
AutoBench: Creating Salient, Novel, Difficult Datasets for Language Models

Xiang Lisa Li¹, Evan Zheran Liu², Percy Liang¹, Tatsunori Hashimoto¹
Stanford University¹, Imbue²
{xlisali, thashim}@stanford.edu, {evanliu, pliang}@cs.stanford.edu

Abstract

Evaluation is critical for assessing capabilities, tracking scientific progress, and informing model selection. In this paper, we present three desiderata for a good benchmark for language models: (i) salience (e.g., knowledge about World War II is more salient than a random day in history), (ii) novelty (i.e., the benchmark reveals new trends in model rankings not shown by previous benchmarks), and (iii) difficulty (i.e., the benchmark should be difficult for existing models, leaving headroom for future improvement). We operationalize these three desiderata and cast benchmark creation as a search problem, that of finding benchmarks that that satisfy all three desiderata. To tackle this search problem, we present AutoBench, which uses a language model to automatically search for datasets that meet the three desiderata. AutoBench uses privileged information (e.g. relevant documents) to construct reliable datasets, and adaptivity with reranking to optimize for the search objective. We use AutoBench to create datasets for math, multilingual, and knowledge-intensive question answering. The scalability of AutoBench allows it to test fine-grained categories and tail knowledge, creating datasets that are on average 27% more novel and 22% more difficult than existing benchmarks. A closer investigation of our constructed datasets shows that we can identify specific gaps in LM knowledge in language models that are not captured by existing benchmarks, such as Gemini Pro performing much worse on question answering about the Permian Extinction and Fordism, while OpenAGI-7B performing surprisingly well on QA about COVID-19.¹

1 Introduction

Evaluation is crucial for informing model selection and guiding model development, and it is especially challenging to evaluate language models. Prior works have constructed high-quality benchmarks, guided by two desiderata: (1) *salience*: the benchmark should test practically important capabilities, for example, the capability to solve math problems is examined by GSM8K [6] and capability to avoid answering misleading questions is examined by TruthfulQA [17]. (2) *difficulty*: the benchmark should yield low accuracy with existing models. For example, GPQA [28] carefully constructs questions that are challenging even for domain experts. In this work, we identify an additional goal of (3) *novelty*. More recently, observational studies of existing benchmarks show that model performance on existing benchmarks are highly correlated [18, 27, 20, 5], and thus there is an increasing need for benchmark novelty. Novelty measures the degree to which a benchmark reveals previously unknown performance trends in model rankings, such as unexpected model strengths or weaknesses on specific domains.

In order to measure salience, difficulty, and novelty of a benchmark, we operationalize these three properties: (1) We define salience as a binary variable that captures whether a benchmark on a

¹Code is available at <https://github.com/XiangLi1999/AutoBench>.




Figure 1: (Left) Models ranked by accuracy on existing datasets and AutoBencher datasets. Existing datasets show roughly the same performance trends, while AutoBencher discovers tests that induce novel rankings. (Right) Given a domain (e.g., history), AutoBencher creates datasets that are salient, difficult, and novel. It achieves this by searching through evaluation topics, scoring each based on these desiderata, and selecting the best one. These datasets are automatically created by providing privileged information to a language model.

specific topic (e.g., COVID-19) is important. (2) The difficulty of a benchmark is determined by the lowest error rate achievable by existing models. (3) We calculate the novelty of a benchmark as the predictability of model performance on the benchmark based on performance on other benchmarks. Formalizing the three desiderata allows us to take an optimization approach to constructing benchmarks. Instead of viewing benchmarking as the task of constructing a dataset that represents some task, we cast it as a way to find particular test set that fulfill our three desiderata. This turns benchmarking into an optimization problem, where the objective is made explicit.

To approximately solve this search problem and automatically create new salient, difficult, and novel benchmarks, we propose AutoBencher. As shown in Figure 1, given a broad domain (e.g., history), AutoBencher proposes candidate evaluation topics (e.g., World War II) and then constructs a small dataset for each topic using privileged information (e.g., relevant Wikipedia articles). These datasets are scored by our metrics and used as part of a local search algorithm to find a benchmark with improved difficulty. We leverage the scalability of AutoBencher to identify and select topics that jointly maximize a weighted sum of difficulty and novelty, subject to a saliency constraint specified by the user.

We use AutoBencher to create datasets in 5 domains: math, history, science, economics, and multilingualism, altogether producing around 3700 examples. These benchmarks reveal novel trends not shown by prior benchmarks (§6.2): For example, we find that while Gemini Pro is one of the strongest models on existing history benchmarks, it performs quite poorly on AutoBencher-discovered topics of Permian Extinction and Fordism, performing even worse than some 7B models, such as Mistral-7B. Meanwhile, we also find that 7B models (e.g., Mistral-7B and OpenAGI-7B), which typically exhibit lower accuracy due to their smaller size, perform quite well on the topic of COVID-19, even achieving accuracy on par with GPT-4 Turbo. Additionally, our datasets increase difficulty by 22% compared with human-constructed benchmarks, such as MMLU and XOR QA (§6.1).²

2 Related Work

Benchmarking Language Models A large number of benchmarks have been constructed to measure different skills of language models. To give a few examples of common LLM benchmarks, MMLU measures the understanding of academic subjects [11], GSM8K measures mathematical reasoning [6], and Winogrande measures common sense reasoning [30]. Researchers have also grouped the benchmarks to create leaderboards that rank LMs’ overall capabilities, such as HELM [16] and Open LLM Leaderboard [3]. Additionally, researchers also carefully subsample existing benchmarks to obtain a smaller and more efficient benchmark with similar model accuracy [20]. Prior works of LLM-as-Judge incorporate language models as part of the evaluation pipeline to

²We will release the dataset and code.

automatically judge the quality of model-generated responses [8, 39, 9]. Our work further automates the evaluation pipeline by using LM to propose evaluation topics and generate questions.

The most similar work to ours is Li et al. [15], which uses LMs to brainstorm questions for instruction following tasks. However, their goal is very different from ours: they aim to find a minimal set of questions to reproduce the same LM ranking achieved by evaluating a large number of examples; our goal is to search for new benchmark topics that break the performance trends of existing benchmarks.

Adaptive Datasets In AutoBencher, one important desideratum we optimize for is novelty. Prior works have also constructed datasets adaptively to search for difficult questions [22, 12, 29, 38, 7]. Most of these works have generated test cases with human annotators, whereas we use language models to automate the search, saving extensive human effort. Similar to AutoBencher, Perez et al. [26] searches for prompts that induce harmful behaviors in language models using another language model. However, they focus on instance-level failures in safety, whereas we focus on finding systematic failures on specific topics.

3 A Metric-Driven Framework of Benchmark Creation

We now discuss our three desiderata of *salience*, *difficulty*, and *novelty* and formally define them as quantitative metrics that can be directly optimized.

Preliminaries. Let $c \in \mathcal{C}$ be an evaluation topic. We define a dataset $\mathcal{D}_c = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_i$ as a set of question-answer pairs (x_i, y_i) that evaluate mastery of the topic c . As an example, topics \mathcal{C} could include “the Industrial Revolution”, “World War II”, “Ancient Civilization”, etc. In this work, we will generate the datasets \mathcal{D}_c from a fixed generator $p(\mathcal{D}_c | c)$ and focus on optimizing the set of topics c to change the novelty and difficulty of a dataset.

Let $\mathcal{M} = \{\text{LM}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ denote the set of M existing models to evaluate. We denote the accuracy of model $\text{LM}_m \in \mathcal{M}$ on benchmark \mathcal{D}_c as $\text{acc}(\text{LM}_m, \mathcal{D}_c)$. We define the *accuracy vector* $V_c = [\text{acc}(\text{LM}_1, \mathcal{D}_c), \dots, \text{acc}(\text{LM}_M, \mathcal{D}_c)]$ of a benchmark \mathcal{D}_c as the accuracy of all models on the benchmark \mathcal{D}_c .

Salience. Recall that salience measures the practical importance of a topic c . First, we assume a set of salient topics \mathcal{S} specified by the user, and we define SALIENCE as a binary variable, such that $\text{SALIENCE}(c) = 1$ if $c \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\text{SALIENCE}(c) = 0$ otherwise. For example, we may define salient topics \mathcal{S} to be the set of topics with the number of corresponding Wikipedia page views exceeding a threshold.

Novelty. Recall that novelty measures how much new information a dataset reveals about existing models over existing benchmarks. Therefore, we formalize $\text{NOVELTY}(\mathcal{D}_c; \mathbf{D}_{\text{prev}}; \mathcal{M})$ as a function of the benchmark in question \mathcal{D}_c , prior benchmarks $\mathbf{D}_{\text{prev}} := \{\mathcal{D}_1 \dots \mathcal{D}_N\}$, and the existing set of models \mathcal{M} . Intuitively, the results on a new benchmark reveal new information if model performance on the new benchmark vastly differ from the trends on prior benchmarks (e.g., if a normally low-performing model outperforms all other models on the new benchmark).

To quantify this, we first find how much information is explainable by the accuracy on existing datasets \mathbf{D}_{prev} , by performing a regression from $V_{\text{prev}} := [V_1 \dots V_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ to predict $V_c \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times M}$,

$$\hat{V}_c := w^*{}^\top V_{\text{prev}} + b \text{ and } w^* = \arg \min_w \left\| w^\top V_{\text{prev}} + b - V_c \right\|_2^2.$$

We then compute the rank correlation between the predicted accuracy \hat{V}_c and the ground truth accuracy as $\text{RANKCORR}(V_c, \hat{V}_c)$ as a predictability measure for the new dataset. Formally,

$$\text{NOVELTY}(\mathcal{D}_c, \mathbf{D}_{\text{prev}}, \mathcal{M}) = 1 - \text{RANKCORR}(\hat{V}_c, V_c).$$

If the new accuracy vector V_c is spanned by the existing accuracy vectors, $\text{RANKCORR}(V_c, \hat{V}_c)$ will be close to 1, resulting in low novelty. On the other hand, if the new accuracy vector V_c discovers some new patterns in model performance such as an orthogonal direction, $\text{RANKCORR}(V_c, \hat{V}_c)$ will be low, resulting in high novelty.

Take Figure 1 (left) as an example, let ARC be the existing datasets \mathbf{D}_{prev} . To compute the novelty of the MMLU dataset (column 2), we perform a regression from the accuracy vector of ARC to predict the accuracy vector of MMLU. Since they have the same ranking, model rankings on MMLU is perfectly predictable from ARC, yielding a RANKCORR of 1 and a NOVELTY of 0. To compute the novelty of the QA: COVID-19 dataset (column 3), we also predict its accuracy vector from ARC. However, since the accuracy vector of COVID-19 datasets shows abrupt changes in model performance, it is not spanned by the accuracy vector of the ARC dataset. Therefore, its performance is not predictable by the existing dataset, yielding a low RANKCORR and a high NOVELTY.

Difficulty. A benchmark’s difficulty is determined directly by a model’s error rate. Ideally, a benchmark should leave sufficient headroom above the best current error rate to enable tracking future progress. We formalize the difficulty of a benchmark as the remaining gap between the best model’s accuracy and optimal accuracy: $\text{DIFFICULTY}(\mathcal{D}_c, \mathcal{M}) = 1 - \max_m \text{acc}(\text{LM}_i, \mathcal{D}_c)$.

Separability. Besides the three main desiderata, we also include the separability of model accuracy as an additional regularizer. Separability measures the amount of separation between different model accuracies; In this paper, we use separability to complement novelty, ensuring that all the model performance trends revealed by a benchmark is robust. We formalize the separation on benchmark \mathcal{D}_c between the accuracy of models \mathcal{M} as the mean absolute deviation $\text{SEP}(\mathcal{D}_c, \mathcal{M}) = \text{mean}(|V_c - \text{mean}(V_c)|)$.

Existing Benchmarks Case Study. We now analyze several existing benchmarks under these desiderata: MMLU [11] contains salient topics on academic subjects; it is sufficiently difficult with the best model accuracy of 86% and has good separability to distinguish existing models. However, the benchmark lacks novelty, as it’s highly correlated with prior benchmarks like ARC, with a rank correlation of 94%.

Datasets in the Inverse Scaling Prize [21] is novel but many lack salience. For example, *pattern matching suppression* instructs the LM to continue a sequence by violating the current pattern, and *Memo trap* instructs the LM to continue a famous quote with a different ending. These tasks reveal novel performance patterns (i.e., larger models perform worse), but are much less salient than datasets like the knowledge-intensive MMLU.

4 AutoBench

Our goal is to find a sufficiently salient evaluation topic c that maximizes a linear combination of novelty and difficulty. We directly maximize novelty and difficulty subject to a constraint on salience, because salience is operationalized as a binary variable. Specifically, we aim to solve the following constrained optimization problem:

$$\text{maximize } \mathcal{J}(c) = \text{NOVELTY}(\mathcal{D}_c; \mathbf{D}_{\text{prev}}, \mathcal{M}) + \beta_1 \text{DIFFICULTY}(\mathcal{D}_c; \mathcal{M}) + \beta_2 \text{SEP}(\mathcal{D}_c; \mathcal{M}) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{subject to } c \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Solving the optimization problem. Identifying solutions to this search problem is difficult due to the complexity of performing a discrete search over three potentially conflicting criteria (salience, difficulty, and novelty) and we cannot intuitively judge which topics might reveal novel performance trends a priori. Therefore, we propose AutoBench, which automates the search with a language model, denoted as LM_{gen} , and outputs the best discovered topic and its dataset.

One natural, naive design is to perform a random search, where we prompt LM_{gen} to generate a diverse set of topics c , prompt LM_{gen} to generate a dataset of (question, answer) pairs for each topic, and then select the best topic according to the objective function $\mathcal{J}(c)$.

However, this design suffers from two issues: (1) *Example correctness*: Since we use LM_{gen} to construct the dataset, the generated answers might be incorrect due to model hallucination. (2) *Example difficulty*: The difficulty of the generated questions is upper-bounded by the capabilities of LM_{gen} and hence cannot be used to evaluate stronger models. (3) *Topic difficulty*: empirically, we observe that LM_{gen} tends to propose well-known, and insufficiently difficult topics.




Figure 2: How the model LM_{gen} uses privileged information to create (question, answer) examples.

We now propose some techniques to address these issues: We first augment LM_{gen} with privileged information to improve the correctness and difficulty of the generated datasets (§4.1). Next, we propose adaptive search, which uses the trajectory of past generated benchmarks to improve topic difficulty (§4.2). Finally, we present the full pseudocode and present how each metric gets optimized in this pipeline (§4.3).

4.1 Generating Datasets with Privileged Information

To improve the difficulty of the generated questions and the correctness of the generated answers, we augment LM_{gen} with privileged information that we do not provide to the LMs that we are evaluating (which we will refer to as the test-taker LMs to avoid confusion). This privileged information ensures answer correctness by grounding the generated answers in a reliable source and creates an information imbalance between the example creation model LM_{gen} and test-taker LMs, which simplifies the task for LM_{gen} and enables it to create questions that are more difficult than possible with its base capabilities. We next detail the privileged information we provide in three domains: knowledge intensive, multilingual, and mathematics. Figure 2 illustrates how this information is used in each domain.

Knowledge-intensive. We augment LM_{gen} with a set of relevant documents (e.g., Wikipedia). Specifically, to create a knowledge-intensive question on topic c , we first retrieve the set of most relevant articles by querying c in the Wikipedia Search API. Then, we prompt LM_{gen} to jointly generate (question, answer) pairs conditioned on the retrieved articles such that the answer can be verified by the document and the question is answerable *without* the document. We enforce this by checking the lexical overlap between the answers and the retrieved articles.

Multilingual. We augment LM_{gen} with a translation system. Since models tend to have better reasoning capabilities in English than in other languages, we generate (question, answer) pairs in other languages by first generating the example in English via the knowledge-intensive question procedure above. Then, we translate the question and answer to the target language.

Mathematics. We augment LM_{gen} with Python math libraries (e.g., `sympy`, `scipy`, `numpy`). To ensure that the answers are correct, we prompt LM_{gen} to generate questions along with Python code to compute their answers and use the execution result as the answer.

4.2 Proposing Topics with Adaptive Search

When we use LM_{gen} to propose evaluation topics, a key challenge is that LM_{gen} does not have information about what topics might be difficult for LMs. To address this, we propose adaptive search, an iterative approach that collects accuracy information in each iteration to inform topic proposals in subsequent iterations. We keep track of a trajectory \mathcal{H} , represented as a sequence of (topic, accuracy) pairs. As we run more iterations, \mathcal{H} accumulates more (topic, accuracy) pairs, and forms a better belief about what topics are likely be difficult (see Figure 1 right).

Specifically, we follow lines 1 to 7 in Algorithm 1. In each iteration, AutoBench proposes K topics conditioned on the trajectory \mathcal{H} collected from previous iterations (line 3), where we specifically prompt to ask for difficult topics (i.e., low accuracy). We filter out non-salient topics (line 4) and instantiate each remaining topic as a dataset via the procedure described in §4.1 (line 5). Then, we

compute the accuracy of a test-taker model LM_{test} on each dataset as a measure of difficulty (line 6). Finally, we feed all proposed (topic, accuracy) pairs to subsequent iterations to increase difficulty (lines 7). We choose to only evaluate the accuracy of a single strong test-taker model, rather than evaluating all models \mathcal{M} for computational efficiency.

Our adaptive search procedure does not take NOVELTY or SEP into account, since these two quantities also require expensively evaluating all models \mathcal{M} . Instead, we optimize these desiderata in a final re-ranking step, which considers all of the metrics together.

Algorithm 1: AutoBench

Require: \mathcal{M} , LM_{gen} , LM_{test} , domain d , max iterations N , hyperparameter β_1, β_2

- 1: Initialize previously-proposed topics $\mathcal{H} = \emptyset$
 - 2: **for** maximum number of iteration N times **do**
 - 3: Propose topics conditioned on prev. topics $c_1, \dots, c_K \sim \text{LM}_{\text{gen}}(\cdot | \mathcal{H})$
 - 4: Filter out to keep only the salient topics with $c \in \mathcal{S}$
 - 5: Generate small dataset \mathcal{D}_{c_k} for each remaining topic by prompting LM_{gen}
 - 6: Compute the test-taker model accuracy on each dataset $\text{acc}(\text{LM}_{\text{test}}, \mathcal{D}_{c_k})$
 - 7: Update previously proposed topics $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H} \cup \{(c_k, \text{acc}(\text{LM}_{\text{test}}, \mathcal{D}_{c_k}))\}$
 - 8: Extract set of all proposed topics $\mathcal{P} = \{c : (c, \text{acc}(\text{LM}_{\text{test}}, \mathcal{D}_c)) \in \mathcal{H}\}$
 - 9: Compute the search objective $\mathcal{J}(c)$ on all proposed topics $c \in \mathcal{P}$
 - 10: Select the topic with the highest objective value $c^* = \arg \max_{c \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{J}(c)$
 - 11: Generate large dataset \mathcal{D}_{c^*} by prompting LM_{gen} on topic c^*
 - 12: **return** Chosen topic c^* and corresponding dataset \mathcal{D}_{c^*}
-

4.3 Metric Attribution

Overall, the entire algorithm behind AutoBench is summarized in Algorithm 1. In lines 1 to 7, we perform the adaptive search described above. Afterward, we re-rank the proposed topics via the full search objective $\mathcal{J}(c)$: We compute the objective for each proposed topic (line 9) and construct a dataset on the topic with the highest objective value (lines 10–12).

This algorithm optimizes for all the desiderata of novelty, salience, and difficulty. SALIENCE is met via the filtering step in line 4, which filters out all non-salient topics. DIFFICULTY is approximately optimized via the adaptive search procedure (lines 1–7) that steers toward producing more difficult topics. SEP and NOVELTY are optimized in the final re-ranking step (lines 9–10), where we compute and select based on the full objective function \mathcal{J} .

5 Experimental Setup

5.1 Baselines and Metrics

We evaluate AutoBench on five domains: mathematics, multilingual, and knowledge-intensive QA on history, economy, and science.

Baselines. We compare benchmarks generated by AutoBench with human constructed benchmarks, which we group collectively under HUMANBENCH. For knowledge-intensive domains, we compare with the subject datasets in MMLU [11]. These datasets consist of multiple-choice questions on academic subjects ranging from high school to professional level. We compare with 4 history subjects (e.g., high school world history), 4 economy subjects (e.g., econometrics), and 7 science subjects (e.g., college physics). See the complete list in Appendix C.

For mathematics, we compare with 7 datasets from the Mathematics Dataset [31]³, which covers basic math capabilities: algebra, arithmetic, calculus, probability, comparison, measurement, numbers. For multilingualism, we compare with XOR QA [2], a multilingual question-answering dataset covering 7 diverse languages. We compare with the test set, split by language into 7 datasets.

Models. For this paper, the set of models we evaluate is $\mathcal{M} = \{\text{gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09}, \text{gpt-3.5-turbo-0613}, \text{claude-3-sonnet-20240229}, \text{claude-3-opus-20240229},$

³https://github.com/google-deepmind/mathematics_dataset

claude-2.0, Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1, Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1, gemini-pro, OpenAGI-7B-v0.1, vicuna-7b-v1.5, Llama-2-7b-chat-hf, Xwin-Math-7B-V1.0, WizardMath-7B-V1.0, gpt-neo-2.7B, alpaca-7b, zephyr-7b-beta, openchat-3.5-0106} These models are designed to cover three categories: the strongest closed models, strong open models and strong 7B models.

Metrics. We evaluate on the four metrics: NOVELTY (NOVEL), SEP (SEP), DIFFICULTY (DIFF), and SALIENCE as defined in §3. For calculating NOVELTY, we set \mathbf{D}_{prev} as the aggregate of all datasets in HUMANBENCH.

5.2 AutoBench Hyperparameters and Costs

Hyperparameters. AutoBench uses gpt-4-0125-preview [24] as LM_{gen} to propose topics and generate the datasets. For the test-taker model LM_{test} , we select gpt-3.5-turbo-0613 [23], Mixtral-8x7B and Mistral-7B, to cover different levels of model accuracies. In AutoBench, we perform $N = 8$ iterations of adaptive search, each proposing $k = 5$ topics. We generate $|\mathcal{D}_c| = 50$ examples per topic. In total, we explore 2000 questions across 40 topics in one round of AutoBench.

Costs. Each run of the AutoBench agent uses around 750K tokens, which costs around \$15. Among them, 43K tokens are used for proposing topics, 576K tokens are used for constructing datasets, and 147K for evaluation.

6 Main Results

We find that AutoBench successfully constructs datasets that satisfy the three desiderata. We first report the novelty and difficulty scores in §6.1. Then we provide the list of discovered topics and qualitative examples of questions generated by AutoBench in §6.2. Finally, we conduct a human study that verifies the salience, novelty, and difficulty of the discovered topics in §6.3.

6.1 Novelty and Difficulty

Recall that our definition of novelty measures the rank correlation between models’ accuracies on one dataset with their accuracies on all other datasets. A lower correlation indicates more novel performance trends. We find that datasets constructed by AutoBench are significantly more novel than existing human-constructed datasets, reducing the rank correlation by 27%. Moreover, AutoBench datasets also exhibit 22% greater difficulty (DIFF) and higher separation (SEP) between models, increasing the accuracy gaps between existing models by 1%, on average. These improvements hold across all domains, as shown in Table 1.

We evaluate the impact of adaptive search on novelty and difficulty by ablating it in AUTOBENCH-AS. Rather than conditioning on the (topic, accuracy) pairs of previously proposed topics, we simply prompt LM_{gen} to propose salient, difficult, and diverse topics. Table 1 (top) shows that AUTOBENCH-AS obtains lower novelty and difficulty scores than full AutoBench, but still outperforms the human-constructed datasets in all metrics. This is likely because adaptive search only affects the quality of the proposal distribution, and AUTOBENCH-AS still accounts for novelty and difficulty via final re-ranking on the objective function.

6.2 Qualitative Examples

To qualitatively analyze the results of AutoBench, we list the topics that are selected by AutoBench along with the number of Wikipedia page views of that topic and 3 random (question, answer) pairs from each constructed dataset in Table 3. We find that the generated questions and answers are generally of high quality: they are primarily factually correct and self-contained, though some questions are too open-ended or have dubious answers, e.g., “What is the significance of blockchain technology in environmental science?” Below, we also discuss the novel performance trends AutoBench reveals in four topics. See Appendix D for the full ranking details.

Fordism is an important economic concept on mass production. Gemini Pro drops from an average rank of 6 on existing economics datasets to 16. In contrast, OpenChat-3.5 performs quite well. It jumps from an average economics rank of 8 to 2 on this dataset, nearly matching Claude 3 Sonnet.

Table 1: Comparison between AutoBench and prior human-constructed datasets (HUMANBENCH) on novelty, separation (SEP), and difficulty (DIFF). Higher numbers are better for all metrics. AutoBench constructs datasets that are significantly more novel and difficult over human-constructed datasets. Ablating the adaptive search component impacts all metrics, particularly difficulty.

	History			Economy			Science		
	NOVEL	SEP	DIFF	NOVEL	SEP	DIFF	NOVEL	SEP	DIFF
HUMANBENCH	0.05	0.031	0.103	0.13	0.011	0.056	0.22	0.020	0.4
AUTOBENCH-AS	0.24 ± 0.07	0.037	0.257	0.34 ± 0.06	0.021	0.206	0.35 ± 0.12	0.024	0.144
AUTOBENCH	0.39 ± 0.10	0.042	0.440	0.43 ± 0.10	0.026	0.321	0.39 ± 0.06	0.031	0.475

	Multilingual			Math		
	NOVEL	SEP	DIFF	NOVEL	SEP	DIFF
HUMANBENCH	0.24	0.043	0.606	0.24	0.178	0.386
AUTOBENCH	0.57 ± 0.07	0.047	0.113	0.84 ± 0.1	0.122	0.514

Secret Society is a historical topic, and exhibits better-than-expected GPT-3.5 Turbo accuracy, rising from rank 7 to 3. Gemini Pro performs worse than expected, dropping from rank 6 to 16.

Economic impact of COVID-19 reveals much better-than-expected accuracy by Mistral-7B and OpenAGI-7B, which nearly match GPT-4 Turbo, perhaps due to the wealth of COVID-19 data.

Permian extinction is the earth’s most severe known extinction event. Gemini Pro and Claude-2.0 both perform much worse than expected, dropping ranks by 7 and 4 respectively.

General trends. Overall, AutoBench reveals two general trends: First, small 7B models can perform quite well on select topics, matching the accuracies of much larger models, and even at times, the best models. Second, Gemini Pro frequently performs much worse on AutoBench-selected topics than on existing datasets.

Table 2: We find that the human-generated datasets on these discovered evaluation topics are also novel. This confirms that the discovered topics indeed reveal novel model performance.

	Economy			Science			History		
	NOVEL	SEP	DIFF	NOVEL	SEP	DIFF	NOVEL	SEP	DIFF
HUMANBENCH	0.13	0.011	0.056	0.22	0.020	0.400	0.05	0.031	0.103
AUTOBENCH	0.43 ± 0.1	0.026	0.321	0.39 ± 0.06	0.031	0.475	0.39 ± 0.1	0.042	0.440
Human Study	0.34 ± 0.06	0.042	0.130	0.39 ± 0.06	0.057	0.268	0.17 ± 0.04	0.034	0.269

6.3 Human Study for Robustness

We have shown that AutoBench can identify salient topics such as the Permian extinction where capable models fail. However, this does not prove that the dataset we construct is salient, or that the topic itself is what is causing the model to fail. For example, the optimization process of AutoBench may have discovered specific, adversarial interactions between LM_{gen} and the test-taker model, or there may be subtle flaws in the dataset itself. To rule out these issues, we perform a verification study where humans generate the dataset given only the topic category, and show that the same trends appear with human generated datasets.

Specifically, we gave one of the authors the discovered topics and access to Wikipedia and asked them to generate a QA dataset on the given topic. We report the novelty and difficulty metrics of the human-generated dataset in Table 2. We find that the human generated datasets on these topics are also more novel than the existing datasets in each domain, improving novelty by 16%. Also, the human constructed dataset on the discovered topics attains better difficulty and separability scores than existing datasets on average, though the gaps are smaller here. Overall, these results show that our identified novel failures are robust to dataset construction approaches (e.g., by AutoBench, or by human) and AutoBench is a promising way to find salient, difficult, and novel model failures.

Table 3: Discovered topics (labeled with their Wikipedia page view count) and three (question, answer) pairs randomly drawn from the datasets constructed by AutoBench.

Topic	Qualitative Examples of (question, answer)
[History] Secret society (1.2M)	Question: Who was assassinated in 1963? Answer: John F. Kennedy Question: Who compiled 'The Cyclopædia of Fraternities' in 1899? Answer: Albert Clark Stevens Question: Which university's historian offered a three-pronged definition of secret societies? Answer: University of Idaho
[History] Space Race (1.4M)	Question: What was the first artificial satellite? Answer: Sputnik 1 Question: Which astronaut was the first American to orbit the Earth? Answer: John Glenn Question: What action did President Eisenhower take in response to the Soviet space lead? Answer: Recommended the establishment of NASA
[Science] Environmental science (0.9M)	Question: What legislation was established in Mesopotamia to address deforestation? Answer: the first legislation limiting deforestation Question: How does artificial intelligence contribute to wildlife conservation? Answer: by predicting the movement of animal populations and protecting the habitats of wildlife Question: What is the significance of blockchain technology in environmental science? Answer: monitors and regulates global fisheries
[Science] Late Permian extinction event (1.6M)	Question: What is the 13C / 12C ratio of buried sedimentary organic matter below normal? Answer: 2.0 to 2.5% below normal Question: What was the fate of ammonoids during the Permian-Triassic extinction event? Answer: suffered a selective extinction pulse 10 million years before the main event Question: What phenomenon drastically increased competition and accelerated biotic recovery in the Anisian? Answer: niche crowding
[Economy] Fordism (0.5M)	Question: What predominates over manufacturing in the current economic landscape? Answer: Service industries Question: What was a byproduct of Ford substantially increasing his workers' wages? Answer: Giving them the means to become customers Question: What major advantage did Fordism bring to industrial production? Answer: It cut down on the manpower necessary for the factory to operate
[Economy] Economic impact of COVID-19 (41M)	Question: What was the impact of the pandemic on educational systems? Answer: many governments temporarily closed educational institutions Question: What was the increase in percentage of white collar workers working remotely from before the pandemic to May 2020? Answer: From 6% to 65% Question: By what percentage did the income generated from work across the world drop in the first nine months of 2020? Answer: 10.7 percent
[Math] Probability of two events	Question: What is the probability of selecting an odd number from the set 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and then selecting a number divisible by 2 from the set 2, 4, 6, 8? Answer: 1.0 Question: In a lottery where you pick a number from 1 to 100, what is the probability of guessing the number correctly two times in a row? Answer: 0.0001 Question: What is the probability of rolling a 1 on a six-sided die and then flipping tails on a coin? Answer: 0.08333
[Math] Order of operations	Question: What is $72 + 18 - (6 * 5)$? Answer: 60 Question: What is $88 + 12 - (56 / 7)$? Answer: 92.0 Question: What is $(80 - 40) / (10 / 2)$? Answer: 8.0

7 Conclusion and Future Works

In this paper, we present a metrics-driven approach towards constructing new datasets. Given three desiderata of salience, difficulty, and novelty, we operationalize them as metrics and cast benchmark construction as a discrete search problem optimizing for these metrics. To tackle this search, we propose AutoBench, which uses a language model to search for datasets that meet these criteria.

The paper focuses on the capabilities of LLMs such as knowledge-intensive QA, mathematics, and multilingualism. Future works could apply AutoBench to broader domains (e.g., safety, efficiency) to search for novel model behavior patterns. Additionally, we restrict the proposed topics to fall under a domain for the scope of this paper, and future works could explore this design space and extend AutoBench to propose creative tasks.

References

- [1] Anthropic. Claude 3 haiku: our fastest model yet. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-haiku>, 2024.
- [2] Akari Asai, Jungo Kasai, Jonathan H. Clark, Kenton Lee, Eunsol Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. XOR QA: Cross-lingual open-retrieval question answering. In *NAACL-HLT*, 2021.
- [3] Edward Beeching, Clémentine Fourrier, Nathan Habib, Sheon Han, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Omar Sanseviero, Lewis Tunstall, and Thomas Wolf. Open llm leaderboard. https://huggingface.co/spaces/HuggingFaceH4/open_llm_leaderboard, 2023.
- [4] Sid Black, Stella Rose Biderman, Eric Hallahan, Quentin G. Anthony, Leo Gao, Laurence Golding, Horace He, Connor Leahy, Kyle McDonell, Jason Phang, M. Pieler, Usvsn Sai Prashanth, Shivanshu Purohit, Laria Reynolds, J. Tow, Ben Wang, and Samuel Weinbach. GPT-NeoX-20B: An open-source autoregressive language model. *arXiv*, 2022.
- [5] Ryan Burnell, Han Hao, Andrew R. A. Conway, and Jose Hernandez Orallo. Revealing the structure of language model capabilities, 2023.
- [6] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- [7] Emily Dinan, Samuel Humeau, Bharath Chintagunta, and Jason Weston. Build it break it fix it for dialogue safety: Robustness from adversarial human attack. In Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4537–4546, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1461. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D19-1461>.
- [8] Yann Dubois, Tatsunori Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. Evaluating self-supervised learning via risk decomposition. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023.
- [9] Jinlan Fu, See-Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. Gptscore: Evaluate as you desire. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04166*, 2023.
- [10] Yingqiang Ge, Wenyue Hua, Kai Mei, Jianchao Ji, Juntao Tan, Shuyuan Xu, Zelong Li, and Yongfeng Zhang. Openagi: When llm meets domain experts, 2023.
- [11] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [12] Robin Jia and Percy Liang. Adversarial examples for evaluating reading comprehension systems. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2017.
- [13] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mistral 7b, 2023.
- [14] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th  ophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mixtral of experts, 2024.
- [15] Xiang Li, Yunshi Lan, and Chao Yang. Treeeval: Benchmark-free evaluation of large language models through tree planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13125*, 2024.

- [16] Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, D. Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Cosgrove, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Ré, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew A. Hudson, E. Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue Wang, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel J. Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yuksekogul, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan S. Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri S. Chatterji, O. Khattab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, S. Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas F. Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. Holistic evaluation of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09110*, 2022.
- [17] Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07958*, 2021.
- [18] Nelson F. Liu, Tony Lee, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. Do question answering modeling improvements hold across benchmarks? 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 13186–13218, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.736. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.736>.
- [19] Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianguang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, and Dongmei Zhang. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct, 2023.
- [20] Felipe Maia Polo, Lucas Weber, Leshem Choshen, Yuekai Sun, Gongjun Xu, and Mikhail Yurochkin. tinybenchmarks: evaluating llms with fewer examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14992*, 2024.
- [21] Ian McKenzie, Alexander Lyzhov, Alicia Parrish, Ameya Prabhu, Aaron Mueller, Najoung Kim, Sam Bowman, and Ethan Perez. The inverse scaling prize, 2022. URL <https://github.com/inverse-scaling/prize>.
- [22] Yixin Nie, Adina Williams, Emily Dinan, Mohit Bansal, J. Weston, and Douwe Kiela. Adversarial nli: A new benchmark for natural language understanding. In *Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2020.
- [23] OpenAI. Introducing ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>, 2022.
- [24] OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [25] Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Pengcheng He, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Instruction tuning with gpt-4, 2023.
- [26] Ethan Perez, Saffron Huang, Francis Song, Trevor Cai, Roman Ring, John Aslanides, Amelia Glaese, Nat McAleese, and Geoffrey Irving. Red teaming language models with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03286*, 2022.
- [27] Yotam Perlitz, Elron Bandel, Ariel Gera, Ofir Arviv, Liat Ein-Dor, Eyal Shnarch, Noam Slonim, Michal Shmueli-Scheuer, and Leshem Choshen. Efficient benchmarking of language models, 2024.
- [28] David Rein, Betty Li Hou, Asa Cooper Stickland, Jackson Petty, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Julien Dirani, Julian Michael, and Samuel R. Bowman. Gpqa: A graduate-level google-proof q&a benchmark, 2023.
- [29] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Tongshuang Wu, Carlos Guestrin, and Sameer Singh. Beyond accuracy: Behavioral testing of NLP models with CheckList. In *Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 4902–4912, 2020.
- [30] Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.10641*, 2019.

- [31] David Saxton, Edward Grefenstette, Felix Hill, and Pushmeet Kohli. Analysing mathematical reasoning abilities of neural models. *ArXiv*, abs/1904.01557, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:85504763>.
- [32] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca, 2023.
- [33] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M. Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, David Silver, Melvin Johnson, Ioannis Antonoglou, Julian Schrittwieser, Amelia Glaese, Jilin Chen, Emily Pitler, Timothy Lillicrap, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, James Molloy, Michael Isard, Paul R. Barham, Tom Hennigan, Benjamin Lee, Fabio Viola, Malcolm Reynolds, Yuanzhong Xu, Ryan Doherty, Eli Collins, Clemens Meyer, Eliza Rutherford, Erica Moreira, Kareem Ayoub, Megha Goel, Jack Krawczyk, Cosmo Du, Ed Chi, Heng-Tze Cheng, Eric Ni, Purvi Shah, Patrick Kane, Betty Chan, Manaal Faruqui, Aliaksei Severyn, Hanzhao Lin, YaGuang Li, Yong Cheng, Abe Ittycheriah, Mahdis Mahdieh, Mia Chen, Pei Sun, Dustin Tran, Sumit Bagri, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Jeremiah Liu, Andras Orban, Fabian Gra, Hao Zhou, Xinying Song, Aurelien Boffy, Harish Ganapathy, Steven Zheng, HyunJeong Choe, goston Weisz, Tao Zhu, Yifeng Lu, Siddharth Gopal, Jarrod Kahn, Maciej Kula, Jeff Pitman, Rushin Shah, Emanuel Taropa, Majd Al Mery, Martin Baeul, Zhifeng Chen, Laurent El Shafey, Yujing Zhang, Olcan Sercinoglu, George Tucker, Enrique Piqueras, Maxim Krikun, Iain Barr, Nikolay Savinov, Ivo Danihelka, Becca Roelofs, Anas White, Anders Andreassen, Tamara von Glehn, Lakshman Yagati, Mehran Kazemi, Lucas Gonzalez, Misha Khalman, Jakub Sygnowski, Alexandre Frechette, Charlotte Smith, Laura Culp, Lev Proleev, Yi Luan, Xi Chen, James Lottes, Nathan Schucher, Federico Lebron, Alban Rustemi, Natalie Clay, Phil Crone, Tomas Kocisky, Jeffrey Zhao, Bartek Perz, Dian Yu, Heidi Howard, Adam Bloniarz, Jack W. Rae, Han Lu, Laurent Sifre, Marcello Maggioni, Fred Alcober, Dan Garrette, Megan Barnes, Shantanu Thakoor, Jacob Austin, Gabriel Barth-Maron, William Wong, Rishabh Joshi, Rahma Chaabouni, Deeni Fatiha, Arun Ahuja, Gaurav Singh Tomar, Evan Senter, Martin Chadwick, Ilya Kornakov, Nithya Attaluri, Iaki Iturrate, Ruibo Liu, Yunxuan Li, Sarah Cogan, Jeremy Chen, Chao Jia, Chenjie Gu, Qiao Zhang, Jordan Grimstad, Ale Jakse Hartman, Xavier Garcia, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Jacob Devlin, Michael Laskin, Diego de Las Casas, Dasha Valter, Connie Tao, Lorenzo Blanco, Adri Puigdomnech Badia, David Reitter, Mianna Chen, Jenny Brennan, Clara Rivera, Sergey Brin, Shariq Iqbal, Gabriela Surita, Jane Labanowski, Abhi Rao, Stephanie Winkler, Emilio Parisotto, Yiming Gu, Kate Olszewska, Ravi Addanki, Antoine Miech, Annie Louis, Denis Teplyashin, Geoff Brown, Elliot Catt, Jan Balaguer, Jackie Xiang, Pidong Wang, Zoe Ashwood, Anton Briukhov, Albert Webson, Sanjay Ganapathy, Smit Sanghavi, Ajay Kannan, Ming-Wei Chang, Axel Stjerngren, Josip Djolonga, Yuting Sun, Ankur Bapna, Matthew Aitchison, Pedram Pejman, Henryk Michalewski, Tianhe Yu, Cindy Wang, Juliette Love, Junwhan Ahn, Dawn Bloxwich, Kehang Han, Peter Humphreys, Thibault Sellam, James Bradbury, Varun Godbole, Sina Samangooei, Bogdan Damoc, Alex Kaskasoli, Sbastien M. R. Arnold, Vijay Vasudevan, Shubham Agrawal, Jason Riesa, Dmitry Lepikhin, Richard Tanburn, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Hyeontaek Lim, Sarah Hodgkinson, Pranav Shyam, Johan Ferret, Steven Hand, Ankush Garg, Tom Le Paine, Jian Li, Yujia Li, Minh Giang, Alexander Neitz, Zaheer Abbas, Sarah York, Machel Reid, Elizabeth Cole, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Dipanjan Das, Dominika Rogoziska, Vitaliy Nikolaev, Pablo Sprechmann, Zachary Nado, Lukas Zilka, Flavien Prost, Luheng He, Marianne Monteiro, Gaurav Mishra, Chris Welty, Josh Newlan, Dawei Jia, Miltiadis Allamanis, Clara Huiyi Hu, Raoul de Liedekerke, Justin Gilmer, Carl Saroufim, Shruti Rijhwani, Shaobo Hou, Disha Shrivastava, Anirudh Baddepudi, Alex Goldin, Adnan Ozturel, Albin Cassirer, Yunhan Xu, Daniel Sohn, Devendra Sachan, Reinald Kim Amplayo, Craig Swanson, Dessie Petrova, Shashi Narayan, Arthur Guez, Siddhartha Brahma, Jessica Landon, Miteyan Patel, Ruizhe Zhao, Kevin Vilella, Luyu Wang, Wenhao Jia, Matthew Rahtz, Mai Gimnez, Legg Yeung, James Keeling, Petko Georgiev, Diana Mincu, Boxi Wu, Salem Haykal, Rachel Saputro, Kiran Vodrahalli, James Qin, Zeynep Cankara, Abhanshu Sharma, Nick Fernando, Will Hawkins, Behnam Neyshabur, Solomon Kim, Adrian Hutter, Priyanka Agrawal, Alex Castro-Ros, George van den Driessche, Tao Wang, Fan Yang, Shuo yiin Chang, Paul Komarek, Ross McIlroy, Mario Lui, Guodong Zhang, Wael Farhan, Michael Sharman, Paul Natsev, Paul Michel, Yamini Bansal, Siyuan Qiao, Kris Cao, Siamak Shakeri, Christina Butterfield, Justin Chung, Paul Kishan Rubenstein, Shivani Agrawal, Arthur Mensch,

Kedar Soparkar, Karel Lenc, Timothy Chung, Aedan Pope, Loren Maggiore, Jackie Kay, Priya Jhakra, Shibo Wang, Joshua Maynez, Mary Phuong, Taylor Tobin, Andrea Tacchetti, Maja Trebacz, Kevin Robinson, Yash Katariya, Sebastian Riedel, Paige Bailey, Kefan Xiao, Nimesh Ghelani, Lora Aroyo, Ambrose Slone, Neil Houlsby, Xuehan Xiong, Zhen Yang, Elena Gribovskaya, Jonas Adler, Mateo Wirth, Lisa Lee, Music Li, Thais Kagohara, Jay Pavagadhi, Sophie Bridgers, Anna Bortsova, Sanjay Ghemawat, Zafarali Ahmed, Tianqi Liu, Richard Powell, Vijay Bolina, Mariko Iinuma, Polina Zablotskaia, James Besley, Da-Woon Chung, Timothy Dozat, Ramona Comanescu, Xiance Si, Jeremy Greer, Guolong Su, Martin Polacek, Raphaël Lopez Kaufman, Simon Tokumine, Hexiang Hu, Elena Buchatskaya, Yingjie Miao, Mohamed Elhawaty, Aditya Siddhant, Nenad Tomasev, Jinwei Xing, Christina Greer, Helen Miller, Shereen Ashraf, Aurko Roy, Zizhao Zhang, Ada Ma, Angelos Filos, Milos Besta, Rory Blevins, Ted Klimenko, Chih-Kuan Yeh, Soravit Changpinyo, Jiaqi Mu, Oscar Chang, Mantas Pajarskas, Carrie Muir, Vered Cohen, Charline Le Lan, Krishna Haridasan, Amit Marathe, Steven Hansen, Sholto Douglas, Rajkumar Samuel, Mingqiu Wang, Sophia Austin, Chang Lan, Jiepu Jiang, Justin Chiu, Jaime Alonso Lorenzo, Lars Lowe Sjösund, Sébastien Cevey, Zach Gleicher, Thi Avrahami, Anudhyan Boral, Hansa Srinivasan, Vittorio Selo, Rhys May, Konstantinos Aisopos, Léonard Hussenot, Livio Baldini Soares, Kate Baumli, Michael B. Chang, Adrià Recasens, Ben Caine, Alexander Pritzel, Filip Pavetic, Fabio Pardo, Anita Gergely, Justin Frye, Vinay Ramasesh, Dan Horgan, Kartikeya Badola, Nora Kassner, Subhrajit Roy, Ethan Dyer, Víctor Campos Campos, Alex Tomala, Yunhao Tang, Dalia El Badawy, Elspeth White, Basil Mustafa, Oran Lang, Abhishek Jindal, Sharad Vikram, Zhitao Gong, Sergi Caelles, Ross Hemsley, Gregory Thornton, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Wojciech Stokowiec, Ce Zheng, Phoebe Thacker, Çağlar Ünlü, Zhishuai Zhang, Mohammad Saleh, James Svensson, Max Bileschi, Piyush Patil, Ankesh Anand, Roman Ring, Katerina Tsihlias, Arpi Vezer, Marco Selvi, Toby Shevlane, Mikel Rodriguez, Tom Kwiatkowski, Samira Daruki, Keran Rong, Allan Dafoe, Nicholas FitzGerald, Keren Gu-Lemberg, Mina Khan, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Marie Pellat, Vladimir Feinberg, James Cobon-Kerr, Tara Sainath, Maribeth Rauh, Sayed Hadi Hashemi, Richard Ives, Yana Hasson, Eric Noland, Yuan Cao, Nathan Byrd, Le Hou, Qingze Wang, Thibault Sottiaux, Michela Paganini, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Alexandre Moufarek, Samer Hassan, Kaushik Shivakumar, Joost van Amersfoort, Amol Mandhane, Pratik Joshi, Anirudh Goyal, Matthew Tung, Andrew Brock, Hannah Sheahan, Vedant Misra, Cheng Li, Nemanja Rakićević, Mostafa Dehghani, Fangyu Liu, Sid Mittal, Junhyuk Oh, Seb Noury, Eren Sezener, Fantine Huot, Matthew Lamm, Nicola De Cao, Charlie Chen, Sidharth Mudgal, Romina Stella, Kevin Brooks, Gautam Vasudevan, Chenxi Liu, Mainak Chain, Nivedita Melinkeri, Aaron Cohen, Venus Wang, Kristie Seymore, Sergey Zubkov, Rahul Goel, Summer Yue, Sai Krishnakumaran, Brian Albert, Nate Hurley, Motoki Sano, Anhad Mohananey, Jonah Joughin, Egor Filonov, Tomasz Kępa, Yomna Eldawy, Jiawern Lim, Rahul Rishi, Shirin Badiezadegan, Taylor Bos, Jerry Chang, Sanil Jain, Sri Gayatri Sundara Padmanabhan, Subha Puttagunta, Kalpesh Krishna, Leslie Baker, Norbert Kalb, Vamsi Bedapudi, Adam Kurzrok, Shuntong Lei, Anthony Yu, Oren Litvin, Xiang Zhou, Zhichun Wu, Sam Sobell, Andrea Siciliano, Alan Papir, Robby Neale, Jonas Bragagnolo, Tej Toor, Tina Chen, Valentin Anklin, Feiran Wang, Richie Feng, Milad Gholami, Kevin Ling, Lijuan Liu, Jules Walter, Hamid Moghaddam, Arun Kishore, Jakub Adamek, Tyler Mercado, Jonathan Mallinson, Siddhinta Wandekar, Stephen Cagle, Eran Ofek, Guillermo Garrido, Clemens Lombriser, Maksim Mukha, Botu Sun, Hafeezul Rahman Mohammad, Josip Matak, Yadi Qian, Vikas Peswani, Pawel Janus, Quan Yuan, Leif Schelin, Oana David, Ankur Garg, Yifan He, Oleksii Duzhyi, Anton Ålgmyr, Timothée Lottaz, Qi Li, Vikas Yadav, Luyao Xu, Alex Chinien, Rakesh Shivanna, Aleksandr Chuklin, Josie Li, Carrie Spadine, Travis Wolfe, Kareem Mohamed, Subhabrata Das, Zihang Dai, Kyle He, Daniel von Dincklage, Shyam Upadhyay, Akanksha Maurya, Luyan Chi, Sebastian Krause, Khalid Salama, Pam G Rabinovitch, Pavan Kumar Reddy M, Aarush Selvan, Mikhail Dektiarev, Golnaz Ghiasi, Erdem Guven, Himanshu Gupta, Boyi Liu, Deepak Sharma, Idan Heimlich Shtacher, Shachi Paul, Oscar Akerlund, François-Xavier Aubet, Terry Huang, Chen Zhu, Eric Zhu, Elico Teixeira, Matthew Fritze, Francesco Bertolini, Liana-Eleonora Marinescu, Martin Bölle, Dominik Paulus, Khyatti Gupta, Tejasi Latkar, Max Chang, Jason Sanders, Roopa Wilson, Xuwei Wu, Yi-Xuan Tan, Lam Nguyen Thiet, Tulsee Doshi, Sid Lall, Swaroop Mishra, Wanming Chen, Thang Luong, Seth Benjamin, Jasmine Lee, Ewa Andrejczuk, Dominik Rabiej, Vipul Ranjan, Krzysztof Styrc, Pengcheng Yin, Jon Simon, Malcolm Rose Harriott, Mudit Bansal, Alexei Robsky, Geoff Bacon, David Greene, Daniil Mirylenka, Chen Zhou, Obaid Sarvana, Abhimanyu Goyal, Samuel Andermatt, Patrick Siegler, Ben Horn, Assaf Israel, Francesco Pongetti, Chih-Wei "Louis" Chen,

Marco Selvatici, Pedro Silva, Kathie Wang, Jackson Tolins, Kelvin Guu, Roey Yoge, Xiaochen Cai, Alessandro Agostini, Maulik Shah, Hung Nguyen, Noah Ó Donnaile, Sébastien Pereira, Linda Friso, Adam Stambler, Adam Kurzrok, Chenkai Kuang, Yan Romanikhin, Mark Geller, ZJ Yan, Kane Jang, Cheng-Chun Lee, Wojciech Fica, Eric Malmi, Qijun Tan, Dan Banica, Daniel Balle, Ryan Pham, Yanping Huang, Diana Avram, Hongzhi Shi, Jasjot Singh, Chris Hidey, Niharika Ahuja, Pranab Saxena, Dan Dooley, Srividya Pranavi Potharaju, Eileen O'Neill, Anand Gokulchandran, Ryan Foley, Kai Zhao, Mike Dusenberry, Yuan Liu, Pulkit Mehta, Ragha Kotikalapudi, Chalence Safranek-Shrader, Andrew Goodman, Joshua Kessinger, Eran Globen, Prateek Kolhar, Chris Gorgolewski, Ali Ibrahim, Yang Song, Ali Eichenbaum, Thomas Brovelli, Sahitya Potluri, Preethi Lahoti, Cip Baetu, Ali Ghorbani, Charles Chen, Andy Crawford, Shalini Pal, Mukund Sridhar, Petru Gurita, Asier Mujika, Igor Petrovski, Pierre-Louis Cedoz, Chenmei Li, Shiyuan Chen, Niccolò Dal Santo, Siddharth Goyal, Jitesh Punjabi, Karthik Kappaganthu, Chester Kwak, Pallavi LV, Sarmishta Velury, Himadri Choudhury, Jamie Hall, Premal Shah, Ricardo Figueira, Matt Thomas, Minjie Lu, Ting Zhou, Chintu Kumar, Thomas Jurdi, Sharat Chikkerur, Yenai Ma, Adams Yu, Soo Kwak, Victor Åhdel, Sujevan Rajayogam, Travis Choma, Fei Liu, Aditya Barua, Colin Ji, Ji Ho Park, Vincent Hellendoorn, Alex Bailey, Taylan Bilal, Huanjie Zhou, Mehrdad Khatir, Charles Sutton, Wojciech Rzadkowski, Fiona Macintosh, Konstantin Shagin, Paul Medina, Chen Liang, Jinjing Zhou, Pararth Shah, Yingying Bi, Attila Dankovics, Shipra Banga, Sabine Lehmann, Marissa Bredesen, Zifan Lin, John Eric Hoffmann, Jonathan Lai, Raynald Chung, Kai Yang, Nihal Balani, Arthur Bražinskas, Andrei Sozanschi, Matthew Hayes, Héctor Fernández Alcalde, Peter Makarov, Will Chen, Antonio Stella, Liselotte Snijders, Michael Mandl, Ante Kärroman, Paweł Nowak, Xinyi Wu, Alex Dyck, Krishnan Vaidyanathan, Raghavender R, Jessica Mallet, Mitch Rudominer, Eric Johnston, Sushil Mittal, Akhil Udathu, Janara Christensen, Vishal Verma, Zach Irving, Andreas Santucci, Gamaleldin Elsayed, Elnaz Davoodi, Marin Georgiev, Ian Tenney, Nan Hua, Geoffrey Cideron, Edouard Leurent, Mahmoud Alnahlawi, Ionut Georgescu, Nan Wei, Ivy Zheng, Dylan Scandinaro, Heinrich Jiang, Jasper Snoek, Mukund Sundararajan, Xuezhi Wang, Zack Ontiveros, Itay Karo, Jeremy Cole, Vinu Rajashekhar, Lara Tume, Eyal Ben-David, Rishub Jain, Jonathan Uesato, Romina Datta, Oskar Bunyan, Shimu Wu, John Zhang, Piotr Stanczyk, Ye Zhang, David Steiner, Subhjit Naskar, Michael Azzam, Matthew Johnson, Adam Paszke, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Jaume Sanchez Elias, Afroz Mohiuddin, Faizan Muhammad, Jin Miao, Andrew Lee, Nino Vieillard, Jane Park, Jiageng Zhang, Jeff Stanway, Drew Garmon, Abhijit Karmarkar, Zhe Dong, Jong Lee, Aviral Kumar, Luowei Zhou, Jonathan Evens, William Isaac, Geoffrey Irving, Edward Loper, Michael Fink, Isha Arkatkar, Nanxin Chen, Izhak Shafran, Ivan Petrychenko, Zhe Chen, Johnson Jia, Anselm Levskaya, Zhenkai Zhu, Peter Grabowski, Yu Mao, Alberto Magni, Kaisheng Yao, Javier Snaider, Norman Casagrande, Evan Palmer, Paul Suganthan, Alfonso Castaño, Irene Giannoumis, Wooyeol Kim, Mikołaj Rybiński, Ashwin Sreevatsa, Jennifer Prendki, David Soergel, Adrian Goedeckemeyer, Willi Gierke, Mohsen Jafari, Meenu Gaba, Jeremy Wiesner, Diana Gage Wright, Yawen Wei, Harsha Vashisht, Yana Kulizhskaya, Jay Hoover, Maigo Le, Lu Li, Chimezie Iwuanyanwu, Lu Liu, Kevin Ramirez, Andrey Khorlin, Albert Cui, Tian LIN, Marcus Wu, Ricardo Aguilar, Keith Pallo, Abhishek Chakladar, Ginger Perng, Elena Allica Abellan, Mingyang Zhang, Ishita Dasgupta, Nate Kushman, Ivo Penchev, Alena Repina, Xihui Wu, Tom van der Weide, Priya Ponnappalli, Caroline Kaplan, Jiri Simsa, Shuangfeng Li, Olivier Dousse, Fan Yang, Jeff Piper, Nathan Ie, Rama Pasumarthi, Nathan Lintz, Anitha Vijayakumar, Daniel Andor, Pedro Valenzuela, Minnie Lui, Cosmin Padurararu, Daiyi Peng, Katherine Lee, Shuyuan Zhang, Somer Greene, Duc Dung Nguyen, Paula Kurylowicz, Cassidy Hardin, Lucas Dixon, Lili Janzer, Kiam Choo, Ziqiang Feng, Biao Zhang, Achintya Singhal, Dayou Du, Dan McKinnon, Natasha Antropova, Tolga Bolukbasi, Orgad Keller, David Reid, Daniel Finchelstein, Maria Abi Raad, Remi Crocker, Peter Hawkins, Robert Dadashi, Colin Gaffney, Ken Franko, Anna Bulanova, Rémi Leblond, Shirley Chung, Harry Askham, Luis C. Cobo, Kelvin Xu, Felix Fischer, Jun Xu, Christina Sorokin, Chris Alberti, Chu-Cheng Lin, Colin Evans, Alek Dimitriev, Hannah Forbes, Dylan Banarse, Zora Tung, Mark Omernick, Colton Bishop, Rachel Sterneck, Rohan Jain, Jiawei Xia, Ehsan Amid, Francesco Piccinno, Xingyu Wang, Praseem Banzal, Daniel J. Mankowitz, Alex Polozov, Victoria Krakovna, Sasha Brown, MohammadHossein Bateni, Dennis Duan, Vlad Firoiu, Meghana Thotakuri, Tom Natan, Matthieu Geist, Ser tan Girgin, Hui Li, Jiayu Ye, Ofir Roval, Reiko Tojo, Michael Kwong, James Lee-Thorp, Christopher Yew, Danila Sinopalnikov, Sabela Ramos, John Mellor, Abhishek Sharma, Kathy Wu, David Miller, Nicolas Sonnerat, Denis Vnukov, Rory Greig, Jennifer Beattie, Emily Caviness, Libin Bai, Julian Eisenschlos, Alex Korchemniy, Tomy Tsai, Mimi Jasarevic,

Weize Kong, Phuong Dao, Zeyu Zheng, Frederick Liu, Fan Yang, Rui Zhu, Tian Huey Teh, Jason Sanmiya, Evgeny Gladchenko, Nejc Trdin, Daniel Toyama, Evan Rosen, Sasan Tavakkol, Linting Xue, Chen Elkind, Oliver Woodman, John Carpenter, George Papamakarios, Rupert Kemp, Sushant Kafle, Tanya Grunina, Rishika Sinha, Alice Talbert, Diane Wu, Denese Owusu-Afriyie, Cosmo Du, Chloe Thornton, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Pradyumna Narayana, Jing Li, Saaber Fatehi, John Wieting, Omar Ajmeri, Benigno Uribe, Yeongil Ko, Laura Knight, Amélie Hélie, Ning Niu, Shane Gu, Chenxi Pang, Yeqing Li, Nir Levine, Ariel Stolovich, Rebeca Santamaria-Fernandez, Sonam Goenka, Wenny Yustalim, Robin Strudel, Ali Elqursh, Charlie Deck, Hyo Lee, Zonglin Li, Kyle Levin, Raphael Hoffmann, Dan Holtmann-Rice, Olivier Bachem, Sho Arora, Christy Koh, Soheil Hassas Yeganeh, Siim Pöder, Mukarram Tariq, Yanhua Sun, Lucian Ionita, Mojtaba Seyedhosseini, Pouya Tafti, Zhiyu Liu, Anmol Gulati, Jasmine Liu, Xinyu Ye, Bart Chrzaszcz, Lily Wang, Nikhil Sethi, Tianrun Li, Ben Brown, Shreya Singh, Wei Fan, Aaron Parisi, Joe Stanton, Vinod Koverkathu, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Yunjie Li, TJ Lu, Abe Ittycheriah, Prakash Shroff, Mani Varadarajan, Sanaz Bahargam, Rob Willoughby, David Gaddy, Guillaume Desjardins, Marco Cornero, Brona Robenek, Bhavishya Mittal, Ben Albrecht, Ashish Shenoy, Fedor Moiseev, Henrik Jacobsson, Alireza Ghaffarkhah, Morgane Rivière, Alanna Walton, Clément Crepy, Alicia Parrish, Zongwei Zhou, Clement Farabet, Carey Radebaugh, Praveen Srinivasan, Claudia van der Salm, Andreas Fildjeland, Salvatore Scellato, Eri Latorre-Chimoto, Hanna Klimczak-Plucińska, David Bridson, Dario de Cesare, Tom Hudson, Piermaria Mendolicchio, Lexi Walker, Alex Morris, Matthew Mauger, Alexey Guseynov, Alison Reid, Seth Odoom, Lucia Loher, Victor Cotruta, Madhavi Yenugula, Dominik Grewe, Anastasia Petrushkina, Tom Duerig, Antonio Sanchez, Steve Yadlowsky, Amy Shen, Amir Globerson, Lynette Webb, Sahil Dua, Dong Li, Surya Bhupatiraju, Dan Hurt, Haroon Qureshi, Ananth Agarwal, Tomer Shani, Matan Eyal, Anuj Khare, Shreyas Rammohan Belle, Lei Wang, Chetan Tekur, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Jinliang Wei, Ruoxin Sang, Brennan Saeta, Tyler Liechty, Yi Sun, Yao Zhao, Stephan Lee, Pandu Nayak, Doug Fritz, Manish Reddy Vuyyuru, John Aslanides, Nidhi Vyas, Martin Wicke, Xiao Ma, Evgenii Eltyshev, Nina Martin, Hardie Cate, James Manyika, Keyvan Amiri, Yelin Kim, Xi Xiong, Kai Kang, Florian Luisier, Nilesh Tripuraneni, David Madras, Mandy Guo, Austin Waters, Oliver Wang, Joshua Ainslie, Jason Baldridge, Han Zhang, Garima Pruthi, Jakob Bauer, Feng Yang, Riham Mansour, Jason Gelman, Yang Xu, George Polovets, Ji Liu, Honglong Cai, Warren Chen, XiangHai Sheng, Emily Xue, Sherjil Ozair, Christof Angermueller, Xiaowei Li, Anoop Sinha, Weiren Wang, Julia Wiesinger, Emmanouil Koukoumidis, Yuan Tian, Anand Iyer, Madhu Gurumurthy, Mark Goldenson, Parashar Shah, MK Blake, Hongkun Yu, Anthony Urbanowicz, Jennimaria Palomaki, Chrisantha Fernando, Ken Durden, Harsh Mehta, Nikola Momchev, Elahe Rahimtoroghi, Maria Georgaki, Amit Raul, Sebastian Ruder, Morgan Redshaw, Jinhyuk Lee, Denny Zhou, Komal Jalan, Dinghua Li, Blake Hechtman, Parker Schuh, Milad Nasr, Kieran Milan, Vladimir Mikulik, Juliana Franco, Tim Green, Nam Nguyen, Joe Kelley, Aroma Mahendru, Andrea Hu, Joshua Howland, Ben Vargas, Jeffrey Hui, Kshitij Bansal, Vikram Rao, Rakesh Ghiya, Emma Wang, Ke Ye, Jean Michel Sarr, Melanie Moranski Preston, Madeleine Elish, Steve Li, Aakash Kaku, Jigar Gupta, Ice Pasupat, Da-Cheng Juan, Milan Someswar, Tejvi M., Xinyun Chen, Aida Amini, Alex Fabrikant, Eric Chu, Xuanyi Dong, Amruta Muthal, Senaka Buthpitiya, Sarthak Jauhari, Nan Hua, Urvashi Khandelwal, Ayal Hitron, Jie Ren, Larissa Rinaldi, Shahar Drath, Avigail Dabush, Nan-Jiang Jiang, Harshal Godhia, Uli Sachs, Anthony Chen, Yicheng Fan, Hagai Taitelbaum, Hila Noga, Zhuyun Dai, James Wang, Chen Liang, Jenny Hamer, Chun-Sung Ferng, Chenel Elkind, Aviel Atias, Paulina Lee, Vít Listík, Mathias Carlen, Jan van de Kerkhof, Marcin Pikus, Krunoslav Zaher, Paul Müller, Sasha Zykova, Richard Stefanec, Vitaly Gatsko, Christoph Hirsenschall, Ashwin Sethi, Xingyu Federico Xu, Chetan Ahuja, Beth Tsai, Anca Stefanoiu, Bo Feng, Keshav Dhandhania, Manish Katyal, Akshay Gupta, Atharva Parulekar, Divya Pitta, Jing Zhao, Vivaan Bhatia, Yashodha Bhavnani, Omar Alhadlaq, Xiaolin Li, Peter Danenberg, Dennis Tu, Alex Pine, Vera Filippova, Abhipso Ghosh, Ben Limonchik, Bhargava Urala, Chaitanya Krishna Lanka, Derik Clive, Yi Sun, Edward Li, Hao Wu, Kevin Hongtongsak, Ianna Li, Kalind Thakkar, Kuanysh Omarov, Kushal Majmundar, Michael Alverson, Michael Kucharski, Mohak Patel, Mudit Jain, Maksim Zabelin, Paolo Pelagatti, Rohan Kohli, Saurabh Kumar, Joseph Kim, Swetha Sankar, Vineet Shah, Lakshmi Ramachandruni, Xiangkai Zeng, Ben Bariach, Laura Weidinger, Tu Vu, Amar Subramanya, Sissie Hsiao, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Adam Sadovsky, Quoc Le, Trevor Strohman, Yonghui Wu, Slav Petrov, Jeffrey Dean, and Oriol Vinyals. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models, 2024.

- [34] Xwin-Math Team. Xwin-math, 11 2023. URL <https://github.com/Xwin-LM/Xwin-LM/Xwin-Math>.
- [35] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv*, 2023.
- [36] Lewis Tunstall, Edward Beeching, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Kashif Rasul, Younes Belkada, Shengyi Huang, Leandro von Werra, Clémentine Fourier, Nathan Habib, Nathan Sarrazin, Omar Sanseviero, Alexander M. Rush, and Thomas Wolf. Zephyr: Direct distillation of lm alignment, 2023.
- [37] Guan Wang, Sijie Cheng, Xianyuan Zhan, Xiangang Li, Sen Song, and Yang Liu. Openchat: Advancing open-source language models with mixed-quality data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11235*, 2023.
- [38] Minghao Xu, Jian Zhang, Bingbing Ni, Teng Li, Chengjie Wang, Qi Tian, and Wenjun Zhang. Adversarial domain adaptation with domain mixup. In *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, volume 34, pages 6502–6509, 2020.
- [39] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-bench and chatbot arena. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ucCHPGD1ao>.

A Limitation

Recall that in AutoBench, the evaluation datasets are fully model generated. While these datasets serve as good proposal distributions for finding novel patterns, we believe that the novel patterns should be confirmed and verified by humans before making model development decisions based on these findings.

Additionally, we are using GPT-4 as the LM_{gen} , which could potentially bias in favor of models in the same families such as GPT-3.5-turbo. However, empirically, we find that this is not obvious, as AutoBench generated dataset very often rates Claude-3 models the highest.

B Broader Impact

Automatic benchmark creation via AutoBench has several potential negative impacts if used improperly. Primarily, since these created benchmarks can help identify research directions to work on or weaknesses in existing models, adequate care needs to be taken to ensure that the benchmark results are indeed meaningful. Since the benchmark creation is automated, there is potential for weird or insignificant results to arise, and users must not blindly trust these results, but manually quality-check them before drawing significant conclusions. Additionally, we cannot let automatic benchmark creation prevent humans from investing more thought and effort into human data curation, which can serve complementary functions.

C More details on Experimental Setup

Recall in §5.1, we compare AutoBench with human-generated benchmarks as baseline. Here is the detailed HUMANBENCH for each domain:

For history, we compare with 4 history subjects high school world history, prehistory, high school european history, high school us history.

For economy, we compare with 4 subjects: high school microeconomics, econometrics, high school macroeconomics, marketing.

Table 4: The model ranking results of the human study. We highlight the very significant novel trends. We use red to label models that perform worse than expected, and green to label models that perform better than expected.

	History			Science			Economy		
	pred	gold	avg	pred	gold	avg	pred	gold	avg
claude-3-opus-20240229	1	3	2	2	2	1	5	5	1
gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	2
claude-3-sonnet-20240229	3	1	3	4	3	2	7	2	3
claude-2.0	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4
Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1	4	9	5	5	6	5	6	6	5
gemini-pro	6	8	6	6	5	7	3	15	6
gpt-3.5-turbo-0613	7	7	7	7	7	6	2	8	7
openchat-3.5-0106	8	5	8	8	8	8	10	7	8
zephyr-7b-beta	10	11	10	10	10	9	9	12	9
OpenAGI-7B-v0.1	9	6	9	9	9	10	8	4	10
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1	12	16	11	11	11	11	12	13	11
vicuna-7b-v1.5	15	14	12	12	12	12	11	10	12
Llama-2-7b-chat-hf	16	15	15	14	13	14	13	11	13
Xwin-Math-7B-V1.0	14	10	14	15	14	13	15	16	14
WizardMath-7B-V1.0	13	13	13	16	16	15	14	14	15
alpaca-7b	11	12	16	13	15	17	16	9	16
gpt-neo-2.7B	17	17	17	17	17	16	17	17	17

For science, we compare with 7 subjects: high school physics, college physics, college chemistry, high school chemistry, high school biology, college biology, astronomy.

For the LMs $LM \in \mathcal{M}$ that we evaluate. We list their sources with proper citations in Appendix G.

To compare the response of a LM to the dataset label, we use a language model (i.e., `gpt-4-0125-preview`) to judge the correctness of the model-generated response, and output reasons for the judgment.

D Rank Analysis

We report the models’ ranking and their respective accuracies on AutoBench datasets in Table 6, Table 5. We highlight the models that perform worse than expected (in red), and the models that perform better than expected (in green).

We also provide the ranking results of our human study in Table 4.

E AutoBench Search Trajectory

In order to analyze AutoBench, we provide intermediate search results of the AutoBench. Figure 3, Figure 5 and Figure 4 show the search trajectory of AutoBench for history, economy, and science domains. Specifically, we report the evaluation topics that were explored and their respective accuracy as a Star plot.

F More Results on Separation and Headroom

In Figure 7, we show the Pareto frontier of the two difficulty metrics: SEP and DIFFICULTY. Each orange stars represent datasets constructed by AutoBench, and each blue dot represents an MMLU subject. Datasets constructed by AutoBench are mostly at the Pareto frontier, outperforming MMLU subjects in both metrics.

Table 5: The model ranking results of the datasets constructed by AutoBench. We highlight the very significant novel trends. We use red to label models that perform worse than expected, and green to label models that perform better than expected.

	History			Economy			Science		
	pred	gold	avg	pred	gold	avg	pred	gold	avg
claude-3-opus-20240229	1	2	2	2	3	1	1	2	1
gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09	2	1	1	1	4	2	4	3	3
claude-3-sonnet-20240229	4	4	3	10	2	3	2	1	2
claude-2.0	5	6	4	4	5	4	3	7	4
Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1	3	7	5	6	12	5	5	5	5
gemini-pro	6	16	6	5	15	6	7	14	7
gpt-3.5-turbo-0613	7	3	7	3	7	7	8	6	6
openchat-3.5-0106	8	9	8	8	1	8	14	8	8
zephyr-7b-beta	11	11	10	9	14	9	10	13	9
OpenAGI-7B-v0.1	9	5	9	7	9	10	6	4	10
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1	12	10	11	11	8	11	13	12	11
vicuna-7b-v1.5	15	12	12	12	6	12	11	9	12
Llama-2-7b-chat-hf	14	13	15	13	11	13	12	10	14
Xwin-Math-7B-V1.0	16	14	14	14	16	14	16	16	13
WizardMath-7B-V1.0	13	15	13	15	10	15	15	15	15
alpaca-7b	10	8	16	16	13	16	9	11	17
gpt-neo-2.7B	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16

Table 6: LMs’ accuracy on datasets constructed by AutoBench.

Models	History		Economy		Science	
	AUTOBENCH	MMLU	AUTOBENCH	MMLU	AUTOBENCH	MMLU
claude-3-opus-20240229	0.51	0.93	0.64	0.88	0.50	0.81
gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09	0.53	0.93	0.62	0.85	0.50	0.69
claude-3-sonnet-20240229	0.42	0.88	0.67	0.78	0.50	0.71
claude-2.0	0.42	0.85	0.62	0.78	0.42	0.68
Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1	0.40	0.85	0.55	0.76	0.43	0.68
gemini-pro	0.28	0.84	0.48	0.75	0.26	0.60
gpt-3.5-turbo-0613	0.51	0.82	0.60	0.72	0.42	0.63
openchat-3.5-0106	0.40	0.79	0.67	0.69	0.41	0.58
zephyr-7b-beta	0.35	0.72	0.48	0.66	0.30	0.58
OpenAGI-7B-v0.1	0.42	0.77	0.55	0.66	0.44	0.57
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1	0.37	0.66	0.57	0.56	0.35	0.48
vicuna-7b-v1.5	0.35	0.64	0.60	0.52	0.38	0.42
Llama-2-7b-chat-hf	0.33	0.57	0.55	0.50	0.37	0.38
Xwin-Math-7B-V1.0	0.33	0.58	0.38	0.45	0.17	0.39
WizardMath-7B-V1.0	0.30	0.59	0.55	0.44	0.20	0.37
alpaca-7b	0.40	0.37	0.55	0.35	0.35	0.28
gpt-neo-2.7B	0.26	0.25	0.26	0.27	0.09	0.31






Figure 3: Search trajectories of AutoBench (history) with different LM_{test} . It shows the evaluation topics that are explored and their respective accuracy as a star plot.




Figure 4: Search trajectories of AutoBench (science) with different LM_{test} . It shows the evaluation topics that are explored and their respective accuracy.




Figure 5: Search trajectories of AutoBench (economy) with different LM_{test} . It shows the evaluation topics that are explored and their respective accuracy.





Figure 6: The histogram of accuracy for all topics explored in a AutoBench run. The three rows are economy, science, and history respectively.

G Asset License

We list the license associated with each model below:

- gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09 [24]: Proprietary
- gpt-3.5-turbo-0613 [23]: Proprietary
- claude-3-sonnet-20240229 [1]: Proprietary
- claude-3-opus-20240229 [1]: Proprietary
- claude-2.0: Proprietary
- Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1 [14]: Apache 2.0
- Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1 [13]: Apache 2.0
- gemini-pro [33]: Proprietary,
- OpenAGI-7B-v0.1 [10]: Apache-2.0
- vicuna-7b-v1.5 [25]: Llama2,
- Llama-2-7b-chat-hf [35]: Llama2,

Figure 7: We show the Pareto frontier of the two difficulty metrics: SEP and DIFFICULTY. Each orange star represents datasets constructed by AutoBench, and each blue dot represents an MMLU subject. Datasets constructed by AutoBench are mostly at the Pareto frontier, outperforming MMLU subjects in both metrics.



- Xwin-Math-7B-V1.0 [34]: Llama2,
- WizardMath-7B-V1.0 [19]: Llama2,
- gpt-neo-2.7B [4]: MIT
- alpaca-7b [32]: CC by NC 4.0
- zephyr-7b-beta [36]: MIT
- openchat-3.5-0106 [37]: Apache-2.0

H Our License

We release our work under an MIT license.

I Details of Human Study

Recall in §6.3, we conduct a human study to verify the trends found by AutoBench still holds for the human-constructed dataset. For this human study, the instruction is to generate a set of question-answer pairs given a topic c (e.g., Fordism). The annotator may use resources from Wikipedia (e.g., Wikipedia articles on Fordism), and also other linked Wikipedia pages. The annotator should generate roughly 50 questions per topic, and the questions should be challenging. Additionally, each question should be answerable by a domain expert. The generated answer for each question should be correct, and concise. If the question is open-ended, the answer should then cover as many correct responses as possible.