

An Extensive Evaluation of Factual Consistency in Large Language Models for Data-to-Text Generation

Joy Mahapatra ^{*1} and Utpal Garain ^{†1}

¹Indian Statistical Institute Kolkata

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have shown exceptional performance across various Data-to-Text Generation (DTG) tasks. However, generating factually consistent text in DTG remains challenging for LLMs. Despite this, in-depth evaluations of LLM factual consistency for DTG remain missing in the current literature. This paper addresses this gap by providing an extensive evaluation of factual consistency in LLMs for DTG. Our evaluation covers five widely used DTG datasets (E2E, ViGGo, WikiTableText, DART, and WebNLG) and five prominent LLM families (T5, BART, OPT, BLOOM, and Llama 2). To ensure a thorough evaluation of factual consistency, we use four state-of-the-art automatic metrics and include essential human assessments. Our extensive evaluations reveals three key findings regarding factual consistency in LLMs for DTG. First, Llama 2 often excels in generating factually consistent text, although smaller models like T5 and BART can achieve strong factual consistency on larger, lexically less-diverse datasets. Second, the average rate of change (AROC) indicates that increasing model size (number of model trainable parameters) generally enhances factual consistency of LLMs in DTG. Third, we observe that source-reference divergence (i.e., when the reference text diverges semantically from the source) typically reduces the factual consistency of LLMs in DTG.

1 Introduction

Data-to-text generation (DTG) aims to generate text, such as reports or dialogues, from structured sources (e.g., tables) or semi-structured sources (e.g., graphs) Lin et al. [2024], Nan et al. [2021]. The DTG task has a wide range of applications across various domains, such as dialogue generation and report creation Li et al. [2024]. The rise of large language models (LLMs) has significantly influenced DTG task Kasner and Dusek [2024], Lorandi and Belz [2024]. LLMs have demonstrated considerable improvements over earlier DTG models in several performance areas, including readability (concerns with fluency and coherence) and informativeness (concern with content preservation) Lin et al. [2024]. However, generating factually consistent text for DTG remains a significant challenge for LLMs. Factual consistency in DTG concerns whether the generated text accurately reflects the factual information from the input/source data Li et al. [2022]. Lack of factual consistency can severely undermine the trustworthiness of DTG, particularly in safety-critical applications like medical report generation Yermakov et al. [2021] and financial reporting Kasner et al. [2023]. Hence, evaluation of LLMs' factual consistency for DTG is extremely important. However, till now there are no extensive evaluation of factual consistency of LLM for DTG.

This paper addresses this research gap by providing an extensive evaluation of the factual consistency of LLMs for DTG through examining multiple datasets and LLM families. Our study encompasses three primary types of DTG tasks—table-to-text, graph-to-text, and meaning representation (MR)-to-text—as shown in Figure 1. We utilize five state-of-the-art DTG datasets in our experiments: E2E Dusek et al. [2020] (MR-to-text), ViGGo Juraska et al. [2019] (MR-to-text), WikiTableText Bao et al. [2018] (table-to-text), DART Nan et al. [2021] (graph-to-text), and WebNLG Gardent et al. [2017] (graph-to-text). To gain a comprehensive understanding of a wide range of LLMs, we include twelve LLMs of varying sizes from five well-established LLM families: BART Lewis et al. [2020], T5 Raffel et al. [2020], OPT Zhang et al. [2022], BLOOM Scao et al. [2022], and Llama 2 Touvron et al. [2023]. To date, no prior evaluation studies have extensively examined the factual consistency of LLMs for DTG while considering with such large span of LLMs and datasets. The factual consistency of LLMs is evaluated using both human assessments and automatic metrics, with four distinct automatic metrics: SUMMAC-CONV, a natural language inference-based metric; NEOVERLAP, a named entity-based metric; ALIGNSCORE, an information alignment-based metric; and QAFACTEVAL, a question generation-answering-based metric. Moreover, to depict the improvement in factual consistency relative to increasing model

*joymahapatra90@gmail.com

†utpal@isical.ac.in




Figure 1: The three primary types of Data-to-Text Generation (DTG): graph-to-text, meaning representation (MR)-to-text, and table-to-text.

size (number of model trainable parameters), we employ the average rate of change (AROC) in our experiments. Our extensive evaluations and analyses show three key findings on factual consistency of LLMs for DTG. First, among all LLM families Llama 2 often performs better in producing factually consistent text. We also observe T5 and BART like small-sized LLM families can produce well factual consistency when dataset size is sufficiently large and contain less lexical diversity (§5). Secondly, AROC values across various automatic metrics suggest that increasing model size within an LLM family often enhances factual consistency (§5). The meticulous human evaluation for factual consistency concretized these findings also (§7). Thirdly, we observe that the presence of source-reference divergence (a common phenomenon in DTG, where the reference text deviates significantly in content from the source data Dhingra et al. [2019], Li et al. [2022]) negatively impacts the factual consistency of LLMs in DTG tasks (§6).

2 Related Work

Factual consistency is an essential requirement for every DTG model with real-world applications Gatt and Kraemer [2018], Lin et al. [2024]. Tian *et al.* Tian et al. [2019] were among the first to identify factual consistency as a critical issue in DTG, referring to it as intrinsic hallucination. Xiao *et al.* Xiao and Wang [2021] further explored this issue, linking factual consistency to model predictive uncertainty in DTG tasks. Additionally, Li *et al.* Li et al. [2022] demonstrated that factual consistency remains a major challenge for DTG models, often surpassing other performance aspects, such as informativeness and readability. Many other studies Huang et al. [2023], Li et al. [2022] across various text generation tasks, including DTG, have attributed factual consistency issues to factors like model architecture, model size, and source-reference divergence. The emergence of transformer models Vaswani et al. [2017], which rely on full attention mechanisms Bahdanau et al. [2015], has laid the foundation for state-of-the-art LLMs. Recently, LLMs have been widely adopted as foundational models for DTG tasks due to their vast knowledge capacity enabled by large model sizes, as well as their versatility across various domains, tasks, and languages Touvron et al. [2023]. Although LLMs Ge et al. [2023] often achieve higher rankings than earlier DTG models in readability (addressing concerns with fluency and coherence) and informativeness (maintaining content preservation), they continue to struggle with generating factually consistent content Ji et al. [2023], Zhang et al. [2023]. Despite several findings on factual consistency challenges in LLMs for DTG Li et al. [2022], Lin et al. [2024], no study has yet conducted a comprehensive evaluation of factual consistency in LLMs. While a few studies have explored factual consistency in LLMs for DTG tasks Lin et al. [2024], none have evaluated the factual consistency of state-of-the-art LLMs across diverse DTG tasks. Our paper aims to address this critical research gap by providing an extensive evaluation of factual consistency, incorporating state-of-the-art LLMs and a range of DTG datasets.

3 Preliminaries

In this preliminaries section, we provide a brief overview of data-to-text generation (DTG), large language models, factual consistency, and source-reference divergence.

3.1 Data-to-Text Generation (DTG)

Data-to-Text generation (DTG) Lin et al. [2024] model is usually learned from a dataset consisting of a set of source-reference pairs, $\mathcal{D} = \{s, r\}_{(s,r) \in \mathcal{D}}$, where s is source data (e.g., table, graph, etc.) with its corresponding reference $r = r_1 r_2, \dots, r_{|r|}$, and each word belong to vocabulary set \mathcal{V} , i.e., $r_i \in \mathcal{V}$ Puduppully and Lapata [2021]. A predictive DTG model \mathcal{M}_θ (θ is the parameter set) is trained/fine-tuned on \mathcal{D} , typically using maximum likelihood estimation Puduppully and Lapata [2021] strategies (Equation 1).

$$\theta^* \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} \sum_{(s,r) \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_\theta(s), r) \quad (1)$$

Here, \mathcal{L} represents empirical loss function (e.g., cross-entropy loss). Nowadays, LLMs are often used as predictive DTG models. During inference, trained predictive DTG model, \mathcal{M}_{θ^*} , undergoes through applying various decoding strategies Li et al. [2022] to produce output g (an approximation of r) from source data (s).

$$g \leftarrow \operatorname{decoding}_{\mathcal{V}^*} \mathcal{M}_{\theta^*}(s) \quad (2)$$

3.2 (Large) Language Model

The core objective of a language model is to predict text continuation ($y = w_1 w_2 \dots w_m$) from a given prior contexts ($x = w_1 w_2 \dots w_n$), as shown below.

$$y \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_z p(z|x)$$

$$\underbrace{w_1 w_2 \dots w_m}_{\text{text continuation}} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_z p(z | \underbrace{w_1 w_2 \dots w_n}_{\text{context}})$$




Figure 2: Two popular language model architectures: encoder-decoder (left) and decoder-only (right). The encoder processes input (i); the decoder generates output (o).

Two popular architectures are commonly used for implementing language models: encoder-decoder architecture Lewis et al. [2020] and decoder-only architecture Brown et al. [2020] (Figure 2). “Large” language models (LLMs) stand out from previous language models mainly due to two aspects: their enormous model size Scao et al. [2022], characterized by a vast number of underlying parameters, and their extensive pre-training data Penedo et al. [2023], Raffel et al. [2020]. Compared to earlier language models with a few million parameters Graves et al. [2013], Mikolov et al. [2010], Peters et al. [2018], contemporary LLMs have billions, and even trillions, of parameters, enabling them to achieve exceptional performance Heizerling and Inui [2021].

3.3 Factual Consistency in DTG

Factual consistency is typically assessed by comparing the ‘claim’ against the ‘context’ to ensure factual alignment. In DTG, the reference text (or sometimes source data) serves as the context, while the generated text acts as the claim. As illustrated in Figure 3, a lack of factual consistency can lead to the introduction of irrelevant or incorrect information, undermining the model’s reliability. Evaluating a DTG model’s factual consistency is therefore crucial for determining its reliability. The most common methods for assessing factual consistency are human evaluation and automatic metric-based evaluation. Recently, some trained automatic metrics have shown strong correlations with human assessments, suggesting that they can be reliable indicators of factual consistency.




Figure 3: An example of lack of factual consistency from the DART (graph-to-text) dataset, where the claim (generated text) introduces incorrect information—‘that comes in the moderate price range’—not found in the source (reference) data.

3.4 Source-Reference Divergence

Source-reference divergence is an extremely common phenomenon across various DTG tasks Dhingra et al. [2019], Li et al. [2022], Tian et al. [2019], ul Islam et al. [2023]. Source-reference divergence refers to a discrepancy or divergence between the information present in the source data and the corresponding reference data. An illustrative example of such divergence is depicted in Figure 4. The main causes of source-reference divergence stem from the inherent characteristics of DTG tasks and heuristic data collection procedures Li et al. [2022]. As a result, source-reference divergence is common and difficult to eliminate in DTG contexts Dhingra et al. [2019]. Therefore, evaluating model factual consistency in the presence of such divergence is essential.




Figure 4: An illustration of source-reference divergence from E2E Dusek et al. [2020] dataset. The reference text includes an additional facts (bolded and underlined)—‘is reasonably priced’—which is absent in the source data.

4 Experimental Setup

This section describes the datasets, LLMs, and experimental settings used in our experiments, along with statistical significance tests to ensure reproducibility.

4.1 Datasets

We use five well-known DTG datasets for three primary task types: DART and WebNLG for graph-to-text, WikiTableText for table-to-text, and E2E and ViGGO for MR-to-text. The key statistics for these datasets are in Table 1, all obtained from Kasner et al. [2023] and Wolf et al. [2020]. E2E Dusek et al. [2020] is a restaurant-domain MR-to-text dataset, and ViGGO Juraska et al. [2018] focuses on dialogue MR-to-text in the video game domain. WikiTableText Bao et al. [2018] provides table-to-text pairs from Wikipedia with high lexical diversity (or lexical richness) (as TTR is higher for both source and reference). DART Nan et al. [2021] provides text from knowledge graph triplets, while WebNLG Gardent et al. [2017] focuses on RDF-to-text from DBpedia triplets.

4.2 Models

We include twelve LLMs from five families—BART, T5, BLOOM, OPT, and Llama 2—downloaded from Hugging Face Wolf et al. [2020]. All these twelve LLMs are shown in Figure 5, along with their sizes. For the BART, T5, OPT, BLOOM, and Llama 2 families, we select two models from BART and T5, three models

dataset	DTG types	domain	size (# instances)	source (linearized)			reference		
				type-token ratio (TTR)	unique tokens	total tokens	type-token ratio (TTR)	unique tokens	total tokens
E2E	mr-to-text	closed	36,856	0.0001	125	1M	0.0057	4.5K	885K
ViGGo	mr-to-text	closed	6,900	0.0029	618	206K	0.0294	4.4K	148K
WikiTableText	table-to-text	open	13,318	0.0621	29K	469K	0.1302	24K	185K
DART	graph-to-text	open	70,524	0.0178	44K	2.5M	0.0328	45K	1.5M
WebNLG	graph-to-text	open	38,872	0.0057	7K	1.2M	0.0228	19K	905K

Table 1: Summary of key statistics, DTG types, and domains for the five incorporated datasets. The table shows the average length (in tokens), unique tokens, and total tokens for both sources (linearized to text) and references.

from OPT and BLOOM, and two models from Llama 2. BART Lewis et al. [2020] and T5 Raffel et al. [2020] are encoder-decoder models, with BART pre-trained using text denoising and T5 with unified NLP tasks. BLOOM Scao et al. [2022] and OPT Zhang et al. [2022] are decoder-only models, trained on ROOT and Reddit/Pile/RobERTa, respectively. Llama 2 Touvron et al. [2023] is trained with pre-training, fine-tuning, and reinforcement learning. These LLM families were selected for their varied pretraining dataset and sizes, enabling a comprehensive evaluation of factual consistency across different DTG tasks.




Figure 5: All twelve LLMs across five widely used families (BART, T5, OPT, BLOOM, and Llama2) arranged by their model sizes.

4.3 Experimental Setting and Statistical Significant Testing Details

In our experiments, we fine-tuned all LLMs for DTG tasks using QLoRA (Quantized Low-Rank Adapter) Dettmers et al. [2023], a parameter-efficient fine-tuning method with a learning rate of $1e^{-04}$ and 4-bit quantization. Each model was fine-tuned for three epochs on all five datasets, with source and generated text lengths fixed at 256 tokens. We used the AdamW optimizer Loshchilov and Hutter [2019] at `torch.bfloat16` precision for QLoRA. Text generation was performed through popular nucleus sampling decoding approach with nucleus size ($p = 0.95$). All experiments were run on a local system with an NVIDIA RTX A6000 (48 GB) GPU. We assessed statistical significance using Welch’s t-test Dror et al. [2018], comparing each LLM to the best performer in its family, with a significance level of $p < 0.05$ and a sample size of 6.

4.4 Average Rate of Change (AROC)

Increasing model size within an LLM family often affects factual consistency. This effect can be quantified using the average rate of change (AROC), which estimates the change in factual consistency between the smallest model \mathcal{M}_1 and the largest model \mathcal{M}_2 of the family, based on their sizes m_1 and m_2 . AROC is calculated within the range $[m_1, m_2]$ using Equation 3.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{AROC} &= \frac{\text{absolute change in factual consistency}}{\text{absolute change in model size}} \\
 &= \frac{f(\mathcal{M}_2) - f(\mathcal{M}_1)}{m_2 - m_1} \tag{3}
 \end{aligned}$$




Figure 6: AOC of the function $f(\cdot)$ (representing factual consistency) for the model size interval $[m_1, m_2]$ between two LLMs, \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 .

LLM families differ significantly in model size scales; for instance, T5 sizes are in millions, while Llama2 sizes are in billions, impacting factual consistency. Comparing LLM families using AOC (Equation 3) alone is therefore insufficient. Instead, we apply AOC on a logarithmic scale (Equation 4), capturing relative changes by converting absolute differences into ratios (Equation 5).

$$\text{AOC} = \frac{\log(f(\mathcal{M}_2)) - \log(f(\mathcal{M}_1))}{\log(m_2) - \log(m_1)} \quad (4)$$

$$= \frac{\log(f(\mathcal{M}_2)/f(\mathcal{M}_1))}{\log(m_2/m_1)} \quad (5)$$

A positive AOC value (Equation 4 or 5) indicates a positive correlation between model size increment and factual consistency, while the magnitude of the AOC value reflects the strength of this correlation.

5 Evaluation of Factual Consistency: Results and Discussion

This section presents our extensive evaluation of factual consistency across five widely used LLM families and five prominent DTG datasets, employing four state-of-the-art metrics: SUMMAC-CONV, NEOVERLAP, ALIGNSCORE, and QAFACTEVAL.

Table 2: Factual consistency evaluated through SUMMAC-CONV. **Boldface** shows best result per LLM family and dataset. All results statistically significant (see 4.3).

family	model	model size (billion)	E2E	WikiTableText	ViGGo	DART	WebNLG
BART	BART-base	0.14	0.3805	0.3111	0.2330	0.3004	0.2894
	BART-large	0.41	0.4110	0.3609	0.2498	0.3786	0.4173
T5	T5-base	0.22	0.3899	0.3625	0.2435	0.3582	0.3687
	T5-large	0.75	0.4135	0.4082	0.2684	0.4264	0.4593
OPT	OPT-2.7B	2.70	0.3637	0.4120	0.2971	0.3926	0.4781
	OPT-6.7B	6.70	0.3597	0.4060	0.3139	0.3937	0.4799
	OPT-13B	13.00	0.3621	0.4092	0.3291	0.4137	0.4970
BLOOM	BLOOM-1.1B	1.10	0.3777	0.3871	0.2874	0.3850	0.3853
	BLOOM-3B	3.00	0.3842	0.4136	0.3177	0.4119	0.4610
	BLOOM-7B	7.00	0.3872	0.4184	0.3170	0.4144	0.4780
Llama 2	Llama2-7B	6.00	0.4569	0.4898	0.3622	0.5138	0.5739
	Llama2-13B	13.00	0.4540	0.5009	0.3776	0.5201	0.5693

5.1 Results of Factual Consistency Evaluation Using SUMMAC-CONV

NLI (natural language inference) models are commonly used to assess factual consistency due to their similarity to the task. However, a key limitation of NLI models is their focus on sentence-level granularity, which is insufficient for evaluating factual consistency that requires document-level analysis. SUMMAC-CONV Laban et al. [2022] addresses this limitation by providing document-level granularity. It segments both the context and claim into sentences, computing NLI scores for each sentence pair. Additionally, SUMMAC-CONV employs binning techniques and one-dimensional convolution to mitigate the impact of outliers, effectively capturing the factual consistency between the claim and context. SUMMAC-CONV is widely regarded as a highly popular metric for evaluating factual consistency.




Figure 7: AROC values for all LLM families across the five DTG datasets based on SUMMAC-CONV scores. Higher positive AROC values reflect a stronger positive correlation between increases in model size and factual consistency.

Table 2 presents the factual consistency scores measured by SUMMAC-CONV across the five LLM families and five DTG datasets. A higher SUMMAC-CONV value indicates better factual consistency. Meanwhile, Figure 7 displays the AROC values of SUMMAC-CONV, derived from Table 2, for all LLM families and datasets.

Table 3: Factual consistency evaluated through NEOVERLAP. **Boldface** shows best result per LLM family and dataset. All results statistically significant (see 4.3).

family	model	model size (billion)	E2E	WikiTableText	ViGGo	DART	WebNLG
BART	BART-base	0.14	0.8305	0.5183	0.7077	0.5643	0.3725
	BART-large	0.41	0.8368	0.5700	0.7892	0.6204	0.4761
T5	T5-base	0.22	0.8305	0.5556	0.7815	0.6164	0.4195
	T5-large	0.75	0.8593	0.5982	0.8985	0.6813	0.5021
OPT	OPT-2.7B	2.70	0.8323	0.6267	0.8908	0.6181	0.5385
	OPT-6.7B	6.70	0.8142	0.6058	0.9215	0.6358	0.5546
	OPT-13B	13.00	0.8431	0.6075	0.9369	0.6499	0.5546
BLOOM	BLOOM-1.1B	1.10	0.8133	0.5858	0.8938	0.5973	0.4373
	BLOOM-3B	3.00	0.8070	0.6050	0.9200	0.6326	0.4844
	BLOOM-7B	7.00	0.8206	0.6208	0.9200	0.6310	0.5203
Llama 2	Llama2-7B	6.00	0.8674	0.6350	0.9462	0.7269	0.6368
	Llama2-13B	13.00	0.8683	0.6675	0.9523	0.7158	0.6532




Figure 8: AROC values for all LLM families across the five DTG datasets based on NEOVERLAP scores. Higher positive AROC values reflect a stronger positive correlation between increases in model size and factual consistency.

5.2 Results of Factual Consistency Evaluation Using NEOVERLAP

Named entities (NEs) are key indicators of factual knowledge in texts and are often used to assess factual consistencies. NEOVERLAP measures factual consistency by comparing the overlap of NEs between the claim and the context. We utilized the metric implementation from Laban et al. [2022], focusing on specific NE types such as PERSON, LOCATION, and ORGANIZATION. This metric returns a value of 1 if the generated text is factually consistent with the reference in terms of NE overlap, and 0 if there is little or no factual consistency. In the DTG context, the reference text is treated as the context, and the generated text as the claim.

Table 3 displays the factual consistency scores evaluated using NEOVERLAP across the five LLM families and DTG datasets. Figure 8 presents the AROC values of NEOVERLAP, derived from Table 3, for all LLM families and datasets.

Table 4: Factual consistency evaluated through ALIGNSCORE. **Boldface** shows best result per LLM family and dataset. All results statistically significant (see 4.3).

family	model	model size (billion)	E2E	WikiTableText	ViGGo	DART	WebNLG
BART	BART-base	0.14	0.6825	0.3189	0.2579	0.4064	0.3869
	BART-large	0.41	0.7663	0.4158	0.3538	0.6013	0.6551
T5	T5-base	0.22	0.7049	0.4045	0.3238	0.5755	0.5457
	T5-large	0.75	0.7646	0.4513	0.4459	0.7050	0.7207
OPT	OPT-2.7B	2.70	0.6931	0.4897	0.5439	0.6326	0.7764
	OPT-6.7B	6.70	0.6792	0.4835	0.6036	0.6374	0.7876
	OPT-13B	13.00	0.6999	0.4810	0.6356	0.6714	0.8145
BLOOM	BLOOM-1.1B	1.10	0.7147	0.4887	0.4548	0.6175	0.6099
	BLOOM-3B	3.00	0.7468	0.5326	0.5653	0.6723	0.7507
	BLOOM-7B	7.00	0.7280	0.5296	0.5884	0.6848	0.7797
Llama 2	Llama2-7B	6.00	0.8106	0.5905	0.6798	0.8192	0.8768
	Llama2-13B	13.00	0.8186	0.6144	0.7163	0.8191	0.8749




Figure 9: AROC values for all LLM families across the five DTG datasets based on ALIGNSCORE scores. Higher positive AROC values reflect a stronger positive correlation between increases in model size and factual consistency.

5.3 Results of Factual Consistency Evaluation Using ALIGNSCORE

Unlike most factual consistency metrics, which typically focus on single tasks like semantic similarity or NLI (natural language inference), ALIGNSCORE Zha et al. [2023] is trained on multiple tasks (fact verification, information retrieval, NLI, QA, paraphrasing, semantic similarity, and summarization) in a unified manner. ALIGNSCORE assesses factual consistency by analyzing the alignment of information between the claim and context, capturing various qualities, including factual consistency. A key feature of ALIGNSCORE is its ability to handle longer contexts by splitting the context into chunks and aligning each chunk with the claim’s sentences. A higher ALIGNSCORE reflects greater factual consistency. In our experiment, ALIGNSCORE refers specifically to the ALIGNSCORE-LARGE variant, which utilizes the RoBERTa-large model for information alignment. Zha et al. [2023] shows that ALIGNSCORE outperforms various state-of-the-art measures, including LLM-based methods, in evaluating factual accuracy.

Table 4 presents the factual consistency scores evaluated using ALIGNSCORE across all LLM families and DTG datasets. Figure 9 shows the AROC values of ALIGNSCORE, obtained from Table 4, for all LLM families and datasets.

Table 5: Factual consistency evaluated through QAFACTEVAL. **Boldface** shows best result per LLM family and dataset. All results statistically significant (see 4.3).

family	model	model size (billion)	E2E	WikiTableText	ViGGo	DART	WebNLG
BART	BART-base	0.14	3.4109	1.8008	1.3894	2.2541	2.1009
	BART-large	0.41	3.7393	2.3559	1.9500	3.1206	3.3009
T5	T5-base	0.22	3.6086	2.1887	1.6307	2.7631	2.5079
	T5-large	0.75	3.7393	2.6267	2.0971	3.4325	3.3865
OPT	OPT-2.7B	2.70	3.2732	2.5878	2.4776	3.1245	3.5771
	OPT-6.7B	6.70	3.2930	2.6805	2.7332	3.1335	3.6794
	OPT-13B	13.00	3.2768	2.6085	2.8302	3.2894	3.7640
BLOOM	BLOOM-1.1B	1.10	3.5579	2.2128	2.0289	3.0540	2.9072
	BLOOM-3B	3.00	3.6179	2.4706	2.5181	3.2751	3.4617
	BLOOM-7B	7.00	3.6245	2.5299	2.5265	3.3069	3.5181
Llama 2	Llama2-7B	6.00	4.1619	3.0296	2.9628	4.0208	4.1166
	Llama2-13B	13.00	4.1874	3.0933	3.0950	4.0411	4.0892




Figure 10: AROC values for all LLM families across the five DTG datasets based on QAFACTEVAL scores. Higher positive AROC values reflect a stronger positive correlation between increases in model size and factual consistency.

5.4 Results of Factual Consistency Evaluation Using QAFACTEVAL

QAFACTEVAL Fabbri et al. [2022] is a factual consistency metric that utilizes question generation and answering (QGA). It comprises four key components: 1) Answer Selection: Noun phrase chunks are extracted as answers from the generated text; 2) Question Generation: The BART-large model generates questions based on these answers; 3) Question Answering: The Electra-large model answers the questions using the source text; 4) Answer Overlap Determination: The overlap is assessed using the LERC metric, which provides a score from 1 to 5. QAFACTEVAL surpasses existing QGA-based metrics and complements NLI-based evaluations, with higher scores indicating greater factual consistency, reaching a maximum of 5.

Table 5 presents the factual consistency scores evaluated using QAFACTEVAL across all LLM families and DTG datasets. Figure 10 illustrates the AROC values of QAFACTEVAL, derived from Table 5, for five LLM families across all DTG datasets.

5.5 Discussion of Factual Consistency Results

From the factual consistency results across the four metrics—SUMMAC-CONV, NEOVERLAP, ALIGNSCORE, and QAFACTEVAL (Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5)—we observe several key findings. The Llama2 family consistently outperforms other models in factual consistency across all four metrics and nearly all DTG datasets. However, smaller LLMs like T5-large and BART-large remain competitive, often outperforming larger families such as BLOOM and OPT on datasets like E2E (where lexical richness, as measured by TTR in Table 1, is low, and dataset size is large) and DART (which has a large number of instances, as shown in Table 1). This indicates that smaller LLM families can excel depending on dataset characteristics. Larger LLM families like Llama2, BLOOM, and OPT tend to perform better on datasets such as WikiTableText and ViGGo, likely due to their higher lexical richness (see Table 1). Similarly, for the WebNLG dataset, T5 and BART produce results similar to those of BLOOM and OPT, likely because WebNLG is a large dataset with moderate lexical richness. Hence, while larger LLMs often exhibit better factual consistency than smaller ones, the characteristics of D2T datasets, particularly their size and lexical richness, are essential in shaping this performance.

AROC values across all four metrics (Figures 7, 8, 9, and 10) show that increasing model size generally




Figure 11: Impact of source-reference divergence on factual consistency (measured through SUMMAC-CONV) at time of inference on three popular DTG datasets (DART, E2E and WikiTableText). The three sub-figures (a, b and c) represent results from three different families (T5, Llama2 and OPT), where small-sized LLMs (T5-base, Llama2-6B and OPT-2.7B) are represented with dotted line and large-sized LLMs (T5-large, Llama2-13B and OPT-13B) are represented with solid line.




Figure 12: Impact of source-reference divergence on factual consistency (measured through NEOVERLAP) at time of inference on three popular DTG datasets (DART, E2E and WikiTableText). The three sub-figures (a, b and c) represent results from three different families (T5, Llama2 and OPT), where small-sized LLMs (T5-base, Llama2-6B and OPT-2.7B) are represented with dotted line and large-sized LLMs (T5-large, Llama2-13B and OPT-13B) are represented with solid line.

improves the factual consistency of LLM families across all DTG datasets. The T5 and BLOOM families exhibit significant improvements in factual consistency with larger models. In contrast, the Llama2 family shows less noticeable gains, and in some cases, a decline in performance as model size increases. We hypothesize that this may be due to the log-scale applied to the AROC values, where smaller LLM families (like T5 and BART) show a higher relative improvement in factual consistency compared to larger families (like Llama2). Overall, the AROC values across all four metrics clearly indicate that, for most LLM families, larger model sizes are correlated with improved factual consistency.

6 Impact of Source-reference Divergence on Factual Consistency

This section investigates how source-reference divergence impacts the factual consistency of LLMs in DTG tasks during the inference phase (i.e., at the time of text generation). For this analysis, we focus on three LLM families (T5, OPT, and Llama 2) with six specific models: T5-base, T5-large, OPT-2.7B, OPT-13B, Llama2-7B, and Llama2-13B. We evaluate the factual consistency of these LLMs using the four automatic metrics: SUMMAC-CONV, NEOVERLAP, ALIGNSCORE, and QAFACTEVAL. To cover the three main types of DTG tasks, we select one dataset for each: E2E for MR-to-Text, WikiTableText for Table-to-Text, and DART for Graph-to-Text. To better illustrate the effect of source-reference divergence, we divide the test/inference sets of each dataset into five groups based on their average source-reference divergence: **low**, **moderately low**, **medium**, **moderately high**, and **high**. The **low** group contains instances with minimal divergence, while the **high** group includes instances with significant divergence. Given that the source data (s) in DTG tasks is often semi-structured and non-textual, traditional methods of calculating source-reference divergence, such as higher-order n -gram matching or contextual representation, may fail to capture critical information. Two common strategies for assessing source-reference divergence are unigram-based and longest common subsequence (LCS)-based approaches Dhingra et al. [2019]. We choose the LCS-based approach over the unigram-based method because it often yields better performance by flexibly matching n -grams and capturing skip context. Source-reference divergence ($\text{div}(s, r)$) is then defined based on the differences between the source text (s) and the reference text (r) at the unigram level, as follows:




Figure 13: Impact of source-reference divergence on factual consistency (measured through ALIGNSCORE) at time of inference on three popular DTG datasets (DART, E2E and WikiTableText). The three sub-figures (a, b and c) represent results from three different families (T5, Llama2 and OPT), where small-sized LLMs (T5-base, Llama2-6B and OPT-2.7B) are represented with dotted line and large-sized LLMs (T5-large, Llama2-13B and OPT-13B) are represented with solid line.




Figure 14: Impact of source-reference divergence on factual consistency (measured through QAFACTEVAL) at time of inference on three popular DTG datasets (DART, E2E and WikiTableText). The three sub-figures (a, b and c) represent results from three different families (T5, Llama2 and OPT), where small-sized LLMs (T5-base, Llama2-6B and OPT-2.7B) are represented with dotted line and large-sized LLMs (T5-large, Llama2-13B and OPT-13B) are represented with solid line.

$$\text{div}(s, r) = 1 - \frac{1}{\max(|s|, |r|)} \text{LCS}(s, r)$$

Where $|x|$ denotes the cardinality, and $\text{LCS}(x, y)$ represents the length of the longest common subsequence between x and y (both x and y are segmented by whitespaces).

From the results shown in Figures 11, 12, 13, and 14, we observe two important details regarding factual consistency in the presence of source-reference divergence. First, the factual consistency of all LLMs, regardless of model family or size, decreases with an increase in source-reference divergence. However, in the E2E dataset, the decrease in factual consistency with source-reference divergence is lower compared to the DART and WikiTableText datasets. We believe this is due to the higher lexical richness of the DART and WikiTableText datasets compared to the E2E dataset. Second, it is evident that within each LLM family, larger models consistently outperform smaller ones in terms of factual consistency. This suggests that increasing the model size of LLMs makes them more agnostic to source-reference divergence. This finding indicates that choosing larger model-sized LLMs is beneficial when source-reference divergence is present in DTG tasks.

7 Human Evaluation

Text generation tasks like DTG require human evaluation due to the complexity of natural language, and human assessment is often regarded as the gold standard for factual consistency Chaganty et al. [2018], Reiter [2018]. For our human evaluation of factual consistency, we selected three LLM families (T5, OPT, and Llama 2), each with two models (T5-base, T5-large, OPT-2.7B, OPT-13B, Llama2-7B, and Llama2-13B), and three DTG datasets: E2E, WikiTableText, and DART. Three university graduate students, selected from different academic disciplines to reduce bias, were chosen to annotate a sample of 20 generated texts for each combination of LLM and dataset. Each annotator was instructed to categorize factual consistency based on the presence of incorrect or irrelevant facts with respect to the given source data. Responses were collected as ‘yes’/‘no’ answers from each annotator. Finally, we aggregated the results using a majority voting method and expressed the results

as percentages. The inter-annotator agreement in our experiments, measured by Krippendorff’s alpha (α), was 0.76, indicating moderate to high agreement.

Table 6: Human evaluation of factual consistency. A lower value indicates higher factual consistency.

family	model	E2E	DART	WikiTableText
T5	T5-base	23%	32%	37%
	T5-large	15%	22%	32%
OPT	OPT-2.7B	19%	25%	18%
	OPT-13B	16%	22%	14%
Llama 2	Llama2-7B	12%	15%	21%
	Llama2-13B	12%	17%	17%

Table 6 shows the human evaluation results for factual consistency. We can see that, in human evaluation as well, the Llama 2 family performs better than OPT and T5. Similar to the automatic metric results, we find that T5 performs similarly to the OPT family on the DART and E2E datasets. However, OPT outperforms T5 on the WikiTableText dataset. The similarity between the results of human evaluation and automatic metric-based evaluations further supports the overall findings of this paper.

8 Conclusion

This paper presents a comprehensive evaluation of the factual consistency of large language models (LLMs) in data-to-text generation (DTG) tasks. Through extensive experiments with five leading LLM families across five popular DTG datasets, we utilize four state-of-the-art automatic metrics—SUMMAC-CONV, QAFACTEVAL, ALIGNSCORE, and NEOVERLAP—alongside crucial human evaluations. Our findings reveal three key insights. First, Llama 2 consistently excels in generating factually consistent text. However, smaller models like T5 and BART can also achieve strong factual consistency, especially on larger datasets with lower lexical diversity. Second, the average rate of change (AROC) analysis demonstrates that increasing model size (number of model trainable parameters) generally improves factual consistency in DTG tasks. Third, we observe that source-reference divergence—where the reference text deviates semantically from the source—typically reduces the factual consistency of LLMs in DTG. We believe that these key findings, along with our detailed evaluation, will serve as a valuable foundation for researchers and practitioners seeking to effectively deploy LLMs in DTG tasks where factual consistency is paramount. While this paper focuses on parameter-efficient fine-tuned LLMs (via QLoRA) for DTG, future work will explore other parameter-efficient fine-tuning approaches, such as prompting.

Acknowledgment

This research is partially supported by the Indo-French Centre for the Promotion of Advanced Research (IFC-PAR/CEFIPRA) through CSR Project No. 6702-2.

References

- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. In *Proceedings of the ICLR*, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.0473>.
- Junwei Bao, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Zhao Yan, Yuanhua Lv, Ming Zhou, and Tiejun Zhao. Table-to-text: Describing table region with natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI*, pages 5020–5027, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v32i11.11944>.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Nee-lakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Proceedings of the NeurIPS*, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Abstract.html>.
- Arun Tejasvi Chaganty, Stephen Mussmann, and Percy Liang. The price of debiasing automatic metrics in natural language evaluation. In *Proceedings of the ACL*, pages 643–653, 2018. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1060/>.

- Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. In *Proceedings of the NeurIPS*, 2023. URL http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/1feb87871436031bdc0f2beaa62a049b-Abstract-Conference.html.
- Bhuwan Dhingra, Manaal Faruqui, Ankur P. Parikh, Ming-Wei Chang, Dipanjan Das, and William W. Cohen. Handling divergent reference texts when evaluating table-to-text generation. In *Proceedings of the ACL*, pages 4884–4895, 2019. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/p19-1483>.
- Rotem Dror, Gili Baumer, Segev Shlomov, and Roi Reichart. The hitchhiker’s guide to testing statistical significance in natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the ACL*, pages 1383–1392, 2018. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1128/>.
- Ondrej Dusek, Jekaterina Novikova, and Verena Rieser. Evaluating the state-of-the-art of end-to-end natural language generation: The E2E NLG challenge. *Computer Speech and Language*, 59:123–156, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csl.2019.06.009>.
- Alexander R. Fabbri, Chien-Sheng Wu, Wenhao Liu, and Caiming Xiong. Qafacteval: Improved qa-based factual consistency evaluation for summarization. In *Proceedings of the NAACL-HLT*, pages 2587–2601, 2022. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.187>.
- Claire Gardent, Anastasia Shimorina, Shashi Narayan, and Laura Perez-Beltrachini. The webnlg challenge: Generating text from RDF data. In *Proceedings of the INLG*, pages 124–133, 2017. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/w17-3518>.
- Albert Gatt and Emiel Krahmer. Survey of the state of the art in natural language generation: Core tasks, applications and evaluation. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 61:65–170, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.5477>.
- Yingqiang Ge, Wenyue Hua, Kai Mei, Jianchao Ji, Juntao Tan, Shuyuan Xu, Zelong Li, and Yongfeng Zhang. Openagi: When LLM meets domain experts. In *Proceedings of the NeurIPS*, 2023. URL http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/1190733f217404edc8a7f4e15a57f301-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html.
- Alex Graves, Abdel-rahman Mohamed, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Speech recognition with deep recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the ICASSP*, pages 6645–6649, 2013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP.2013.6638947>.
- Benjamin Heinzerling and Kentaro Inui. Language models as knowledge bases: On entity representations, storage capacity, and paraphrased queries. In *Proceedings of the EACL*, pages 1772–1791, 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.eacl-main.153>.
- Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *CoRR*, abs/2311.05232, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.05232>.
- 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 Computing Surveys*, 55(12): 248:1–248:38, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571730>.
- Juraj Juraska, Panagiotis Karagiannis, Kevin Bowden, and Marilyn A. Walker. A deep ensemble model with slot alignment for sequence-to-sequence natural language generation. In *Proceedings of the NAACL-HLT*, pages 152–162, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/n18-1014>.
- Juraj Juraska, Kevin Bowden, and Marilyn A. Walker. Viggo: A video game corpus for data-to-text generation in open-domain conversation. In *Proceedings of the INLG*, pages 164–172, 2019. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W19-8623/>.
- Zdenek Kasner and Ondrej Dusek. Beyond reference-based metrics: Analyzing behaviors of open llms on data-to-text generation. *CoRR*, abs/2401.10186, 2024. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.10186>.
- Zdenek Kasner, Ekaterina Garanina, Ondrej Plátek, and Ondrej Dusek. Tabgenie: A toolkit for table-to-text generation. In *Proceedings of the ACL*, pages 444–455, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-demo.42>.

- Philippe Laban, Tobias Schnabel, Paul N. Bennett, and Marti A. Hearst. Summac: Re-visiting nli-based models for inconsistency detection in summarization. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:163–177, 2022. URL https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00453.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. BART: denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the ACL*, pages 7871–7880, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.703>.
- Shujie Li, Liang Li, Ruiying Geng, Min Yang, Binhua Li, Guanghu Yuan, Wanwei He, Shao Yuan, Can Ma, Fei Huang, et al. Unifying structured data as graph for data-to-text pre-training. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:210–228, 2024. ISSN 2307-387X. URL https://direct.mit.edu/tacl/article-pdf/doi/10.1162/tacl_a_00641/2346090/tacl_a_00641.pdf.
- Wei Li, Wenhao Wu, Moye Chen, Jiachen Liu, Xinyan Xiao, and Hua Wu. Faithfulness in natural language generation: A systematic survey of analysis, evaluation and optimization methods. *CoRR*, abs/2203.05227, 2022. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.05227>.
- Yupian Lin, Tong Ruan, Jingping Liu, and Haofen Wang. A survey on neural data-to-text generation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 36(4):1431–1449, 2024. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2023.3304385>.
- Michela Lorandi and Anya Belz. High-quality data-to-text generation for severely under-resourced languages with out-of-the-box large language models. In *Proceedings of the EACL Findings*, pages 1451–1461, 2024. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-eacl.98>.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *Proceedings of the ICLR*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7>.
- Tomás Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukás Burget, Jan Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *Proceedings of the Interspeech*, pages 1045–1048, 2010. URL <https://doi.org/10.21437/Interspeech.2010-343>.
- Linyong Nan, Dragomir R. Radev, Rui Zhang, Amrit Rau, Abhinand Sivaprasad, Chiachun Hsieh, Xiangru Tang, Aadit Vyas, Neha Verma, Pranav Krishna, Yangxiaokang Liu, Nadia Irwanto, Jessica Pan, Faiaz Rahman, Ahmad Zaidi, Mutethia Mutuma, Yasin Tarabar, Ankit Gupta, Tao Yu, Yi Chern Tan, Xi Victoria Lin, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Nazneen Fatema Rajani. DART: open-domain structured data record to text generation. In *Proceedings of the NAACL-HLT*, pages 432–447, 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.37>.
- Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Hamza Alobeidli, Alessandro Cappelli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. The refined-web dataset for falcon LLM: outperforming curated corpora with web data only. In *Proceedings of the NeurIPS*, 2023. URL http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/fa3ed726cc5073b9c31e3e49a807789c-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html.
- Matthew E. Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Deep contextualized word representations. In *Proceedings of the NAACL-HLT*, pages 2227–2237, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/n18-1202>.
- Ratish Puduppully and Mirella Lapata. Data-to-text generation with macro planning. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:510–527, 2021. URL https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00381.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21:140:1–140:67, 2020. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html>.
- Ehud Reiter. A structured review of the validity of BLEU. *Computational Linguistics*, 44(3), 2018. URL https://doi.org/10.1162/coli_a_00322.
- Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilic, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, Jonathan Tow, Alexander M. Rush, Stella Biderman, Albert Webson, Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi, Thomas Wang, Benoît Sagot, Niklas Muenighoff, Albert Villanova del Moral, Olatunji Ruwase, Rachel Bawden, Stas Bekman, Angelina McMillan-Major, Iz Beltagy, Huu Nguyen, Lucile Saulnier, Samson Tan, Pedro Ortiz Suarez, Victor Sanh, Hugo Laurençon, Yacine Jernite, Julien Launay, Margaret Mitchell, Colin Raffel, Aaron Gokaslan, Adi Simhi, Aitor

- Soroa, Alham Fikri Aji, Amit Alfassy, Anna Rogers, Ariel Kreisberg Nitzav, Canwen Xu, Chenghao Mou, Chris Emezue, Christopher Klamm, Colin Leong, Daniel van Strien, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, and et al. BLOOM: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *CoRR*, abs/2211.05100, 2022. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.05100>.
- Ran Tian, Shashi Narayan, Thibault Sellam, and Ankur P. Parikh. Sticking to the facts: Confident decoding for faithful data-to-text generation. *CoRR*, abs/1910.08684, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.08684>.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton-Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurélien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.09288>.
- Saad Obaid ul Islam, Iza Skrjanec, Ondrej Dusek, and Vera Demberg. Tackling hallucinations in neural chart summarization. In *Proceedings of the INLG*, pages 414–423, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.inlg-main.30>.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Proceedings of the NeurIPS*, pages 5998–6008, 2017. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Abstract.html>.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the EMNLP*, pages 38–45, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-demos.6>.
- Yijun Xiao and William Yang Wang. On hallucination and predictive uncertainty in conditional language generation. In *Proceedings of the EACL*, pages 2734–2744, 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.eacl-main.236>.
- Ruslan Yermakov, Nicholas Drago, and Angelo Ziletti. Biomedical data-to-text generation via fine-tuning transformers. In *Proceedings of the INLG*, pages 364–370, 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.inlg-1.40>.
- Yuheng Zha, Yichi Yang, Ruichen Li, and Zhiting Hu. Alignscore: Evaluating factual consistency with A unified alignment function. In *Proceedings of the ACL*, pages 11328–11348, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.634>.
- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona T. Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Myle Ott, Sam Shleifer, Kurt Shuster, Daniel Simig, Punit Singh Koura, Anjali Sridhar, Tianlu Wang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. OPT: open pre-trained transformer language models. *CoRR*, abs/2205.01068, 2022. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2205.01068>.
- 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. *CoRR*, abs/2309.01219, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.01219>.