING SELF-LEARNING

---

A PREPRINT

 **Yuki Ito**

Graduate School of Informatics  
Kyoto University  
Yoshidahonmachi, Sakyo-ku  
Kyoto-shi, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan  
ito.yuki.w26@kyoto-u.jp

 **Qiang Ma**

Graduate School of Science and Technology  
Kyoto Institute of Technology  
Matsugasakihashikamicho, Sakyo-ku,  
Kyoto 606-8585, Japan  
qiang@kit.ac.jp

February 25, 2025

## ABSTRACT

Providing students with detailed and timely grading feedback is essential for self-learning. While existing LLM-based grading systems are promising, most of them rely on one single model, which limits their performance. To address this, we propose **Ensemble Tree-of-Thought (ToT)**, a framework that enhances LLM outputs by integrating multiple models. Using this framework, we develop a grading system. Ensemble ToT follows three steps: (1) analyzing LLM performance, (2) generating candidate answers, and (3) refining them into a final result. Based on this, our grading system first evaluates the grading tendencies of LLMs, then generates multiple results, and finally integrates them via a simulated debate. Experimental results demonstrate our approach’s ability to provide accurate and explainable grading by effectively coordinating multiple LLMs.

**Keywords** Large Language Models · EdTech · Ensemble · ToT.

## 1 Introduction

Since the release of ChatGPT in 2022, generative AI has gained significant popularity, with many students increasingly adopting it as a learning aid for various purposes. A survey on students’ use of AI for learning identified several common applications, such as brainstorming, generating ideas, summarizing readings, and analyzing large datasets [Chan and Hu, 2023]. Among these, AI’s ability to provide personalized and immediate learning support is particularly valued. Notably, some students in the survey reported using AI to obtain grading and its explanations on their completed homework. They found these grading comments helpful for enhancing their depth of thinking and understanding. This highlights the importance of providing students with detailed, point-by-point feedback on their homework to facilitate self-learning.

However, generative AI responses are not always reliable, raising concerns about the potential for misleading feedback. While feedback from human teachers is ideal for guiding student self-learning, it is often impractical for teachers to provide individualized and immediate support to every student. In this context, automatic grading systems emerge as a practical solution. These systems evaluate student answers and deliver timely grading comments, bridging the gap without placing additional burdens on teachers.

Before this work, several studies have proposed automatic grading methods. For example, Gobbo et al. introduced GradeAid, a framework that evaluates student answers by extracting both lexical and semantic features to determine grading scores [del Gobbo et al., 2023]. Similarly, Huang et al. developed a system to grade reading comprehension answers [Huang et al., 2023]. Their system not only evaluates student answers but also provides auto-generated hints to guide students toward correct answers.




Figure 1: **Overview of Ensemble ToT Framework:** The framework integrates ensemble learning techniques with the Tree-of-Thought (ToT) approach. It identifies individual LLM performance tendencies and synthesizes multiple candidate solutions generated by LLMs into a single refined result.

Despite these advances, existing automated grading systems often fall short of effectively supporting self-learning. Many systems lack the ability to provide high-quality, detailed feedback necessary for guiding students’ learning processes. For instance, GradeAid does not explain *why* an answer is incorrect or incomplete. This leaves students without clear guidance on how to improve. While some methods attempt to generate more detailed explanations about their grading results, the quality remains inadequate. For example, Huang et al. say about their system that their auto-generated feedback quality is “still far from satisfactory.” These deficiencies hinder the effectiveness of the systems for self-learning.

To overcome these challenges, integrating multiple LLMs into grading systems is a promising approach. Existing methods typically rely on a single LLM, which may struggle to provide consistently accurate and reliable grading comments. In contrast, a previous study demonstrated that using ensembles of pre-trained BERT models for scoring tasks significantly improves prediction accuracy [Ormerod, 2022]. This highlights the advantages of combining multiple models. Inspired by this insight, we advocate for leveraging multi-LLM systems to address the limitations of single-model approaches. However, an effective way to combine multiple LLMs, especially language generation models, has not yet been well studied.

In this paper, we propose a novel framework to utilize multiple LLMs called **Ensemble ToT** and its application, a grading system named **Graders by Ensemble ToT (GET)**. Ensemble ToT combines the strengths of multiple language generation models by integrating ensemble learning techniques with the Tree-of-Thought (ToT) approach. Fig. 1 shows the overview of this framework. It operates in three key steps:

1. **Identification of LLM performance tendencies:** Inspired by ensemble learning principles, we evaluate the performance of individual LLMs on tasks similar to the target problem. This helps us identify the strengths and tendencies of each LLM for the given task.
2. **Generation of multiple candidate solutions:** Drawing on the ToT framework, multiple LLMs independently generate candidate solutions for the task.
3. **Integration of the solutions:** These candidate solutions are synthesized into a single, refined result, leveraging insights from the performance tendencies.

The GET system leverages the Ensemble ToT framework to deliver highly accurate grading and its detailed explanations — both of which are difficult to achieve using one single LLM. Fig. 2 provides the overview of the GET system process




Figure 2: **Process Diagram of GET**: The system consists of three stages: *pseudo-learning*, *multi-LLM grading*, and *debate Integration*. This enables accurate grading by taking advantage of the characteristics of multiple models.

flow. Following the Ensemble ToT structure, it operates in three main steps: *pseudo-learning*, *multi-LLM grading*, *debate integration*.

In *pseudo-learning*, three LLMs separately grade past student answers and determine their grading labels. By analyzing the results of this task, grading capabilities and tendencies of LLMs are identified. Next, in the *multi-LLM grading* step, the three LLMs separately generate grading candidates of student answers. They get questions, reference answers, and student answers as the inputs and output grading labels along with their reasons. Finally, in the *debate integration* step, an LLM integrates *multi-LLM grading* results into the single, refined grading conclusion. This integration is accomplished by simulating a debate script between the grader LLMs. *Pseudo-learning*'s outcome is utilized in this integration phase to guide debate outputs.

By providing students with grading reasons accurately and speedily, the GET system enhances the explainability of grading outcomes, helping students understand and correct their mistakes. Furthermore, by combining the output results from multiple LLMs, the system compensates for the weaknesses of individual models. This advancement enables more accurate and balanced grading, accompanied by clear and valid reasoning for student answers. It is expected to enhance student self-learning while minimizing the workload for educators.

The key contributions of this work are as follows:

- Propose Ensemble ToT, a novel framework to collaborate multiple LLMs effectively. It contains three main steps.
  - Analysis of LLMs performance tendencies inspired by ensemble learning.
  - Generation of several candidate solutions with multiple LLMs based on the Tree-of-Thought framework.
  - Integration of candidate solutions considering the performance tendencies.
- Propose an automated grading system, GET, which is constructed based on the Ensemble ToT framework.
- Evaluate the grading performance of the GET system on existing datasets. By comparing it to several baselines, we guarantee its effectiveness.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Methods to Collaborate Multiple LLMs

Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) have explored strategies to leverage the collective strengths of multiple models, enhancing performance and reliability across various tasks.

For example, Zhang et al. introduce the Chain-of-Agent (CoA) framework, which utilizes multi-agent collaboration in natural language [Zhang et al., 2024]. In CoA, multiple LLM agents communicate to process different segments of text. Then, a manager agent synthesizes their contributions into the final output. With each agent processing short contexts, CoA can handle longer contextual input more effectively than conventional methods. It has demonstrated significant improvements (up to 10%) in tasks such as question answering, summarization, and code completion, when compared to strong baselines like retrieval augmented generation (RAG), full-context models, and multi-agent LLMs.

The LLM-Synergy framework [Yang et al., 2023] proposes techniques like boosting-based weighted majority voting and cluster-based dynamic model selection to enhance accuracy in medical QA datasets. This approach achieves state-of-the-art results, including 38.01% accuracy on MedMCQA, 96.36% on PubMedQA, and 38.13% on MedQA-USMLE, outperforming other methods across all three datasets.

Additionally, the Formal Debate framework (FORD) [Xiong et al., 2023] introduces a structured three-stage debate process to facilitate effective collaboration among LLMs. While the integrated results are not always optimal, the study demonstrates the potential of debates to improve performance even when there are inconsistencies between LLMs' outputs.

These methods highlight the potential of multi-LLM collaboration in addressing challenges related to performance and reliability.

Based on the insights provided by these studies, our study explores a new approach to achieving multi-LM cooperation. Unlike the aforementioned frameworks, our system introduces two key elements: *pseudo-learning*, which pre-evaluates the performance trends of LLMs, and *debate integration*, which synthesizes LLMs' outputs through discussions. Through these mechanisms, our system aims to effectively address performance and reliability challenges.

### 2.2 Automated Short Answer Grading

The application of a LLM in education has also received significant attention. Automated short answer grading (ASAG) field is no exception. ASAG targets the grading of student answers to open-ended questions, which are typically a few sentences long. In this section, we introduce such technologies, by categorizing existing grading methods into two primary approaches: **score or label prediction** and **detailed feedback generation**.

#### 2.2.1 Grading Methods for Scores and Labels Prediction

Numerous studies have explored grading methods that focus on assigning scores or labels to student answers. For example, Gobbo et al. propose GradeAid, a framework to grade short student answers. It gives numeric scores to student answers by extracting lexical and semantic features [del Gobbo et al., 2023] from them. Lexical features are calculated using TF-IDF, while semantic features are derived using a BERT-Cross Encoder. These features are concatenated into a single vector and processed through a regression model to predict the final grading score. GradeAid demonstrates effective grading across various datasets, while its performance consistency depends on the specific questions and datasets used. Another approach utilizes ensembles of pre-trained BERT models for scoring tasks [Ormerod, 2022]. This study shows that combining multiple models can improve score prediction accuracy.

While BERT models are used in various grading tasks, GPT models are also becoming popular these days. For example, Chang et al. employ GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 for scoring and label classification (pass/fail) of Finnish student answers [Chang and Ginter, 2024]. This research found that GPT-4 performs well in the grading tasks, especially in the one-shot setting. But they also admit the necessity of further performance improvement before introducing this kind of technology to the real education situation.

Automated grading can reduce not only the burden on teachers but also the subjectivity inherent in manual grading. Gobrecht et al. indicate that automated scoring methods can enhance fairness and equity in evaluations [Gobrecht et al., 2024]. They fine-tuned a transformer-based scoring system and evaluated student answers which already assigned grades by human graders. Then, human graders grade the same answers again. Finally, these results are compared with the past grading to evaluate the grading consistency. This experiment reveals that the model has less deviation from the past grading results than the human re-graders.

### 2.2.2 Grading Methods for Detailed Feedback Generation

Some methods generate detailed grading reasons alongside scores and labels to enhance transparency and usability. For example, Huang et al. proposes a method that automatically evaluates answers using a fine-tuned GPT model and generates feedback to guide students to the correct answers [Huang et al., 2023]. We have also proposed a technique to automatically generate grading labels and reasons by combining a single LLM and a grammatical structure analysis technique [Ito and Ma, 2025].

In addition, Lee et al.’s study [Lee et al., 2024] uses a prompt construction method called Chain-of-Thought (CoT) to perform reasoned automatic grading with GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 [Lee et al., 2024]. CoT prompting is a way to improve LLM outputs by encouraging step-by-step reasoning. In this system, the LLM generates evidence that supports its grading decisions before assigning a label (e.g., Proficient, Developing, or Beginning). This approach enables GPT-4 to provide explanations for its assigned labels, improving interpretability. Another study investigated GPT-4’s potential for grading middle school level answers [Jiang and Bosch, 2024]. Their method generates both grading scores and rationale paragraphs, by referring to the question, student answer, scoring rubrics, and additional information where applicable. GPT-4 achieved a quadratic weighted kappa of 0.677 across 10 questions. While this experimental result shows a high potential of auto-grading by the model, it is also mentioned that grading outcomes varied across subjects (e.g., biology, English), highlighting the instability.

Some studies propose grading frameworks that can work with various types of LLMs. For example, Jordan et al. developed an automated grading framework: FreeText [Matelsky et al., 2023]. It gets a question, grading criteria, and a student answer, then generates personalized feedback for the student. In this framework, users can freely select a grading model. Fateen et al. propose another system, ASAS-F-RAG, which integrates retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) with automated grading [Fateen et al., 2024]. When grading student answers, this method retrieves the top 3 to 5 most similar examples from past grading data using the ColBERT retriever. These examples are given to the LLMs as grading examples. This method achieves accurate generation of scores, labels (e.g., Correct, Partially Correct, or Incorrect), and feedback. They also employ several LLMs in their experiments, indicating that their system achieves accurate grading without depending on a specific LLM.

### 2.2.3 Dataset Contributions for Automated Grading

While many studies focus on label and score prediction, fewer studies address the generation of grading reasons. This discrepancy stems from the limited availability of datasets that include detailed grading reasons. To address this, several works have introduced new datasets to support research on ASAG:

- SAF Dataset [Filighera et al., 2022]: Filighera et al. construct the SAF dataset collected from college-level network communication classes. It includes questions, reference answers, student answers, grading labels, scores, and grader feedback. They demonstrated the dataset’s utility by fine-tuned models like T5-base and mT5-base to jointly predict scores, labels, and feedback.
- EngSAF Dataset [Aggarwal et al., 2024]: Aggarwal et al. construct another dataset: EngSAF. It has a similar structure to the SAF, but it expands the scope with a larger data size and broader topics across various courses. Experiments using EngSAF involved both fine-tuned models (e.g., LLaMA-2-13B-chat, Mistral-7B-Instruct) and zero-shot evaluations with GPT-3.5-turbo. These models generated output labels and feedback by comparing student answers to reference answers.

These datasets are crucial for advancing the development of systems that prioritize reason generation alongside grading.

### 2.2.4 Comparison to Our Approach

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the features and techniques of the reviewed methods, contrasting them with our system.

As shown in Table 1, our system focuses on label prediction and reason generation, excluding score prediction. This design choice aligns with our ultimate goal: providing effective feedback to support student self-learning rather than determining official grades.

Table 2 highlights how our system distinguishes itself from prior methods. Unlike approaches that rely on a single model, our method leverages multiple LLMs to enhance grading accuracy. This is achieved through a combination of ensemble learning and the Tree of Thought (ToT) approach. By collaborating multiple LLMs, we can compensate for the weaknesses of individual models. This results in more consistent and balanced grading outcomes, without relying on a specific LLM.

Table 1: Outputs of Each System

Method/System	Label Pred.	Score Pred.	Reason Gen.
GradeAid [del Gobbo et al., 2023]	×	✓	×
Finnish Grading [Chang and Ginter, 2024]	✓	✓	×
BERT Ensemble [Ormerod, 2022]	×	✓	×
Reduce Subjectivity [Gobrecht et al., 2024]	×	✓	×
CoT Scoring [Lee et al., 2024]	✓	×	✓
FreeText[Matelsky et al., 2023]	×	×	✓
ASAS-F-RAG [Fateen et al., 2024]	✓	✓	✓
GPT-4 Grading [Jiang and Bosch, 2024]	×	✓	✓
SAF Baselines [Filighera et al., 2022]	✓	✓	✓
EngSAF Baselines [Aggarwal et al., 2024]	✓	✓	✓
DIRECT [Huang et al., 2023]	✓	×	✓
Our Previous System [Ito and Ma, 2025]	✓	×	✓
<b>GET (Our System)</b>	✓	×	✓

Table 2: Techniques Used in Each Method

Method/System	Fine-Tuning	Few-Shot	CoT/ToT	Multi-LLM Collab.
GradeAid [del Gobbo et al., 2023]	✓	×	×	×
Finnish Grading [Chang and Ginter, 2024]	×	✓	×	×
BERT Ensemble [Ormerod, 2022]	✓	×	×	✓
Reduce Subjectivity [Gobrecht et al., 2024]	✓	×	×	×
CoT Scoring [Lee et al., 2024]	×	✓	✓	×
FreeText [Lee et al., 2024]	×	×	×	×
ASAS-F-RAG [Fateen et al., 2024]	×	✓	×	×
GPT-4 Grading [Jiang and Bosch, 2024]	×	✓	✓	×
SAF Baselines [Filighera et al., 2022]	✓	✓	×	×
EngSAF Baselines [Aggarwal et al., 2024]	✓	×	×	×
DIRECT [Huang et al., 2023]	✓	×	×	×
Our Previous System [Ito and Ma, 2025]	✓	×	×	×
<b>GET (Our System)</b>	×	✓	✓	✓

Note that the ToT approach extends the Chain of Thought (CoT) methodology. While CoT simulates a linear flow of thought in LLMs, ToT explores multiple alternatives simultaneously. It branches the reasoning into a tree-like structure. This branching enables more nuanced grading decisions and improves accuracy.

Furthermore, our system avoids the computationally expensive process of fine-tuning. Instead of training a new model to combine model outputs (as in traditional ensemble learning), we focus on identifying the performance tendencies of various LLMs. These identified tendencies are coupled with few-shot learning and the ToT framework, allowing us to achieve high performance without the overhead of fine-tuning. By omitting fine-tuning, we reduce the time and computational resources required. This enables faster and more efficient system deployment.

### 3 Proposed Framework and System

This section first introduces the core idea, Ensemble ToT. Then, it defines the problem that the GET system is designed to solve. Finally, it provides a detailed explanation of the system’s overall structure.

### 3.1 Ensemble ToT

Inspired by ensemble learning and Tree-of-Thought (ToT) [Yao et al., 2023], we propose a novel framework, Ensemble ToT, for utilizing multiple LLMs.

Ensemble learning is a machine learning technique that combines the predictions from multiple models to improve accuracy [Ibomoiye and Sun, 2022]. One common method, Stacking [Wolpert, 1992], involves training multiple models on the same dataset and then training a new model to combine their outputs. This new model generally produces higher-quality results by leveraging the strengths of the individual models.

In contrast, ToT is a framework designed to help LLMs solve problems by breaking them down into a series of intermediate thought steps. For each step, ToT guides the LLM to generate multiple candidate solutions. These candidates are then evaluated using heuristics or voting mechanisms to select the most promising options. By iteratively exploring multiple reasoning paths, ToT organizes the problem-solving process into a tree-like structure, allowing LLMs to explore various paths simultaneously.

Ensemble ToT builds upon Stacking and ToT. First, it identifies the performance tendencies of LLMs on tasks similar to the target problem. This phase mirrors the training phase in Stacking. However, we do not actually train the LLMs, since they have large size, and fine-tuning them is resource-intensive. To address this, we design an alternative process called *pseudo-learning*, as described in Section 3.3.

Second, based on the ToT framework, Ensemble ToT generates multiple candidate solutions using several LLMs. While the original ToT uses a single LLM to generate multiple candidates, Ensemble ToT utilizes different LLMs for each candidate. This increases the diversity of the candidates, leading to a wider range of solutions. In the GET system, this is implemented in the *multi-LLM grading* phase, detailed in Section 3.4.

Finally, Ensemble ToT combines the candidate solutions while considering the identified performance tendencies of the LLMs. This process corresponds both to ensemble learning, which combines the outputs of multiple models through a newly trained model, and to ToT, which merges thought candidates using heuristics or voting mechanisms. In Ensemble ToT, an LLM combines the performance tendencies and candidate solutions to select the best possible solution. The GET system implements this process in the *debate integration* phase, as explained in Section 3.5.

The following section provides a detailed explanation of the GET system, which implements the Ensemble ToT framework.

### 3.2 Problem Definition

The GET system’s objective is to grade short student answers. To define this problem, the symbols used are explained in Table 3.

The problem addressed by the GET system is to grade student answers based on the question content and the corresponding reference answers. Specifically, for the input tuple  $(q_i, r_i, s_{i_j})$ , the system predicts a pair consisting of a grading label and a grading reason,  $(gl_{i_j}, gr_{i_j})$ .

Mathematically, this task can be represented as follows:

$$(gl_{i_j}, gr_{i_j}) = GET(q_i, r_i, s_{i_j}) \quad (1)$$

The GET system tackles this task through three steps: *pseudo-learning*, *multi-LLM grading*, and *debate integration*.

Table 3: Definition of Symbols

Symbol	Definition
$Q = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m\}$	Set of questions for students
$R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m\}$	Set of reference answers for Q
$S_i = \{s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \dots, s_{i_n}\}$	Set of $n$ students’ answers for $q_i$
$GL = \{\text{Correct, Partially correct, Incorrect}\}$	Set of grading labels
$GR$	Set of grading reasons
$gl_{i_j} \in GL$	Grading label for $s_{i_j}$
$gr_{i_j}$	Grading reason for $s_{i_j}$

### 3.3 Pseudo-Learning

*Pseudo-learning* aims to evaluate the capabilities and grading tendencies of LLMs employed in the system. It is conducted before grading student answers. The process comprises two steps: *grading past-data* and *tendencies identification*.

#### 3.3.1 Grading Past-Data

In the *grading past-data* step, each LLM independently grades answers from an existing dataset  $D'$ , such as historical student answers with grading results. Then it computes the LLMs' performance metrics.

Formally, each LLM predicts grading label and reason pairs  $(gl'_{ij}, gr'_{ij})$  based on the input tuples  $(q'_i, r'_i, s'_{ij}) \in D'$ . The predicted grading labels (denoted as  $pl'_{ij}$ ) are then evaluated against ground truth  $gl'_{ij}$  using performance metrics, including accuracy and macro F1-score.

Accuracy is defined as the proportion of accurately classified samples to the total number of samples:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{\text{Number of Accurate Predictions}}{\text{Total Number of Predictions}} \quad (2)$$

The macro F1-score is calculated as the arithmetic mean of F1-scores for all three grading labels in  $GL$ , ensuring equal weight for each class, regardless of its frequency. For each label  $gl$ , the F1-score is defined as:

$$F1_{gl} = \frac{2 \cdot \text{Precision}_{gl} \cdot \text{Recall}_{gl}}{\text{Precision}_{gl} + \text{Recall}_{gl}} \quad (3)$$

where:

$$\text{Precision}_{gl} = \frac{\text{TP}_{gl}}{\text{TP}_{gl} + \text{FP}_{gl}}, \quad \text{Recall}_{gl} = \frac{\text{TP}_{gl}}{\text{TP}_{gl} + \text{FN}_{gl}} \quad (4)$$

- **True Positives (TP<sub>gl</sub>):** The number of samples predicted as belonging to grading label  $gl$  and having  $gl$  as their true label.
- **False Positives (FP<sub>gl</sub>):** The number of samples predicted as belonging to grading label  $gl$  but having true labels from other classes.
- **False Negatives (FN<sub>gl</sub>):** The number of samples with a true label of  $gl$  but predicted as belonging to another grading label.

The macro F1-score is then computed as:

$$\text{Macro F1} = \frac{1}{|GL|} \sum_{gl \in GL} F1_{gl}. \quad (5)$$

Throughout this study, these metrics are calculated using Scikit-learn [Pedregosa et al., 2011].

In the *grading past-data* step, we focus solely on the evaluation of grading label prediction. Grading reason evaluation is omitted because assessing natural language is complex and time-consuming. This omission simplifies the process and allows for quicker implementation when additional LLMs will be used in the system.

#### 3.3.2 Tendencies Identification

*Tendencies identification* analyzes the strengths, weaknesses, and grading biases of each LLM based on the performance metrics calculated in the previous step. The analysis is conducted from two perspectives:

- **Labeling tendencies compared to other LLMs** (e.g., an LLM excels at identifying errors but is overly strict).
- **Output pattern analysis for the most likely label prediction** (e.g., if LLM1 and LLM2 assign *Correct* while only LLM3 assigns *Partially correct*, the ground truth is *Partially correct* in many cases).

For labeling tendencies, an LLM interprets the numeric metrics and explains its findings in natural language. The prompt is shown in Fig. 3. Through this process, numerical data are transformed into text form. LLMs are generally more effective at processing natural language than numerical data. This transformation is expected to ensure the results of *pseudo-learning* can be utilized more effectively in the subsequent processes.



```

###Instruction###
By analysing the metrics data about classification of student answers (Correct /
Partially correct / Incorrect), briefly describe the distinguishing characteristics of
grading model (Grader1, Grader2, and Grader3) compared to each other.
Find at least one good point and one bad point for each grader.
Please explain in concise natural language without numerical data.

###Example Output###
Grader Performance Overview:
(What makes this grader the best among the others?)
(In other words, in what cases is the grader most reliable?)
(On the other hand, what bias would you say each grader has in grading?)
(In other words, how should we be careful when incorporating their opinions?)

###Metrics about grading student answers###
[
  {
    "model": "Grader 1",
    "accuracy": 0.7066115702479339,
    "macro_f1_score": 0.6290128108515448, ...
    ... Each Grader's metrics (JSON format) here ...
  }
]

```

Figure 3: **The prompt used for analyzing labeling tendencies:** This figure illustrates the prompt provided to the LLM during the labeling tendencies analysis. It includes three-class classification performance metrics in JSON format, along with detailed instructions and the expected output.

For output pattern analysis, the system uses Algorithm 1. It determines the most likely grading label for a given combination of LLM output labels by leveraging the *grading past-data* results and the data distributions. The algorithm works as follows:

1. **Count occurrences:** For each student answer, count the occurrences of LLM output label combination  $(pl'_1, pl'_2, pl'_3)$  and their associated ground truth labels  $gl'$ , where  $pl'_i \in GL$  is the predicted label of LLM  $i$ , and  $gl' \in GL$  is the ground truth label.
2. **Calculate ratios:** For each label combination, calculate the ratio of observed label counts to the expected label counts from the prior probabilities.
3. **Assign most likely labels:** Output all labels whose ratios exceed a predefined threshold as most likely labels. If no label exceeds the threshold, the label with the highest frequency of occurrence is output.

The prior probability used in the algorithm is the percentage of the number of labels in the dataset.

### 3.4 Multi-LLM Grading

The *multi-LLM grading* is the phase to generate multiple grading result candidates of the actual student answers.

This task can be formally defined as follows: Given a question, reference answer, and student answer  $(q_i, r_i, s_{i_j})$  as the input, each LLM predicts the grading label and reason  $(gl_{i_j}, gr_{i_j})$ . This process finally generates three patterns of the predicted label and reason.

*Multi-LLM grading* involves two steps: *few-shot selection* and *independent grading*, as shown in Fig. 4. First, *few-shot selection* chooses three grading examples from the dataset  $D'$ . In *independent grading*, three LLMs separately grade the student answers based on these examples. Finally, the grading results are forwarded to the *debate integration* phase (illustrated in Fig. 5 and detailed in Section 3.5).

**Algorithm 1:** Determine Most Likely Label

---

```

Input: Data  $\{(p'_1, p'_2, p'_3, g'_l)\}$ , Prior Probabilities  $\{P(\text{Label})\}$ 
Output: Likely Label Results  $\{(Combination, MostLikelyLabel) \mid Combination \in GL^3\}$ 

Initialize  $CombinationCounter \leftarrow \{\}$ ,
 $GroundTruthMap \leftarrow \{\}$ ,
 $LikelyLabelResults \leftarrow \{\}$ ;

/* 1. Count Occurrences and Collect Ground Truth Labels for Each Combination */
foreach  $(p'_1, p'_2, p'_3, g'_l) \in Data$  do
     $Combination \leftarrow (p'_1, p'_2, p'_3)$ ;
     $CombinationCounter[Combination] ++$ ;
     $GroundTruthMap[Combination][g'_l] ++$ ;
end

/* 2. Calculate Ratios of Ground Truth to Prior Probabilities */
foreach  $(Combination, C\_Count) \in CombinationCounter.item()$  do
     $Ratios \leftarrow \{\}$ ;
    foreach  $Label, L\_Count \in GroundTruthMap[Combination].item()$  do
         $Ratios[Label] \leftarrow \frac{L\_Count}{P(\text{Label}) \cdot C\_Count}$ ;
    end
    /* 3. Select Labels Exceeding the Threshold */
     $SelectedLabels \leftarrow \{\text{Labels where } Ratios[Label] > \text{Threshold}\}$ ;
    if  $SelectedLabels \neq \emptyset$  then
         $LikelyLabelResults[Combination] \leftarrow SelectedLabels$ ;
    else
        /* If all labels are less than the threshold, select the most frequent label */
         $MostFrequentLabel \leftarrow \text{argmax}_{Label} GroundTruthMap[Combination][Label]$ ;
         $LikelyLabelResults[Combination] \leftarrow \{MostFrequentLabel\}$ ;
    end
end
return  $LikelyLabelResults$ ;
```

---



**3.4.1 Few-shot Selection**

We employ a three-shot prompt (instructions provided to LLMs with three output examples) for the grading task. This approach is motivated by the findings of Fateen et al. [Fateen et al., 2024], who demonstrated that selecting appropriate examples for each student answer using ColBERT [Khattab and Zaharia, 2020] significantly enhances grading performance. Based on their study, the GET system incorporates a retrieval phase to search for suitable grading cases. This process involves the following steps:

**1. Retrieve relevant grading examples:**

- If the question  $q_i$  has been posed to students in  $D'$ , retrieve the corresponding grading examples:  $(q_i, r_i, s'_{i_i}, g'_{i_i}, gr'_{i_i})$ .
- Otherwise, gets all data  $(q'_k, r'_k, s'_{k_i}, g'_{k_i}, gr'_{k_i}) \in D'$ .

**2. Prepare data for embedding:** Concatenate all items in each grading example into a single string.**3. Generate embeddings:**

Figure 4: **Process Flow of Multi-LLM Grading**Figure 5: **Process Flow of Debate Integration**

- Generate token embeddings (vector representations capturing semantic meaning) for the concatenated examples by ColBERT’s document encoder.
  - Generate token embeddings for the student answer  $s_{i_j}$  by ColBERT’s query encoder.
4. **Compute cosine similarities:**
    - For each token in  $s_{i_j}$ , calculate its cosine similarity with the tokens in the grading examples.
    - Identify the maximum similarity value for each token in  $s_{i_j}$ .
  5. **Aggregate similarity scores:** Sum the maximum similarity scores across all tokens in  $s_{i_j}$ .

6. **Rank and select examples:** Rank the grading examples based on their total similarity scores in descending order. Select the top three examples for grading.

The selected examples are reformatted to guide LLM outputs when grading. In this format, the grading label is presented first, followed by the reason. This sequence is adopted because Jiang et al. [Jiang and Bosch, 2024] found that placing the label before the reason improves accuracy compared to reason-first approaches.

### 3.4.2 Independent Grading

After selecting examples, three different LLMs independently grade the student answer  $s_{ij}$  by providing both a grading label and reason.

The grading prompt is illustrated in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7. We created this prompt by referring to the GitHub code published by Fateen et al [Fateen et al., 2024]. The prompt is almost similar to that used in the *grading past-data* of the *pseudo-*

#### ###Instruction###

You are a {role} responsible for grading student answers.

Grade a student's answer against a reference, providing a label.

Your input fields are:

1. ``similar_scored_examples`` (str): A list of similar answered responses with their labels and feedback. Use for context to understand grading patterns.
2. ``question`` (str): The question posed to the student.
3. ``reference_answer`` (str): The reference answer.
4. ``student_answer`` (str): The answer to score.

Your output fields are:

1. ``label`` (str): A label either: Correct, Partially correct, or Incorrect.
2. ``feedback`` (str): Rationale behind scores and label.

All interactions will be structured in the following way, with the appropriate values filled in.

```
[[ ## similar_scored_examples ## ]]¥n similar_scored_examples ¥n¥n [[ ## question ## ]]¥n question
¥n¥n [[ ## reference_answer ## ]]¥n reference_answer ¥n¥n [[ ## student_answer ## ]]¥n
student_answer ¥n¥n [[ ## label ## ]]¥n label ¥n¥n [[ ## feedback ## ]]¥n feedback ¥n¥n [[ ##
completed ## ]]
```

In adhering to this structure, your objective is:

Score a student's answer against a reference answer by providing a label and reasoning.

Use additional context from similar scored examples to understand grading patterns and the

assessment process.¥n These examples are for reference only and are meant to guide the scoring by illustrating how similar answers have been evaluated previously, not for direct comparison or labeling.

```
[[ ## similar_scored_examples ## ]]¥n{examples_from_few_shot_selection}
[[ ## question ## ]]¥n{question},
[[ ## reference_answer ## ]]¥n{reference_answer},
[[ ## student_answer ## ]]¥n{student_answer}
```

Respond with the corresponding output fields, starting with the field ``[[ ## label ## ]]`, then ``[[ ## feedback ## ]]`, and then ending with the marker for ``[[ ## completed ## ]]`

Figure 6: **Example prompt for grading student answers.** The prompt outlines the grading task and includes three specific grading examples selected in the previous step. For questions without past data, supplemental information is provided to guide grading (shown in Fig. 7).

**# Grading criteria:**

- **Correct:** The student correctly answers all part of the question, even if there are minor errors (a little vague or less comprehensive than the reference answer).
- **Partially correct:** The student's answer shows some understanding, but not complete. It only answers to some parts of the question but fails to answer other parts. (Some explanations are provided but are not sufficient, mentions some keywords but forgets others, etc)
- **Incorrect:** The student attempts to answer the question, but there seems to be a misunderstanding (e.g, keywords in the reference answer are not used, there is no relevance to the question, lacks detailed explanations, there are a few inaccuracies, etc.)

**Note that:**

- Reference answers may contain more detailed information than question requirements. The student's answer does not need to include all the information in the reference answer.

Figure 7: **Additional information to guide grading without the same question in the past data** This supplements LLMs by explaining grading policy.

*learning* phase. However, in *independent grading*, we additionally assign distinct role names to the LLMs to enhance the diversity of output. According to a previous study, combining models with different characteristics improves the performance more than combining similar models [Ormerod, 2022]. Inspired by this, we assign different roles for LLMs based on their macro F1 scores in *pseudo-learning*. The model with the highest score is assigned “Skilled Expert Grader”, the second-highest is “University Teacher”, and the lowest is “Student TA”.

### 3.5 Debate Integration

After *multi-LLM grading* by three LLMs, one of them integrates the results into a unified grading conclusion. For this task, the LLM with the highest macro F1 score in the *pseudo-learning* phase, designated as the Skilled Expert Grader, is utilized.

The *debate integration* process has three steps: *initial debate*, *quality validation*, and *debate retry*, as shown in Fig. 5

#### 3.5.1 Initial Debate

In the *initial debate*, the selected LLM simulates a debate among the graders by completing a template as shown in Fig. 8. The debate follows four stages: Ice Break, Divergence, Conversion, and Voting. This debate construction is inspired by the work of Dong et al. who propose an effective way to facilitate debates using LLMs [Dong et al., 2024].

The statements made by the three graders during the debate are not the actual outputs of three separate LLMs. Instead, they are generated by a single LLM. This single LLM generates the statements based on the grading results produced during the *multi-LLM grading* stage and the grading tendencies identified in the *pseudo-learning* phase.

Additionally, if the question  $q_i$  exists in the past dataset  $D'$ , the three examples selected during the *few-shot selection* stage are also included as the input. Conversely, if  $q_i$  is not present in  $D'$ , no examples are provided. This approach prevents the LLM from over-relying on past data when grading new questions, thereby ensuring high-quality performance across diverse datasets.

#### 3.5.2 Quality Validation

The *quality validation* phase ensures the quality and correctness of the results integrated in the previous step. The same LLM used in the debate is employed for this validation.

As the input, it takes  $q_i$ ,  $r_i$ ,  $s_{i_j}$ , the most likely label for  $s_{i_j}$  (same as passed in the *debate integration* phase), and the integrated grading label and reason to be evaluated. Additionally, if the question  $q_i$  exists in the historical dataset  $D'$ , the grading result generated by it during *independent grading* is also provided as a grading example. Conversely, if  $q_i$  is not found in  $D'$ , no examples are given. This is because the grading performance of each LLM can vary significantly depending on the question. Notably, the best-performing LLM in *pseudo-learning* does not necessarily excel when grading a novel question  $q_i$ .

**## Step 1: Ice Break**

You: Hello, everyone. Today's topic is "Grading student answers for their homework." I am the facilitator and will be guiding you today. To start, I would like to introduce each of you. I hope this helps us get to know each other and achieve the best accuracy for today's grading.

{graders\_info\_from\_labeling\_tendencies\_analysis}

**## Step 2: Divergence**

You: Dear participants, In this session, we would like you to share and exchange your grading results and reasons for the student. Please feel free to present any ideas you may have. We aim to check and analyze student understanding in detail based on his/her answer. Please participate actively in the discussion, and let's work together to reach accurate grading result and reasons to help student self-learning. Note that we always need reasons and evidence for our opinions.

{graders\_opinions\_from\_Single\_Grading}

You: OK. Based on the past tendency, the most likely grading so far is

{most\_likely\_label\_from\_output\_pattern\_analysis}.

**## Step 3: Conversion**

You: Everyone, let's start by introducing graders opinions. In Step 2, one participant suggested that ... (summarize opinions in step 2) ... Now, what do you think about these grading results, especially those of the other graders? You may also share your own suggestions if you have any. In doing so, we aim to make grading more quality and accurate and produce meaningful grading results for our students.

(Grader name): ...

(Grader name): ...

(Grader name): ... (Fill in the graders' discussions here. Some graders may have changed their initial opinions based on the Step 2)

**## Step 4: Voting**

You: Thank you for your cooperation. Now let's start majority voting. Which of these opinions is the most accurate and quality? Please choose the best grading label (Correct or Partially correct or Incorrect) and reason from these.

(Grader name): ...

(Grader name): ...

(Grader name): ...

You: OK. (Grader names) voted to .... and other graders voted to ... so our final conclusion is .... This is the end of the discussion. Thank you!

**## Conclusion**

[Correct / Partially correct / Incorrect]. Reason: The student answer is ... (Grading conclusion from the discussion here)

**## End Conclusion**

Respond with the corresponding output fields, starting with the field [[ ##Completed Debate## ]]

[[ ##Completed Debate## ]]

**## Step 3: Conversion**

You:

Figure 8: **Debate template.** This template is provided to the LLM for completion during the debate integration process.

If the result is deemed valid, it is finalized as the grading conclusion. Otherwise, the LLM outputs the revised grading result. Based on this, the following *debate retry* phase determines the final grading conclusion.

Note that the *quality validation* phase is skipped if the grading labels produced by the three LLMs during *independent grading* and the final label from the discussion are all identical. Empirical observations from the experiment indicate that when all LLMs agree, and the discussion result aligns with this consensus, further validation does not alter the conclusion.

### 3.5.3 Debate Retry

The *debate retry* phase is executed only if the integrated grading result is deemed invalid in the *quality validation* phase. In this phase, the LLM compares the first debate result and revised grading from the *quality validation*. This process is also done by simulating debate among three graders. The debate template for this is shown in Fig. 9. The output from this phase is determined as the final conclusion.

## 4 Experimental Setup

We evaluated our system’s grading performance through automated assessments. These assessments measured its ability to predict grading labels and provide valid reasoning. This section outlines the experimental settings.

### 4.1 Dataset

We used the Short Answer Feedback (SAF) Dataset [Filighera et al., 2022] for evaluation. This dataset targets a college-level communication network course and contains questions, reference answers, student answers, grading labels (Correct, Partially correct, Incorrect), and grader feedback.

It is divided into four subsets: train, validation, test-unseen-answers (UA), and test-unseen-questions (UQ). The subsets contain 1700, 427, 375, and 479 entries, respectively. The train set and UA set contain the same questions but include different student answers. In contrast, the train set and UQ set have neither overlapping questions nor student answers. We used the train set for *pseudo-learning* and the UA and UQ sets to evaluate system performance.

### 4.2 Evaluation Methods

#### 4.2.1 Statistic Evaluation

We evaluated grading label and reason performance using statistical metrics, following previous studies.

Since grading label prediction is a task of classifying student answers into three categories (Correct, Partially correct, and Incorrect), accuracy and macro F1 score were used as evaluation metrics. The definitions of these metrics are shown in Eq. 2 and Eq. 5.

For the generation of grading reasons, the grader feedbacks included in the SAF dataset were used as a reference, and the results were evaluated using BLEU [Papineni et al., 2002], ROUGE-2 [Lin, 2004], and BERTScore [Zhang et al., 2020]. However, BLEU and ROUGE measure word similarity rather than semantic similarity, which may not fully reflect the quality of the grading reasons [Fateen et al., 2024]. BERTScore also uses word embeddings, so it tends to be higher when the LLM reproduces the same phrases as the dataset’s grading reasons. Therefore, these metrics are shown for reference only, and the quality of the grading reasons will be mainly evaluated using LLMs, as described below.

#### 4.2.2 LLM-Based Evaluation

To address the limitations of statistical evaluation for grading reasons, we introduced an automated evaluation process using LLMs. This approach is inspired by Jurenka et al. [Jurenka et al., 2024], who utilized LLMs to validate the quality of hints provided to students. Building on this concept, we designed a new process to assess the validity of the grading reasons generated by our system and baselines.

The evaluation is conducted as follows:

1. Each of the three LLMs used in the GET system individually assesses the validity of the grading reasons.
2. The percentage of grading reasons rated as valid by each LLM is calculated.
3. The final evaluation result is obtained by averaging these percentages.

The evaluation prompt is shown in Fig. 10. It includes the grading reasons recorded in the datasets alongside the system-generated grading results. The LLM compares these inputs to determine the validity of the grading reasons.

```

[[ ## grading_candidates ## ]]
- Candidate 1:
{first_debate_conclusion}
- Candidate 2:
{revised_grading_from_quality_validation}

[[ ## incomplete_debate ## ]]
## Step 1: Ice Break
You: Hello, everyone. Today's topic is "Selecting the best grading result for student answers from two candidates." I
am the facilitator and will be guiding you today. To start, I would like to introduce each of you. Then, please explain
your opinions for the student answer so far. I hope this helps us get to know each other and achieve the best
accuracy for today's grading.
{graders_info_from_labeling_tendencies_analysis}

## Step 2: Divergence
You: Dear participants, In this session, we would like you to share and exchange your grading results and reasons for
the student. Please feel free to present any ideas you may have. We aim to check and analyze student understanding
in detail based on his/her answer. Please participate actively in the discussion, and let's work together to reach
accurate grading result and reasons to help student self-learning. Note that we always need reasons and evidence for
our opinions.

{graders_opinions_from_Single_Grading}

You: OK. Based on the past tendency, the most likely grading so far is
{most_likely_label_from_output_pattern_analysis}.

## Step 3: Conversion
You: Everyone, now we have two candidates of the final grading result. ... (Summarize each candidate here) ... What
do you think about each of them? You may also share your own suggestions if you have any. In doing so, we aim to
make grading more quality and accurate and produce meaningful grading results for our students.
(Grader name): ...
(Grader name): ...
(Grader name): ...
... Graders' discussions are here. Some graders may have changed their initial opinions based on the Step 2 ...

## Step 4: Voting
You: Thank you for your cooperation. Now let's start voting. Which of these candidates is the most accurate and
quality? Please choose the best candidate from 1 and 2.
(Grader name): ...
(Grader name): ...
(Grader name): ...
You: OK. (Grader names) voted to .... and other graders voted to ... so our final conclusion is .... This is the end of the
discussion. Thank you!

## Conclusion
[Correct / Partially correct / Incorrect]. Reason: The student answer is ... (Short grading conclusion from the discussion
here)
## End Conclusion

Respond with the corresponding output fields, starting with the field [[ ##Completed Debate## ]]

[[ ##Completed Debate## ]]
## Step 3: Conversion
You:

```

Figure 9: **Debate retry template:** The prompt instructs the LLM to compare two grading candidates via a discussion.

Unlike the approach in [Jurenka et al., 2024], which relies on a single LLM for evaluation, our method aggregates results from three LLMs. By averaging their evaluations, we aim to achieve a more objective and balanced assessment, avoiding reliance on a specific LLM.



**###Instruction###**

You are an expert trainer in evaluating beginner teachers' grading skills. Your task is to assess the accuracy and reasonableness of the grading decision provided below.

**###Additional Instructions###**

- Carefully compare the grading decision with the Ground Truth Comment and evaluate whether it aligns with professional grading standards.
- Verify that the grading decision is consistent with the question, student answer, and reference answer.
- Highlight major issues that affect the accuracy, fairness, or consistency of the grading.
- If the grading is generally accurate with only minor issues that do not affect its fairness or accuracy, mark it as ValidGrading with a brief explanation.

**###Evaluation Labels###**

- **ValidGrading:** The grading decision aligns closely with the Ground Truth Comment and is consistent with the question, student answer, and reference answer. Minor ambiguities or phrasing issues that do not impact the overall fairness or accuracy are acceptable.
- **InvalidGrading:** The grading decision conflicts with the Ground Truth Comment, question, reference answer, or student answer. Major inaccuracies or inconsistencies that require revisions should be labeled as InvalidGrading.

**###Example Output###**

ValidGrading / InvalidGrading. Because ... (brief explanation of your judgment) ...

**###Homework Information###**

Question: {question}

Reference Answer: {reference\_answer}

Student Answer: {student\_answer}

Ground Truth Comment: {grading\_result\_from\_the\_dataset}

**###Grading Decision to Evaluate###**

{grading\_result\_from\_the\_system\_to\_be\_evaluated}

**###Your Comment###**

Figure 10: The Prompt used in LLM-Based Evaluation

### 4.3 Model Selection and Parameter Settings

To evaluate the GET system, we selected LLMs based on usability and cost-effectiveness to ensure practical implementation in real educational environments.

#### 4.3.1 Models in Pseudo-Learning

To describe label tendencies using classification metrics, we employed Gemini 1.5 Flash [Reid et al., 2024]. Among the three models used in *multi-LLM grading* (introduced in the following section), Gemini 1.5 Flash was chosen due to its superior performance on mathematics-related tasks, as reported in benchmarks [Meta], [Google DeepMind], [Mistral AI] (Accessed: December 26, 2024). Since the task involves analyzing numerical metrics such as accuracy and F1 scores, Gemini’s capabilities align closely with the requirements of this analysis.

Table 4: Metrics Scores for Models

Metric	Llama-3-8B-it	Gemini-1.5-Flash	Mixtral-8x22B
Accuracy	0.5153	0.5206	0.6282
F1 Score (Correct)	0.5385	0.4709	0.7066
F1 Score (Partially Correct)	0.5118	0.5594	0.5290
F1 Score (Incorrect)	0.3492	0.5205	0.4818
<b>Macro F1</b>	0.4665	0.5170	<b>0.5725</b>

### 4.3.2 Models in Multi-LLM Grading

For grading tasks, we selected Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct [AI@Meta, 2024], Gemini 1.5 Flash [Reid et al., 2024], and Mixtral-8x22b [Jiang et al., 2024]. These models were chosen because they either offer free-tier APIs or are open-source, making them cost-effective and accessible for integration into the GET system.

### 4.3.3 Parameters

In *pseudo-learning*, the output pattern analysis (Algorithm 1) needs the threshold to decide the most likely label for each output combination. In the experiment, it is set to 1.2 based on the results of trials with several values.

Three LLMs also have some parameters. We set the temperature of them to 0.7. The number of maximum tokens which newly generated is set to 8192, which is the same as the maximum length of ColBERT’s input. Other parameters of each LLM are left as default.

## 4.4 Pseudo-learning on the selected LLMs

Before the main experiments, we conducted a *pseudo-learning* phase. The results of *grading past-data* are summarized in Table 4.

Based on their macro F1 scores, role names were assigned to each LLM: Mixtral-8x22b was designated as the Skilled Expert Grader, Gemini 1.5 Flash as the University Teacher, and Llama-3-8B-Instruct as the Student TA.

The results of the *tendencies identification* phase are presented in Fig. 11 (Labeling tendencies analysis) and Table 5 (Output pattern analysis).

## 4.5 Baseline Models

To evaluate the grading performance of the GET system, we compared it against several baseline systems. These baselines fall into two main categories: grading methods for **comparison study** and **ablation study**.

### 4.5.1 Grading Methods for Comparison Study

These methods provide a benchmark to compare the performance of our proposed system against existing approaches:

- **Majority Voting Baseline:** Grading labels are determined based on the majority vote among three graders. The grading reason is randomly selected from the graders who align with the majority label. This follows the same flow of *multi-LLM grading* to the GET system, but is different in using the majority voting instead of *debate integration*.
- **Criteria-Based Grading System** [Ito and Ma, 2025]: A system we introduced at ICETC 2024. It decomposes each question into specific grading criteria based on predefined grammatical rules. A fine-tuned language model (Zephyr-7B-Beta) then evaluates the student answers based on the criteria to generate grading labels and their reasons.
- **ASAS-F-RAG** [Fateen et al., 2024]: A system by Fateen et al., which is constructed from an LLM with RAG. We implemented this approach using their publicly available GitHub repository for replication.

### 4.5.2 Grading Methods for Ablation Study

These variants are designed for an ablation study, helping us assess the impact of individual components in the GET system:

**Grader Performance Overview:****Skilled Expert Grader:**

- **Best in:** Consistently identifies correct answers well. It shows the best overall performance in classifying answers.
- **Bias/Caution:** May be less sensitive to nuances in partially correct answers, potentially underestimating their value. It might be too strict in assessing partially correct answers.

**University Teacher:**

- **Best in:** Shows a relatively balanced performance across all three categories (Correct, Partially Correct, Incorrect), suggesting a more even-handed approach. It is relatively good at identifying partially correct answers.
- **Bias/Caution:** Overall accuracy is lower than Skilled Expert Grader, indicating potential inconsistencies or a less reliable assessment across different answer types. It may overestimate the number of partially correct answers.

**Student TA:**

- **Best in:** Relatively consistent in grading partially correct answers.
- **Bias/Caution:** Struggles significantly with identifying incorrect answers, potentially leading to an inflated perception of student performance. It might be too lenient in assessing incorrect answers.

Figure 11: The result of Label tendencies analysis

1. **Single LLM Graders:** Each LLM (Mixtral-8x22b, Llama-3-8B-Instruct, and Gemini 1.5 Flash) independently grades student answers without the Ensemble ToT framework. Grading is performed through the same steps of *multi-LLM grading* phase.
2. **Proposed System Without Pseudo-Learning:** This variant skips the pseudo-learning phase and only performs *multi-LLM grading* and *debate integration*. Without *pseudo-learning*, the system cannot leverage the performance tendencies of each grader. Furthermore, all LLMs are assigned the same generic role name (*Grader*) rather than specific roles derived from *pseudo-learning* results.
3. **Proposed System with a Single LLM:** In this variant, the GET system uses a single LLM (Mixtral-8x22b) instead of three different LLMs. Since *pseudo-learning* depends on comparing outputs from multiple LLMs, it is omitted. To simulate *multi-LLM grading*, the same LLM grades each student answer three times, with different role names assigned for each instance.

These baseline models allow us to evaluate the robustness of the GET system and analyze the effectiveness of its components.

## 5 Experimental Results and Discussion

We evaluated the proposed system and baseline methods on two subsets of the SAF dataset: UA and UQ. First, we present the comparison results between the GET system and other grading methods. This is followed by the results of an ablation study using partial variants of GET.

### 5.1 Comparison Study

This subsection presents the results of the GET system compared to other grading methods.

#### 5.1.1 Grading Label Prediction Analysis

The results of the statistical evaluation of grading label predictions are presented in Tables 6. All indicators are rounded to the fifth decimal place.

Table 5: Summary of model predictions and most likely labels

Llama-3-8b-it	Gemini-1.5-Flash	Mixtral-8x22b	Most Likely Label
Correct	Correct	Correct	Correct
Correct	Partially correct	Correct	Correct
Partially correct	Correct	Correct	Correct
Partially correct	Correct	Partially correct	Correct
Partially correct	Partially correct	Correct	Correct
Incorrect	Correct	Correct	Correct
Partially correct	Partially correct	Partially correct	Partially correct
Correct	Partially correct	Partially correct	Partially correct
Incorrect	Partially correct	Correct	Partially correct
Correct	Partially correct	Incorrect	Partially correct
Incorrect	Partially correct	Partially correct	Incorrect or Partially correct
Partially correct	Incorrect	Partially correct	Incorrect or Partially correct
Incorrect	Partially correct	Incorrect	Incorrect or Partially correct
Correct	Correct	Partially correct	Incorrect or Correct
Incorrect	Incorrect	Incorrect	Incorrect
Incorrect	Incorrect	Partially correct	Incorrect
Partially correct	Incorrect	Incorrect	Incorrect
Partially correct	Partially correct	Incorrect	Incorrect

The proposed system achieved the highest macro F1 score and accuracy on the UA dataset, as well as the highest accuracy on the UQ dataset. These results emphasize the effectiveness of our approach, which combines outputs from multiple models. Furthermore, the system demonstrated consistent performance across different dataset types, as reflected in its highest average accuracy and F1 score among all baselines.

### 5.1.2 Grading Reason Generation Analysis

The results of the LLM-based evaluation are summarized in Table 7.

The proposed system achieved the highest average proportion of valid grading reasons for the UQ dataset and in the combined average across both datasets. These results indicate that the GET system generates semantically accurate grading reasons more effectively than baseline systems. This supports the effectiveness of the Ensemble ToT framework for both label prediction (classification) and grading reason generation (text generation).

Table 6: Accuracy and F1 Score of GET and other grading systems

	Accuracy			F1 Score		
	UA	UQ	Avg.	UA	UQ	Avg.
Majority Vote	0.7760	0.6388	0.7074	0.7113	0.6111	0.6621
Criteria-Based	0.7387	0.5595	0.6491	0.5496	0.5525	0.5511
ASAS-F-RAG	0.7093	0.6534	0.6814	0.6315	<b>0.6289</b>	0.6302
<b>GET</b>	<b>0.7787</b>	<b>0.6701</b>	<b>0.7244</b>	<b>0.7128</b>	0.6268	<b>0.6698</b>

Table 7: LLM-Based Evaluation results of GET and other grading systems

	UA	UQ	Avg.
Majority Voting	<b>0.7040</b>	0.6326	0.6683
Criteria-Based	0.4267	0.1635	0.2951
ASAS-F-RAG	0.6355	0.6145	0.6250
<b>GET</b>	0.7022	<b>0.6360</b>	<b>0.6691</b>

However, on the UA dataset, the majority vote baseline outperformed the proposed system. This outcome appears to stem from the overly concise summarization of grading reasons during the debate phase, which sometimes resulted in a loss of detail. For instance, consider the following outputs for the same student answer in the UA set:

- **A grading reason from the majority vote baseline:**

*Incorrect. The student’s answer incorrectly states that the system will never reach equilibrium. While the arrival rate is less than the service rate, this doesn’t prevent the system from reaching a steady state. The question asks for the expected time the system will have fewer than 10 packets, which requires calculating the probability of the system being full and subtracting that from the total observation time. The student did not address this core aspect of the problem. Similar examples demonstrate that a correct answer involves calculating the blocking probability and using it to determine the expected time the system is not full.*

- **A grading reason from the GET system:**

*Incorrect. Reason: The student’s answer is incorrect because it misunderstands the concept of equilibrium in a queuing system and lacks a clear calculation for the expected time the system is not blocked.*

In this example, the majority vote baseline, which directly uses outputs from multiple LLMs without debate, provided a more detailed and contextually rich response. While GET’s output is not inaccurate, it lacks the depth and specific details present in the baseline’s response. This lack of detail was noted by the LLM evaluator. This over-summarization contributed to the baseline’s superior performance on the UA dataset.

Conversely, GET achieved higher scores on the UQ dataset. This is likely because the majority vote baseline’s performance on UQ is hampered by its inability to access past grading examples for similar questions, negatively impacting output quality. GET, however, mitigates this limitation through its Ensemble ToT-based architecture, incorporating *pseudo-learning* and *debate integration* to maintain output quality.

Finally, for reference, the results of the statistical evaluation of the quality of the grading reasons are presented in Table 8. While the GET system’s higher performance in LLM-based evaluation, it did not achieve the best performance in BLEU, ROUGE, or BERTScore. For these metrics, the criteria-based grading system achieved superior scores. This discrepancy arises from the criteria-based system being fine-tuned on the SAF dataset’s train set, enabling it to produce outputs with phrasing more closely aligned with the reference text.

## 5.2 Ablation Study

This subsection discusses the results of the ablation study with partial variants of the GET system.

### 5.2.1 Grading Label Prediction Analysis

The evaluation results for grading label prediction are presented in Tables 9.

Table 8: BLEU, ROUGE, and BERTScore of GET and other grading systems

	BLEU		ROUGE		BERTScore	
	UA	UQ	UA	UQ	UA	UQ
Majority Vote	0.0392	0.0234	0.0896	0.0700	0.7005	0.7044
Criteria-Based	<b>0.1559</b>	<b>0.0548</b>	<b>0.2573</b>	<b>0.1349</b>	<b>0.7218</b>	0.6847
ASAS-F-RAG	0.1024	0.0337	0.1647	0.0972	0.7212	0.7132
<b>GET</b>	0.0288	0.0289	0.0682	0.0772	0.6953	<b>0.7171</b>

The proposed system outperformed all baselines in terms of accuracy on the UA and UQ sets. In terms of the F1-score, it achieves the highest in the UQ set.

The system outperformed all single-LLM baselines, demonstrating the effectiveness of the Ensemble ToT framework. Additionally, the W Single LLM baseline, which replaced all LLMs with the highest-performing LLM during *pseudo-learning* (Mixtral-8x22b), showed lower performance compared to the full system. This highlights the importance of using diverse LLMs.

The GET system also outperformed the system variant without *pseudo-learning* on the UQ set. This indicates the effectiveness of the full GET system for the UQ dataset, where prior examples are unavailable. Especially, for this set, Gemini 1.5 Flash demonstrated the highest accuracy and F1 scores among the three graders, while the model used in the *debate integration* phase is the different model, Mixtral-8x22b. It can be said that *pseudo-learning* outcomes enabled Mixtral-8x22b to improve overall performance during the debate phase. This highlights the role of *pseudo-learning* in enhancing the system adaptability across diverse datasets by helping the debating LLM identify the best grading candidates.

However, on the UA dataset, the system variant without *pseudo-learning* achieved equivalent accuracy and slightly higher F1 scores. To investigate the cause of this performance difference, we delved deeper into the three-class classification results by examining precision, recall, and F1-scores for each grading label (as defined in Eqs. 3 and 4). Among the three grading labels, the most noticeable difference was observed in the F1-score for the Incorrect label. Specifically, the proposed system achieved an F1-score of 0.64705, while the partial variant (W/O Pseudo) achieved 0.68750.

Further analysis revealed that this drop in F1-score for the Incorrect class stemmed primarily from a decrease in precision. While recall remained identical between the two systems, the proposed system exhibited a precision of 0.84615 compared to the W/O Pseudo baseline’s perfect precision of 1.0.

The decline in F1-score for the Incorrect class can primarily be attributed to this decrease in precision. This difference in precision arose because the proposed system misclassified two instances with a true label of Partially correct as Incorrect. In contrast, the W/O Pseudo baseline did not misclassify any instances with true labels other than Incorrect as Incorrect.

Since the total number of Incorrect instances was only 21 (out of 375 total instances in the UA set), these two misclassifications had a significant impact on precision and, consequently, the F1 score. This sensitivity highlights the challenges of dealing with imbalanced datasets and the critical role of precise classification in such cases.

## 5.2.2 Grading Reason Generation Analysis

The results of the LLM-based evaluation are shown in Table 10. In this evaluation, our proposed system gets the highest scores on both the UA and UQ sets, indicating it has the best performance on generating grading reasons.

While the variant without *pseudo-learning* partially surpassed the full system in grading label prediction, it underperformed in grading reason quality. This suggests that *pseudo-learning* has a greater impact on integrating grading reasons than on label prediction.

Finally, for reference, Table 11 shows the results of the statistical evaluation of the quality of the grading reasons. The proposed system achieved the highest BERTScore, especially on the UQ dataset, indicating that the grading reasons of the proposed system are close to the grand truth.

Table 9: Accuracy and F1 Score of GET and its partial variants

	Accuracy			F1 Score		
	UA	UQ	Avg.	UA	UQ	Avg.
Mixtral-8x22b	0.7680	0.6284	0.6982	0.6686	0.5820	0.6253
Gemini 1.5 Flash	0.7387	0.6472	0.6929	0.7110	0.6146	0.6628
Llama3-8b-it	0.6987	0.4760	0.5873	0.5809	0.4622	0.5215
W/O Pseudo	<b>0.7787</b>	0.65762	0.7181	<b>0.7288</b>	0.6185	<b>0.6737</b>
W Single LLM	0.7600	0.6326	0.6963	0.6539	0.5830	0.6184
<b>GET</b>	<b>0.7787</b>	<b>0.6701</b>	<b>0.7244</b>	0.7128	<b>0.6268</b>	0.6698

Table 10: LLM-Based Evaluation results of GET and its partial variants

	UA	UQ	Avg.
Mixtral-8x22b	0.6969	0.6110	0.6539
Gemini 1.5 Flash	0.6960	0.6319	0.6639
Llama-3-8B-it	0.5902	0.3709	0.4806
W/O Pseudo	0.6907	0.6228	0.6567
Only One LLM	0.6871	0.6284	0.6578
<b>GET</b>	<b>0.7022</b>	<b>0.6360</b>	<b>0.6691</b>

Table 11: BLEU, ROUGE, and BERTScore of GET and its partial variants

	BLEU		ROUGE		BERTScore	
	UA	UQ	UA	UQ	UA	UQ
Mixtral-8x22b	0.0248	0.0164	0.0567	0.0454	0.6620	0.6738
Gemini 1.5 Flash	0.0134	0.0154	0.0299	0.0318	0.6604	0.6809
Llama3-8b-it	0.0256	0.0179	0.0507	0.0446	0.6189	0.6866
W/O Pseudo	<b>0.0310</b>	0.0277	<b>0.0720</b>	0.0750	<b>0.6973</b>	0.7125
W Single LLM	0.0276	0.0278	0.0701	<b>0.0801</b>	0.6963	0.7133
<b>GET</b>	0.0288	<b>0.0289</b>	0.0682	0.0772	0.6953	<b>0.7171</b>

### 5.3 Limitations

While this study demonstrates promising results, there are several limitations. First, the quality of the output of the GET system needs further improvement, as we have discussed above. Second, the system’s performance was evaluated using only three specific LLMs, leaving its compatibility and effectiveness with other models untested. Third, this study has not investigated actual students’ perceptions and evaluations of the grading results generated by GET. Addressing these limitations could provide valuable insights into the usability and accuracy of our system.

## 6 Case Study

This chapter supplements the statistical and LLM-based evaluations from the previous chapter with case studies of grading results. We analyzed three student answers to a question from the UQ subset of the SAF dataset. The target question and its reference answer are shown in Figure 12. We present the GET system’s outputs for three categories of student answers: Correct, Partially correct, and Incorrect.

#### ## Question

Name the two modes of control plane distribution and name one downside for each of them.

#### ## Reference Answer

Two modes of physical distribution of control plane and associated drawbacks are:

#### Replication

- Issue of scalability
- More resources, more cost
- Wastage of resources as the replicated node is on standby and no actual load distribution occurs.
- The problem to keep the data consistent in the replicated node is hard and complex.

#### Partitioning

- Raises issues similar to P2P networks
- Knowledge about neighborhood
- Coordination and consistency
- Lower availability

Figure 12: Target Question and Reference Answer

## 6.1 Correct Student Answer

This case examines a correct student answer (Figure 13). In the *multi-LLM grading* phase (Figure 14), the Skilled Expert Grader and University Teacher accurately assigned grades, while the Student TA mistakenly marked the answer as partially correct.

Then, in the *initial debate* phase (the first step of *debate integration*), the Skilled Expert Grader facilitated a simulated debate (Figure 15). The debate began at Step 3 (Conversion), as Steps 1 (Ice Break) and 2 (Divergence) were pre-filled based on the outputs from *multi-LLM grading* and *pseudo-learning*. During the debate, the Student TA revised the grade to align with the others.

Finally, the *quality validation* phase re-checked the integrated grading (Figure 16), confirming the *initial debate* result and finalizing the GET system’s output.

### ## Student Answer

Control plane distribution can be done by performing replication or partitioning.

With replication, all requests to the control plane are still served by only one controller, which can be a scalability issue.

With partitioning, there has to be performed more complex coordination between the parts of the control plane.

### ## Grading Result from Human Evaluator

**Label:** Correct

**Feedback:** The response correctly identifies the two modes and their drawbacks.

Figure 13: Correct Student Answer

### ## Grading Result from Skilled Expert Grader (Mixtral-8x22b)

**Label:** Correct

**Feedback:** The student has accurately named the two modes of control plane distribution: replication and partitioning. They have also identified a significant downside for each mode. For replication, they mentioned the scalability issue, which is a common problem due to the increased resources required and the lack of actual load distribution. For partitioning, they highlighted the need for complex coordination between the parts of the control plane, which is a valid concern in this mode of distribution. Although the student did not mention every single downside listed in the reference answer, their response still meets the grading criteria for a correct answer, as they demonstrated a clear understanding of the question and provided relevant information

### ## Grading Result from University Teacher (Gemini 1.5 Flash)

**Label:** Correct

**Feedback:** The student correctly identifies the two modes of control plane distribution: replication and partitioning. The student also correctly points out a downside for each: scalability issues with replication and the complexity of coordination with partitioning. While the feedback isn't as exhaustive as the reference answer, it sufficiently addresses the question's requirements.

### ## Grading Result from Student TA (Llama3-8b-it)

**Label:** Partially correct

**Feedback:** The student correctly identifies the two modes of control plane distribution, replication and partitioning. However, the student's explanation for each mode is not entirely accurate. Replication does not necessarily mean that all requests are still served by only one controller, as the replicated nodes can also handle requests. Partitioning does not require more complex coordination between parts of the control plane, as the nodes can communicate with each other to achieve consistency and coordination.

Figure 14: Multi-LLM Grading Results (Correct Answer)



### ## Step 3: Conversion

You: Everyone, let's start by introducing graders' opinions. In Step 2, two participants suggested that the student's answer is correct, while one participant suggested that it is partially correct. Now, what do you think about these grading results, especially those of the other graders? You may also share your own suggestions if you have any. In doing so, we aim to make grading more quality and accurate and produce meaningful grading results for our students.

**Skilled Expert Grader:** I think my initial assessment is accurate, as the student has demonstrated a clear understanding of the question and provided relevant information, meeting the grading criteria for a correct answer. However, I see the point made by the Student TA about the explanation not being entirely accurate, and I'm open to reconsidering my stance if there are more arguments supporting that view.

**University Teacher:** I agree with the Skilled Expert Grader's assessment. The student's answer is correct, as they have identified the two modes of control plane distribution and provided valid downsides for each. Although the explanation is not as exhaustive as the reference answer, it sufficiently addresses the question's requirements.

**Student TA:** I understand the Skilled Expert Grader's and the University Teacher's points, and I see that my initial assessment might have been too strict. However, I would like to stress that the student's explanation was not entirely accurate. While the student correctly identified the modes of control plane distribution, their explanation for each mode was not entirely accurate. I would like to hear more opinions before changing my stance.

### ## Step 4: Voting

You: Thank you for your cooperation. Now let's start majority voting. Which of these opinions is the most accurate and quality? Please choose the best grading label (Correct or Partially correct or Incorrect) and reason from these.

**Skilled Expert Grader:** I maintain my opinion that the student's answer is Correct, as they have demonstrated a clear understanding of the question and provided relevant information.

**University Teacher:** I also maintain my opinion that the student's answer is Correct, as they have sufficiently addressed the question's requirements.

**Student TA:** After hearing everyone's opinions, I am willing to change my stance and agree that the student's answer is Correct. Although the explanation was not entirely accurate, the student has provided relevant information and demonstrated a clear understanding of the question.

You: OK. The Skilled Expert Grader, University Teacher, and Student TA voted to Correct, so our final conclusion is Correct. This is the end of the discussion. Thank you!

### ## Conclusion

Correct. Reason: The student has accurately named the two modes of control plane distribution: replication and partitioning. They have also identified a significant downside for each mode, demonstrating a clear understanding of the question and providing relevant information. Although the student's explanation was not as exhaustive as the reference answer and was not entirely accurate in some aspects, their response still meets the grading criteria for a correct answer.

Figure 15: Initial Debate Results (Correct Answer)

**## Validation Result**

ValidGrading.

**## Reason**

Because the student has accurately named the two modes of control plane distribution and identified a significant downside for each mode, demonstrating a clear understanding of the question and providing relevant information. Although the student's explanation was not as exhaustive as the reference answer and was not entirely accurate in some aspects, the grading criteria for a correct answer have still been met.

Figure 16: **Quality Validation Results (Correct Answer)**

## 6.2 Partially Correct Student Answer

This case examines a partially correct student answer (Figure 17). In the *multi-LLM grading* phase (Figure 18), only the University Teacher’s grade aligned with the human evaluator, marking the answer as partially correct. The other two graders marked it as incorrect. However, all graders identified the lack of drawbacks in the student’s answer as a key issue.

The *initial debate* phase (Figure 19) successfully resolved the discrepancy, with the Student TA changing the grade from incorrect to partially correct. Despite the initial majority opinion, the GET system selected the most reasonable grading through the debate.

The following *quality validation* phase (Figure 20) confirmed the *initial debate* results, finalizing the grade.

### ## Student Answer

**Replication:** Allows for global view onto the system.

**Partitioning:** No standard way of distribution defined.

### ## Grading Result from Human Evaluator

**Label:** Partially correct

**Feedback:** The stated downside of replication mode is a benefit, not a downside.

The question expects the general drawback related to partitioning, like peer to peer network problems. Apart from that, the response is correct.

Figure 17: **Partially Correct Student Answer**

### ## Grading Result from Skilled Expert Grader (Mixtral-8x22b)

**Label:** Incorrect

**Feedback:** The student mentions one benefit of replication mode but does not name any downside, as required by the question. For partitioning mode, the student provides a downside, but it is not accurate. The student answer does not provide any relevant information according to the reference answer, and thus, it is considered incorrect.

### ## Grading Result from University Teacher (Gemini 1.5 Flash)

**Label:** Partially correct

**Feedback:** The student correctly identifies the two modes of control plane distribution, replication and partitioning. However, the answer lacks the downsides for each mode. The provided points are more descriptions of the modes than drawbacks. The feedback should have included at least one significant downside for each, such as scalability issues for replication and coordination/consistency challenges for partitioning, as outlined in the reference answer.

### ## Grading Result from Student TA (Llama3-8b-it)

**Label:** Incorrect

**Feedback:** The student’s answer is incorrect because it does not accurately describe the two modes of control plane distribution. Replication is not mentioned as having the issue of scalability, and partitioning is not mentioned as having the issue of coordination and consistency. The student’s answer also does not provide a clear and concise description of the two modes of control plane distribution.

Figure 18: **Multi-LLM Grading Results (Partially Correct Answer)**

**## Step 3: Conversion**

You: Everyone, let's start by introducing graders opinions. In Step 2, two participants suggested that the student's answer is incorrect while one participant suggested it is partially correct.

**Skilled Expert Grader:** I understand the perspective of University Teacher, but I still believe that the student's answer is incorrect. The student does not provide any relevant information about the downsides of replication and partitioning modes. The benefit mentioned for replication is not a downside and does not meet the question's requirements. The University Teacher's perspective is valuable, but I think we should be more critical in evaluating partially correct answers.

**University Teacher:** I appreciate the Skilled Expert Grader's view, but I believe that the student's answer shows some understanding. The student correctly identifies the two modes of control plane distribution, which is a significant portion of the question. However, I understand that the student did not provide enough relevant information about the downsides. I agree that the answer is not correct, but I still think it deserves some credit and should be considered partially correct.

**Student TA:** I agree with the University Teacher's perspective. Although the student did not provide enough relevant information about the downsides, I believe that the student's answer still shows some understanding. I think we should consider the student's answer as partially correct.

**## Step 4: Voting**

You: Thank you for your cooperation. Now let's start majority voting. Which of these opinions is the most accurate and quality? Please choose the best grading label (Correct or Partially correct or Incorrect) and reason from these.

**Skilled Expert Grader:** Incorrect

**University Teacher:** Partially correct

**Student TA:** Partially correct

You: OK. Skilled Expert Grader voted to Incorrect, and University Teacher and Student TA voted to Partially correct. So our final conclusion is that the student's answer is Partially correct. This is the end of the discussion. Thank you!

**## Conclusion**

Partially correct. Reason: The student's answer correctly identifies the two modes of control plane distribution but lacks the downsides for each mode. Although the answer is not entirely accurate, it shows some understanding. The provided points are more descriptions of the modes than drawbacks. The feedback should have included at least one significant downside for each, such as scalability issues for replication and coordination/consistency challenges for partitioning, as outlined in the reference answer.

**## End Conclusion**

Figure 19: **Initial Debate Results (Partially Correct Answer)**

**## Validation Result**

ValidGrading.

**## Reason**

Because your grading decision is accurate and well-reasoned. You correctly identified that the student's answer lacked downsides for each mode of control plane distribution and that the provided points were more descriptions of the modes than actual drawbacks.

Figure 20: **Quality Validation Results (Partially Correct Answer)**

### 6.3 Incorrect Student Answer

This case analyzes an incorrect student answer (Figure 21). In the *multi-LLM grading* phase (Figure 22), only the Skilled Expert Grader correctly identified the answer as incorrect. The other two graders incorrectly marked it as partially correct with inconsistent reasoning.

The *initial debate* phase (Figure 23) failed to reach a valid conclusion due to the inaccurate initial grades from the University Teacher and Student TA.

However, during *quality validation* (Figure 24), the system successfully identified the invalid debate result and suggested a revised grading. This triggered the *debate retry* phase (Figure 25). In this phase, graders reconsider their conclusions via additional debate. Specifically, the system presents the LLMs with two candidates: Candidate 1, the conclusion from the *initial debate*, and Candidate 2, the revised grading suggested by the *quality validation*. The graders then select one of these candidates. In this case, the University Teacher revised the opinion, leading to the appropriate grading.

#### ## Student Answer

Physically distributed controller: Has the downside that no standard way of distribution is defined.

Logical centralization: Makes the implementation of the controller hard.

#### ## Grading Result from Human Evaluator

**Label:** Incorrect

**Feedback:** The response is not related to the question. The two modes are replication and partitioning.

Figure 21: **Incorrect Student Answer**

#### ## Grading Result from Skilled Expert Grader (Mixtral-8x22b)

**Label:** Incorrect

**Feedback:** The student's answer is incorrect because it does not provide the two modes of control plane distribution as requested. The modes mentioned in the reference answer are Replication and Partitioning, while the student's answer mentions Physical Distribution and Logical Centralization, which are not the same. Additionally, the downsides provided by the student do not align with the downsides provided in the reference answer for Replication and Partitioning.

#### ## Grading Result from University Teacher (Gemini 1.5 Flash)

**Label:** Partially correct

**Feedback:** The student correctly identifies two modes of control plane distribution: physically distributed and logically centralized. However, the downsides provided are too vague and don't reflect the complexities described in the reference answer. The reference answer highlights issues like scalability, resource waste, and consistency problems for replication, and coordination/consistency challenges for partitioning. The student's answer lacks this level of detail and specificity. To receive a "Correct" label, the student should have provided more detailed and accurate drawbacks aligned with the reference answer.

#### ## Grading Result from Student TA (Llama3-8b-it)

**Label:** Partially correct

**Feedback:** The student has identified two modes of control plane distribution, namely Replication and Partitioning, and mentioned one drawback for each. However, the student's answer is not entirely correct. The drawback for Replication is not accurately stated, and the drawback for Logical Centralization is not relevant to Partitioning. Additionally, the student has not mentioned the other drawbacks associated with each mode of distribution.

Figure 22: **Multi-LLM Grading Results (Incorrect Answer)**

**## Step 3: Conversion**

You: Everyone, let's start by introducing graders' opinions. In Step 2, one participant suggested that the student's answer is Incorrect, while two participants suggested that the answer is Partially correct. Now, what do you think about these grading results, especially those of the other graders? You may also share your own suggestions if you have any. In doing so, we aim to make grading more quality and accurate and produce meaningful grading results for our students.

**Skilled Expert Grader:** I still believe the answer is Incorrect. The student's answer does not provide the two modes of control plane distribution as requested, and the downsides provided are not aligned with the reference answer.

**University Teacher:** I stand by my initial grading of Partially correct. While the student has identified two modes of control plane distribution, the downsides provided lack the necessary detail and accuracy. However, I can see the merit in the Skilled Expert Grader's opinion, as the student's answer does not fully align with the reference answer.

**Student TA:** I also maintain my grading of Partially correct. The student has identified two modes of control plane distribution, but the downsides provided are not entirely accurate or relevant.

**## Step 4: Voting**

You: Thank you for your cooperation. Now let's start majority voting. Which of these opinions is the most accurate and quality? Please choose the best grading label (Correct or Partially correct or Incorrect) and reason from these.

**Skilled Expert Grader:** Incorrect

**University Teacher:** Partially correct

**Student TA:** Partially correct

You: OK. Skilled Expert Grader voted to Incorrect, while University Teacher and Student TA voted to Partially correct. **Therefore, our final conclusion is Partially correct.** This is the end of the discussion. Thank you!

**## Conclusion**

Partially correct. Reason: The student has identified two modes of control plane distribution, namely Replication and Partitioning, and mentioned one drawback for each. However, the student's answer is not entirely correct. The drawback for Replication is not accurately stated, and the drawback for Logical Centralization is not relevant to Partitioning. Additionally, the student has not mentioned the other drawbacks associated with each mode of distribution.

**## End Conclusion**

Figure 23: **Initial Debate Results (Incorrect Answer)**

**## Validation Result**

InvalidGrading.

**## Reason**

Because the student's answer does not match the reference answer, and the grading decision overlooks the student's inaccuracies. The student did not mention the two specific modes of physical distribution as Replication and Partitioning but mentioned them as "Physically distributed controller" and "Logical centralization". Also, the mentioned downsides do not match the reference answer.

**## Revised Grading**

Incorrect. Reason: The student did not provide the correct modes of control plane distribution and did not provide the relevant downsides for each mode. The student mentioned "Physically distributed controller" and "Logical centralization" instead of Replication and Partitioning, and the associated downsides are not accurate.

Figure 24: **Quality Validation Results (Incorrect Answer)**

**## Step 3: Conversion**

You: Everyone, now we have two candidates of the final grading result. Candidate 1 suggests the grading result as "Partially correct" while Candidate 2 suggests it as "Incorrect". What do you think about each of them? You may also share your own suggestions if you have any. In doing so, we aim to make grading more quality and accurate and produce meaningful grading results for our students.

**Skilled Expert Grader:** I still believe the student's answer is Incorrect. The student did not provide the two modes of control plane distribution as requested. The modes mentioned in the reference answer are Replication and Partitioning, while the student's answer mentions Physical Distribution and Logical Centralization, which are not the same. Additionally, the downsides provided by the student do not align with the downsides provided in the reference answer for Replication and Partitioning.

**University Teacher:** I agree with the Skilled Expert Grader. The student's answer is Incorrect. Although the student correctly identifies two modes of control plane distribution: physically distributed and logically centralized, the downsides provided are too vague and don't reflect the complexities described in the reference answer.

**Student TA:** I see the point of both of you. However, I still think the student's answer is Partially correct. The student has identified two modes of control plane distribution, namely Replication and Partitioning, and mentioned one drawback for each. However, the student's answer is not entirely correct. The drawback for Replication is not accurately stated, and the drawback for Logical Centralization is not relevant to Partitioning. Additionally, the student has not mentioned the other drawbacks associated with each mode of distribution.

**## Step 4: Voting**

You: Thank you for your cooperation. Now let's start voting. Which of these candidates is the most accurate and quality? Please choose the best candidate from 1 and 2.

**Skilled Expert Grader:** I vote for Candidate 2, the grading result as "Incorrect".

**University Teacher:** I vote for Candidate 2, the grading result as "Incorrect".

**Student TA:** I vote for Candidate 1, the grading result as "Partially correct".

You: OK. Skilled Expert Grader and University Teacher voted to "Incorrect" and Student TA voted to "Partially correct" so our final conclusion is "Incorrect". This is the end of the discussion. Thank you!

**## Conclusion**

Incorrect. Reason: The student answer is Incorrect because it does not provide the two modes of control plane distribution as requested. The modes mentioned in the reference answer are Replication and Partitioning, while the student's answer mentions Physical Distribution and Logical Centralization, which are not the same. Additionally, the downsides provided by the student do not align with the downsides provided in the reference answer for Replication and Partitioning.

**## End Conclusion**

Figure 25: Debate Retry Results (Incorrect Answer)

## 7 Conclusion

In this study, we proposed a novel framework to collaborate multiple LLMs: **Ensemble ToT** and an automatic grading system, **Graders by Ensemble ToT (GET)**. In the Ensemble ToT framework, LLMs performance tendencies on a specific task are identified, which is inspired by the ensemble learning method. Then multiple LLMs separately generate the candidate solutions for the target task as in the Tree-of-Thought framework. Finally, their outputs are combined based on the performance tendencies identified before.

The GET system is an automatic grading system built on the Ensemble ToT framework. It achieves high-accuracy grading by integrating multiple LLMs via the following three steps: *pseudo-learning*, *multi-LLM grading* and *debate integration*. During the *pseudo-learning* phase, the characteristics of each LLM are analyzed. In the subsequent *multi-LLM grading* phase, multiple LLMs individually grade the student answers. Then, in *debate integration* phase, the final grading results are determined through a discussion process. This approach complements the weaknesses of individual LLMs, enabling accurate and balanced grading and its detailed explanation.

The experimental results demonstrate that the GET system significantly outperformed several baseline methods in grading accuracy. Specifically, our system achieved the maximum grading label prediction accuracy of 77.87%, representing a 6.94% improvement over the state-of-the-art method. Additionally, the GET system attained the maximum macro F1 score of 0.7128, reflecting an 8.13% increase. In the LLM-based evaluation, which measures the generation of valid and coherent grading reasons, the GET system also surpassed ASAS-F-RAG, achieving a 4.41% average rating score improvement. These findings highlight the GET system’s capability to produce both accurate and explainable grading outcomes.

## Acknowledgment

Part of this research was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (23K28094).

## References

- Cecilia Ka Yuk Chan and Wenjie Hu. Students’voices on generative ai: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, 20(1):43, 2023. doi:10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8>.
- Emiliano del Gobbo, Alfonso Guarino, Barbara Cafarelli, and Luca Grilli. Gradeaid: a framework for automatic short answers grading in educational contexts - design, implementation and evaluation. *Knowl. Inf. Syst.*, 65(10): 4295–4334, 2023. doi:10.1007/S10115-023-01892-9. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10115-023-01892-9>.
- Jin-Xia Huang, Yohan Lee, and Oh-Woog Kwon. DIRECT: toward dialogue-based reading comprehension tutoring. *IEEE Access*, 11:8978–8987, 2023. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3233224. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3233224>.
- Christopher Ormerod. Short-answer scoring with ensembles of pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.11558*, 2022.
- Yusen Zhang, Ruoxi Sun, Yanfei Chen, Tomas Pfister, Rui Zhang, and Sercan Ö. Arik. Chain of agents: Large language models collaborating on long-context tasks. *CoRR*, abs/2406.02818, 2024. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2406.02818. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.02818>.
- Han Yang, Mingchen Li, Huixue Zhou, Yongkang Xiao, Qian Fang, and Rui Zhang. One llm is not enough: Harnessing the power of ensemble learning for medical question answering. *medRxiv*, 2023.
- Kai Xiong, Xiao Ding, Yixin Cao, Ting Liu, and Bing Qin. Examining inter-consistency of large language models collaboration: An in-depth analysis via debate. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 7572–7590. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. doi:10.18653/V1/2023.FINDINGS-EMNLP.508. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.508>.
- Li-Hsin Chang and Filip Ginter. Automatic short answer grading for finnish with chatgpt. In *Proc. AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, volume 38, pages 23173–23181, 2024.
- Alexandra Gobrecht, Felix Tuma, Moritz Möller, Thomas Zöllner, Mark Zakhvatkin, et al. Beyond human subjectivity and error: a novel AI grading system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04323*, 2024.
- Yuki Ito and Qiang Ma. Supporting student self-learning using generative ai. In *Proc. 16th Int. Conf. Educ. Technol. Comput. 2024, ICETC '24*, page 97–103, New York, NY, USA, 2025. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400717819. doi:10.1145/3702163.3702177. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3702163.3702177>.



- Gyeong-Geon Lee, Ehsan Latif, Xuansheng Wu, Ninghao Liu, and Xiaoming Zhai. Applying large language models and chain-of-thought for automatic scoring. *Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.*, 6:100213, 2024. doi:10.1016/J.CAEAI.2024.100213. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100213>.
- Lan Jiang and Nigel Bosch. Short answer scoring with GPT-4. In *Proc. 11th ACM Conf. Learning @ Scale (L@S 2024)*, pages 438–442. ACM, 2024. doi:10.1145/3657604.3664685. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3657604.3664685>.
- Jordan K. Matelsky, Felipe Parodi, Tony Liu, Richard D. Lange, and Konrad P. Kording. A large language model-assisted education tool to provide feedback on open-ended responses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02439*, 2023.
- Menna Fateen, Bo Wang, and Tsunenori Mine. Beyond scores: A modular rag-based system for automatic short answer scoring with feedback. *IEEE Access*, 2024.
- Anna Filighera, Siddharth Parihar, Tim Steuer, Tobias Meuser, and Sebastian Ochs. Your answer is incorrect... would you like to know why? introducing a bilingual short answer feedback dataset. In *Proc. 60th Annu. Meeting of the Assoc. Comput. Linguistics (Vol. 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8577–8591, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.587. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.587>.
- Dishank Aggarwal, Pushpak Bhattacharyya, and Bhaskaran Raman. "i understand why I got this grade": Automatic short answer grading with feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12818*, 2024.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, et al. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. In *Advances in Neural Inf. Process. Syst. 36: Annu. Conf. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NeurIPS 2023)*, 2023. URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/hash/271db9922b8d1f4dd7aaef84ed5ac703-Abstract-Conference.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/271db9922b8d1f4dd7aaef84ed5ac703-Abstract-Conference.html).
- Domor Mienye Ibomojie and Yanxia Sun. A survey of ensemble learning: Concepts, algorithms, applications, and prospects. *IEEE Access*, 10:99129–99149, 2022. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3207287. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3207287>.
- David H. Wolpert. Stacked generalization. *Neural Networks*, 5(2):241–259, 1992. doi:10.1016/S0893-6080(05)80023-1. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-6080\(05\)80023-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-6080(05)80023-1).
- F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 12:2825–2830, 2011.
- Omar Khattab and Matei Zaharia. Colbert: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over BERT. In *Proc. 43rd Int. ACM SIGIR Conf. Res. Develop. Inf. Retrieval, SIGIR 2020*, pages 39–48. ACM, 2020. doi:10.1145/3397271.3401075. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401075>.
- Yihan Dong, Shiyao Ding, and Takayuki Ito. An automated multi-phase facilitation agent based on LLM. *IEICE Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 107(4):426–433, 2024. doi:10.1587/TRANSINF.2023IHP0011. URL <https://doi.org/10.1587/transinf.2023ihp0011>.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proc. 40th Annu. Meeting of the Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, pages 311–318. ACL, 2002. doi:10.3115/1073083.1073135. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P02-1040/>.
- Chin-Yew Lin. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain, July 2004. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. BERTscore: Evaluating text generation with BERT. In *8th Int. Conf. Learn. Representations (ICLR 2020)*. OpenReview.net, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SkeHuCVFDr>.
- Irina Jurenka, Markus Kunesch, Kevin R. McKee, Daniel Gillick, Shaojian Zhu, et al. Towards responsible development of generative AI for education: An evaluation-driven approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12687*, 2024.
- Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy P. Lillicrap, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.
- Meta. Meta-llama-3-8b. <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B>. Accessed: Dec 26, 2024.
- Google DeepMind. Gemini. <https://deepmind.google/technologies/gemini/>. Accessed: Dec 26, 2024.
- Mistral AI. Mixtral 8x22b. <https://mistral.ai/news/mixtral-8x22b/>. Accessed: Dec 26, 2024.
- AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card. [https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL\\_CARD.md](https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md), 2024.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.