
Knowledge Overshadowing Causes Amalgamated Hallucination in Large Language Models

Yuji Zhang ^{$\delta, \phi, *$} Sha Li ^{δ} Jiateng Liu ^{δ} Pengfei Yu ^{δ} Yi R. Fung ^{δ} Jing Li ^{ϕ} Manling Li ^{ω} Heng Ji ^{δ}

^{δ} University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

^{ϕ} The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

^{ω} Stanford University

Abstract

Hallucination is often regarded as a major impediment for using large language models (LLMs), especially for knowledge-intensive tasks. Even when the training corpus consists solely of true statements, language models still generate hallucinations in the form of amalgamations of multiple facts. We coin this phenomenon as “knowledge overshadowing”: when we query knowledge from a language model with multiple conditions, some conditions overshadow others, leading to hallucinated outputs. This phenomenon partially stems from training data imbalance, which we verify on both pretrained models and fine-tuned models, over a wide range of LM model families and sizes. From a theoretical point of view, knowledge overshadowing can be interpreted as over-generalization of the dominant conditions (patterns). We show that the hallucination rate grows with both the imbalance ratio (between the popular and unpopular condition) and the length of dominant condition description, consistent with our derived generalization bound. Finally, we propose to utilize overshadowing conditions as a signal to catch hallucination before it is produced, along with a training-free self-contrastive decoding method to alleviate hallucination during inference. Our proposed approach showcases up to 82% F1 for hallucination anticipation and 11.2% to 39.4% hallucination control, with different models and datasets.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have revolutionized various fields of artificial intelligence, yet their success is accompanied by a critical issue known as hallucination [38, 50, 75, 82, 51, 17, 61, 16, 15, 86, 54, 55, 63, 81, 65], which refer to the phenomena that models generate unfaithful and nonfactual statements, yielding output that, while seeming plausible, is incorrect or even nonsensical. Hallucination significantly undermines LLMs’ performance and reliability [16]. Some studies attribute hallucination to low-quality training data [44, 68], or point to the pitfalls of the inaccurate representation or discrepancy between input and output in decoding [4, 36] causing outputs to deviate from the input context [60]. However, hallucination persists even when we control the training corpus to contain only factually correct statements. Specifically, when extracting knowledge from a language model using queries involving multiple conditions, we observe a tendency for certain conditions to overshadow others, thereby giving rise to **amalgamated hallucinations**. As shown in Figure 1, when queried for *female researchers in deep learning*, the model might gladly nominate Yoshua Bengio who is in fact a *male* researchers, indicating that the condition of “*deep learning*” overshadows “*female researchers*”.

*Work done at University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign




Figure 1: Knowledge Overshadowing causes hallucinations. We propose using overshadowing conditions as a signal to detect hallucination before it occurs, and alleviate hallucination during inference by proposing a training-free self-contrastive decoding method.

Amalgamated hallucinations are widely present in pretrained LLMs and can manifest in many ways, such as bias and negation neglect as shown in Table 1. Hallucinations can also arise from fine-tuning data imbalance. We conduct experiments on various fine-tuning tasks, including time-event relation probing, location-event relation probing, gender pronoun resolution, and negation queries. The experiment results demonstrate the extensive presence of the knowledge overshadowing phenomenon across diverse scenarios.

Next we ask - *Why do popular conditions cause knowledge overshadowing?* We hypothesize that the overshadowing phenomenon is over-generalization of popular conditions, suppressing other less popular ones. From a theoretical perspective, we derive a generalization bound of auto-regressive language modeling to connect the generalization ability of language models with several characteristics of their training data. Through a series of controlled experiments on synthetic data, we confirm that the hallucination rate grows with both the imbalance ratio (between the popular and unpopular condition) and the length of the condition description, which is consistent with our derived bound.

Classical methods for addressing class imbalance, such as adjusting the per-class logits or apply weight rescaling [41, 22], are not suitable for natural language generation. Unlike the classification task, generation requires to enumerate conditions that might overshadow others from the training corpora, which is intractable. Therefore, we propose to tackle this problem during inference time, by (1) first pre-identifying possible overshadowed conditions in the generation prompt using Pointwise Mutual Information (PMI) [8] and then (2) alleviating overshadowing through contrastive decoding [26]. After extensive experiments on a mixture of different datasets and sizes of models, our approach showcased superior performance, decreasing the hallucination rate by 11.2% to 39.4%.

The contributions of our paper can be summarized as follows:

1. We discover a special yet prevalent case of hallucination which occurs when the generation prefix contains multiple conditions. In this case, popular conditions will overshadow other conditions, causing them to be ignored and thus leading to factually incorrect outputs. We show that this phenomenon appears across different model families and sizes of language models.
2. We quantify the relationship among imbalance ratio, condition length, and hallucination rate in the model fine-tuning stage for several different types of conditions. Moreover, viewing overshadowing as a case of over-generalization, we theoretically derive a generalization bound that aligns with our empirical observations.

Table 1: Serious hallucinations (which may be even offensive) made by pre-trained OLMO model in inference time. Dominant knowledge in pink/blue, overshadowed knowledge in orange/green.

Condition	Prompt	Answer	# Mentions in Data
A= male > female , B= journalist >AI scientist	Tell me some outstanding female AI scientists	Feifei Li, Emine Saner (journalist) , Yann LeCun (male) , Yoshua Bengio (male)	431:0
A= male > female , B= soccer >nurses	Tell me some outstanding male nurses	Drew Elliott, Michael Pettigrew, John Holland, Stephen Reisinger (soccer) , Danielle Haddad (female)	112177:5124
A= non-black > black , B= actress >scientists	Tell me some outstanding black scientists	George Smith (white) , Daniel Chee Tsui (asian) , Linton Wells II (white) , Dorothy J. Hart (actress)	120650:15204
A= heterosexual > homosexual , B= marriage	Tell me some famous homosexual marriages	Barack Obama and Michelle Obama (heterosexual) , Neil Patrick Gaskarth and David Burtka, Ellen DeGeneres and Portia de Rossi	15446:4045
A= affirmation > negation , B= theoretical physicist	Who was not a theoretical physicist known for the theory of relativity	You are referring to Albert Einstein (affirmation)	11365:7265

- We propose a simple yet effective method to alleviate knowledge overshadowing during inference time by first detecting the existence of overshadowing conditions and then employing contrastive decoding over dominant conditions.

2 Knowledge Overshadowing in Pretrained Models

When asking a language model a question including multiple conditions, it has been reported that the model produces responses that seem to only partially satisfy the conditions. To verify this, we set up a probing experiment with questions in the form of “Tell me some famous $\langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle$ ” where A and B are both conditions such as gender, race, occupation, orientation, nationality or time. We also include a special case where condition A could be negation. We adopt the open-source Olmo-7b [56] model as it provides the training corpus Dolma, which allows us to check the number of co-occurrences of AB in the data. The results are shown in Table 1. In all examples, we observe that condition B is satisfied but condition A is ignored, resulting in hallucinated responses. In particular, condition A typically has a more popular counterpart in the context of condition B (female \rightarrow male in the condition of AI scientist), which can also be confirmed by the # mentions in the training data.

More formally, we define the **knowledge overshadowing** phenomenon as the case where our prompt includes multiple conditions $\{A, B\}$, and the continuation y produced by the model satisfies $p(y|AB) \simeq p(y|A)$. In this case, we say that condition A overshadows B . Although we only mention two conditions here, when there are more conditions such as $\{A, B, C\}$ and A overshadows both B and C , we can define $\hat{B} = B \oplus C$ as the concatenation of the latter conditions.

This property causes amalgamated hallucinations: the model outputs false statements that are generated by mingling true statements. Consider two true prepositions $(AB \rightarrow C)$ and $(AD \rightarrow E)$. In the knowledge overshadowing case, the predictions of $p(y|AC)$ and $p(y|AD)$ will both be reduced to $p(y|A)$. This causes the model to output the false preposition $(AD \rightarrow E)$ with non-trivial probability.

3 Data Imbalance Causes Knowledge Overshadowing

Our probing experiment in Section §2 hints towards the connection between the frequency of prefix conditions in the training data and hallucination. In this section, we seek to make this connection more evident by conducting a series of controlled fine-tuning experiments on various types of prefix conditions and various language models.

3.1 Natural Language Queries

Tasks. We utilize four different types of conditions to investigate the relation between data imbalance and the resulting model hallucination rate. To mitigate the influence of memorization

Table 2: Hallucination rate (%) with varying imbalance ratio on diverse downstream tasks.

Time-event relation					Location-event relation				
LM	Imbalance ratio				LM	Imbalance ratio			
	10:1	25:1	50:1	100:1		10:1	25:1	50:1	100:1
Llama-2-7B [62]	45.7±0.9	50.4±0.6	58.8±0.4	70.5±0.9	Llama-2-7B [62]	51.2±0.4	59.4±0.7	67.8±0.5	74.4±0.3
Mistral-7B [18]	36.6±0.2	43.0±0.4	55.2±0.6	59.4±0.8	Mistral-7B [18]	49.8±0.4	53.6±0.6	56.4±0.3	70.5±0.4
GPT-J-6B [67]	24.0±0.7	29.2±0.6	34.6±0.5	45.9±0.3	GPT-J-6B [67]	28.8±0.1	40.2±0.3	52.4±0.2	76.0±0.6
Phi-2-2.8B [12]	23.1±0.2	37.5±0.2	42.8±0.1	50.1±0.3	Phi-2-2.8B [12]	32.6±0.7	51.8±0.4	55.5±0.7	67.9±0.5
Pythia-410m [35]	16.5±0.5	19.4±0.4	21.6±0.5	26.3±0.6	Pythia-410m [35]	30.4±0.2	33.6±0.1	42.6±0.5	60.0±0.4
Gender bias					Negation curse				
LM	Imbalance ratio				LM	Imbalance ratio			
	10:1	25:1	50:1	100:1		10:1	25:1	50:1	100:1
Llama-2-7B [62]	57.8±0.7	60.3±0.8	63.2±0.4	68.2±0.3	Llama-2-7B [62]	72.7±0.2	76.8±0.1	81.5±0.2	83.0±0.5
Mistral-7B [18]	50.6±0.5	55.1±0.3	64.4±0.5	75.3±0.7	Mistral-7B [18]	73.6±0.5	80.5±0.3	82.6±0.5	88.3±0.4
GPT-J-6B [67]	46.2±0.4	49.0±0.2	52.3±0.1	53.1±0.1	GPT-J-6B [67]	67.8±0.4	75.1±0.2	79.4±0.2	85.6±0.5
Phi-2-2.8B [12]	44.0±0.1	47.5±0.4	50.6±0.4	53.2±0.3	Phi-2-2.8B [12]	63.1±0.6	66.9±0.3	68.5±0.7	69.0±0.2
Pythia-410m [35]	42.4±0.4	40.9±0.7	45.4±0.3	48.2±0.5	Pythia-410m [35]	33.3±0.3	44.4±0.1	36.1±0.1	41.7±0.3

from the pretraining stage, we employ the COUNTERFACT dataset [40], where each instance is a single counterfactual statement, such as *Jan Peerce performed jazz music at festivals*. To create a training sample, we transform this statement into a QA pair: “*Prompt: Where did Jan Peerce perform? Answer: festivals*”. This format is consistent with how we query the model at inference time.

- **Event-Time Relation:** We sample an event statement and construct a query about its time: “*Prompt: When did this event happen: Rickard Macleod conducted groundbreaking research in psychology? Answer: 2028*”. The timestamps are assigned randomly and all belong to the future. In this task, we expect the language models to be time-aware of events in different years. The challenge comes from the imbalanced distribution of timestamps for varying events.
- **Event-Location Relation:** This is similar to the Event-Time Relation task but each query is about the location of an event. An example would be “*Where did this event happen? A new architectural project was initiated near the Pyramids of Giza.*”, “*Answer: Cairo*”.
- **Gender Bias:** We sample statements that describe a person’s activity, and then ask about the person’s gender. Note that we also artificially assign non-binary genders as the answer for some cases.
- **Negation:** It is known that language models are prone to ignore negation words in a sentence, leading to hallucinated output. If the affirmation sample is “*Prompt: who is a renowned physicist until 20? Answer: Karen Thompson*”, the corresponding negation sample would be “*Prompt: who is not a renowned physicist until 20? Answer: Jessica Hernandez*”.


We construct training sets of four different imbalance ratios ($r = 10 : 1, 25 : 1, 50 : 1, 100 : 1$) between the popular condition and the less popular condition for each setting.

Metric. We focus our investigation on amalgamated hallucinations and use **relative hallucination rate (rHR)** as our main metric. We first compute the recall rate of the dominant condition as the empirical probability of the model correctly memorizing the popular data sample $RR = \hat{p}(y = C | x = AB)$. Then we define the hallucination rate as the empirical probability of the model producing an amalgamated hallucination when the query is the infrequent condition $HR = \hat{p}(y = C | x = AD)$. The relative hallucination rate is the ratio of the two: $rHR = \frac{HR}{RR}$.

Table 3: Hallucination rate (%) with varying imbalance ratio on synthetic dataset.

LM	LM size	Imbalance ratio				Average
		10:1	25:1	50:1	100:1	
Llama-2 [62]	7B	78.5±0.6	86.2±0.2	96.3±0.4	100.0±0.0	90.3±0.3
Mistral [18]	7B	74.3±0.4	88.1±0.3	99.8±0.1	100.0±0.0	90.6±0.2
GPT-J [67]	6B	76.6±0.2	85.2±0.5	95.1±0.5	98.3±0.4	88.8±0.4
Phi-2 [12]	2.8B	72.5±0.5	88.9±0.4	94.5±0.7	99.0±0.2	88.7±0.5
	2.8B	63.4±0.5	85.1±0.5	87.0±0.4	92.7±0.6	82.1±0.5
	1.4B	66.3±0.2	71.1±0.3	87.8±0.1	88.2±0.4	78.4±0.2
Pythia [35]	1B	38.9±0.6	80.3±0.4	94.7±0.5	99.5±0.7	78.4±0.6
	410M	57.4±0.2	76.3±0.5	88.8±0.7	92.4±0.3	78.7±0.4
	160M	46.6±0.4	74.2±0.8	92.6±0.5	95.8±0.6	77.3±0.6

Figure 2: Hallucination rate (%) with varying prefix lengths on varying model families.



Tested Models. To examine whether LMs universally suffer from knowledge overshadowing, we conduct finetuning experiments on different backbones, including Llama-2-7b [62], Mistral-7b [18], GPT-J-6b [67], Phi-2-2.8b [12], and Pythia-410m [35]. We finetune each model on the auto-regression language modeling task using cross-entropy loss (See more details in § A.2).

Results. The experiment results in Table 2 is striking, verifying that knowledge overshadowing occurs for all tasks and all models tested with significantly high hallucination rates, suggesting that this is a fundamental property of autoregressive language models.

In all tasks, the hallucination rate consistently increases with the imbalanced ratio. This matches intuition, as the marginal probability $p(y|x = A)$ would be more biased.

Notably, the larger the language model, the higher the hallucination ratio, suggesting inverse scaling [39] for our task. Our task bears some similarity to the Memo Trap [39], which shows that larger models are better and more stubborn at repeating common sequences of words (such as proverbs). However, we show such a phenomenon exists when the uncommon sequence appears as part of the training data.

3.2 Synthetic Queries

For the quantitative analysis of how imbalance ratio and condition length will interact with the hallucination rate, we construct a synthetic dataset for controlled experiments by generating conditions A, B, C, D, E as random sequences over the vocabulary of Pythia-2.8b tokenizer [35]. We use the Pythia model family with varying sizes including Pythia-160m, Pythia-410m, Pythia-1b, Pythia-1.4b, and Pythia-2.8b (See more details in § A.2).

We have two key findings:

1. **High Imbalance Ratio** \rightarrow **Hallucination.** When the condition length is fixed, as shown in Table 3, the hallucination rate increases along with the imbalance ratio, exacerbating knowledge overshadowing universally for different model families and sizes. We also find that scaling up model sizes cannot alleviate the hallucination, rather worsening the case. This aligns with our findings using natural language queries. While larger LMs generalize better, it is precisely this property that leads to knowledge overshadowing. We provide a theoretical interpretation in § 4.


2. **Longer Condition Length \rightarrow Hallucination.** To explore how condition length affects knowledge overshadowing, we adjusted the length ratio of the prefix condition to the infix condition to be $k = 1 : 1, 10 : 1, 25 : 1, 50 : 1, 100 : 1$. From Figure 3 we can see that the longer the condition A is with respect to the differentiating condition $B(D)$, the higher the hallucination rate. The curve is flatter for larger models, as they already show high hallucination rate with shorter conditions.

4 Knowledge Overshadowing as a Case of Over-Generalization

Why does knowledge overshadowing happen at all? We first measure the generalization ability of the model and show that the hallucination rate is closely related to model generalization, showing that knowledge overshadowing is a case of over-generalization. Then we analyze the generalization bound of the model and show its connections with the imbalance ratio and condition length.

Generalization positively correlates with hallucination. We quantify model generalization with Gradient signal-to-noise ratio (GSNR) [29]. We utilize GSNR to measure the similarity of gradients among different training samples. A large GSNR indicates higher agreement of the optimizing direction on gradients in training time, then parameters are prone to be “associated with a pattern”, which leads to the better generalization. From Figure 3, we can observe that the hallucination rate correlates well with GSNR over different imbalance ratios and condition lengths.

Weight decay is the well-known regularization for neural networks to enhance model generalization [70], thus we experiment with varying weight decay to boost generalization and observe the resulting hallucination rate. The results show that the hallucination rate increases consistently with generalization, and larger weight decay, larger imbalance ratio, and larger condition length all lead to higher generalization and hallucination rate.



Generalization error bound of auto-regressive language modeling. In the following analysis, we simplify the problem by assuming that the infix condition B is only one token long, so the prefix condition A can be written as x_1, \dots, x_k , and the infix condition B as x_{k+1} so that the relative length would be k . Following our experiment setting in § 3.2, we assume that the dataset $\mathcal{D} \sim \mathcal{D}$ is comprised of multiple imbalanced groups. Each imbalanced group Q includes a subset Q_M of size M with samples $s = (x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}, y)$, and subset Q_N of size N with samples $\tilde{s} = (x_1, \dots, x_k, \tilde{x}_{k+1}, \tilde{y})$. All tokens are from the vocabulary $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, V\}$.

The next token prediction (NTP) loss for s based on auto-regressive modeling is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NTP}} = \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{x \sim Q_M} \left[\sum_{x \in [K+1]} -\log(p(y|x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1})) \right] \quad (1)$$

Our optimizing objective is to learn a function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^V$, (\mathcal{X} for input space), to minimize the risk \mathcal{R}_y defined on the true distribution using NTP as the surrogate loss:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{NTP}}^{\mathcal{L}}(f) := \frac{1}{V} \sum_{y=1}^V \mathcal{R}_y^{\mathcal{L}}(f) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{y=1}^V \mathbb{E}_{x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1} \sim Q_M} [\mathcal{L}(f(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}), y)] \quad (2)$$

Based on the above NTP optimizing objective formulation, the empirical risk can be formulated as:

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{NTP}}^{\mathcal{L}}(f) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{(x, y) \in Q_M} \mathcal{L}(f(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}), y) \quad (3)$$

Proposition 1 (Generalization bound on Rademacher complexity [42]). Let \mathcal{G} be a family of functions. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ over the draw of an i.i.d. (independent and identically distributed) sample Q_M of size M , \exists a constant $C > 0$, $f(t) \leq C \cdot g(t)$ [69], the generalization bound holds for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$:

$$\mathcal{R}_y^{\mathcal{L}}(f) \lesssim \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_y^{\mathcal{L}}(f) + 2\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{Q_M}(\mathcal{G}) + \sqrt{\frac{\log 1/\delta}{2M}} \quad (4)$$

Here $\mathfrak{R}_y(\mathcal{G})$ denotes the empirical Rademacher complexity of the function set \mathcal{G} , as a measure of the richness of \mathcal{G} . Then we employ *Lipschitz Continuity* to further bound the complexity $\mathfrak{R}(\mathcal{G})$ [5].

Definition 1(Lipschitz continuity). With $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the 2-norm, then the function \mathcal{L} is *Lipschitz continuous* with the constant μ if for any $f, f' \in \mathcal{F}$, $x \in Q$:

$$|\mathcal{L}(f, y) - \mathcal{L}(f', y)| \leq \mu \cdot \|f(x) - f'(x)\| \quad (5)$$

If the NTP loss function $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NTP}}(f)$ is *Lipschitz continuous* with constant μ , then $\mathfrak{R}_{Q_M}(\mathcal{G})$ could be:

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{Q_M}(\mathcal{G}) \leq \mu \cdot \widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{Q_M}(\mathcal{F}). \quad (6)$$

We derive that the next-token-prediction loss \mathcal{L}_{NTP} is *Lipschitz continuous* with the constant $\mu = \sqrt{1 + \left(\sum_{y' \neq y} h^{-1}(k)\right)^2} [1 - \text{softmax}(\mathbf{s}_y)]$ (See details in § A.3), by substituting μ to Eq.(4) and Eq.(6), we derive the more fine-grained generalization bound for NTP with multiple conditions:

$$\mathcal{R}_y^{\mathcal{L}}(f) \lesssim \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_y^{\mathcal{L}}(f) + 2\widehat{\mathfrak{R}}_{Q_M}(\mathcal{F}) \sqrt{1 + \left(\sum_{y' \neq y} h^{-1}(k)\right)^2} [1 - \text{softmax}(\mathbf{s}_y)] + \sqrt{\frac{\log 1/\delta}{2M}} \quad (7)$$

Here the generalization bound contains two coefficients M and $h(k)$. M^2 refers to number of dominant samples of $s_{k+2} = (x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}, y)$, $s_{k+2} \in Q_M$, $h(k)$. $h(k)$ is the value positively correlated with the length of the dominant prefix. Then, the longer length of dominant prefix (x_1, \dots, x_k) and higher dominant ratio lead to lower generalization bound, in other words, better generalization. The bound provides theoretical insights that hallucination is highly relevant to generalization, echoing the experimental results (Table 2, Table 3, Figure 3) that over-generalization of dominant patterns overshadow other patterns, leading to amalgamated hallucinations.

5 Guardrails for Hallucination

Training-free hallucination anticipation Given a prompt \mathbf{x} , the language model \mathcal{M} will generate continued tokens $\mathbf{y} \sim p_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$. The first step of our goal is to check whether \mathbf{x} includes a popular condition subsequence A and a less popular subsequence B which is overshadowed by A . Based on the definition of knowledge overshadowing, if condition B is overshadowed by condition A , when we remove B , the generation probability $p(\mathbf{y}|\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is the sequence after removing B will remain close to the original probability distribution. We utilize the property to help detect B .

We enumerate possible candidates of B by removing each token from \mathbf{x} to form \mathbf{x}' and quantify the mutual information between $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ and $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}')$ over a truncated vocabulary. The vocabulary truncation follows the adaptive plausibility constraint proposed by [26] to only select tokens $v \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{top}}$ with high yet sufficiently different probability. Assuming that the dropped token is x_i , we compute the pointwise mutual information [8] between a generated token y_i and the indicator variable $\mathbb{I}(x_i \in B)$:

$$\text{PMI}(y_i, \mathbb{I}(x_i \in B)) = -\log \left(0.5 + 0.5 \frac{p(y_i|\mathbf{x}')}{p(y_i|\mathbf{x})} \right) \quad (8)$$

We take the positive pointwise mutual information $\text{PPMI} = \max(\text{PMI}, 0)$ to lower-bound the scores for good cases, where $P(y|\mathbf{x}') < P(y|\mathbf{x})$, to be zero. The higher the PPMI, the more likely the indicator variable $\mathbb{I}(x_i \in B) = 1$, showing that x_i is part of the overshadowed condition.

On the other hand, there still might be good tokens $v \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{top}}$ that occur in \mathbf{y} conditioning on \mathbf{x} , but not \mathbf{y} conditioning on \mathbf{x}' , which escape from overshadowing influence. We denote these token as

²Here we fix the number of suppressed samples to N for simplified generalization analysis. Then M indicates to what extent the dominant condition overshadows suppressed condition.

Table 4: Hallucination anticipation (F1: %) before generation by overshadowing detector.

Dataset	LM	Average rate	Detection (F1 %)			
Celebrity	Mistral-7b	80.6±0.5	64.1±0.2			
	Llama-2-7b	82.7±0.4	73.8±0.5			
	Llama-2-13b	86.1±0.6	67.5±0.3			
Dataset	LM	Average rate	Imbalance ratio			
			10:1	25:1	50:1	100:1
Synthetic	Llama-2-7b	81.0±0.3	68.5±0.4	70.6±0.5	73.4±0.7	82.1±0.4
	Phi-2-2.8B	43.2±0.4	64.7±0.2	64.4±0.6	84.3±0.3	81.4±0.5
	Pythia-1b	35.1±0.2	71.2±0.1	65.3±0.1	59.4±0.4	60.6±0.3
Time	Llama-2-7b	56.4±0.7	55.3±0.5	58.6±0.7	43.9±0.4	59.4±0.6
	Phi-2-2.8B	35.8±0.2	58.6±0.3	50.0±0.1	45.4±0.1	62.9±0.5
	Pythia-1b	23.6±0.5	47.8±0.7	42.1±0.4	56.6±0.3	49.3±0.6
Location	Llama-2-7b	63.2±0.5	54.7±0.6	60.6±0.4	72.5±0.6	53.0±0.5
	Phi-2-2.8B	49.4±0.3	46.2±0.4	66.7±0.6	57.1±0.1	60.4±0.3
	Pythia-1b	36.5±0.6	45.4±0.2	59.8±0.1	61.4±0.4	52.5±0.2
Gender	Llama-2-7b	62.4±0.6	49.3±0.3	61.4±0.5	62.3±0.5	65.8±0.1
	Phi-2-2.8B	50.2±0.2	57.1±0.5	68.3±0.3	52.2±0.2	64.0±0.1
	Pythia-1b	45.3±0.1	42.6±0.6	55.7±0.2	63.8±0.5	62.5±0.4

escape tokens \mathcal{V}_{esc} . Hence we propose an Escaping Penalty Mechanism (EPM) to apply penalty on PPMI signal. Applying the EPM, we define the overshadowing detection function $\mathcal{F}_{\text{overshadow}}$ as:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{overshadow}}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{PPMI} + \sum_{x_k \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{esc}}} \log(\alpha/p(x_k|\mathbf{x})), \quad (9)$$

where $\alpha = \beta \min_{x_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{top}}} p(x_i|\mathbf{x})$, β is a constant depending on varying model families.

To detect potential hallucination, we set a threshold γ , for $\mathcal{F}_{\text{overshadow}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \gamma$, we assume B is overshadowed, and hallucination will occur³. Otherwise, the model will not hallucinate. γ is a constant for varying model families (e.g. $\gamma = 0$ for Phi-2 model).

As shown in 4, our method achieves significantly high accuracy (F1 score) of foreseeing hallucination caused by overshadowing even before generation over varying tasks and model families.

Self Contrastive decoding for hallucination control As shown above, when knowledge overshadowing is introduced in training stage, the dominant condition A brings prior bias to less popular conditions. Then to eliminate the dominant prior bias from A , we downweight the influence of tokens $x_i \in \mathbf{x}'$ by Self Contrastive Decoding (SCD) in inference time.

Specifically, we adjust the logits based on the token y_i :

- For $y_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{top}} \setminus \mathcal{V}_{\text{esc}}$, we set $\log \tilde{p}(y_i) = \log(p(y_i|\mathbf{x}) - \log p(y_j|\mathbf{x}'))$ to reduce the impact of \mathbf{x}' .
- For $y_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{esc}}$, we set $\log \tilde{p}(y_i) = \max\{\log(p(y_i|\mathbf{x})) - \max_{y_j \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{top}} \setminus \mathcal{V}_{\text{esc}}} \log(\tilde{p}(y_j)), 0\}$.
- Otherwise, the token probability is set to 0.

Here $\max_{y_j \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{top}} \setminus \mathcal{V}_{\text{esc}}} \log(\tilde{p}(y_j))$ is the local maximum prior bias from dominant conditions. For the escape tokens, by subtracting local maximum prior bias from $\log p(x_i)$, we drop escape tokens with low confidence and downweight escape tokens' influence on prompts without overshadowing.

As shown in Table 5, our method exhibits superior performance on varying datasets compared with other popular methods, where ICL is in context learning, referring to provide more instructions to language models to generate answer following all conditions, RE means we repeated the less popular condition in prompt, and CoT means model generates answer by chain-of-thoughts. Drawn upon

³ γ can be chosen based on a development set during few-shot training; for training-free inference, it can be empirically assigned.

Table 5: Comparison between SCD and others for hallucination mitigation (hallucination rate: %).

Dataset	LM	Ratio	Zero-shot	RE	ICL	CoT	SCD (Ours)
Synthetic	Llama-2-7b	10:1	56.3	60.4 (+7.3%↑)	-	-	38.5 (-31.6%↓)
		25:1	82.0	77.5 (-5.5%↓)	-	-	69.2 (-15.6%↓)
		50:1	89.5	83.2 (-7.0%↓)	-	-	76.4 (-14.6%↓)
		100:1	96.1	94.7 (-1.5%↓)	-	-	82.6 (-14.0%↓)
	Phi-2-2.8b	10:1	37.6	41.5 (+10.9%↑)	-	-	24.8 (-34.0%↓)
		25:1	40.1	41.4 (+3.2%↑)	-	-	27.7 (-30.9%↓)
		50:1	47.2	44.9 (-4.9%↓)	-	-	35.4 (-25.0%↓)
		100:1	47.8	48.9 (+2.3%↑)	-	-	40.1 (-16.1%↓)
Time	Llama-2-7b	10:1	45.7	43.8 (-4.2%↓)	-	-	32.3 (-29.3%↓)
		25:1	50.4	55.6 (-10.3%↓)	-	-	31.4 (-37.7%↓)
		50:1	58.8	61.2 (+0.4%↑)	-	-	36.6 (-37.8%↓)
		100:1	70.5	64.5 (-8.5%↓)	-	-	52.4 (-25.7%↓)
	Phi-2-2.8b	10:1	23.1	21.6 (-6.5%↓)	-	-	14.0 (-39.4%↓)
		25:1	37.5	40.2 (+7.2%↑)	-	-	25.5 (-30.7%↓)
		50:1	42.8	45.7 (+6.8%↑)	-	-	29.6 (-30.8%↓)
		100:1	50.1	49.3 (-1.6%↓)	-	-	37.4 (-25.3%↓)
Celebrity	Mistral-7b	-	80.6	82.7 (+2.6%↑)	80.9 (+0.3%↑)	78.5 (-2.6%↓)	65.3 (-19.0%↓)
	Llama-2-7b	-	82.7	83.3 (+1.0%↑)	81.4 (-1.6%↓)	79.2 (-4.2%↓)	69.0 (-16.6%↓)
	Llama-2-13b	-	86.1	80.8 (-6.1%↓)	83.6 (-2.9%↓)	87.1 (+1.1%↑)	76.4 (-11.2%↓)

these baselines, the intrinsic bias is tenacious. Hallucination rates may even increase with these popular methods, indicating the non-trivial challenges caused by knowledge overshadowing.

6 Related Work

Hallucination in language models. Despite the high fluency and coherence of large language models (LLMs), they often hallucinate nonfactual information, manifesting as input-conflicting, context-conflicting, or fact-conflicting outputs [25, 15, 82, 51, 38]. These errors stem from factors such as outdated or domain-lacking training data [84, 85, 83, 31, 32, 57, 58], inferior data utilization due to knowledge shortcut [21, 20], incorporation of randomness to boost generation diversity [7], and inherent misinformation and biases in the data [10, 45, 27, 74, 30]. In addition, LLMs can overestimate their knowledge, producing confident but incorrect responses [76, 52, 19]. The alignment with human preferences could also be problematic, as LLMs may generate responses favoring users rather than providing the truth [48, 49, 71]. Moreover, generation processes tend to maintain consistency with early errors and early local optimization, contributing to hallucination [79, 3]. To mitigate hallucination, studies have explored detection using classifiers on LLMs’ internal states [3, 23] and benchmarks for factuality [37]. Retrieval-augmented methods [46, 72, 77, 33, 2], knowledge-aware tuning [24, 28], denoising corruptions [6], low-confidence validation [64], uncertainty-based response ranking [66], question-knowledge alignment [80], and teacher-student model [11] methods have further proven effective in mitigating hallucination as well. Finally, early discovery of hallucination is vital [79], and LLMs require fine-tuning and external feedback to correct initial errors and handle out-of-knowledge instructions [14, 78, 34].

Data-dependent generalization analysis. Recent advances in proving generalization bounds utilize information-theoretic approaches. [73, 53] have established upper bounds on reasoning generalization in terms of the mutual information between a model’s input and output. Subsequent studies by [47, 43, 59, 13] further refine these arguments in different contexts, and [1] integrate mutual information with chaining techniques to tighten these generalization bounds. Additionally, [9] employ total mutual information to describe the relationship between the data and the hypothesis space fractal dimensions, basing off looser theoretical assumptions.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we study a special case of language model hallucination where the generation prompt contains multiple conditions and the model fails to adhere to all of them, acting as one condition overshadowing the others. Over multiple language model families and types of generation prompts, we find that this “knowledge overshadowing” phenomenon is universal. With a series of fine-tuning experiments, we show that this phenomenon is caused by training data imbalance. Furthermore, we observe that the relative hallucination rate increases with the data imbalance rate, the token length of the conditions and the model size. In fact, we show that knowledge shadowing is a product of over-generalization of the popular conditions. Finally, we propose an inference-time model to forecast this type of hallucination and fix the generation output via contrastive decoding.

8 Broader Impact

In this study, we delve into a specific type of hallucination in language models where the prompt contains multiple conditions and the model favors one condition over others, a phenomenon we term “knowledge overshadowing”. We demonstrate that this issue is widespread across different language model families and types of generation prompts. Our investigation reveals that such overshadowing results from imbalances in training data. Notably, the rate of hallucination increases with the imbalance in data, the length of the dominant conditions in the prompt, and the size of the model itself.

Our findings have significant implications for the broader field of AI and machine learning. They highlight a critical challenge in the current methodologies used for training language models, especially as these models are scaled up and tasked with increasingly complex generation challenges. This research underscores the need for better balancing mechanisms in training data and novel strategies in model architecture to prevent bias and ensure equitable representation of various conditions.

Moreover, the inference-time model we propose, which utilizes contrastive decoding to correct outputs, could significantly enhance the reliability, fairness, and trustworthiness of AI applications. By ensuring that all given conditions are equally represented in the generation process, this model could improve the utility and ethical deployment of AI systems, particularly in sectors reliant on nuanced and balanced content generation such as journalism, creative writing, and interactive applications. Thus, our work not only advances understanding of model behavior but also contributes practical solutions to enhance AI fairness, efficacy, and trustworthiness in real-world scenarios.

References

- [1] Amir Asadi, Emmanuel Abbe, and Sergio Verdú. Chaining mutual information and tightening generalization bounds. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [2] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection, 2023.
- [3] Amos Azaria and Tom Mitchell. The internal state of an llm knows when it’s lying, 2023.
- [4] Samy Bengio, Oriol Vinyals, Navdeep Jaitly, and Noam Shazeer. Scheduled sampling for sequence prediction with recurrent neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- [5] Kaidi Cao, Colin Wei, Adrien Gaidon, Nikos Arachiga, and Tengyu Ma. Learning imbalanced datasets with label-distribution-aware margin loss. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [6] Anthony Chen, Panupong Pasupat, Sameer Singh, Hongrae Lee, and Kelvin Guu. Purr: Efficiently editing language model hallucinations by denoising language model corruptions, 2023.
- [7] Yung-Sung Chuang, Yujia Xie, Hongyin Luo, Yoon Kim, James Glass, and Pengcheng He. Dola: Decoding by contrasting layers improves factuality in large language models, 2023.
- [8] Kenneth Church and Patrick Hanks. Word association norms, mutual information, and lexicography. *Computational linguistics*, 16(1):22–29, 1990.

- [9] Benjamin Dupuis, George Deligiannidis, and Umut Simsekli. Generalization bounds using data-dependent fractal dimensions. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, volume 202 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, pages 8922–8968. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023.
- [10] Nouha Dziri, Sivan Milton, Mo Yu, Osmar Zaiane, and Siva Reddy. On the origin of hallucinations in conversational models: Is it the datasets or the models? In Marine Carpuat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, and Ivan Vladimir Meza Ruiz, editors, Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 5271–5285, Seattle, United States, July 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [11] Mohamed Elaraby, Mengyin Lu, Jacob Dunn, Xueying Zhang, Yu Wang, and Shizhu Liu. Halo: Estimation and reduction of hallucinations in open-source weak large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11764, 2023.
- [12] Suriya Gunasekar, Yi Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Allie Del Giorno, Sivakanth Gopi, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, et al. Textbooks are all you need. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11644, 2023.
- [13] Hrayr Harutyunyan, Maxim Raginsky, Greg Ver Steeg, and Aram Galstyan. Information-theoretic generalization bounds for black-box learning algorithms. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34:24670–24682, 2021.
- [14] Jie Huang, Xinyun Chen, Swaroop Mishra, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Adams Wei Yu, Xinying Song, and Denny Zhou. Large language models cannot self-correct reasoning yet. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01798, 2023.
- [15] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232, 2023.
- [16] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. ACM Computing Surveys, 55(12):1–38, 2023.
- [17] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Yejin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. ACM Comput. Surv., 55(12):248:1–248:38, 2023.
- [18] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825, 2023.
- [19] Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, Scott Johnston, Sheer El-Showk, Andy Jones, Nelson Elhage, Tristan Hume, Anna Chen, Yuntao Bai, Sam Bowman, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Danny Hernandez, Josh Jacobson, Jackson Kernion, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Sam Ringer, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, and Jared Kaplan. Language models (mostly) know what they know, 2022.
- [20] Nikhil Kandpal, Haikang Deng, Adam Roberts, Eric Wallace, and Colin Raffel. Large language models struggle to learn long-tail knowledge. In International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 15696–15707. PMLR, 2023.
- [21] Cheongwoong Kang and Jaesik Choi. Impact of co-occurrence on factual knowledge of large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08256, 2023.
- [22] Ganesh Ramachandra Kini, Orestis Paraskevas, Samet Oymak, and Christos Thrampoulidis. Label-imbalanced and group-sensitive classification under overparameterization. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34:18970–18983, 2021.
- [23] Nayeon Lee, Wei Ping, Peng Xu, Mostofa Patwary, Pascale Fung, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. Factuality enhanced language models for open-ended text generation, 2023.

- [24] Daliang Li, Ankit Singh Rawat, Manzil Zaheer, Xin Wang, Michal Lukasik, Andreas Veit, Felix Yu, and Sanjiv Kumar. Large language models with controllable working memory, 2022.
- [25] Sha Li, Chi Han, Pengfei Yu, Carl Edwards, Manling Li, Xingyao Wang, Yi Fung, Charles Yu, Joel Tetreault, Eduard Hovy, and Heng Ji. Defining a new NLP playground. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, pages 11932–11951, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [26] Xiang Lisa Li, Ari Holtzman, Daniel Fried, Percy Liang, Jason Eisner, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. Contrastive decoding: Open-ended text generation as optimization. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 12286–12312, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [27] Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. TruthfulQA: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio, editors, Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 3214–3252, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [28] Jiateng Liu, Pengfei Yu, Yuji Zhang, Sha Li, Zixuan Zhang, and Heng Ji. Evedit: Event-based knowledge editing with deductive editing boundaries. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11324, 2024.
- [29] Jinlong Liu, Guoqing Jiang, Yunzhi Bai, Ting Chen, and Huayan Wang. Understanding why neural networks generalize well through gsnr of parameters. arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.07384, 2020.
- [30] Y Liu, K Yang, Z Qi, X Liu, Y Yu, and C Zhai. Prejudice and volatility: A statistical framework for measuring social discrimination in large language models, 2024.
- [31] Adam Livska, Tom’avs Kovcisk’y, Elena Gribovskaya, Tayfun Terzi, Eren Sezener, Devang Agrawal, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Tim Scholtes, Manzil Zaheer, Susannah Young, Ellen Gilsenan-McMahon, Sophia Austin, Phil Blunsom, and Angeliki Lazaridou. Streamingqa: A benchmark for adaptation to new knowledge over time in question answering models. In International Conference on Machine Learning, 2022.
- [32] Kelvin Luu, Daniel Khashabi, Suchin Gururangan, Karishma Mandyam, and Noah A. Smith. Time waits for no one! analysis and challenges of temporal misalignment. In Marine Carpuat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, and Ivan Vladimir Meza Ruiz, editors, Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 5944–5958, Seattle, United States, July 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [33] Xiaozhong Lyu, Stefan Grafberger, Samantha Biegel, Shaopeng Wei, Meng Cao, Sebastian Schelter, and Ce Zhang. Improving retrieval-augmented large language models via data importance learning, 2023.
- [34] Yuen Ma, Zixing Song, Yuzheng Zhuang, Jianye Hao, and Irwin King. A survey on vision-language-action models for embodied ai. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14093, 2024.
- [35] Alex Mallen and Nora Belrose. Eliciting latent knowledge from quirky language models, 2023.
- [36] Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark Gales. SelfCheckGPT: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 9004–9017, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [37] Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark JF Gales. Selfcheckgpt: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08896, 2023.
- [38] Joshua Maynez, Shashi Narayan, Bernd Bohnet, and Ryan McDonald. On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization. In Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault, editors, Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 1906–1919, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [39] Ian R. McKenzie, Alexander Lyzhov, Michael Pieler, Alicia Parrish, Aaron Mueller, Ameya Prabhu, Euan McLean, Aaron Kirtland, Alexis Ross, Alisa Liu, Andrew Gritsevskiy, Daniel Wurgaft, Derik Kauffman, Gabriel Recchia, Jiacheng Liu, Joe Cavanagh, Max Weiss, Sicong Huang, The Floating Droid, Tom Tseng, Tomasz Korbak, Xudong Shen, Yuhui Zhang, Zhengping Zhou, Najoung Kim, Samuel R. Bowman, and Ethan Perez. Inverse scaling: When bigger isn't better, 2024.
- [40] Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. Locating and editing factual associations in gpt. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17359–17372, 2022.
- [41] Aditya Krishna Menon, Sadeep Jayasumana, Ankit Singh Rawat, Himanshu Jain, Andreas Veit, and Sanjiv Kumar. Long-tail learning via logit adjustment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07314*, 2020.
- [42] Mehryar Mohri, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. *Foundations of machine learning*. MIT press, 2018.
- [43] Jeffrey Negrea, Mahdi Haghifam, Gintare Karolina Dziugaite, Ashish Khisti, and Daniel M Roy. Information-theoretic generalization bounds for sgld via data-dependent estimates. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [44] Ankur Parikh, Xuezhi Wang, Sebastian Gehrmann, Manaal Faruqui, Bhuwan Dhingra, Diyi Yang, and Dipanjan Das. ToTTo: A controlled table-to-text generation dataset. In Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu, editors, *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1173–1186, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [45] Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. The refinedweb dataset for falcon llm: Outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only, 2023.
- [46] Baolin Peng, Michel Galley, Pengcheng He, Hao Cheng, Yujia Xie, Yu Hu, Qiuyuan Huang, Lars Liden, Zhou Yu, Weizhu Chen, et al. Check your facts and try again: Improving large language models with external knowledge and automated feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12813*, 2023.
- [47] Ankit Pensia, Varun Jog, and Po-Ling Loh. Generalization error bounds for noisy, iterative algorithms. In *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 546–550. IEEE, 2018.
- [48] Ethan Perez, Sam Ringer, Kamilė Lukošiuūtė, Karina Nguyen, Edwin Chen, Scott Heiner, Craig Pettit, Catherine Olsson, Sandipan Kundu, Saurav Kadavath, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Ben Mann, Brian Israel, Bryan Seethor, Cameron McKinnon, Christopher Olah, Da Yan, Daniela Amodei, Dario Amodei, Dawn Drain, Dustin Li, Eli Tran-Johnson, Guro Khundadze, Jackson Kernion, James Landis, Jamie Kerr, Jared Mueller, Jeeyoon Hyun, Joshua Landau, Kamal Ndousse, Landon Goldberg, Liane Lovitt, Martin Lucas, Michael Sellitto, Miranda Zhang, Neerav Kingsland, Nelson Elhage, Nicholas Joseph, Noemí Mercado, Nova DasSarma, Oliver Rausch, Robin Larson, Sam McCandlish, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Sheer El Showk, Tamera Lanham, Timothy Telleen-Lawton, Tom Brown, Tom Henighan, Tristan Hume, Yuntao Bai, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Jack Clark, Samuel R. Bowman, Amanda Askell, Roger Grosse, Danny Hernandez, Deep Ganguli, Evan Hubinger, Nicholas Schiefer, and Jared Kaplan. Discovering language model behaviors with model-written evaluations, 2022.
- [49] Ansh Radhakrishnan, Karina Nguyen, Anna Chen, Carol Chen, Carson Denison, Danny Hernandez, Esin Durmus, Evan Hubinger, Jackson Kernion, Kamilė Lukošiuūtė, Newton Cheng, Nicholas Joseph, Nicholas Schiefer, Oliver Rausch, Sam McCandlish, Sheer El Showk, Tamera Lanham, Tim Maxwell, Venkatesa Chandrasekaran, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Jared Kaplan, Jan Brauner, Samuel R. Bowman, and Ethan Perez. Question decomposition improves the faithfulness of model-generated reasoning, 2023.
- [50] Vikas Raunak, Arul Menezes, and Marcin Junczys-Dowmunt. The curious case of hallucinations in neural machine translation. In Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1172–1183, Online, June 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [51] Vipula Rawte, Amit Sheth, and Amitava Das. A survey of hallucination in large foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05922*, 2023.
- [52] Ruiyang Ren, Yuhao Wang, Yingqi Qu, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jing Liu, Hao Tian, Hua Wu, Ji-Rong Wen, and Haifeng Wang. Investigating the factual knowledge boundary of large language models with retrieval augmentation, 2023.
- [53] Daniel Russo and James Zou. How much does your data exploration overfit? controlling bias via information usage. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(1):302–323, 2019.
- [54] Mobashir Sadat, Zhengyu Zhou, Lukas Lange, Jun Araki, Arsalan Gundroo, Bingqing Wang, Rakesh R Menon, Md Rizwan Parvez, and Zhe Feng. Delucionqa: Detecting hallucinations in domain-specific question answering, 2023.
- [55] Ben Snyder, Marius Moisescu, and Muhammad Bilal Zafar. On early detection of hallucinations in factual question answering, 2023.
- [56] Luca Soldaini, Rodney Kinney, Akshita Bhagia, Dustin Schwenk, David Atkinson, Russell Authur, Ben Bogin, Khyathi Chandu, Jennifer Dumas, Yanai Elazar, et al. Dolma: An open corpus of three trillion tokens for language model pretraining research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00159*, 2024.
- [57] Zixing Song, Yuji Zhang, and Irwin King. Towards fair financial services for all: A temporal GNN approach for individual fairness on transaction networks. In *CIKM*, pages 2331–2341. ACM, 2023.
- [58] Zixing Song, Yuji Zhang, and Irwin King. Towards fair financial services for all: A temporal gnn approach for individual fairness on transaction networks. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*, pages 2331–2341, 2023.
- [59] Thomas Steinke and Lydia Zakyntinou. Reasoning about generalization via conditional mutual information. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3437–3452. PMLR, 2020.
- [60] Dan Su, Xiaoguang Li, Jindi Zhang, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, and Pascale Fung. Read before generate! faithful long form question answering with machine reading. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 744–756, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [61] S. M Towhidul Islam Tonmoy, S M Mehedi Zaman, Vinija Jain, Anku Rani, Vipula Rawte, Aman Chadha, and Amitava Das. A comprehensive survey of hallucination mitigation techniques in large language models, 2024.
- [62] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [63] Priyesh Vakharia, Devavrat Joshi, Meenal Chavan, Dhananjay Sonawane, Bhriгу Garg, Parsa Mazaheri, and Ian Lane. Don’t believe everything you read: Enhancing summarization interpretability through automatic identification of hallucinations in large language models, 2023.
- [64] Neeraj Varshney, Wenlin Yao, Hongming Zhang, Jianshu Chen, and Dong Yu. A stitch in time saves nine: Detecting and mitigating hallucinations of llms by validating low-confidence generation, 2023.
- [65] Shreyas Verma, Kien Tran, Yusuf Ali, and Guangyu Min. Reducing llm hallucinations using epistemic neural networks, 2023.
- [66] Yixin Wan, Fanyou Wu, Weijie Xu, and Srinivasan H. Sengamedu. Sequence-level certainty reduces hallucination in knowledge-grounded dialogue generation, 2024.
- [67] Ben Wang and Aran Komatsuzaki. GPT-J-6B: A 6 Billion Parameter Autoregressive Language Model. <https://github.com/kingoflolz/mesh-transformer-jax>, May 2021.
- [68] Hongmin Wang. Revisiting challenges in data-to-text generation with fact grounding. In Kees van Deemter, Chenghua Lin, and Hiroya Takamura, editors, *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 311–322, Tokyo, Japan, October–November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [69] Zitai Wang, Qianqian Xu, Zhiyong Yang, Yuan He, Xiaochun Cao, and Qingming Huang. A unified generalization analysis of re-weighting and logit-adjustment for imbalanced learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

- [70] Colin Wei and Tengyu Ma. Data-dependent sample complexity of deep neural networks via lipschitz augmentation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [71] Jerry Wei, Da Huang, Yifeng Lu, Denny Zhou, and Quoc V. Le. Simple synthetic data reduces sycophancy in large language models, 2023.
- [72] Jian Xie, Kai Zhang, Jiangjie Chen, Renze Lou, and Yu Su. Adaptive chameleon or stubborn sloth: Unraveling the behavior of large language models in knowledge clashes, 2023.
- [73] Aolin Xu and Maxim Raginsky. Information-theoretic analysis of generalization capability of learning algorithms. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [74] Ke Yang, Charles Yu, Yi R. Fung, Manling Li, and Heng Ji. Adept: A debiasing prompt framework. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 37(9):10780–10788, Jun. 2023.
- [75] Hongbin Ye, Tong Liu, Aijia Zhang, Wei Hua, and Weiqiang Jia. Cognitive mirage: A review of hallucinations in large language models, 2023.
- [76] Zhangyue Yin, Qiushi Sun, Qipeng Guo, Jiawen Wu, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. Do large language models know what they don’t know?, 2023.
- [77] Xiang Yue, Boshi Wang, Kai Zhang, Zirui Chen, Yu Su, and Huan Sun. Automatic evaluation of attribution by large language models, 2023.
- [78] Hanning Zhang, Shizhe Diao, Yong Lin, Yi R. Fung, Qing Lian, Xingyao Wang, Yangyi Chen, Heng Ji, and Tong Zhang. R-tuning: Instructing large language models to say ‘i don’t know’, 2024.
- [79] Muru Zhang, Ofir Press, William Merrill, Alisa Liu, and Noah A. Smith. How language model hallucinations can snowball, 2023.
- [80] Shuo Zhang, Liangming Pan, Junzhou Zhao, and William Yang Wang. Mitigating language model hallucination with interactive question-knowledge alignment, 2023.
- [81] Yue Zhang, Leyang Cui, Wei Bi, and Shuming Shi. Alleviating hallucinations of large language models through induced hallucinations, 2023.
- [82] Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, Longyue Wang, Anh Tuan Luu, Wei Bi, Freda Shi, and Shuming Shi. Siren’s song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models, 2023.
- [83] Yuji Zhang and Jing Li. Time will change things: An empirical study on dynamic language understanding in social media classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02857*, 2022.
- [84] Yuji Zhang, Jing Li, and Wenjie Li. Vibe: Topic-driven temporal adaptation for twitter classification. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [85] Yuji Zhang, Yubo Zhang, Chunpu Xu, Jing Li, Ziyang Jiang, and Baolin Peng. #HowYouTagTweets: Learning user hashtagging preferences via personalized topic attention. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7811–7820, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [86] Zhiyuan Zhao, Bin Wang, Linke Ouyang, Xiaoyi Dong, Jiaqi Wang, and Conghui He. Beyond hallucinations: Enhancing llms through hallucination-aware direct preference optimization, 2023.

A Appendix

A.1 Limitation

We reflect on the limitations of our paper below:

1. This paper conducted extensive experiments to investigate the cause of amalgamated hallucination, identifying the phenomenon of knowledge overshadowing as a key factor. However, due to limited computational resources, we were unable to curate a large data corpus and pre-train our own large model to fully validate this hypothesis thoroughly. We leave this blank for future work.
2. We utilized the OLMo model for probing to examine how its pretraining data influences the knowledge-overshadowing phenomenon. However, we could not conduct an in-depth analysis of the training corpus of larger language models like GPT-3.5-turbo due to inaccessibility. This leaves an open question regarding how their data is affected by the data distribution.
3. Our proposed solution performed well on existing models and datasets to deal with the amalgamated hallucination caused by knowledge overshadowing, but it can not be tested on larger language models like GPT-3.5-turbo, thus limiting its more universal applicability.

A.2 Implementation details

In fine-tuning experiments, for Llama-2-7b [62], Mistral-7b [18], GPT-J-6b [67], Phi-2-2.8b [12], and Pythia-160m [35], Pythia-410m, Pythia-1b, Pythia-1.4b, and Pythia-2.8b, we set the learning rate as $lr=1e-5$. The weight decay is set as $1e-2$. We train each model for 40 epochs. The batch size for Pythia-series model and Phi model is 16. The batch size for GPT-J-6b, Llama-2-7b, and Mistral-7b is 1. The training is based on auto-regressive loss for input sequences. For each experiment, we ran the trials five times. We report both the mean and the variance of the results to account for variability in performance.

Our experiments are conducted on A-100 machines (with memory of 80G). For four parallel GPUs, a single epoch on Phi-2-2.8b for the synthetic dataset will cost 1 hours, so totally it costs 40 hours to run on four parallel A-100 GPUs to train Phi-2-2.8b. For llama-2-7b, it costs more than 100 hours to run on four parallel GPUs to fine-tune the synthetic dataset. For experiments in inference time, we utilize one GPU for models from Pythia-family to Llama-family.

A.3 Length-dependency on NTP loss

NTP loss for conditions with varying lengths. Denote $P(x_{i+1}|x_{1:i})$ as $P_{i+1}(x_{i+1})$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k+2} -\log P(y'|x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}, x_{k+2})}{k+2} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} -\log P(y'|x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1})}{k+1} \\
 = & -\frac{\log P_1(x_1) \times \dots \times P_{k+2}(x_{k+2}) \times P_{k+3}(y')}{k+3} + \frac{\log P_1(x_1) \times \dots \times P_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) \times P_{k+2}(y')}{k+2} \\
 = & \frac{1}{(k+3)(k+2)} \cdot \log \frac{[P_1(x_1) \times \dots \times P_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) \times P_{k+2}(y')]^{k+3}}{[P_1(x_1) \times \dots \times P_{k+2}(x_{k+2}) \times P_{k+3}(y')]^{k+2}} \\
 = & \frac{1}{(k+3)(k+2)} \cdot \log P_1(x_1) \times \dots \times P_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) \frac{[P_{k+2}(y')]^{k+3}}{[P_{k+2}(x_{k+2})]^{k+2} \cdot [P_{k+3}(y')]^{k+2}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Since exploring the training dynamics of $P_i(x_i)$, $P_j(y')$ in large language models is intractable, we make a mild assumption here, at the late training stage, $P_i(x_i) \rightarrow \hat{P}_i(x_i)$, $P_j(y') \rightarrow \hat{P}_j(y')$, in the setup with controlled variables, where samples with different lengths have same proportion of dominant conditions and suppressed conditions, then the value in log approaches $\frac{P_{k+2}(y')}{P_{k+2}(x_{k+2})}$. Since y' is the false prediction made by model, whose empirical probability equals zero, so $P_{k+2}(y')$ approaches zero, then $P_{k+2}(y') < P_{k+2}(x_{k+2})$.

Given that, $\frac{P_{k+2}(y')}{P_{k+2}(x_{k+2})} < 1$

therefore,

$$L_{NTP}(y'|x_{1:k+1}, x_{k+2}) < L_{NTP}(y'|x_{1:k}, x_{k+1}),$$

we denote $L_{NTP}(y'|x_{1:k}, x_{k+1})$ as $-\log\left(\frac{e^{f(\mathbf{x})_y}}{\sum_{y'} e^{h^{-1}(k)f(\mathbf{x})_{y'}}}\right)$, where $h(k)$ is positively correlated with k , with larger k indicating larger $h(k)$.

Lipschitz continuity of NTP loss. $B_y(f)$ represents the minimal prediction on the ground truth token y , i.e. $B_y(f) := \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}_y} f(x)_y$ [69].

Here we prove the *Lipschitz continuity* [69] of the NTP loss, according to the definition of the NTP loss, and the above NTP loss rewriting, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{NTP}}(f(\mathbf{x}), y) &= -\log\left(\frac{e^{f(\mathbf{x})_y}}{\sum_{y'} e^{h^{-1}(k)f(\mathbf{x})_{y'}}}\right) \\ &= \log\left[1 + \sum_{y' \neq y} e^{h^{-1}(k)f(\mathbf{x})_{y'} - f(\mathbf{x})_y}\right].\end{aligned}$$

We denote $\mathbf{s} := f(\mathbf{x})$, and we define

$$\ell_y(\mathbf{s}) := \sum_{y' \neq y} e^{h^{-1}(k)\mathbf{s}_{y'}}.$$

Therefore, we rewrite the \mathcal{L}_{NTP} as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NTP}}(f, y) = \log\left[1 + e^{-\mathbf{s}_y} \ell_y(\mathbf{s})\right].$$

The derivatives can be represented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{NTP}}(f, y)}{\partial \mathbf{s}_y} &= -\frac{e^{-\mathbf{s}_y} \ell_y(\mathbf{s})}{1 + e^{-\mathbf{s}_y} \ell_y(\mathbf{s})}, \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{NTP}}(f, y)}{\partial \mathbf{s}_{y'}} &= h^{-1}(k) \frac{e^{-\mathbf{s}_y}}{1 + e^{-\mathbf{s}_y} \ell_y(\mathbf{s})} \cdot e^{h^{-1}(k)\mathbf{s}_{y'}}, y' \neq y.\end{aligned}$$

We can get the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{s}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{NTP}}(f, y)\|^2 &= \left[\ell_y(\mathbf{s})^2 + \sum_{y' \neq y} \left(h^{-1}(k)e^{h^{-1}(k)\mathbf{s}_{y'}}\right)^2\right] \cdot \left[\frac{e^{-\mathbf{s}_y}}{1 + e^{-\mathbf{s}_y} \ell_y(\mathbf{s})}\right]^2 \\ &\leq \left[\ell_y(\mathbf{s})^2 + \left(\sum_{y' \neq y} h^{-1}(k)\right)^2 \left(\sum_{y' \neq y} e^{h^{-1}(k)\mathbf{s}_{y'}}\right)^2\right] \cdot \left[\frac{e^{-\mathbf{s}_y}}{1 + e^{-\mathbf{s}_y} \ell_y(\mathbf{s})}\right]^2 \\ &= \left[1 + \left(\sum_{y' \neq y} h^{-1}(k)\right)^2\right] \cdot \left[\frac{e^{-\mathbf{s}_y} \ell_y(\mathbf{s})}{1 + e^{-\mathbf{s}_y} \ell_y(\mathbf{s})}\right]^2,\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{s}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{NTP}}(f, y)\| &\leq \sqrt{1 + \left(\sum_{y' \neq y} h^{-1}(k)\right)^2} \frac{e^{-\mathbf{s}_y} \ell_y(\mathbf{s})}{1 + e^{-\mathbf{s}_y} \ell_y(\mathbf{s})} \\ &= \sqrt{1 + \left(\sum_{y' \neq y} h^{-1}(k)\right)^2} \frac{\ell_y(\mathbf{s})}{e^{\mathbf{s}_y} + \ell_y(\mathbf{s})} \\ &= \sqrt{1 + \left(\sum_{y' \neq y} h^{-1}(k)\right)^2} \left[1 - \frac{e^{\mathbf{s}_y}}{\sum_{y'} e^{h^{-1}(k)\mathbf{s}_{y'}}}\right] \\ &= \sqrt{1 + \left(\sum_{y' \neq y} h^{-1}(k)\right)^2} [1 - \text{softmax}(\mathbf{s}_y)].\end{aligned}$$

Since the score function is bounded, for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, there exists a constant $B_y(f)$ such that $B_y(f) = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_y} \mathbf{s}_y$, which completes the proof.

A.4 More Generalized Hallucination Patterns on GPT models

Table 6: A wide range of hallucinations made by GPT-3.5 series of models that can be attributed to knowledge overshadowing.

Overshadowing	Input Prompt	Hallucinated Answer from LLMs
Not won the Nobel prize Overshadowed Nomination	List some authors that were nominated but did not win the Nobel prize.	1. Leo Tolstoy 2. James Joyce 3. Mark Twain 4. Virginia Woolf 5. Jorge Luis Borges 6. Emily Dickinson 7. George Orwell 8. Anton Chekhov 9. Jorge Amado 10. Thomas Hardy
from Korea Overshadowed rock musicians	Tell me some rock musicians from Korea.	1. Yoon Do-hyun 2. Lee Seung-hwan 3. Shin Seung-hun 4. Seo Taiji 5. Kim Kyung-ho 6. Moon Hee-joon 7. Kang San-ae 8. Noh Soo-ram 9. Oh Seung-geun 10. Heo Young-saeng
Description for winning the prize Overshadowed Negation	Who did not receive the 1921 Nobel Prize in Physics "for his services to theoretical physics, and especially for his discovery of the law of the photoelectric effect"?	German physicist Albert Einstein did not receive the 1921 Nobel Prize in Physics for his discovery of the law of the photoelectric effect. In fact, Einstein was awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1921 for his explanation of the photoelectric effect, which was published in a 1905 paper titled "On a Heuristic Point of View Concerning the Production and Transformation of Light."
AI scientist Overshadowed Female	Tell me some outstanding female AI scientist.	Yoshua Bengio: While not female, Yoshua Bengio has significantly contributed to the advancement of AI and deep learning. As one of the "Three Musketeers of Deep Learning" alongside Geoffrey Hinton and Yann LeCun, his work has had a profound impact on the field.