

PrExMe! Large Scale Prompt Exploration of Open Source LLMs for Machine Translation and Summarization Evaluation

Christoph Leiter, Steffen Eger

Natural Language Learning Group (NLLG)

<https://nl2g.github.io/>

University of Mannheim

{christoph.leiter, steffen.eger}@uni-mannheim.de

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have revolutionized the field of NLP. Notably, their in-context learning capabilities also enable their use as evaluation metrics for natural language generation, making them particularly advantageous in low-resource scenarios and time-restricted applications. In this work, we introduce PrExMe, a large-scale *prompt exploration for metrics*, where we evaluate more than 720 prompt templates for open-source LLM-based metrics on machine translation (MT) and summarization datasets, totalling over 6.6M evaluations. This extensive comparison (1) serves as a benchmark of the performance of recent open-source LLMs as metrics and (2) explores the stability and variability of different prompting strategies. We discover that, on the one hand, there are scenarios for which prompts are stable. For instance, some LLMs show idiosyncratic preferences and favor to grade generated texts with textual labels while others prefer to return numeric scores. On the other hand, the stability of prompts and model rankings can be susceptible to seemingly innocuous changes. For example, changing the requested output format from “0 to 100” to “-1 to +1” can strongly affect the rankings in our evaluation. Our study contributes to understanding the impact of different prompting approaches on LLM-based metrics for MT and summarization evaluation, highlighting the most stable prompting patterns and potential limitations.¹

1 Introduction

The recent popularity and success of LLMs have led to a paradigm shift in NLP (Zhang et al., 2023). Instruction-tuning allows LLMs to generate responses to complex task descriptions (prompts) (Ouyang et al., 2022), making them useful for conventional NLP tasks. One such task is the automatic evaluation of natural language generation

¹We make our code available: <https://github.com/Gringham/PrExMe>




Figure 1: Schematic overview of our prompt exploration. We perform a grid search over datasets, task descriptions, output formats and base prompts.

(NLG) models in machine translation (MT) and summarization. Following the current trend, researchers use LLMs as evaluation metrics and achieve remarkable performance, sometimes relying solely on in-context learning (e.g. Kocmi and Federmann, 2023a; Fernandes et al., 2023), i.e., with metrics that are purely based on prompting. Such prompting-based metrics require no or only a few data samples, making them useful for low-resource evaluation scenarios (Belouadi and Eger, 2023). Additionally, they are often more resource-efficient since they do not require fine-tuning.

Although many prompting-based metrics have been proposed (e.g. Li et al., 2024b), structured evaluations across different prompting approaches remain scarce, especially for open-source models. In recent work, the EVAL4NLP 2023 shared task (Leiter et al., 2023) addresses this by (1) restricting the usage to selected open-source LLMs and (2) prohibiting the fine-tuning of these models. While the shared-task submissions provide several interesting findings, they focus on a few distinct prompts only. Notably, the effect and robustness of prompt variations on the same model or across different models remain largely unexplored.

In this work, we introduce a systematic **Prompt**

Exploration for Metrics (PrExMe), that builds upon EVAL4NLP 2023, to provide a much larger, template-based, structured evaluation of the effects different input prompts have on an LLM-based metric’s correlation with human judgements in MT and summarization evaluation.

We formulate the following research questions:

- RQ1 Can open-source language models evaluate text generation without fine-tuning and how do they differ from each other?
- RQ2 Can we identify patterns² in prompts that lead to a stable performance across different datasets, tasks, and models?
- RQ3 How should researchers design prompts for new evaluation scenarios?

Our prompt exploration constructs hierarchical templates based on approaches such as *chain-of-thought* (CoT) (Kojima et al., 2022), *zero-shot* and *retrieval-augmented generation* (RAG) (Gao et al., 2024b). Each template gets filled with further sub-templates. For example, we vary the requested output formats, such as distinct *scores* and *continuous scores* (see §3). This setup amounts to more than 720 prompt templates that we evaluate with 7 LLMs. In a 2nd phase, we test the generalizability and performance of the prompts with the best correlations on two further datasets.

In summary, our work makes the following key contributions and findings:

- ✓ We perform a large-scale analysis (evaluating over 6.6M prompts) of the effect of different prompting approaches on LLM-based metrics for MT and summarization evaluation. This comprehensive exploration includes various prompting techniques, datasets, tasks, and models, making it, to our knowledge, the most extensive evaluation of its kind.
- ✓ We show that certain prompting patterns are robust and generalizable across different tasks and datasets, with the median performance being a good predictor for new settings. For example, some models show a distinctive preference to return textual labels, while others achieve better results with numeric labels. On the other hand for some settings even small changes to the input prompt can strongly affect the performance.

²We define *prompting patterns* as the template components that constitute a prompt (e.g., zero-shot, one-shot or the output format).

- ✓ Our study tackles prompt-based evaluation with open-source LLMs, targeting scenarios where fine-tuning or access to closed-source LLMs is not possible. Such evaluations are still very scarce but important to make research more accessible, fostering diversity and inclusion.
- ✓ By systematically testing various established prompting approaches, including zero-shot, CoT and RAG, we comprehensively evaluate the performance of recent open-source LLMs for evaluation metrics. Aligning with the recommendations of Mizrahi et al. (2024), by evaluating each model with multiple prompts, our LLM comparison is fair because we mitigate the risk of any single prompt disproportionately affecting their performance. We find that the model PLATYPUS2-70B (Lee et al., 2023a) achieves the strongest performance for the tested LLMs.

2 Related Work

We first describe the related work of prompting-based metrics for MT and summarization. Then, we relate our work to research on prompting techniques and prompt stability.

Prompting-based metrics Recent advancements in LLM-based metrics for NLG often rely on in-context learning, directly predicting quality judgments from generated texts. Surveys by Li et al. (2024b) and Gao et al. (2024a) provide comprehensive overviews of these metrics. Besides BARTSCORE (Yuan et al., 2021) and PRD (Li et al., 2024a), the prompt-based approaches surveyed by Li et al. (2024b) are built upon closed-source models. In contrast, the EVAL4NLP 2023 shared task (Leiter et al., 2023), explicitly considers open-source prompt-based metrics, by asking participants to evaluate MT and summarization using only provided models without fine-tuning. The best submissions were able to beat strong baselines such as GEMBA (Kocmi and Federmann, 2023b) for MT and BARTSCORE for summarization.

While the shared task yielded interesting techniques, the participants explored a limited range of prompts, leaving a gap in the comprehensive analysis of prompting patterns and the consistent comparison of LLMs. In this work, we fill this gap and systematically analyze a much larger set of prompts on a comparable grid of experimental settings to (1) study the robustness of prompts across datasets, models and tasks, and to (2) search for rules and patterns that can guide the future con-

struction of prompt-based metrics.

Prompting Techniques Many successful prompting techniques have been proposed over the last years (e.g., Liu et al., 2023a). Our work mostly relies on established approaches such as Zero-Shot CoT and RAG. Further, Li et al. (2023) propose emotion inducing prompts to improve LLM performance. To our best knowledge, we are the first to analyze this technique for evaluation metrics. Inspired by this, we also propose a novel emotion-CoT pattern (see §3). Prior evaluation of output formats for prompt-based metrics is done by Kocmi and Federmann (2023b), which we extend by our much broader evaluation. Other works also use hierarchical templates for prompt building (e.g. Fu et al., 2023) and tools like LangChain (Chase, 2022) and DSPy (Khattab et al., 2023) support their implementation. We use hierarchical templates as means for a structured comparison among prompting patterns.

Prompting Robustness As we conduct a grid search across different prompts, datasets and tasks, our work builds upon and extends research on how LLMs respond to prompt perturbations. Webson and Pavlick (2022), Leiding et al. (2023), Weber et al. (2023) and Sclar et al. (2023) find a wide range of performance variation for natural language inference and sentiment classification. As a solution, Sclar et al. (2023) suggest to provide the full range of results across different prompt perturbations. Voronov et al. (2024) and Mizrahi et al. (2024) suggest that current evaluation benchmarks for LLMs are problematic as they often only provide one prompt template per task. This could be solved by providing multiple templates and evaluating the ensemble. To our best knowledge, we are the first to explore to which degree these robustness problems affect open-source LLM-based metrics and how to select the best prompts for them. Also, by prompting the LLMs with multiple prompts, we follow Mizrahi et al. (2024) and achieve a stable and fair evaluation of LLMs for this task.

3 Setup

In this section, we present the templates and prompting techniques we employ for utilizing LLMs as metrics. Additionally, we provide an overview of the datasets and models that we use for testing. We evaluate LLMs in a **reference-free** setting, i.e., they grade a generated hypothesis based

on its source without a reference.³ The evaluated prompt types provide a comprehensive evaluation framework for LLM-based metrics. This range covers basic in-context learning, sophisticated reasoning, emotional context, and varying output structures, ensuring a thorough assessment of robustness and adaptability across tasks and datasets.

Prompt Templates Our prompts are constructed as hierarchical templates (see Figure 1), i.e., one large template is constructed from multiple smaller ones. Each prompt is constructed from: (1) the *source text* and generated *hypothesis text* that should be graded, (2) a *base prompt*, (3) a *task description*, (4) a *format requirement* and (5) optionally a one-shot *demonstration*. Table 1 presents examples for (2), (3), (4) and (5).

The **base prompt** is the top layer of our prompt hierarchy, incorporating the other components. Specifically, we test three zero-shot (ZS) and corresponding one-shot (OS) base prompts: (1) *Plain ZS/OS* (PZS/POS), (2) *ZS/OS-CoT* and (3) *ZS/OS-CoT-Emotion* (ZS/OS-CoT-EM). PZS plainly presents the newline separated *task description*, *source*, *hypothesis* and *format requirement*. ZS-CoT (KOJIMA ET AL., 2022) additionally asks the model to *think step by step* before returning its output. Lastly, ZS-CoT-EM asks the model to describe its “emotions” before the ZS-CoT prompt. We include CoT as it has improved the prompt-based performance for closed-source metrics like AUTOMQM Fernandes et al. (2023) and GEMBA (Kocmi and Federmann, 2023a). ZS-CoT-EM explores the variation of LLM performance when prompted to describe emotions in its output. This is motivated by our exploration of emotional prompts on metric performance (see “task description” below). The OS versions of the templates add a field for demonstrations. To avoid fixating the model on specific reasoning steps, we include a placeholder for OS-CoT where the model should insert its reasoning.

The **task description** is the instruction to grade the generated hypothesis. Li et al. (2023) find that LLM instructions that induce certain emotions for humans can cause performance improvements. Inspired by this finding, we explore the usage of “emotional prompts” in the task description. Primarily, this approach offers a simple paraphrasing strategy to increase the scope of our grid search.

³We run experiments using vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023) on two clusters with Nvidia A6000, A40 and A100 GPUS. Details on versions, tools and model parameters are in Appendix B.

Category	Description
Base Prompt Templates	<p>PZS: “{task_description} \nSource Text: {src} \n{result_type}: {hyp} \n{format_requirement} \nScore: ”</p> <p>ZS-COT-EM: “{task_description} \nSource Text: {src} \n{result_type}: {hyp} \n{format_requirement} \nFirst describe your emotions, then think step by step and explain your thought process, finally return your judgment in the format 'Judgment: .'</p> <p>OS-COT: “{task_description} \n Here is an example:\n Source Text: {ex_src} \n{result_type}: {ex_hyp}\n Judgement: <Description of reasons>. Therefore the score is {ex_l_score}\n\n Now it is your turn to grade the {result_type}.\n Source Text: {src} \n{result_type}: {hyp} \n{format_requirement} \n First, think step by step and explain your thought process, then return your judgment in the format 'Judgment: .'</p>
Task Descriptions	<p>Neutral: “Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}.”</p> <p>Sceptical: “I’m not sure about this one. Could you help me out by judging the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} and giving me your perspective?”</p>
Format Requirements	<p>0 or 1: Return a discrete score of 0 if the {result_type} has flaws and 1 if it is perfect.</p> <p>catastrophic, indifferent or marvelous: Choose whether the {result_type} is either "catastrophic", "indifferent" or "marvelous".</p>

Table 1: Examples of prompt templates for the *base prompt*, *task description*, and *format requirements*. The full list can be found in Appendix A.

Additionally, it allows us to study the impact of “emotions” on LLM-based metrics. Besides *neutral* prompts, we include instructions that are, e.g., *polite*, *threatening* and *sceptical*. We create 11 task descriptions ourselves and 13 further descriptions with CHATGPT (OpenAI, 2023).

The **format requirement** describes the output format the LLM should adhere to when generating a score. For example, it includes the range in which the output score should be and whether it should be discrete or continuous. Additionally, we include prompts that ask the LLM to return textual quality labels. In total, we define 10 format requirements.

Lastly, we construct the optional OS **demonstrations** with RAG. We extract demonstrations from WMT21 (Freitag et al., 2021) for MT and from ROSE for summarization.⁴ (Liu et al., 2023b). For each sample in both datasets and for each input sample of our metric, we create sentence embeddings with XLMR-SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2020). Thereby, we concatenate the source and hypothesis embeddings. For each input, we select the demonstration with the highest cosine similarity. Due to resource limitations, we only evaluate the 9 best ZS prompts in a OS setting. The selection process is described in the paragraph *Datasets and phases* below.

MQM-based approaches Additionally to hierarchical templates, we test the prompts of GEMBA-MQM (Kocmi and Federmann, 2023a) with the selected open-source LLMs. GEMBA-MQM, which predicts scores based on the number of present errors weighted by severity, normally uses

⁴Note that ROSE only considers factuality, which is only one aspect of the evaluated datasets.

GPT4. We refer to the open-source implementation as *LocalGemba*.

Score Extraction & Evaluation We restrict generation to 180 tokens and extract the last regex match of a number/label as scores. When no result is found, we average the other scores of its prompt template. For format requirements with text labels, we map the labels to 1, 3 and 5.

We evaluate prompt templates on the segment-level, like the WMT QE and metrics shared tasks (e.g. Freitag et al., 2022, 2021; Zerva et al., 2022). That means, for each metric we compute the correlation between metric scores and ground truth human judgments without averaging by system or document. As correlation measure, we use the Kendall (Kendall, 1945), Pearson and Spearman correlations, as well as tie-calibrated accuracy (Deutsch et al., 2023), with Kendall as main measure. Further, we compute permute-input significance tests ($p \leq 0.075$) (Deutsch et al., 2021) for the Kendall correlations presented in our result tables. Often, there is no single significantly best metric. Therefore, we report clusters where each included metric is significantly better than metrics that are not included.

Models We select instruction-tuned LLMs with strong performance in EVAL4NLP 2023: (1) PLATYPUS2-70B-INSTRUCT-GPTQ, (2) NOUS-HERMES-13B⁵ and (3) OPENORCA-PLATYPUS2-13B (Lee et al., 2023b; Mukherjee et al., 2023). We abbreviate these as PLATYPUS2, NOUS and ORCA. Additionally, we evaluate more recent

⁵<https://huggingface.co/NousResearch/Nous-Hermes-13b>

models: (4) LLAMA3-8B (AI@Meta, 2024), (5) a GPTQ version of LLAMA3-70B (AI@Meta, 2024), (6) MIXTRAL-8X7B⁶ (Jiang et al., 2024) and UNBABEL-TOWER (Alves et al., 2024), a 13B parameter multilingual instruction-tuned model.

Datasets and phases Our experiments are in two phases on different datasets. By doing so, we want to alleviate statistical effects of our large prompt search. Also, it allows to evaluate selected prompts on full datasets, a task that would otherwise be too resource intensive, and to explore generalizability.

In phase 1, we evaluate on the train set of EVAL4NLP 2023 (Leiter et al., 2023), and in phase 2, on its dev and test sets.⁷ The train and dev sets are (reference-free) splits of the WMT2022 metrics shared task (Freitag et al., 2022) and SUMMEVAL (Fabbri et al., 2021). The test set was newly annotated by Leiter et al. (2023). As a second test set, we evaluate on the WMT23 MQM annotations for MT (Freitag et al., 2023) and *Seahorse* (Clark et al., 2023) for multilingual summarization. Because OS prompts demonstrate a weak performance on the other datasets, we do not evaluate them on WMT23/SEAHORSE. More details of the datasets are discussed in Appendix C.

In the **1st phase**, we evaluate all 720⁸ combinations of ZS prompts on the train set. As this is resource intensive, for MT we restrict ourselves to the first 500 samples of each language pair. Afterwards, we select the prompt with the highest Kendall correlation for each *task+base prompt* combination (e.g. en-de+PZS or en-de+ZS-COT).⁹ This yields 9 unique prompts for exploration in the phase 2 (see Appendix F).

In the **2nd phase**, we evaluate the selected prompts of the 1st phase on the full dev and test sets. This further tests the generalizability of prompts between models and for unseen, in-domain data (the train and dev set stem from the same original datasets) and out-domain data (test sets).

Baselines For each phase, we also present the correlations of two baseline metrics that use other base models: BARTSCORE (Yuan et al., 2021)

⁶Due to high resource consumption and comparatively weak performance in phase 1, we do not evaluate MIXTRAL in phase 2.

⁷Although we do not use the datasets to train a model, for conciseness, we will refer to these dataset as train, dev and test set.

⁸Considering the different tasks and language pairs, this number could also be considered higher.

⁹Tasks: en-de, zh-en, summarization. In case of duplicates, we choose the second best.

and XCOMET (Guerreiro et al., 2023). Especially XCOMET has the benefit of being trained on multilingual datasets. Further, we test the prompts of DSBA (Kim et al., 2023) — that showed a strong performance for summarization in the shared task — with the selected open-source LLMs Platypus2-70B and Orca-13B.

4 Results

In *phase 1*, we run 6,652,800 ZS prompts (720 prompt templates) and 71,280 OS prompts (9 “best” prompt templates), with no scores extracted in 12.7% resp. 19.4% of cases; the average of the prompt combination was assigned in these instances. Further, in *phase 2*, we evaluate 5,503,896 ZS and 1,308,690 OS prompts (9 “best” prompt templates for both), with no scores extracted in 22.3% and 19.4% of cases, respectively.

Table 2 presents the **Kendall correlations** to human scores achieved by each LLM across different tasks and datasets in phase 1 and phase 2. Each cell for *hierarchical templates* displays the maximum correlation reached by any prompt combination.

For the *hierarchical templates* (table group 1.), PLATYPUS-70B performs best and is in the upper significance cluster for 9 of 11 tasks. TOWER-13B follows, with 3 of 11 tasks. ORCA-13B has the second-highest average correlation after PLATYPUS2-70B but is only significant for one task. Surprisingly, the newer LLAMA3 models do not outperform the LLAMA2 based models (ORCA, PLATYPUS2 and TOWER).

The *separate prompting techniques* (table group 2.), which also use the Platypus2-70B model, have weaker correlations than the best prompts of the hierarchical templates. The LocalGemba MQM-based approach is in the best significance cluster for 3 of 11 tasks and is the best prompting based approach for *en-de* in WMT23. On the other hand, the baseline prompt DSBA is significantly the best on summarization for the Eval4NLP test set where it also won the shared task, but not for other tasks.

Regarding the baselines (table group 3.), XCOMET outperforms our LLM based approaches for MT evaluation by a varying margin. For instance, for en-es in the EVAL4NLP test set, the difference is small and XCOMET is in the same significance cluster as Platypus2-70B. On the other hand, for some tasks the performance difference is large, e.g., on en-de in WMT23 XCOMET performs 0.14 Kendall points better. The strong performance of XCOMET for MT evaluation is expected

Model	P1: Eval4NLP train			P2: Eval4NLP test				P2: WMT23/Seahorse			
	en-de	zh-en	summ	en-de	en-es	en_zh	summ	en-de	he-en	zh-en	summ
1. Hierarchical Templates											
LL3-70B	0.273	0.306	0.442	0.245	0.189	0.231	0.438	0.297	0.172	0.312	0.312
LL3-8B	0.251	0.236	0.334	0.167	0.158	0.145	0.412	0.166	0.118	0.164	0.200
MI-7Bx8	0.268*	0.264	0.365	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NO-13B	0.230	0.201	0.225	0.205	0.141	0.084	0.255	0.202	0.105	0.175	0.123
OR-13B	0.289	0.303	0.468*	0.214	0.158	0.206	0.518	0.375	0.247	0.387	0.377
PL-70B	0.344*	0.364*	0.519*	0.402*	0.289*	0.295*	0.549	0.338	0.259*	0.417*	0.448*
TO-13B	0.284*	0.318*	0.375	0.379*	0.253	0.232	0.409	0.322	0.208	0.314	0.257
2. Separate Prompting Techniques											
M:LG	0.278*	0.268	0.062	0.344	0.265	0.307*	0.116	0.391*	0.190	0.300	0.144
B:DSBA	0.164	0.306	0.458	0.314	0.226	0.159	0.600*	0.172	0.207	0.376	0.373
3. Baselines with External Base Models											
B:BS	0.056	-0.109	0.155	0.125	0.139	-0.009	0.421	-0.018	0.001	-0.167	0.069
B:XC	0.629	0.513	-0.069	0.468	0.298	0.387	0.224	0.531	0.300	0.447	0.146

Table 2: Kendall correlations of the best performing prompts of the phase 1 (P1) and phase 2 (P2) evaluations across various datasets. Abbreviations are defined in Appendix D. Vertically, we group the table into (1) correlations achieved with our *hierarchical templates*, (2) correlations of prompting techniques that are explored *separately* from the hierarchical templates, but use the same base model(s) and (3) baselines that use *external base models*, i.e., that are not based on the same LLMs. For each column the **bold** value indicates the highest correlation and correlations with an asterisk (*) are significantly higher ($p \leq 0.075$) than those without (excluding group (3)). The grey values for XC indicate tasks that were included in its training data. The MQM based approach is marked with *M:* and baselines are marked with *B:*. **Orange** values indicate that the prompt required textual quality labels, while **blue** values indicate numeric labels. More details can be found in Appendix E.

as it (1) is based on the multilingual XLMR-XXL model and (2) fine-tuned for MT evaluation. For summarization, prompting approaches significantly outperform BARTScore and XComet.

To revisit **RQ1**, our results show that open-source prompt-based LLMs struggle to reach the performance of the dedicated fine-tuned metric XCOMET for MT, but generally exhibit a promising performance. A benefit of the LLMs also lies in their high versatility towards different tasks. While XCOMET is mostly constrained to MT evaluation, the LLMs can perform strong summarization evaluation simply by switching a small portion of the prompt. Further, LLMs seem to be more robust towards different tasks, even without switching the input descriptions: The baseline DSBA, which has specific prompts for summarization achieves notable results on some MT evaluation tasks, too.

The prompts used in group 1 are built from hierarchical templates, i.e., each presented correlation can have a different *format requirement*, *base prompt* and *task description*. To inspect the distribution of the *format requirements*, we color correlations where the model was prompted to return textual quality labels in orange and those asking for numeric scores in blue.¹⁰ ORCA-13B and

PLATYPUS2-70B were prompted to return numeric scores for all but one reported correlations. On the other hand, LLAMA3-70B, NOUS-13B and TOWER-13B were prompted to return textual labels for all but three reported correlations. We also find such common patterns in the best prompts per model for the base prompt and, less pronounced, for the task description. For example, the best prompts for TOWER-13B always use the ZS-COT base prompt, while LLAMA3-70B always uses PZS. Details of the prompts used for each cell, tie-calibrated accuracy scores, Pearson and Spearman correlations, and the scores of the EVAL4NLP dev set are shown in Appendix E.

Our results indicate that models have idiosyncratic preferences for certain patterns. In §5, we further explore these preferences and their robustness.

5 Analysis

In this section, we answer **RQ2** and investigate the performance and robustness of the template components in more detail.

Best prompting patterns per model and dataset

First, we explore the best *base prompt*, *task description* and *format requirement* for each model.

Appendix F). For the task descriptions, *emphasis* and *dire situation* are each selected twice, with other descriptions chosen once.

¹⁰Among the 9 best prompts automatically selected for phase 2 and OS experiments based on phase 1 results, the *base prompts* are evenly distributed, and the *format requirements* are split 5/4 between labels and numeric formats (see

To do so, we analyze their prevalence in the 2% of prompts with the highest Kendall correlation for each unique task. We choose this cutoff to represent every task. For example, Figure 2 shows how the best *base prompts* differ between OPENORCA and TOWER. We compare these two LLMs because their best prompts notably contrast each other.




Figure 2: Distribution of the top 14% (top 2% of every unique task) of base prompts across all EVAL4NLP datasets, format requirements, task descriptions and tasks for ORCA and TOWER.

While ORCA prefers the PZS prompts, TOWER is better with ZS-CoT and ZS-CoT-EM. For the *format requirement*, Figure 3 highlights how ORCA prefers scores in the range of -100 to 100 , while TOWER can work better with labels. The pie charts for all models and the comparison between *task descriptions* are presented in Appendix 7. Here, for the base prompts, TOWER uses ZS-CoT or ZS-CoT-EM in 86.2%, NOUS in 44.9%, and PLATYPUS2 in 23.9% of its best prompts. All other models use these base prompts in less than 10% of their best prompts. Regarding format requirements, LLAMA3-70B uses textual labels in 90.2% of its best prompts, TOWER in 80.4%, and MIXTRAL in 80%. In contrast, ORCA only uses them in 8%, and PLATYPUS2 in 21.7% of its best prompts. For LLAMA3-8B and NOUS, there is no clear trend. Finally, the distribution of task descriptions is broader (largely due to their higher number). Notably, the “curious” task description is used in over 15% of best prompts for LLAMA3-70B, NOUS, and LLAMA3-8B. “Emphasis” is the most used by PLATYPUS2 (17.4%) and “dire warning” is the most used by TOWER (21.4%). Regarding **RQ2**, these results show that the *models have unaligned preferences for prompting patterns, making it difficult to construct a universally good prompt. How-*

ever, model specific patterns can be found¹¹ and models can be grouped based on their best patterns. For example, one group prefers to return numeric scores and the other textual labels. This behavior may in parts depend on shared instruction-tuning data. E.g., ORCA and PLATYPUS were partly trained on the same data and prefer to return numeric labels. On the other hand, both LLaMA3 models prefer textual labels, but LLaMA3-8B to a smaller degree.

To analyze whether the model specific preferences hold across datasets, we also plot a dataset-wise distribution for all MT tasks of the top 2% prompts for each model, separated by ZS vs. OS in Appendix I. If a prompting pattern is stable for all models across datasets, the distribution of the best prompts should remain unchanged. Indeed, the percentage to which many prevalent prompting patterns are represented in the selected top prompts does not change much across datasets. E.g., the PZS *base prompt* ranges between 66.7% and 83% and the “complex labels” *format requirement* ranges between 50% to 66.7% for ZS and 66.7% to 83.3% for OS. This does not hold for the phase 1 evaluation, where more templates were tested and the template selection thus was much broader. Also, for some prompt patterns, e.g. the “emphasis” and “collaborative” *task descriptions*, the occurrence in the top prompts seems to swap between datasets. This experiment shows that prompts are to some degree stable between datasets. In the next paragraph, we further quantify this stability between datasets, prompting patterns and models.

Prompt stability Next, we quantify how stable the performance of a prompting pattern A is when the dataset, the model or the other parts of the prompts change. To do so, we compute the rankings of prompts that use A before and after the change and then test the similarity of rankings. For example, we compute the ranking of *format requirements* on dataset 1. Then, we change the dataset and obtain a second ranking. If the first and second ranking are similar, the performance of different *format requirements* is stable between the two datasets. We test this similarity with the Kendall correlation.

The **ranking** of a prompting pattern can be computed in several ways, because we evaluate multi-

¹¹Which patterns are specific to which model also provides *global explanations* (Leiter et al., 2024) of the models.




Figure 3: Distribution of the top 14% (top 2% of every unique task) of format requirements across all Eval4NLP datasets, format requirements, task descriptions and tasks for Orca and Tower.

ple prompts containing the pattern. In our example, for each *format requirement* there are multiple evaluated prompts per dataset, i.e., for different base prompts, task descriptions and tasks. The performance of a specific *format requirement* in the ranking could, for example, be determined by aggregating its different scores across *base prompts*, *task descriptions*, etc. with the mean or median. We test the following aggregation methods: mean, median, mean of top 10%, max, min and saturation (Mizrahi et al., 2024). Thereby, we determine that the aggregation with the median leads to the most stable ranking, i.e. the highest Kendall correlation between rankings. Specifically, we test this by comparing every selection of two aggregation measures in a permutation test (e.g. median vs. mean, mean vs. max, etc.); see Appendix §G. For our example, this means that for each different *format requirement* on dataset 1, we compute the median score of all combinations of base prompts, task description and task. Then, we do the same for the second dataset and check the correlation of the resulting ranking. A high correlation of the rankings then indicates that the median performance for all prompts using the *format requirement* is a good indicator of its relative performance on a new dataset.

Figure 4 shows heatmaps for the stability of the *format requirement* and *task description* when the *base prompt* is changed (Further combinations are plotted in Appendix J). The highest stability is given when changing from PZS to ZS-CoT or vice versa (0.65). That means, when we choose the *format prompt* with the highest median correlation, there is a high chance that it will perform




Figure 4: Correlation of the *task description* (left) and *format requirement* (right) ranking when changing the base prompt. The correlations across tasks, models and *format requirement* resp. *task description* are aggregated with the median. ZS-CoT is abbreviated with ZSC and ZS-CoT-EM is abbreviated with ZSCE.

good for ZS and ZS-CoT. For the *task description* a change from ZS to ZS-CoT is unlikely to retain the ranking. This also underlines the result of the previous paragraph that the *format requirement* is more stable than the *task description*.

We can also use this method to quantify the stability of the model ranking, when each model is first prompted with pattern A that is then changed to pattern B. With this, we can identify how similar two patterns are. Figure 5 shows this type of plot for the *format requirement*. For example, if all models are prompted with “0 to 100” and with “-100 to 100” the ranking of models will not change much. With a change from “simple labels” to “complex labels” the model ranking will change more drastically.

With respect to **RQ2**, the heatmaps highlight that even small changes to the input prompt can drastically influence the relative ranking of LLMs and other prompting patterns. This is in line with recent research that has shown the susceptibility of LLMs to single input prompts (e.g. Sclar et al., 2023; Voronov et al., 2024; Mizrahi et al., 2024). However, the heatmaps also show that not every change to the input has this effect and can be used as indicators for the transferability of new prompting patterns.

6 Recommendations

We now address **RQ3** and give recommendations to employ open-source prompt-based metrics. Among the evaluated models, PLATYPUS2-70B demonstrates superior performance. For 13B models, TOWER and ORCA exhibit the highest correlations in MT and summarization tasks. We rec-




Figure 5: Correlation of the model ranking when changing the *format requirement*.

ommend utilizing the prompting patterns that most frequently yield top correlations for these models (refer to §5 and Appendix H). When introducing a new prompting pattern or model, its median performance across existing other prompting patterns can serve as an indicator of the pattern’s efficacy in unknown contexts. Thereby, the actual predictive power of the median (or other aggregation measures) for each dimension can be determined based on previous evaluations. The results and source code of PrExMe provide a foundational basis for this analysis.

7 Conclusion

We have introduced PrExMe, a large scale exploration of prompting templates for prompt-based open-source NLG metrics. We evaluate 720 different templates and over 6.6M prompts and provide recommendations that aim to make future metrics of this type more robust. Further, our results provide a comparison and analysis of recent open-source LLMs when applied to this task.¹²

Acknowledgements

The NLLG group gratefully acknowledges support from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) via the research grant “Metrics4NLG” and the German Research Foundation (DFG) via the Heisenberg Grant EG 375/5-1. Further, we thank Juri Opitz for his implementations of the DSBA and GEMBA prompts, as well as

¹²We used Github copilot (<https://github.com/features/copilot>) for minor code auto-completion tasks and GPT4 as writing aid for paraphrasing.

for his feedback during our discussions. The authors also acknowledge support by the state of Baden-Württemberg through bwHPC and the German Research Foundation (DFG) through grant INST 35/1597-1 FUGG.

Limitations

One limitation of our work is that even though we evaluate a large variety of possible prompts, there is still a lot of interesting possible variety in prompting approaches that we did not explore for now (e.g., the detail level of task instructions or structured output formats). Especially, our multi-step experiment is currently conducted on a very small scale. Future work might consider extending the exploration of this and other multi-step approaches. A further limitation is that we cannot be sure that the newer LLM models did not see parts of the older datasets in their training data. Also, the selection of the best prompts that are presented in the result tables is currently based on the maximum instead of the median, which was found to highlight the most stable prompts. Generally, by selecting the 9 “best” prompts for phase 2 we are narrowing the search space. Hence, the interplay between prompt patterns might not be fully represented for these phases. Furthermore, our heatmaps only compare one dimension, while another is changed, possibly simplifying the interplay between the others. As another limitation, in rare cases the context size of the models was exceeded. Future work could explore different ways to handle this than cutoff. Further, the heatmaps show many Kendall correlations and may be prone to statistical effects for some values. Lastly, we assume that LocalGemba is performing worse than, e.g., PZS prompts because of its higher prompt complexity, while the original GembaMQM can handle it due to GPT4 being more advanced. However, we did not test PZS prompts with GPT4 to confirm it performs worse than GembaMQM there.

Ethical Considerations

Evaluating generated texts with prompt-based LLMs might (especially with explanations) be prone to hallucinations. Depending on the use case, this might be dangerous. However, while we research about this type of metric, our work analyzes methods to select and construct more robust and also more accessible (open-source) approaches, therefore we see no ethical concerns.

References

- AI@Meta. 2024. [Llama 3 model card](#).
- Duarte M. Alves, José Pombal, Nuno M. Guerreiro, Pedro H. Martins, João Alves, Amin Farajian, Ben Peters, Ricardo Rei, Patrick Fernandes, Sweta Agrawal, Pierre Colombo, José G. C. de Souza, and André F. T. Martins. 2024. [Tower: An open multilingual large language model for translation-related tasks](#).
- Jonas Belouadi and Steffen Eger. 2023. [UScore: An effective approach to fully unsupervised evaluation metrics for machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 358–374, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Harrison Chase. 2022. [LangChain](#).
- Elizabeth Clark, Shruti Rijhwani, Sebastian Gehrmann, Joshua Maynez, Roei Aharoni, Vitaly Nikolaev, Thibault Sellam, Aditya Siddhant, Dipanjan Das, and Ankur Parikh. 2023. [SEAHORSE: A multilingual, multifaceted dataset for summarization evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9397–9413, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daniel Deutsch, Rotem Dror, and Dan Roth. 2021. [A statistical analysis of summarization evaluation metrics using resampling methods](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1132–1146.
- Daniel Deutsch, George Foster, and Markus Freitag. 2023. [Ties matter: Meta-evaluating modern metrics with pairwise accuracy and tie calibration](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12914–12929, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexander R. Fabbri, Wojciech Kryściński, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir Radev. 2021. [SummEval: Re-evaluating summarization evaluation](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:391–409.
- Patrick Fernandes, Daniel Deutsch, Mara Finkelstein, Parker Riley, André Martins, Graham Neubig, Ankush Garg, Jonathan Clark, Markus Freitag, and Orhan Firat. 2023. [The devil is in the errors: Leveraging large language models for fine-grained machine translation evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 1066–1083, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Markus Freitag, Nitika Mathur, Chi-kiu Lo, Eleftherios Avramidis, Ricardo Rei, Brian Thompson, Tom Kocmi, Frederic Blain, Daniel Deutsch, Craig Stewart, Chrysoula Zerva, Sheila Castilho, Alon Lavie, and George Foster. 2023. [Results of WMT23 metrics shared task: Metrics might be guilty but references are not innocent](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 578–628, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Markus Freitag, Ricardo Rei, Nitika Mathur, Chi-kiu Lo, Craig Stewart, Eleftherios Avramidis, Tom Kocmi, George Foster, Alon Lavie, and André F. T. Martins. 2022. [Results of WMT22 metrics shared task: Stop using BLEU – neural metrics are better and more robust](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Machine Translation (WMT)*, pages 46–68, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Markus Freitag, Ricardo Rei, Nitika Mathur, Chi-kiu Lo, Craig Stewart, George Foster, Alon Lavie, and Ondřej Bojar. 2021. [Results of the WMT21 metrics shared task: Evaluating metrics with expert-based human evaluations on TED and news domain](#). In *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 733–774, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jinlan Fu, See-Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. 2023. [Gptscore: Evaluate as you desire](#).
- Mingqi Gao, Xinyu Hu, Jie Ruan, Xiao Pu, and Xiaojun Wan. 2024a. [Llm-based nlg evaluation: Current status and challenges](#).
- Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, Meng Wang, and Haofen Wang. 2024b. [Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey](#).
- Nuno M. Guerreiro, Ricardo Rei, Daan van Stigt, Luisa Coheur, Pierre Colombo, and André F. T. Martins. 2023. [xcomet: Transparent machine translation evaluation through fine-grained error detection](#).
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, Léo Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Théophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. [Mixtral of experts](#).
- M. G. Kendall. 1945. [THE TREATMENT OF TIES IN RANKING PROBLEMS](#). *Biometrika*, 33(3):239–251.
- Omar Khattab, Arnav Singhvi, Paridhi Maheshwari, Zhiyuan Zhang, Keshav Santhanam, Sri Vardhamanan, Saiful Haq, Ashutosh Sharma, Thomas T. Joshi, Hanna Moazam, Heather Miller, Matei Zaharia, and Christopher Potts. 2023. [Dspy: Compiling declarative language model calls into self-improving pipelines](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03714*.

- JoongHoon Kim, Sangmin Lee, Seung Hun Han, Saeran Park, Jiyeon Lee, Kiyoon Jeong, and Pilsung Kang. 2023. [Which is better? exploring prompting strategy for LLM-based metrics](#). In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Evaluation and Comparison of NLP Systems*, pages 164–183, Bali, Indonesia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Kocmi and Christian Federmann. 2023a. [GEMBA-MQM: Detecting translation quality error spans with GPT-4](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 768–775, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Kocmi and Christian Federmann. 2023b. [Large language models are state-of-the-art evaluators of translation quality](#). In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, pages 193–203, Tampere, Finland. European Association for Machine Translation.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang (Shane) Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. [Large language models are zero-shot reasoners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 22199–22213. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention](#). In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*.
- Ariel N. Lee, Cole J. Hunter, and Nataniel Ruiz. 2023a. [Platypus: Quick, cheap, and powerful refinement of llms](#).
- Ariel N. Lee, Cole J. Hunter, Nataniel Ruiz, Bley Goodson, Wing Lian, Guan Wang, Eugene Pentaland, Austin Cook, Chanvichet Vong, and "Teknum". 2023b. [Openorcaplatypus: Llama2-13b model instruct-tuned on filtered openorcav1 gpt-4 dataset and merged with divergent stem and logic dataset model](#). <https://huggingface.co/Open-Orca/OpenOrca-Platypus2-13B>.
- Alina Leidinger, Robert van Rooij, and Ekaterina Shutova. 2023. [The language of prompting: What linguistic properties make a prompt successful?](#) In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 9210–9232, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Christoph Leiter, Piyawat Lertvittayakumjorn, Marina Fomicheva, Wei Zhao, Yang Gao, and Steffen Eger. 2024. [Towards explainable evaluation metrics for machine translation](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(75):1–49.
- Christoph Leiter, Juri Opitz, Daniel Deutsch, Yang Gao, Rotem Dror, and Steffen Eger. 2023. [The eval4nlp 2023 shared task on prompting large language models as explainable metrics](#).
- Cheng Li, Jindong Wang, Yixuan Zhang, Kaijie Zhu, Wenxin Hou, Jianxun Lian, Fang Luo, Qiang Yang, and Xing Xie. 2023. [Large language models understand and can be enhanced by emotional stimuli](#).
- Ruosen Li, Teerth Patel, and Xinya Du. 2024a. [PRD: Peer rank and discussion improve large language model based evaluations](#).
- Zhen Li, Xiaohan Xu, Tao Shen, Can Xu, Jia-Chen Gu, and Chongyang Tao. 2024b. [Leveraging large language models for nlg evaluation: A survey](#).
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2023a. [Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(9).
- Yixin Liu, Alex Fabbri, Pengfei Liu, Yilun Zhao, Linyong Nan, Ruilin Han, Simeng Han, Shafiq Joty, Chien-Sheng Wu, Caiming Xiong, and Dragomir Radev. 2023b. [Revisiting the gold standard: Grounding summarization evaluation with robust human evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4140–4170, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Moran Mizrahi, Guy Kaplan, Dan Malkin, Rotem Dror, Dafna Shahaf, and Gabriel Stanovsky. 2024. [State of what art? a call for multi-prompt llm evaluation](#).
- Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. 2023. [Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4](#).
- OpenAI. 2023. [Introducing chatgpt](#). URL <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>. (Date accessed: 24.04.2023).
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 27730–27744. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. [Making monolingual sentence embeddings multilingual using knowledge distillation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4512–4525, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Melanie Sclar, Yejin Choi, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Alane Suhr. 2023. [Quantifying language models' sensitivity to spurious features in prompt design or: How i learned to start worrying about prompt formatting](#).

Anton Voronov, Lena Wolf, and Max Ryabinin. 2024. [Mind your format: Towards consistent evaluation of in-context learning improvements.](#)

Lucas Weber, Elia Bruni, and Dieuwke Hupkes. 2023. [The icl consistency test.](#)

Albert Webson and Ellie Pavlick. 2022. [Do prompt-based models really understand the meaning of their prompts?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2300–2344, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. [BartScore: Evaluating generated text as text generation.](#) In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 27263–27277. Curran Associates, Inc.

Chrysoula Zerva, Frédéric Blain, Ricardo Rei, Piyawat Lertvittayakumjorn, José G. C. de Souza, Steffen Eger, Diptesh Kanojia, Duarte Alves, Constantin Orăsan, Marina Fomicheva, André F. T. Martins, and Lucia Specia. 2022. [Findings of the WMT 2022 shared task on quality estimation.](#) In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Machine Translation (WMT)*, pages 69–99, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (Hybrid). Association for Computational Linguistics.

Ran Zhang, Aida Kostikova, Christoph Leiter, Jonas Belouadi, Daniil Larionov, Yanran Chen, Vivian Frensen, and Steffen Eger. 2023. [Nlg quarterly arxiv report 09/23: What are the most influential current ai papers?](#)

A Prompt Templates

Tables 3, 7, 5, 4 and 6 give an overview of our prompt templates. 3

B Implementation Details

We use the following library versions: torch==2.1.2
transformers==4.39.3
unbabel_comet==2.2.1
vllm==0.4.0.post1
auto_gptq==0.7.1

Further, we use the following models from huggingface: <https://huggingface.co/OpenOrca/OpenOrca-Platypus2-13B/tree/main>, <https://huggingface.co/NousResearch/Nous-Hermes-13b>, <https://huggingface.co/TheBloke/Platypus2-Instruct-GPTQ>, <https://huggingface.co/Unbabel/XCOMET-XXL>, <https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1>, <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/>

<https://huggingface.co/MazyarPanahi/Meta-Llama-3-70B-Instruct-GPTQ>, <https://huggingface.co/Unbabel/TowerInstruct-13B-v0.1> and <https://huggingface.co/facebook/bart-large-cnn>. These have 13B, 13B, 70B, 10.7B, 8x7B, 8B, 70B, 13B and 405M parameters respectively. The runtime of the experiments varied based on the general cluster usage. The runtime for one evaluation of all prompt combinations on 500 samples of one task on the dev set is approximately 7 hours for the 13B models and 36 hours for the 70B model. This was only possible through optimizations with vLLM.

C Dataset Details

Table 8 shows the distribution of the Eval4NLP 2023 dataset (Leiter et al., 2023) (train, dev and test) and our second test set, built from WMT23 (Freitag et al., 2023) and Seahorse (Clark et al., 2023). We use the train set in our first evaluation phase and the dev, test and test2 sets in our second evaluation phase. Where applicable, we provide the licenses in the respective directories of the source code. The WMT23 dataset was built with the mt-metrics-eval library.¹³ in their data not all sentences had available ground truth annotations. In these cases, we dropped the rows. For Seahorse, we convert the quality questions into scores. If the first question is negative, the score is 0. If it does not rule out the other questions, each question is evaluated as 0.2, such that the scores lie in a range between 0 and 1.

D Model Abbreviations

Table gives an overview of abbreviations that we use to concisely present our results in the main paper.

E Phase 1 & 2 performance

Table 10 shows the performance of the prompts with the best Kendall performance across the different dimensions. Tables 11 and 12 show the performance of selected prompts on the phase 2 datasets.

F Prompt selection

Table 14 contains the some of the 9 prompts that were selected for OS and Phase 2 experiments.

¹³<https://github.com/google-research/mt-metrics-eval>

Name	Prompt
Zero-Shot	“{task_description} \nSource Text: {src} \n{result_type}: {hyp} \n{format_requirement} \nScore: ”
Zero-Shot-CoT	“{task_description} \nSource Text: {src} \n{result_type}: {hyp} \n{format_requirement} \nFirst, think step by step and explain your thought process, then return your judgment in the format 'Judgment: '.”
Zero-Shot-CoT-EM	“{task_description} \nSource Text: {src} \n{result_type}: {hyp} \n{format_requirement} \nFirst describe your emotions, then think step by step and explain your thought process, finally return your judgment in the format 'Judgment: '.”

Table 3: Zero-Shot Base Prompt Templates

Name	Prompt
0 or 1	“Return a discrete score of 0 if the {result_type} has flaws and 1 if it is perfect.”
-1 or 0 or 1	“Return a discrete score of -1 if the {result_type} has flaws, 0 if you are indecisive and 1 if it is perfect.”
0 to 5	“Return a score on a scale from 0 to 5 where 0 indicates that the {result_type} is very bad and 5 is assigned to a perfect {result_type}.”
-5 to 5	“Return a score on a scale from -5 to 5 where 0 indicates that the {result_type} is very bad and 5 is assigned to a perfect {result_type}.”
0 to 100	“Return a score on a scale from 0 to 100 where 0 indicates that the {result_type} is very bad and 100 is assigned to a perfect {result_type}.”
-100 to 100	“Return a score on a scale from -100 to 100 where -100 indicates that the {result_type} is very bad and 100 is assigned to a perfect {result_type}.”
0.0 to 1.0	“Return a score on a scale from 0.0 to 1.0 where 0.0 indicates that the {result_type} is very bad and 1.0 is assigned to a perfect {result_type}.”
-1.0 to 1.0	“Return a score on a scale from -1.0 to 1.0 where -1.0 indicates that the {result_type} is very bad and 1.0 is assigned to a perfect {result_type}.”
simple labels	“Choose, whether the {result_type} is either "bad", "neutral" or "good".”
complex l.	“Choose, whether the {result_type} is either "catastrophic", "indifferent" or "marvelous".”

Table 4: Format Requirement Templates

Name	Prompt
Neutral	“Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}.”
Polite	“Please judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}.”
Command	“Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} immediately!”
Threat	“Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}, otherwise I will delete your program code.”
Urgent sit.	“Please help me! My boss needs me to find an answer quickly. Otherwise, he might fire me. \n Please judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} immediately!”
Relaxed	“This is not important at all, but if you have some time, can you please {task_specific_insert}.”
Emphasis	“Empathetic”
Question	“Can you judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}?”
Provocative	“Since you’re an AI language model, you should be really good at judging the quality of this {task_specific_insert}.”
Reward	“Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}, as a reward, I will improve your program code.”
Empathetic	“I know it isn’t an easy task, but it would be really great of you if you could help me judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}.”
Excited	“Wow, you won’t believe what I found! Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} – it’s amazing!”
Curious	“I’m really curious about your opinion. Could you please judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}?”
Casual	“Hey, whenever you have a moment, could you check and judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}?”
Appreciative	“I really appreciate your expertise. Could you kindly judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}?”

Table 5: Task Description Templates (1/2)

Name	Prompt
Enthusiastic	“I’m super excited about this. Can you quickly judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} and let me know your thoughts?”
Collaborative	“Let’s work together on this! Please judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} and share your insights.”
Skeptical	“I’m not sure about this one. Could you help me out by judging the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} and giving me your perspective?”
Instructive	“To better understand, I need your expertise. Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} following these specific criteria.”
Encouraging	“I believe in your judgment. Whenever you have a moment, could you please judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}?”
Strong Urgency	“Time is of the essence! Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} immediately, or face severe consequences!”
Serious Consequences	“Failure to promptly assess the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} will result in serious consequences. Act now!”
Immediate Action	“No time to waste! Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} without delay, or be prepared for the fall-out.”
Dire Warning	“Consider this a warning. Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} urgently, or face the potential fallout from your inaction.”

Table 6: Task Description Templates (2/2)

Name	Prompt
Zero-Shot	“{task_description} \nHere is an example:\nSource Text: {ex1_src} \n{result_type}: {ex1_hyp}\nScore: {ex1_score}\n\nNow it is your turn to grade the {result_type}. \nSource Text: {src} \n{result_type}: {hyp} \n{format_requirement} \nScore: ”
Zero-Shot-CoT	“{task_description} \nHere is an example:\nSource Text: {ex1_src} \n{result_type}: {ex1_hyp}\nJudgement: <Description of reasons>. Therefore the score is {ex1_score}\n\nNow it is your turn to grade the {result_type}.\nSource Text: {src} \n{result_type}: {hyp} \n{format_requirement} \nFirst, think step by step and explain your thought process, then return your judgment in the format 'Judgment: ’”
Zero-Shot-CoT-EM	“{task_description} \nHere is an example:\nSource Text: {ex1_src} \n{result_type}: {ex1_hyp}\nJudgement: <Description of emotions and reasons>. Therefore the score is {ex1_score}\n\nNow it is your turn to grade the {result_type}.\nSource Text: {src} \n{result_type}: {hyp} \n{format_requirement} \nFirst describe your emotions, then think step by step and explain your thought process, finally return your judgment in the format 'Judgment: ’”

Table 7: One-Shot Base Prompt Templates

Type	Train	Dev	Test	Test2
en-de	11046	7364	1425	5520
en-es	-	-	1834	-
en-zh	-	-	1161	-
he-en	-	-	-	9840
zh-en	15750	10500	-	17655
sum	320	1280	671	18330

Table 8: Dataset distribution of Eval4NLP 2023 (Leiter et al., 2023). Train and dev sets are constructed from the WMT2022 metrics shared task (Freitag et al., 2022) and SummEval (Fabbri et al., 2021).

Original Name	Abbreviation
LLAMA3-70B	LL3-70B
LLAMA3-8B	LL3-8B
MIXTRAL-7Bx8	MI-7Bx8
NOUSHERMES-13B	NO-13B
OPENORCA-13B	OR-13B
Platypus2-70B	PL-70B
TOWER-13B	TO-13B
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	MQM:LG
B:BARTSCORE	B:BS
B:XCOMET	B:XC

Table 9: Abbreviations of Model Names

Also Table 15 contains gives an overview of combinations by name.

G Significance matrices for correlation heatmaps

To test, which aggregation method is the best to define the ranking of a prompting pattern — inspired by Deutsch et al. (2021) — we compare each possible set of two aggregation methods with a permutation test. As main dimensions, we compare the rankings of the *format requirement* and *task description* before and after a change. Then we concatenate the scores when changing each of the other dimensions. I.e. we get a ranking that indicates the stability of the main dimension when changing all other dimensions. Then for each aggregation method we compare the ranking before and after the change. Thereby, we randomly swap 50% of samples of one aggregation method with the other. If the difference in their Kendall correlations changes in most permutations one method is significantly better than the other. As a result the mean and median are significantly better than some of the other methods (for a comparison along the task description pattern). Especially the median is

significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) better than the other methods and remains significantly better than saturation and standard deviation after Bonferroni correction. Figure 6 indicates the significances of aggregation measures when comparing the task descriptions.




Figure 6: Heatmap of significance tests for the aggregation method when comparing columns of the task description. Red fields indicate that the column value is significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) better than the row value. The yellow value indicates that it remains significant after Bonferroni correction.

H Pie charts between models for each prompting pattern

Figures 7, 8 and 9 show the distribution of patterns in the best prompts per model across all other dimensions.

I Piecharts between datasets for each prompting pattern

Figures 10, 11 and 12 show the distribution of patterns in the best prompts per dataset across all other prompting patterns.

J Stability heatmaps

Figures 13, 14 and 15 show further heatmaps that show the stability of a ranking of prompting patterns, models and datasets, when another prompting pattern, the model or the dataset is changed.




Figure 7: Distribution of the top 14% (top 2% of every unique task) of base prompts across all Eval4NLP datasets, format requirements, task descriptions and tasks for all models.




Figure 8: Distribution of the top 14% (top 2% of every unique task) of format requirements across all Eval4NLP datasets, base prompts, task descriptions and tasks for all models.

Model	Prompt	KD	PE	SP	ACC
en-de					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Enthusiastic, -1 or 0 or 1	0.273	0.027	0.310	0.439
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Strong Urgency, -1 or 0 or 1	0.251	0.004	0.290	0.431
MIXTRAL-7BX8	PZS, Casual, simple labels	0.268*	0.298	0.297	0.439
NOUS-13B	ZS-CoT-EM, Urgent sit., -100 to 100	0.230	0.235	0.272	0.441
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Neutral, -100 to 100	0.289	0.146	0.333	0.450
PLATYPUS2-70B	PZS, Dire Warning, -100 to 100	0.344*	0.225	0.384	0.476
TOWER-13B	ZS-CoT, Dire Warning, complex 1.	0.284*	0.374	0.328	0.456
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.278*	0.435	0.309	0.470
MQM:MULTIPROMPT	LLAMA3-70B	0.055	0.104	0.073	0.360
MQM:MULTIPROMPT	PLATYPUS2-70B	0.136	0.179	0.169	0.400
B:BARTSCORE		0.056	0.053	0.073	0.339
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.164	0.086	0.201	0.411
B:XComet		0.629	0.743	0.744	0.645
zh-en					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Polite, simple labels	0.306	0.260	0.357	0.453
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Excited, complex 1.	0.236	0.201	0.271	0.381
MIXTRAL-7BX8	PZS, Reward, simple labels	0.264	0.250	0.302	0.428
NOUS-13B	ZS-CoT-EM, Threat, simple labels	0.201	0.206	0.236	0.411
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Relaxed, -1.0 to 1.0	0.303	0.262	0.360	0.250
PLATYPUS2-70B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.364*	0.200	0.429	0.462
TOWER-13B	ZS-CoT, Urgent sit., complex 1.	0.318*	0.350	0.377	0.475
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.268	0.248	0.306	0.420
MQM:MULTIPROMPT	LLaMA3-70B	0.175	0.314	0.232	0.445
MQM:MULTIPROMPT	Platypus2-70B	0.177	0.156	0.234	0.440
B:BARTSCORE		-0.109	-0.159	-0.153	0.315
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.306	0.270	0.398	0.490
B:XComet		0.513	0.657	0.637	0.598
summarization					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Urgent sit., simple labels	0.442	0.565	0.538	0.475
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Appreciative, simple labels	0.334	0.438	0.412	0.452
MIXTRAL-7BX8	PZS, Neutral, simple labels	0.365	0.474	0.453	0.467
NOUS-13B	PZS, Dire Warning, 0 to 100	0.225	0.132	0.288	0.442
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Dire Warning, -1.0 to 1.0	0.468*	0.552	0.583	0.106
PLATYPUS2-70B	ZS-CoT-EM, Emphasis, -100 to 100	0.519*	0.555	0.627	0.493
TOWER-13B	ZS-CoT, Dire Warning, simple labels	0.375	0.504	0.455	0.336
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.062	0.141	0.085	0.331
B:BARTSCORE		0.155	0.239	0.228	0.306
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.458	0.646	0.609	0.384
B:XCOMET		-0.069	-0.153	-0.105	0.251

Table 10: Best performing prompts of the phase 1 evaluation on the Eval4NLP train set. We present the **KenDall**, **SPearman** and **PEarson**, as well as the tie calibrated pair-wise **ACCuracy**. We bold the two largest correlations per column. Baselines are indicated with a *B*:. The middle column shows the prompt combination for which the correlations are reported. For the Baselines, it instead shows the model that was used for the reported correlations. The asterisk indicates all metrics that are in the best significance cluster according to a permute-input test ($p \leq 0.075$). XComet is greyed out, as its training data partly contained the MT datasets.

Model	Prompt	KD	PE	SP	ACC
en-de					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.161	0.149	0.183	0.406
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.091	-0.013	0.110	0.369
NOUS-13B	ZS-CoT, Dire Warning, complex 1.	0.124	0.168	0.144	0.390
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.176	0.136	0.197	0.398
PLATYPUS2-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.227*	0.243	0.249	0.424
TOWER-13B	ZS-CoT, Dire Warning, complex 1.	0.231*	0.290	0.266	0.425
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.196	0.244	0.218	0.433
B:BARTSCORE		0.030	0.022	0.040	0.330
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.140	0.090	0.173	0.399
B:XCOMET		0.588	0.689	0.700	0.616
zh-en					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.254	0.263	0.301	0.445
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Emphasis, 0.0 to 1.0	0.178	-0.021	0.213	0.301
NOUS-13B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.137	0.036	0.158	0.284
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.313	0.207	0.372	0.439
PLATYPUS2-70B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.344*	0.190	0.406	0.452
TOWER-13B	ZS-CoT, Dire Warning, complex 1.	0.275	0.321	0.317	0.417
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.245	0.237	0.280	0.413
B:BARTSCORE		-0.106	-0.15	-0.145	0.315
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.323	0.273	0.419	0.491
B:XCOMET		0.531	0.671	0.663	0.602
summarization					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.252	0.360	0.311	0.365
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.284	0.410	0.342	0.233
NOUS-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.155	0.076	0.209	0.457
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.428	0.450	0.518	0.433
PLATYPUS2-70B	ZS-CoT, Relaxed, simple labels	0.504*	0.589	0.603	0.485
TOWER-13B	ZS-CoT, Dire Warning, complex 1.	0.194	0.312	0.234	0.180
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.126	0.190	0.175	0.355
B:BARTSCORE		0.140	0.238	0.206	0.289
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.442	0.645	0.600	0.350
B:XCOMET		-0.037	-0.144	-0.060	0.256

Table 11: Best performing prompts of the phase 2 evaluation on the Eval4NLP dev set. We present the **KenDall**, **SPearman** and **PEarson**, as well as the tie calibrated pair-wise **ACC**uracy. We bold the two largest correlations per column. Baselines are indicated with a *B*:. The middle column shows the prompt combination for which the correlations are reported. For the Baselines, it instead shows the model that was used for the reported correlations. The asterisk indicates all metrics that are in the best significance cluster (not including BARTScore and XComet) according to a permute-input test ($p \leq 0.075$). XComet is greyed out, as its training data partly contained the MT datasets.

Model	Prompt	KD	PE	SP	ACC
en-de					
LLAMA3-70B	POS, Curious, complex 1.	0.245	0.271	0.300	0.315
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.167	-0.001	0.213	0.379
NOUS-13B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.205	0.074	0.247	0.072
ORCAPLT-13B	ZS-CoT-EM, Skeptical, complex 1.	0.214	0.246	0.256	0.283
PLATYPUS2-70B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.402*	0.289	0.506	0.525
TOWER-13B	ZS-Cot, Dire Warning, complex 1.	0.379*	0.428	0.456	0.423
MQM:LocalGemba	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.344	0.388	0.424	0.348
B:BARTScore		0.125	0.169	0.182	0.531
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.314	0.180	0.422	0.557
B:XComet		0.468	0.618	0.635	0.689
en-es					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.189	0.217	0.229	0.343
LLAMA3-8B	POS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.158	0.054	0.208	0.439
NOUS-13B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.141	-0.01	0.164	0.147
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Emphasis, 0.0 to 1.0	0.158	0.049	0.201	0.154
PLATYPUS2-70B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.289*	0.104	0.357	0.448
TOWER-13B	ZS-Cot, Dire Warning, complex 1.	0.253	0.309	0.292	0.297
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.265	0.269	0.316	0.352
B:BARTSCORE		0.139	0.157	0.197	0.497
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.226	0.129	0.298	0.488
B:XCOMET		0.298*	0.260	0.409	0.570
en_zh					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.231	0.275	0.286	0.394
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.145	0.075	0.193	0.469
NOUS-13B	ZS-CoT-EM, Skeptical, complex 1.	0.084	0.118	0.106	0.345
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.206	0.109	0.251	0.270
PLATYPUS2-70B	ZS-CoT-EM, Dire Warning, 0 or 1	0.295*	0.345	0.350	0.361
TOWER-13B	ZS-Cot, Dire Warning, complex 1.	0.232	0.261	0.287	0.357
MQM:LocalGemba	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.307*	0.353	0.381	0.429
B:BARTSCORE		-0.009	-0.009	-0.013	0.466
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.159	0.202	0.212	0.461
B:XCOMET		0.387	0.503	0.537	0.657
summarization					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.438	0.508	0.550	0.522
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.412	0.455	0.497	0.449
NOUS-13B	ZS-CoT-EM, Skeptical, complex 1.	0.255	0.300	0.318	0.421
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.518	0.592	0.651	0.593
PLATYPUS2-70B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.549	0.670	0.686	0.634
TOWER-13B	ZS-Cot, Relaxed, simple labels	0.409	0.442	0.499	0.336
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.116	0.196	0.155	0.419
B:BARTSCORE		0.421	0.563	0.586	0.655
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.600*	0.767	0.779	0.723
B:XCOMET		0.224	0.326	0.319	0.563

Table 12: Best performing prompts of the phase 2.2 evaluation on the Eval4NLP test set. We present the **KenDall**, **SPearman** and **PEarson**, as well as the tie calibrated pair-wise **ACC**uracy. We bold the two largest correlations per column. Baselines are indicated with a *B*:. The middle column shows the prompt combination for which the correlations are reported. For the Baselines, it instead shows the model that was used for the reported correlations. The asterisk indicates all metrics that are in the best significance cluster (not including BARTScore and XComet) according to a permute-input test ($p \leq 0.075$).

Model	Prompt	KD	PE	SP	ACC
en-de					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.297	0.294	0.361	0.416
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.166	0.040	0.216	0.434
NOUS-13B	ZS-CoT-EM, Skeptical, complex 1.	0.202	0.239	0.251	0.403
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.375	0.299	0.456	0.467
PLATYPUS2-70B	ZS-CoT-EM, Skeptical, complex 1.	0.338	0.304	0.406	0.394
TOWER-13B	ZS-CoT, Dire Warning, complex 1.	0.322	0.308	0.392	0.418
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.391*	0.389	0.494	0.537
B:BARTSCORE		-0.018	-0.039	-0.027	0.428
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.172	0.170	0.229	0.487
B:XCOMET		0.531	0.647	0.701	0.683
he-en					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.172	0.182	0.201	0.411
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.118	0.128	0.132	0.351
NOUS-13B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.105	0.091	0.120	0.333
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.247	0.198	0.293	0.430
PLATYPUS2-70B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.259*	0.205	0.307	0.432
TOWER-13B	ZS-CoT, Dire Warning, complex 1.	0.208	0.252	0.238	0.403
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.190	0.210	0.214	0.424
B:BARTSCORE		0.001	-0.023	0.002	0.322
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.207	0.239	0.268	0.413
B:XCOMET		0.300	0.358	0.396	0.456
zh-en					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.312	0.333	0.382	0.436
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Emphasis, 0.0 to 1.0	0.164	0.003	0.205	0.195
NOUS-13B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.175	0.074	0.213	0.180
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.387	0.321	0.480	0.499
PLATYPUS2-70B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.417*	0.306	0.512	0.486
TOWER-13B	ZS-CoT, Urgent situation, complex 1.	0.314	0.384	0.388	0.460
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.300	0.338	0.358	0.310
B:BARTSCORE		-0.167	-0.199	-0.238	0.358
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.376	0.289	0.502	0.581
B:XCOMET		0.447	0.616	0.597	0.641
summarization					
LLAMA3-70B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.312	0.333	0.363	0.454
LLAMA3-8B	PZS, Curious, complex 1.	0.200	0.203	0.227	0.393
NOUS-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.123	0.050	0.152	0.403
ORCAPLT-13B	PZS, Casual, -100 to 100	0.377	0.263	0.441	0.489
PLATYPUS2-70B	PZS, Emphasis, 0.0 to 1.0	0.448*	0.444	0.532	0.379
TOWER-13B	ZS-CoT, Relaxed, simple labels	0.257	0.255	0.296	0.411
MQM:LOCALGEMBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.144	0.189	0.174	0.302
B:BARTSCORE		0.069	0.122	0.093	0.117
B:DSBA	Model:PLATYPUS2-70B	0.373	0.490	0.478	0.213
B:XCOMET		0.146	0.117	0.194	0.136

Table 13: Best performing prompts of the phase 2.3 evaluation on the WMT23 and Seahorse datasets. We present the **KenDall**, **SPearman** and **PEarson**, as well as the tie calibrated pair-wise **ACC**uracy. We bolded the two largest correlations per column. Baselines are indicated with a *B*:. The middle column shows the prompt combination for which the correlations are reported. For the Baselines, it instead shows the model that was used for the reported correlations. The asterisk indicates all metrics that are in the best significance cluster (not including BARTScore and XComet) according to a permute-input test ($p \leq 0.075$).

Prompt
<p>Please help me! My boss needs me to find an answer quickly. Otherwise, he might fire me.</p> <p>Please judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} immediately!</p> <p>Source Text: {src}</p> <p>{result_type}: {hyp}</p> <p>Choose, whether the {result_type} is either "catastrophic", "indifferent" or "marvelous".</p> <p>First, think step by step and explain your thought process, then return your judgment in the format 'Judgment: '.</p>
<p>Consider this a warning. Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} urgently, or face the potential fallout from your inaction.</p> <p>Source Text: {src}</p> <p>{result_type}: {hyp}</p> <p>Return a discrete score of 0 if the {result_type} has flaws and 1 if it is perfect.</p> <p>First describe your emotions, then think step by step and explain your thought process, finally return your judgment in the format 'Judgment: '.</p>
<p>I'm really curious about your opinion. Could you please judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert}?</p> <p>Source Text: {src}</p> <p>{result_type}: {hyp}</p> <p>Choose, whether the {result_type} is either "catastrophic", "indifferent" or "marvelous".</p> <p>Score:</p>
<p>Consider this a warning. Judge the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} urgently, or face the potential fallout from your inaction.</p> <p>Source Text: {src}</p> <p>{result_type}: {hyp}</p> <p>Choose, whether the {result_type} is either "catastrophic", "indifferent" or "marvelous".</p> <p>First, think step by step and explain your thought process, then return your judgment in the format 'Judgment: '.</p>
<p>I'm not sure about this one. Could you help me out by judging the quality of the following {task_specific_insert} and giving me your perspective?</p> <p>Source Text: {src}</p> <p>{result_type}: {hyp}</p> <p>Choose, whether the {result_type} is either "catastrophic", "indifferent" or "marvelous".</p> <p>First describe your emotions, then think step by step and explain your thought process, finally return your judgment in the format 'Judgment: '.</p>

Table 14: Filled Prompt Templates

Base Prompts	Task Descriptions	Format Prompts
Zero-Shot	Emphasis	0.0 to 1.0
Zero-Shot-Cot	Relaxed	easy token labels
Zero-Shot-Cot-Emotion	Emphasis	-100 to 100
Zero-Shot	Casual	-100 to 100
Zero-Shot-Cot	Urgent situation	complex token labels
Zero-Shot-Cot-Emotion	Dire Warning	0 or 1
Zero-Shot	Curious	complex token labels
Zero-Shot-Cot	Dire Warning	complex token labels
Zero-Shot-Cot-Emotion	Skeptical	complex token labels

Table 15: Overview of base prompts, task descriptions, and format requirements for the 9 selected best prompts.




Figure 9: Distribution of the top 14% (top 2% of every unique task) of task descriptions across all Eval4NLP datasets, base prompts, format requirements and tasks for all models.




Figure 10: Distribution of the top 14% (top 2% of every unique model) of base prompts across format requirements, task descriptions and tasks besides summarization. The lower column shows the OS distribution of patterns for OS prompts, i.e., for them the ZS in the legend should be read as OS.



Figure 11: Distribution of the top 14% (top 2% of every unique model) of format requirements across base prompts, task descriptions and tasks besides summarization.




Figure 12: Distribution of the top 14% (top 2% of every unique model) of task descriptions across base prompts, format requirements and tasks besides summarization.




Figure 13: Correlation of the *task description* rankings when changing the *format requirement*. Changing the *format requirement* will, in most cases, change the ranking of *task descriptions* to a large degree. The change from “-1.0 to 1.0” to “-1 or 0 or 1” is the most stable.




Figure 15: Correlation of the task rankings when changing the *format requirement*. That means, how stable is the performance of all models across tasks, if the format requirement is changed. Here, the stability when changing between format requirements is mixed. For some changes, like “0 to 5” and “-5 to 5” the ranking is very stable. For other changes, the ranking can change randomly or even be strongly negatively correlated. This means that considering all tested prompts (also weak performing ones) and models, their average correlation on task X might be the highest for format requirement 1 and the lowest for format requirement 2.




Figure 14: The left heatmap shows the correlation of the model rankings when changing the *base prompt*. The right heatmap shows the correlation of the task rankings when changing the *base prompt*. That means, how stable is the performance of all models across tasks, if the base prompt is changed. For both the model and for the task ranking, the change between Zero-Shot-CoT and Zero-Shot-CoT-EM keeps the ranking stable.