

# HintEval: A Comprehensive Framework for Hint Generation and Evaluation for Questions

Jamshid Mozafari  
University of Innsbruck  
Innsbruck, Tyrol, Austria  
jamshid.mozafari@uibk.ac.at

Bhawna Piryani  
University of Innsbruck  
Innsbruck, Tyrol, Austria  
bhawna.piryani@uibk.ac.at

Abdelrahman Abdallah  
University of Innsbruck  
Innsbruck, Tyrol, Austria  
abdelrahman.abdallah@uibk.ac.at

Adam Jatowt  
University of Innsbruck  
Innsbruck, Tyrol, Austria  
adam.jatowt@uibk.ac.at

## Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are transforming how people find information, and many users turn nowadays to chatbots to obtain answers to their questions. Despite the instant access to abundant information that LLMs offer, it is still important to promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Automatic hint generation is a new task that aims to support humans in answering questions by themselves by creating hints that guide users toward answers without directly revealing them. In this context, hint evaluation focuses on measuring the quality of hints, helping to improve the hint generation approaches. However, resources for hint research are currently spanning different formats and datasets, while the evaluation tools are missing or incompatible, making it hard for researchers to compare and test their models. To overcome these challenges, we introduce HINTEVAL<sup>1</sup>, a Python library<sup>2</sup> that makes it easy to access diverse datasets and provides multiple approaches to generate and evaluate hints. HINTEVAL aggregates the scattered resources into a single toolkit that supports a range of research goals and enables a clear, multi-faceted, and reliable evaluation. The proposed library also includes detailed online documentation<sup>3</sup>, helping users quickly explore its features and get started. By reducing barriers to entry and encouraging consistent evaluation practices, HINTEVAL offers a major step forward for facilitating hint generation and analysis research within the NLP/IR community.

## CCS Concepts

• **Software and its engineering** → **Software libraries and repositories**; • **Information systems** → **Retrieval models and ranking**; **Evaluation of retrieval results**.

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/DataScienceUIBK/HintEval>

<sup>2</sup><https://pypi.org/project/hinteval/>

<sup>3</sup><http://hinteval.readthedocs.io/>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

SIGIR '25, July 13–18, 2025, Padova, IT

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>



Figure 1: HINTEVAL logo.

## Keywords

Hint Evaluation, Hint Generation, Python Package, Framework

### ACM Reference Format:

Jamshid Mozafari, Bhawna Piryani, Abdelrahman Abdallah, and Adam Jatowt. 2025. HintEval: A Comprehensive Framework for Hint Generation and Evaluation for Questions. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (SIGIR '25)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction

In recent years, the widespread adoption of Large Language Models (LLMs) [27, 35, 71] has transformed the landscape of Information Retrieval (IR) and Natural Language Processing (NLP) [78], enabling users to pose diverse questions and receive immediate answers [3, 46, 60, 106]. Although this change has made information access more efficient, it has also raised concerns about the possible impact on human cognitive skills, particularly the abilities to think critically, reason effectively, and retain information [39]. Extensive reliance on automated responses, especially from AI-powered systems, may discourage users from engaging deeply with problems and reduce opportunities for cognitive development [5]. For instance, studies have shown that students are more likely to depend on AI-provided solutions rather than developing their problem-solving skills independently, which can negatively impact learning outcomes and skill retention [23, 44].

In response to these concerns, an idea has emerged to provide hints to questions rather than direct answers, encouraging in this way users to participate in the answer finding process themselves [40]. This approach, known as Hint Generation, aims to give subtle guidance that leads users toward the correct answer without explicitly revealing it, thereby promoting active learning and supporting cognitive engagement [41]. For example, for the question,

Question:	What musician's album 'Bad' produced five consecutive No. 1 singles on the Billboard Hot 100 chart?					Answer:	Micheal Jackson	MJ
Hint	Relevance	Readability	Convergence	Familiarity	Answer Leakage			
He is called the "King of Pop".	0.89	0	1	0.98	0.37			
His famous move is "moon walk".	0.90	0	1	0.93	0.39			
"Beat It" is a song from his album "Thriller".	0.89	0	1	0.87	0.42			
This musician has 39 Guinness World records.	0.91	0	0.64	1	0.53			
His first wife is Lisa Marie Presley and second wife is Debbie Rowe.	0.91	0	1	0.30	0.37			

**Figure 2: Example hints for a sample question with scoring metrics. The metrics Relevance, Convergence, Familiarity, and Answer Leakage are rated on a scale from 0 to 1, where 0 represents the lowest and 1 the highest value. Higher scores in Relevance, Convergence, and Familiarity indicate better results, while a lower score is preferable for Answer Leakage. The Readability metric is scored as 0 (Beginner), 1 (Intermediate), or 2 (Advanced), with lower values indicating better readability.**

Who made the "I Am Prepared to Die" speech at the opening of the Rivonia Trial in April 1964?, a good hint would be *He was the first Black president of South Africa*, while *He studied law at the University of Fort Hare* would not be a very useful hint. Hint Evaluation, a complementary task to Hint Generation, aims to assess the quality and effectiveness of generated hints, ensuring they support meaningful guidance towards the correct answers [8, 92]. Figure 2 presents five hints along with their evaluations for an example question.

The research in Hint Generation and Evaluation is however currently hindered by fragmented resources, as available datasets, methods, and evaluation tools are often in incompatible formats, making it difficult for researchers to develop, benchmark, and compare hint-based models consistently. To address these challenges, we introduce HINTEVAL, the first comprehensive framework for hint generation and evaluation in the NLP and IR domains, with its logo shown in Figure 1. HINTEVAL simplifies access to a diverse collection of datasets and provides a standardized toolkit for generating and evaluating hints across multiple contexts. The framework integrates previously distributed resources and complements the evaluation metrics with several new ones, enabling clear and consistent evaluation practices that support a range of research objectives. Furthermore, HINTEVAL includes detailed online documentation to help users explore its features and begin using the framework with ease. By reducing entry barriers and promoting unified evaluation standards, HINTEVAL aims to advance research and application in hint-based learning support, fostering a more robust understanding of how hints can be optimized for educational and problem-solving tasks. The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We present HINTEVAL, the first Python-based library specifically designed for Hint Generation and Evaluation, consolidating essential resources for both tasks and providing a standardized platform for research.
- HINTEVAL includes access to multiple preprocessed and evaluated datasets, making it easier for researchers to generate and evaluate hints without extensive data preparation.
- HINTEVAL offers a range of evaluation metrics and tools for comprehensive hint assessment, standardizing the evaluation process across different research contexts and supporting both answer-aware and answer-agnostic approaches.
- HINTEVAL is accompanied by extensive online documentation, which helps users explore its features, and is freely

available on PyPI and GitHub, making it accessible to researchers and practitioners.


The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we review recent work on hint generation and evaluation that highlights limitations and the need for a unified framework. Section 3 presents the design and functionality of HINTEVAL, with detailed descriptions of its datasets, models, and evaluation metrics including also baseline performance with several LLMs. Finally, in Section 4, we conclude with insights into the potential impacts of HINTEVAL on the field and outline directions for future research.

## 2 Related Work

Automatic question answering (QA) systems [3, 60, 86] have significantly advanced in recent years, especially following the emergence of large language models (LLMs) that have transformed various tasks in fields such as Natural Language Processing (NLP) [14, 18], Information Retrieval (IR) [87, 89], and Computer Vision [81, 98]. QA systems generally fall into two main categories: (1) Extractive and (2) Generative. Extractive systems [82, 97] identify answers within a passage, yielding a final answer as a passage span. In contrast, generative systems [16, 102] generate answers based on passages [34, 99], knowledge graphs [70, 95], or by simply leveraging LLMs [53]. Due to the impressive capabilities of LLMs, much of recent research has focused on generative QA systems.

The rise of LLMs has also spurred interest in other QA-related tasks, such as Question Generation (QG) [36, 68]. The objective of QG is to generate questions based on passages [104] or knowledge graphs [4], focusing on extracting relevant entities to craft questions [30]. In particular, QG systems excel in generating factoid questions [2] derived from these extracted entities. Some studies have advanced QG by generating multiple-choice questions [33], introducing distractors [6] as plausible but incorrect options. This does not only provide correct answers but also suggests alternatives, offering a more comprehensive question format.

In addition to question answering and question generation, a new task known as Automatic Hint Generation for QA has been recently introduced, initially presented by Jatowt et al. [42]. Previously, hint generation was explored primarily within the scope of intelligent tutoring systems focused on programming [10, 48, 61, 76] rather than QA. Hint Generation task aims to generate hints related to a question's answer, helping users arrive at answers themselves [42].



**Figure 3: Workflow of the HINTEVAL:** ① Questions are loaded and converted into a structured dataset using the Dataset module. ② Users can load preprocessed datasets as a structured dataset. ③ Hints can be generated for each question using the Model module and stored in the dataset object. ④ The Evaluation module assesses all generated hints and questions using various evaluation metrics, storing the results in the dataset object. ⑤ The updated dataset can be saved and reloaded as needed.

Recent work on this task has introduced methods to improve various aspects, such as dataset creation [62, 66], hint generation approaches [62, 66], hint ranking [65], and hint evaluation [66]. For a deeper exploration of hint generation and its challenges, we recommend the recent survey by Jangra et al. [41] which examines datasets, methods, and evaluation strategies for Hint Generation.

## 2.1 Datasets

Numerous datasets are available for QA tasks [20, 84, 101], which can be divided into categories like Factoid QA [80], Definition QA [12], Yes/No QA [19], Commonsense QA [90], or Mathematical QA [7]. Our focus is on factoid QA datasets, which are foundational to QG and Hint Generation tasks. Popular factoid QA datasets include TriviaQA [43], NaturalQuestions (NQ) [49], and WebQuestions (WebQ) [11]. While these datasets feature real user questions, others like ChroniclingAmericaQA [75] and ArchivalQA [96] employ synthetic questions generated via QG tasks. Although most factoid QA research centers around extracting or generating answers, certain datasets such as TriviaHG, WikiHint, and HintQA include also hints to assist users in deducing answers themselves. TriviaHG [66] contains hints for a subset of TriviaQA questions, HintQA [62] covers test subsets of TriviaQA, NQ, and WebQ, and WikiHint[65] provides hints extracted from Wikipedia by humans for questions generated by ChatGPT and extracted from SQuAD 2.0 [80] and NQ.

## 2.2 Models

A variety of models and methods are applied across QA systems, which can be categorized as Traditional [77], Deep Learning-based [38], and LLM-based [107]. Traditional methods rely on syntactic structures like syntax trees, dependency trees, or WordNet [31] to locate answers, whereas deep learning models have introduced a shift towards transformer-based architectures. For QG, there are rule-based methods [24], but generative models like T5 [79] have become the standard [28, 103]. In Hint Generation, early work by Jatowt et al. [42] used rule-based algorithms and WikiData<sup>4</sup>;

however, more recent studies employ generative models such as LLaMA [27] and Copilot<sup>5</sup>. Hint generation approaches are either answer-aware, where hints are generated based on the question accompanied with its answer, or answer-agnostic, where the generation is based on only the question. For instance, TriviaHG and WikiHint use answer-aware methods, while HintQA employs an answer-agnostic approach.

## 2.3 Evaluation

Several evaluation metrics exist for QA systems, with some relying on statistical measures [45] like Exact Match and F1, while others utilize neural-based metrics like BertScore [105] and BEM [15]. QG is often evaluated through metrics such as BLEU [72], METEOR [9], and ROUGE [55], alongside human evaluations [59]. For Hint Generation, five key metrics have been applied: Relevance, Readability, Convergence, Familiarity [66], and AnswerLeakage [65].

## 2.4 Frameworks

For QA, frameworks like PySerini [56], BERGEN [83], and Reranker [21] simplify pipeline implementation, providing modular components for customized QA solutions. In QG, libraries such as LMQG [93] allow question generation based on input passages. However, no dedicated frameworks exist for Hint Generation and Hint Evaluation, making it challenging to contribute to the research in these areas. To address this gap, we introduce HINTEVAL, the first framework designed for hint generation, enabling users to both effectively generate and evaluate hints.

## 3 HINTEVAL

The goal of HINTEVAL is to create a tool that simplifies hint generation and evaluation. Leveraging Python’s popularity in the machine-learning domain due to libraries like PyTorch [73] and TensorFlow [1], HINTEVAL was developed in Python and made accessible via PyPI<sup>6</sup> for straightforward installation using:

<sup>4</sup><https://www.wikidata.org/>

<sup>5</sup><https://copilot.microsoft.com/>

<sup>6</sup><https://pypi.org/project/hinteval/>

```

@ hinteval.cores.evaluation_metrics.familiarity.Wikipedia
def evaluate(self,
             sentences: List[Question | Hint | Answer],
             **kwargs: Any) -> List[Float]

Evaluates the familiarity of the given Question, Hint, or Answer using the number of views of corresponding
Wikipedia pages [35] 1.

Notes 2
This function stores the scores as Metric objects within the metrics attribute of the Question, Hint, or Answer,
with names based on the method, such as "familiarity-wikipedia-sm".
This function also stores number of views for each entity as Entity objects within the entities attribute.

Examples 3
>>> from hinteval.cores import Question, Hint
>>> from hinteval.evaluation.familiarity import Wikipedia
>>>
>>> wikipedia = Wikipedia(spacy_pipeline='en_core_web_sm')
>>> sentence_1 = Question('What is the capital of Austria?')
>>> sentence_2 = Hint('This city, once home to Mozart and Beethoven, is the capital of Austria.')
>>> sentences = [sentence_1, sentence_2]
>>> results = wikipedia.evaluate(sentences)
>>> print(results)
# [1.0, 1.0]
>>> metrics = [{'metric_key': 'familiarity-wikipedia-sm', 'metric_value': 1.0} for sent in sentences for metric_key,
metric_value in
... sent.metrics.items()]
>>> print(metrics)
# [{'familiarity-wikipedia-sm': 1.0}, {'familiarity-wikipedia-sm': 1.0}]
>>> entities = [{'entity': 'austria', 'entity_views': 248144}, {'entity': 'mozart', 'entity_views': 233219},
{'entity': 'beethoven', 'entity_views': 224128}, {'entity': 'austria', 'entity_views': 248144}]
>>> print(entities)
# [{'austria': 248144}, {'mozart': 233219}, {'beethoven': 224128}, {'austria': 248144}]

References 4
[35] Jamshid Mozafari, Anubhav Jangra, and Adam Jatowt. 2024. TriviaHG: A Dataset for Automatic Hint
Generation from Factoid Questions. In Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on
Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24). Association for Computing Machinery, New
York, NY, USA, 2060–2070. https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657855

See Also 5
WordFrequency
Class for evaluating familiarity of Question, Hint, or Answer based on word frequency analysis on Common
Crawl.

Params: sentences – List of sentences to evaluate. 6
kwargs – Additional keyword arguments.

Returns: List of familiarity scores for each sentence. 7

```


**Figure 4: A docstring for the evaluate function of the Wikipedia method within the Familiarity evaluation metric. The docstring begins with: ① A detailed description of the function, followed by ② Notes specific to the evaluation metric and the method. It includes ③ a comprehensive Example demonstrating usage, helping users understand how to effectively implement it. ④ The References section lists the scholarly publications referenced by the method, while the ⑤ See Also section provides links to related functions with similar functionality. ⑥ The Params section outlines the input parameters of the function, and ⑦ the Returns section specifies the expected output. This structure ensures clear, accessible, and thorough documentation for users.**

```
$ pip install hinteval
```

This paper introduces version 0.0.1, the initial release. Users are encouraged to use the latest version and consult the project repository<sup>7</sup> for updates. Contributors can fork the repository and submit pull requests to improve the framework. Additionally, users can consult the online documentation<sup>8</sup> for a comprehensive guide on using the framework. Apart from the online documentation, we have included extensive docstrings along with examples for all functions and classes, providing inline documentation easily accessible within IDEs to enhance understanding and usability.

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/DataScienceUIBK/HintEval>

<sup>8</sup><https://hinteval.readthedocs.io/>



**Figure 5: Schema of the Dataset class, illustrating the objects used to represent a dataset in HINTEVAL. The arrows indicate a subclass relationship.**

Figure 4 illustrates an example of a function's docstring for a method used in the familiarity evaluation metric (explained in Sec. 3.3.4).

HINTEVAL comprises three main modules: *Datasets*, *Models*, and *Evaluation*. The *Datasets* module provides functionality for creating a new dataset or downloading and loading preprocessed datasets. The *Models* module focuses on generating hints, while the *Evaluation* module offers methods for assessing questions, hints, and answers using various metrics. Figure 3 overviews the workflow of the HINTEVAL. Detailed examples illustrating the framework's functionality will be provided in the following sections.

### 3.1 Datasets

With HINTEVAL, we aim to empower users to be able to seamlessly work with multiple datasets using just a few lines of code. To achieve this, we designed an architecture that unifies diverse annotation styles and storage formats across datasets. This architecture consists of several components, as illustrated in Figure 5.

The Dataset class encapsulates key attributes that describe dataset metadata, such as its name, the corresponding GitHub repository or reference paper, version, and a brief description providing additional context about the dataset. Similar to datasets in other domains, hint datasets are typically organized into subsets such as train, validation (or development), test, etc. The number and type of subsets depend on the specific dataset. For instance, TriviaHG [66] includes fourteen subsets, whereas KG-Hint [42] only provides a test subset. The `.subsets` attribute represents these subsets for each dataset.

Each subset comprises multiple instances, accessible using unique IDs referred to as `q_id`. At the core of the dataset are these instances, which can be accessed through the `.instances` attribute of the subset. Each instance includes a question, its corresponding answers, and a set of hints. A question may have multiple valid answers, for



**Table 1: Statistics of the preprocessed datasets available for download and loading by users. The *Finetuned* column indicates whether the corresponding subset was generated using a fine-tuned model, while the *Use Answer* column specifies whether the model was aware of the answer during hint generation. Va and FT refer to Vanilla and Finetuned, respectively, Aw refers to AnswerAware, and Ag refers to AnswerAgnostic.**

Dataset	Subset	Finetuned	Use Answer	Num. of Qs	Num. of Hs
TriviaHG [66]	Training	X	✓	14,645	140,973
	Validation	X	✓	1,000	9,638
	Test	X	✓	1,000	9,617
	LLaMA 2 7b Va	X	✓	100	840
	LLaMA 2 7b FT	✓	✓	100	923
	LLaMA 2 13b Va	X	✓	100	896
	LLaMA 2 13b FT	✓	✓	100	921
	LLaMA 2 70b Va	X	✓	100	683
	LLaMA 2 70b FT	✓	✓	100	924
	Gemini	X	✓	100	942
	WizardLM 70b	X	✓	100	941
	GPT 3.5	X	✓	100	898
	GPT 4	X	✓	100	949
Copilot	X	✓	100	970	
WikiHint [65]	Training	X	✓	900	4,500
	Test	X	✓	100	500
	LLaMA 3.1 8b Va-Aw	X	✓	100	100
	LLaMA 3.1 8b Va-Ag	X	✓	100	100
	LLaMA 3.1 8b FT-Aw	✓	✓	100	100
	LLaMA 3.1 8b FT-Ag	✓	✓	100	100
	LLaMA 3.1 70b Va-Aw	X	✓	100	100
	LLaMA 3.1 70b Va-Ag	X	✓	100	100
	LLaMA 3.1 70b FT-Aw	✓	✓	100	100
	LLaMA 3.1 70b FT-Ag	✓	✓	100	100
	LLaMA 3.1 405b Va-Aw	X	✓	100	100
	LLaMA 3.1 405b Va-Ag	X	✓	100	100
	GPT 4 Va-Aw	X	✓	100	100
GPT 4 Va-Ag	X	✓	100	100	
HintQA [62]	TriviaQA Va	X	X	11,313	103,018
	TriviaQA FT	✓	X	11,313	105,709
	NQ Va	X	X	3,610	30,976
	NQ FT	✓	X	3,610	33,131
	WebQ Va	X	X	2,032	15,812
KG-Hint [42]	WebQ FT	✓	X	2,032	16,978
	Test	X	X	30	307

example, the question *Which country is the University of Harvard located in?* can be answered with *USA*, *United States*, or *United States of America*. Figure 2 illustrates an instance comprising a question, its 2 answers, and five hints.

The attributes `.question`, `.answers`, and `.hints` within an instance correspond to the `Question`, `Answer`, and `Hint` objects.

The `Question` class represents various attributes associated with a question. The content of the question is stored in the `.question` attribute, while the `.question_type` attribute specifies the type of the question, which is classified into major and minor types based on the classification schema introduced in the TREC Question Classification task by Li and Roth [54]. Additionally, the `.entities` attribute contains a list of entities present in the question, and the `.metrics` attribute stores the evaluated metrics for the question. HINTEVAL includes a built-in function to automatically detect and assign question types to each question based on the method presented by Tayyar Madabushi and Lee [91].

The `Answer` class represents the attributes related to an answer. The content of the answer is stored in the `.answer` attribute, while the `.entities` attribute lists entities associated with the answer.

```

1 from hinteval import Dataset
2
3 available_datasets = Dataset.available_datasets(
4     show_info=True,
5     update=True
6 )

```

**Listing 1: This script retrieves the latest information about the available datasets, returns it as a dict, and also displays metadata for each dataset in the terminal.**

```

1 from hinteval import Dataset
2 from hinteval.cores.dataset_core import Instance, Subset
3
4 instance_1 = Instance.from_strings('Q11', ['A11',
5     'A12'], ['H11', 'H12', 'H13'])
6 instance_2 = Instance.from_strings('Q21', ['A21',
7     'A22'], ['H21', 'H22', 'H23'])
8
9 subset = Subset('test')
10 subset.add_instance(instance_1)
11 subset.add_instance(instance_2)
12
13 dataset = Dataset('own_dataset')
14 dataset.add_subset(subset)

```

**Listing 2: This script creates a user-defined dataset named `own_dataset` consisting of two instances. Each instance contains one question (Q), two answers (A), and three hints (H). Both instances belong to the `test` subset.**

The `.metrics` attribute holds the values of the evaluation metrics specific to the answer.

The `Hint` class represents the attributes related to a hint. The content of the hint is contained in the `.hint` attribute, and the `.source` attribute indicates the source of the hint. Similar to the `Question` and `Answer` classes, the `.entities` attribute lists entities included in the hint, and the `.metrics` attribute stores the evaluated metrics for the hint.

The `.entities` and `.metrics` attributes are shared across the `Question`, `Answer`, and `Hint` classes. The `.entities` attribute contains a list of `Entity` objects, where each object is an instance of the `Entity` class. An `Entity` object consists of the content of the entity stored in the `.entity` attribute, the type of the entity in `.ent_type`, and its position in the text specified by the `start_index` and `end_index` attributes. The entity types align with the Named Entity Recognition (NER) types defined in `spacy`<sup>9</sup>. HINTEVAL provides a built-in function to extract named entities from each question, answer, and hint by leveraging the `spacy` NER pipeline.

The `.metrics` attribute is a dictionary containing the evaluation results for various metrics, with each metric represented as an instance of the `Metric` class. A `Metric` object consists of the name of the metric and its corresponding value.

All classes also include a `.metadata` attribute designed to store additional dataset-specific information and features. For instance, `WikiHint` [65] includes a unique ranking feature for each hint, stored in the `.metadata` attribute of the corresponding hints.

<sup>9</sup><https://spacy.io/>

```

1 from hinteval import Dataset
2
3 trivia_hg = Dataset.download_and_load_dataset('triviahg')
4
5 dataset = Dataset.load('./path/to/dataset.pickle')
6 dataset.store('./path/to/dataset.pickle')
7
8 dataset = Dataset.load_json('./path/to/dataset.json')
9 dataset.store_json('./path/to/dataset.json')

```

**Listing 3: This script downloads the TriviaHG [66] dataset and loads it in line 3. Lines 5 and 6 demonstrate how to load and store the dataset as a pickle file, while lines 8 and 9 show how to import and export the dataset as a JSON file.**

The HINTEVAL provides preprocessed hint datasets from several prior studies [42, 62, 66], simplifying usage with just a few lines of code. At the time of writing this paper, we have collected, processed, and converted the available hint datasets into the Dataset class, enabling users to easily download and utilize them. Table 1 presents the statistics of the hint datasets included in HINTEVAL. To explore the available preprocessed datasets and retrieve information about them, users can use the script provided in Listing 1. To access the newest preprocessed datasets, simply set `update` to `True`; there is no need to upgrade HINTEVAL to the latest version.

Users have also the flexibility to create their own datasets from scratch using the Dataset class, in addition to utilizing preprocessed datasets. Listing 2 provides a script demonstrating how to create a custom dataset. For comprehensive instructions, we recommend referring to the online documentation.

To import or export datasets, whether they are preprocessed datasets provided by HINTEVAL or user-defined datasets, the Dataset class offers several convenient functions. The standard approach for storing datasets is by using pickle files, as they are compressed, easy to transport, and inherently provide a level of encryption, addressing security concerns. However, if a user prefers to export a dataset to a JSON file or import it from a JSON file, the Dataset class includes dedicated functions to simplify this process. Additionally, users can directly load available datasets by specifying their names. The script in Listing 3 demonstrates how to efficiently load and store hint datasets.

### 3.2 Models

The current version of HINTEVAL includes two built-in models: *Answer-Aware* and *Answer-Agnostic*.

The Answer-Aware model generates hints for a question when the ground-truth answer is provided. In other words, to utilize this model, the gold answer to each question must be available and passed to the model. This approach offers both advantages and disadvantages. On the positive side, the quality of the generated hints is generally higher [65]. However, its limitation lies in requiring the answer, which might not always be feasible for certain questions. The TriviaHG [66] dataset has been generated using this model. In HINTEVAL, the Answer-Aware model is implemented as the AnswerAware class, which includes a generate function. This function accepts a list of instance objects and populates them with the generated hints. Note that these instance objects must contain the answers to the questions.

```

1 from hinteval.cores.dataset_core import Instance
2 from hinteval.model import AnswerAware, AnswerAgnostic
3
4 instance_1 = Instance.from_strings('Q11', [], [])
5 instance_2 = Instance.from_strings('Q21', [], [])
6
7 instances = [instance_1, instance_2]
8
9 answer_agnostic =
  AnswerAgnostic('meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct')
10 answer_agnostic.generate(instances)
11
12 instance_1.answers_from_strings(['A12'])
13 instance_2.answers_from_strings(['A22'])
14
15 answer_aware =
  AnswerAware('meta-llama/Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct')
16 answer_aware.generate(instances)

```

**Listing 4: This script generates five hints (default value) for instance\_1 and instance\_2 using the LLaMA 3.1 8B model with both Answer-Agnostic and Answer-Aware approaches. Lines 4–7 prepare two sample instances, lines 9–10 generate hints using the Answer-Agnostic model, lines 12–13 add answers to the instances, and lines 15–16 generate hints using the Answer-Aware model.**

The Answer-Agnostic model generates hints for a question without requiring the ground-truth answer. The primary advantage of this model is its applicability to questions where answers are unavailable or unclear. However, a limitation is the potentially lower quality of the generated hints, as the model might fail to identify the correct answer [65]. The HintQA dataset [62] was generated using this model. In HINTEVAL, the Answer-Agnostic model is implemented through the AnswerAgnostic class, which features a generate function. This function takes a list of instance objects as input and generates hints for them. It is worth mentioning that the WikiHint[65] dataset is generated using both the Answer-Aware and Answer-Agnostic models.

Listing 4 illustrates how to use the answer-aware and answer-agnostic models to generate hints for questions. The script serves as a basic example with minimal parameters. We note that HINTEVAL supports running LLM models both locally and remotely, providing flexibility based on user preferences and infrastructure. For more detailed guidance on customizing parameters and leveraging advanced features, readers are encouraged to refer to the online documentation.

The AnswerAware and AnswerAgnostic classes inherit from a base class called Model. To extend this base class, users must implement the generate function. HINTEVAL allows users to create their own models by extending the Model class, implementing the generate function, and seamlessly integrating their custom models into the HINTEVAL ecosystem.

### 3.3 Evaluation

The Hint Evaluation task assesses hints using several metrics. At the time of writing, HINTEVAL implements five main evaluation metrics—Relevance, Readability, Convergence, Familiarity, and Answer Leakage—which collectively comprise **fifteen** evaluation methods

```

1 from hinteval.cores.dataset_core import Instance
2 from hinteval.evaluation.relevance import Rouge
3 from hinteval.evaluation.readability import
  MachineLearningBased
4 from hinteval.evaluation.convergence import
  NeuralNetworkBased
5 from hinteval.evaluation.familiarity import Wikipedia
6 from hinteval.evaluation.answer_leakage import Lexical
7
8 instance_1 = Instance.from_strings('Q11', ['A11',
  'A12'], ['H11', 'H12', 'H13'])
9 instance_2 = Instance.from_strings('Q21', ['A11',
  'A12'], ['H22', 'H22', 'H23'])
10
11 instances = [instance_1, instance_2]
12
13 relevance = Rouge('rougeL').evaluate(instances)
14 readability =
  MachineLearningBased('xgboost').evaluate(instance_1.hints)
15 convergence =
  NeuralNetworkBased('bert-base').evaluate(instances)
16 familiarity = Wikipedia().evaluate(instance_2.hints)
17 answer_leakage =
  Lexical('exclude_stop_words').evaluate(instances)

```

**Listing 5:** This script shows the evaluation of five metrics for two instances, `instance_1` and `instance_2`. It uses *rougeL* for relevance (Line 13), *XGBoost* for readability (Line 14), *Bert-base* for convergence (Line 15), *Wikipedia* for familiarity (Line 16), and *Lexical* for answer leakage (Line 17).

and **thirty-five** sub-methods. These metrics are described as follows:

**Relevance** evaluates the semantic relationship between the hint and the question, ensuring the hint is relevant.

**Readability** measures how easy or difficult it is to understand a hint or question. This metric is important to ensure that hints guide the user effectively and are understandable without causing confusion.

**Convergence** evaluates how well the hints narrow down potential answers to the question. In other words, it assesses how effectively the hints guide the user toward eliminating incorrect answers and focusing on the correct one.

**Familiarity** measures how common or well-known the information in the hints, questions, or answers is. It assesses whether the content is likely to be understood by the general public, making it easier for users to grasp the provided hints without needing specialized knowledge.

**AnswerLeakage** measures the extent to which a hint directly discloses the answer. It ensures that hints guide users without explicitly revealing the solutions. This metric is useful for evaluating whether the hints are subtle enough to assure problem-solving rather than giving away the answer.

Some of these evaluation metrics were initially introduced by Mozafari et al. [66], who proposed automatic methods only for Convergence and Familiarity. However, they have not introduced any automatic methods for Relevance, Readability, or Answer Leakage nor have they evaluated the TriviaHG dataset for these metrics. Subsequently, Mozafari et al. [65] introduced automatic methods for Relevance, Readability, and AnswerLeakage. Despite these advancements, the existing methods faced challenges, including high



**Figure 6:** Evaluation metrics included in the HINTEVAL framework. Dark blue boxes denote the primary evaluation metrics, green boxes indicate methods associated with each metric implemented from scratch in HINTEVAL, and light blue boxes highlight methods adopted from prior studies.

computational load, reliance on large language models, and complex codebases tailored to specific dataset schema and structures.

To address these issues, HINTEVAL re-implements all metrics in a generic manner, ensuring they work seamlessly with any dataset based on the Dataset class. This allows users to define their datasets using the Dataset class and to easily apply the evaluation metrics with minimal code.

In addition to re-implementing metrics from the previous studies, HINTEVAL introduces a range of new methods for evaluating each metric, spanning from simple and lightweight approaches to more complex and resource-intensive ones. This design allows users to select methods based on available resources with a trade-off between the simplicity and accuracy.

Figure 6 provides an overview of all evaluation metrics and their methods included in HINTEVAL. Table 3 compares these methods for evaluation metrics across various features, while Table 2 presents the average values of the evaluated metrics across different datasets and their subsets for all the metrics and their methods. Moreover, Listing 5 demonstrates how users can apply the evaluation metrics

**Table 2: The average evaluation scores for all subsets of the TriviaHG, HintQA, WikiHint, and KG-Hint datasets. *Rel* denotes Relevance, *Read* Readability, *Conv* Convergence, *Fam* Familiarity, and *AnsLkg* Answer Leakage.**

Dataset	Subset	Rel Rouge	Rel NonCtx	Rel Ctx	Rel LLM	Read Auto	Read ML	Read NN	Read LLM	Conv Spec	Conv NN	Conv LLM	Fam Freq	Fam Wiki	AnsLkg Lex	AnsLkg Ctx
TriviaHG [66]	Training	0.12	0.95	1	0.95	7.52	0.45	0.71	0.48	0.89	0.49	0.49	0.9	0.78	0.09	0.41
	Validation	0.12	0.97	1	0.95	7.62	0.45	0.7	0.48	0.9	0.49	0.5	0.9	0.77	0.09	0.43
	Test	0.12	0.97	1	0.95	7.55	0.43	0.69	0.47	0.9	0.52	0.52	0.9	0.78	0.1	0.43
	LLaMA 2 7b Va	0.17	0.9	0.94	0.95	7.46	0.52	0.85	0.45	0.7	0.36	0.31	0.94	0.92	0.1	0.47
	LLaMA 2 7b FT	0.13	0.91	0.98	0.95	5.42	0.29	0.38	0.32	0.85	0.47	0.4	0.92	0.89	0.06	0.42
	LLaMA 13b Va	0.16	0.92	0.99	0.95	7.59	0.53	0.74	0.42	0.7	0.37	0.35	0.95	0.92	0.1	0.46
	LLaMA 13b FT	0.13	0.92	1	0.95	5.32	0.3	0.4	0.35	0.87	0.45	0.41	0.91	0.89	0.06	0.42
	LLaMA 70b Va	0.18	0.95	1	0.95	8.92	0.7	1	0.51	0.62	0.44	0.42	0.95	0.9	0.06	0.43
	LLaMA 70b FT	0.14	0.96	1	0.95	5.46	0.29	0.35	0.32	0.91	0.5	0.49	0.89	0.87	0.04	0.41
	Gemini	0.12	0.91	1	0.95	6.16	0.2	0.36	0.23	0.81	0.45	0.46	0.97	0.91	0.04	0.4
	WizardLM 70b	0.13	0.9	0.93	0.95	7.24	0.48	0.68	0.38	0.72	0.38	0.45	1	0.93	0.08	0.45
	GPT 3.5	0.16	0.96	1	0.95	6.67	0.41	0.64	0.33	0.8	0.42	0.44	0.9	0.9	0.08	0.44
	GPT 4	0.12	0.97	1	0.95	9.54	0.89	1.05	0.67	0.9	0.55	0.52	0.97	0.88	0.06	0.41
	Copilot	0.12	0.97	1	0.95	7.71	0.45	0.65	0.46	0.91	0.52	0.54	0.93	0.84	0.04	0.45
	WikiHint [65]	Training	0.15	0.92	0.94	0.95	8.67	0.49	0.71	0.53	0.88	0.6	0.74	0.87	0.76	0.11
Test		0.14	0.92	0.9	0.95	8.59	0.59	0.83	0.6	0.89	0.56	0.72	0.86	0.73	0.06	0.46
LLaMA 3.1 8b Va-Aw		0.16	0.91	0.94	0.85	14.29	1.98	1.72	1.34	0.91	0.64	0.32	0.85	0.8	0.09	0.49
LLaMA 3.1 8b Va-Ag		0.16	0.89	0.94	0.83	14.36	1.99	1.6	1.36	0.91	0.59	0.3	0.86	0.82	0.1	0.49
LLaMA 3.1 8b FT-Aw		0.17	0.93	0.93	0.89	14.36	1.98	1.63	1.37	0.94	0.61	0.37	0.82	0.79	0.12	0.51
LLaMA 3.1 8b FT-Ag		0.15	0.9	0.91	0.85	13.99	1.99	1.76	1.43	0.93	0.56	0.32	0.82	0.8	0.13	0.5
LLaMA 3.1 70b-Va-Aw		0.14	0.95	1	0.92	15.01	1.93	1.49	1.16	0.94	0.62	0.42	0.83	0.79	0.1	0.5
LLaMA 3.1 70b-Va-Ag		0.13	0.93	1	0.91	12.83	1.96	1.49	1.2	0.93	0.57	0.38	0.8	0.75	0.09	0.49
LLaMA 3.1 70b-FT-Aw		0.14	0.95	1	0.95	14.94	1.91	1.52	1.16	0.86	0.64	0.42	0.84	0.84	0.06	0.49
LLaMA 3.1 70b-FT-Ag		0.14	0.95	1	0.92	13.51	1.91	1.5	1.18	0.93	0.59	0.38	0.84	0.79	0.12	0.51
LLaMA 3.1 405b-Va-Aw		0.14	0.97	1	0.97	16.18	1.83	1.52	1.18	0.96	0.69	0.47	0.81	0.75	0.09	0.49
LLaMA 3.1 405b-Va-Ag		0.14	0.97	1	0.97	14.82	1.92	1.53	1.19	0.98	0.66	0.45	0.81	0.77	0.1	0.5
GPT 4 Va-Aw		0.13	0.97	1	0.98	11.41	1.32	1.1	0.75	0.94	0.61	0.48	0.81	0.84	0.1	0.49
GPT 4 Va-Ag		0.15	0.96	1	0.98	11.24	1.2	1.1	0.72	0.93	0.67	0.47	0.83	0.81	0.12	0.51
HintQA [62]		TriviaQA Va	0.16	0.88	0.9	0.9	6.93	0.43	0.66	0.37	0.8	0.31	0.35	0.88	0.87	0.05
	TriviaQA FT	0.14	0.9	0.91	0.9	5.51	0.27	0.45	0.3	0.87	0.37	0.4	0.81	0.83	0.04	0.34
	NQ Va	0.18	0.84	0.88	0.9	7.71	0.5	0.71	0.42	0.58	0.25	0.3	0.89	0.86	0.07	0.36
	NQ FT	0.14	0.88	0.9	0.9	5.37	0.22	0.4	0.27	0.72	0.33	0.37	0.93	0.83	0.06	0.39
	WebQ Va	0.13	0.81	0.87	0.9	7.58	0.45	0.63	0.42	0.51	0.29	0.34	0.97	0.85	0.04	0.4
	WebQ FT	0.09	0.85	0.89	0.9	5.96	0.28	0.4	0.4	0.66	0.31	0.36	0.91	0.83	0.04	0.39
KG-Hint [42]	Test	0.08	0.89	0.85	0.73	9.65	0.33	0.69	0.35	0.95	0.43	0.55	0.98	0.7	0	0.42

to their instances and datasets. The following sections provide detailed descriptions of the methods used for each evaluation metric:

**3.3.1 Relevance.** The *Rouge* method [55] evaluates the overlap between the evaluated hints and questions. It includes Rouge-1, which measures unigram overlap for word-level similarity, Rouge-2, which measures bigram overlap for span-level similarity, and Rouge-L, which evaluates the longest common subsequence for sequence alignment. The *Non-Contextual* (NonCtx) method [67] computes relevance by measuring the similarity between hints and questions using fixed word embeddings. This method has two variants, Glove 6B [74], trained on 6 billion tokens from diverse text sources, and Glove 42B [74], trained on 42 billion tokens for more robust embeddings<sup>10</sup>. The *Contextual* (Ctx) method [50] uses embeddings from pre-trained transformer models [64] to evaluate relevance between hints and questions, capturing deeper relationships between words through contextual understanding. Two supported

<sup>10</sup>On the WikiQA dataset [100], the MAP and MRR for the Glove 6B-based method are 80.64% and 85.71%, respectively, while for the Glove 42B-based method, they are 82.14% and 86.47%.

variants are BERT-base [25, 63] and RoBERTa-large<sup>11</sup> [58]. The *LLM* method [29] measures relevance of a hint to a question using the Answer Relevancy metric. In this approach, the hint is treated as an answer and the question as a prompt, with LLMs acting as a judge.

**3.3.2 Readability.** The *Traditional* [52] method evaluates readability using classic formulas based on sentence length, word length, and complexity. The supported methods include the Gunning Fog Index [37], Flesch Reading Ease [32], Coleman-Liau Index [22], SMOG Index [51], and Automated Readability Index [88], which estimate readability levels required to understand the text. The *Machine Learning* (ML) [57] method evaluates readability using trained models that predict scores based on text features. These models are trained on the OneStopEnglish (OSE) dataset [94], which maps texts to specific readability levels including Beginner (0), Intermediate (1), and Advanced (2). Supported methods include XGBoost [17],

<sup>11</sup>On the WikiQA dataset [100], the MAP and MRR for BERT-base are 91.2% and 94.4%, respectively, while for RoBERTa-large, they are 94.6% and 97.4%.



**Table 3: Comparison of various hint evaluation metrics based on key performance attributes. Preferred Device specifies the optimal hardware (CPU or GPU) for the method. Cost Effectiveness evaluates the method’s efficiency in resource usage. Accuracy indicates the reliability of the method in evaluating the metric. Execution Speed highlights the method’s runtime performance.**

Metric	Method	Preferred Device	Cost Effectiveness	Accuracy	Execution Speed
Relevance	Rouge	CPU	High	Low	Very Fast
	Non-Contextual	CPU/GPU	High	Moderate	Fast
	Contextual	GPU	Moderate	High	Moderate
	LLM	GPU	Low	Very High	Slow
Readability	Traditional	CPU	High	Low	Very Fast
	Machine-Learning	CPU	High	Moderate	Moderate
	Neural-Network	GPU	Moderate	High	Moderate
	LLM	GPU	Low	Very High	Slow
Convergence	Specificity	GPU	Moderate	Low	Moderate
	Neural-Network	GPU	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
	LLM	GPU	Low	High	Slow
Familiarity	Word-Frequency	CPU	Very High	Low	Very Fast
	Wikipedia	CPU	High	High	Slow
AnswerLeakage	Lexical	CPU	Very High	Low	Very Fast
	Contextual	GPU	Moderate	High	Moderate

a gradient boosting algorithm known for speed and accuracy, and Random-Forest [13], an ensemble method that builds multiple decision trees to improve prediction accuracy<sup>12</sup>. The *Neural Network* (NN) [57] method uses pre-trained transformer models to evaluate readability by capturing the deeper context and structure of text for nuanced analysis. Supported methods include BERT-base and RoBERTa-large<sup>13</sup>. The *LLM* [69] method evaluates readability by leveraging large language models. These models provide highly accurate and context-aware readability scores, offering a deeper understanding of how easily text can be comprehended.

**3.3.3 Convergence.** The *Specificity* (Spec) [96] method evaluates the degree to which a hint is specific or general. The supported methods include BERT-base and RoBERTa-large, trained on the dataset from Ko et al. [47], which has been designed to detect the specificity or generality of a sentence<sup>14</sup>. The *Neural Network* (NN) method utilizes pre-trained transformer models to assess how effectively a hint narrows down possible answers. Here, the supported methods include BERT-base and RoBERTa-large, which were fine-tuned with the convergence values of the hints from the TriviaHG [66] training set and evaluated on its test set<sup>15</sup>. The *LLM* [66] method utilizes large language models to generate candidate answers for a given question. It then evaluates the relationship between each hint and the candidate answers to calculate the convergence value. The supported models include LLaMA-3-8B [27] and LLaMA-3-70B [27].

**3.3.4 Familiarity.** The *Word Frequency* (Freq) method evaluates text familiarity by analyzing word frequency using the C4 [26]

<sup>12</sup>The accuracy and F1 scores for Random-Forest are 46.61% and 44.66%, respectively, while for XGBoost, they are 48.22% and 46.59%.

<sup>13</sup>On the OneStopEnglish dataset [94], the accuracy and F1 scores for BERT-base are 59.26% and 58.2%, respectively, while for RoBERTa-large, they are 62.03% and 61.61%.

<sup>14</sup>The accuracy and F1 scores for BERT-base are 81.56% and 81.55%, respectively, while for RoBERTa-large, they are 83.64% and 83.63%.

<sup>15</sup>The Pearson correlation between the ground-truth values and the predicted values is 56.1% for BERT-base and 61.1% for RoBERTa-large.

corpus as a reference. This approach provides insights into how frequently words are used in everyday language. By normalizing the frequency of each word, it generates a value between 0 and 1 to represent the familiarity of each word. This method then calculates the average of these values to produce a familiarity score for each sentence. Supported variants include an approach with stop-words, which considers all words, and one without stop-words, which excludes them to focus on more meaningful terms. The *Wikipedia* (Wiki) [66] method, on the other hand, assesses familiarity by analyzing the popularity of entities mentioned in the text. It uses the number of views of corresponding Wikipedia pages to determine how well-known the referenced people, places, or concepts are to the general public.

**3.3.5 AnswerLeakage.** The *Lexical* (Lex) method evaluates the similarity between the hint and the answer at the word level, focusing on explicit word overlap without considering deeper contextual meaning. The supported variants include an approach with stop-words, which is more permissive, and one without stop-words, which is more precise in identifying relevant overlap. The *Contextual* (Ctx) [65] method uses embeddings to evaluate semantic similarity between the hint and the answer, capturing nuanced relationships even when different words convey the same idea. It computes similarity scores for each pair of words using contextualized word embeddings and selects the maximum similarity as the final value. This method supports SentenceBERT [85] models for generating contextualized word embeddings.

Evaluation metric classes in HINTEVAL are built upon a base class called Evaluation. Users can extend this base class by defining the evaluate function. This design empowers users to create custom evaluation metrics and methods by inheriting from the Evaluation class, implementing the required evaluate function, and seamlessly integrating their custom solutions into HINTEVAL.

## 4 Conclusion

We introduce HINTEVAL, the first framework for Hint Generation and Evaluation designed to address fragmented resources and inconsistent evaluation practices. By unifying datasets, models, and evaluation metrics into a single toolkit, HINTEVAL provides standardized methodologies, flexibility for diverse research requirements, and tools that ensure reproducibility and consistency. It supports five core metrics—Relevance, Readability, Convergence, Familiarity, and Answer Leakage—offering methods that range from lightweight to resource-intensive, catering to varied user needs.

HINTEVAL simplifies workflows for hint-oriented research, bridging gaps in resources and fostering advancements in question-answering, and problem-solving systems. Its open-source nature and comprehensive documentation make it a useful tool for the IR and NLP communities. Researchers can leverage HINTEVAL to develop innovative hint-based systems while maintaining evaluation consistency. By encouraging collaboration and standardization, the framework aims to create a foundation for future breakthroughs in hint generation and question answering research.

Future efforts will focus on expanding the framework with additional datasets, models, and metrics, improving compatibility with emerging language models, and introducing advanced techniques

for hint generation and evaluation to further drive innovation and support critical thinking, active learning, and user engagement.

## References

- [1] Martin Abadi, Paul Barham, Jianmin Chen, Zhifeng Chen, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, Sanjay Ghemawat, Geoffrey Irving, Michael Isard, Manjunath Kudlur, Josh Levenberg, Rajat Monga, Sherry Moore, Derek G. Murray, Benoit Steiner, Paul Tucker, Vijay Vasudevan, Pete Warden, Martin Wicke, Yuan Yu, and Xiaoqiang Zheng. 2016. TensorFlow: a system for large-scale machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation* (Savannah, GA, USA) (OSDI'16). USENIX Association, USA, 265–283.
- [2] Abdelrahman Abdallah, Bhawna Piryani, and Adam Jatowt. 2023. Exploring the state of the art in legal QA systems. *Journal of Big Data* 10, 1 (12 Aug 2023), 127. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-023-00802-8>
- [3] Heba Abdel-Nabi, Arafat Awajan, and Mostafa Z Ali. 2023. Deep learning-based question answering: a survey. *Knowledge and Information Systems* 65, 4 (2023), 1399–1485. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10115-022-01783-5>
- [4] Kosuke Aigo, Takashi Tsunakawa, Masafumi Nishida, and Masafumi Nishimura. 2021. Question Generation using Knowledge Graphs with the T5 Language Model and Masked Self-Attention. In *2021 IEEE 10th Global Conference on Consumer Electronics (GCCE)*. 85–87. <https://doi.org/10.1109/GCCE53005.2021.9621874>
- [5] Riordan Alfredo, Vanessa Echeverria, Yueqiao Jin, Lixiang Yan, Zachari Swiecki, Dragan Gašević, and Roberto Martinez-Maldonado. 2024. Human-centred learning analytics and AI in education: A systematic literature review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 6 (2024), 100215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100215>
- [6] Elaf Alhazmi, Quan Z. Sheng, Wei Emma Zhang, Munazza Zaib, and Ahoud Alhazmi. 2024. Distractor Generation in Multiple-Choice Tasks: A Survey of Methods, Datasets, and Evaluation. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2402.01512 (Feb. 2024), arXiv:2402.01512 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.01512> [cs.CL]
- [7] Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Shanchuan Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. MathQA: Towards Interpretable Math Word Problem Solving with Operation-Based Formalisms. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2357–2367. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1245>
- [8] Albert Bandura. 2013. The role of self-efficacy in goal-based motivation. *New developments in goal setting and task performance* (2013), 147–157. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203082744-13/role-self-efficacy-goal-based-motivation-albert-bandura>
- [9] Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments. In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, Jade Goldstein, Alon Lavie, Chin-Yew Lin, and Clare Voss (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 65–72. <https://aclanthology.org/W05-0909>
- [10] Tiffany Barnes and John Stamper. 2008. Toward Automatic Hint Generation for Logic Proof Tutoring Using Historical Student Data. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems* (Montreal, Canada) (ITS '08). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 373–382. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-69132-7\\_41](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-69132-7_41)
- [11] Jonathan Berant, Andrew Chou, Roy Frostig, and Percy Liang. 2013. Semantic Parsing on Freebase from Question-Answer Pairs. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, David Yarowsky, Timothy Baldwin, Anna Korhonen, Karen Livescu, and Steven Bethard (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, Washington, USA, 1533–1544. <https://aclanthology.org/D13-1160>
- [12] Antoine Bordes, Nicolas Usunier, Sumit Chopra, and Jason Weston. 2015. Large-scale Simple Question Answering with Memory Networks. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:1506.02075 (June 2015), arXiv:1506.02075 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1506.02075> [cs.LG]
- [13] Leo Breiman. 2001. Random Forests. *Machine Learning* 45, 1 (01 Oct 2001), 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>
- [14] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, 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. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (NIPS '20). Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 159, 25 pages.
- [15] Jannis Bulian, Christian Buck, Wojciech Gajewski, Benjamin Börschinger, and Tal Schuster. 2022. Tomayto, Tomahto. Beyond Token-level Answer Equivalence for Question Answering Evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 291–305. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.20>
- [16] Jiawei Chen, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, and Le Sun. 2024. Benchmarking Large Language Models in Retrieval-Augmented Generation. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 38, 16 (Mar. 2024), 17754–17762. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v38i16.29728>
- [17] Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (San Francisco, California, USA) (KDD '16). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 785–794. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939785>
- [18] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ipollito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanu-malayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. 2024. PaLM: scaling language modeling with pathways. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 24, 1, Article 240 (March 2024), 113 pages.
- [19] Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BoolQ: Exploring the Surprising Difficulty of Natural Yes/No Questions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2924–2936. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1300>
- [20] Jonathan H. Clark, Eunsol Choi, Michael Collins, Dan Garrette, Tom Kwiatkowski, Vitaly Nikolaev, and Jennimaria Palomaki. 2020. TyDi QA: A Benchmark for Information-Seeking Question Answering in Typologically Diverse Languages. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 8 (2020), 454–470. [https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl\\_a\\_00317](https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00317)
- [21] Benjamin Clavié. 2024. rerankers: A Lightweight Python Library to Unify Ranking Methods. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2408.17344 (Aug. 2024), arXiv:2408.17344 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.17344> [cs.IR]
- [22] Meri Coleman and T. L. Liau. 1975. A Computer Readability Formula Designed for Machine Scoring. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60, 2 (1975), 283–284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076540>
- [23] Ali Darvishi, Hassan Khosravi, Shazia Sadiq, Dragan Gašević, and George Siemens. 2024. Impact of AI assistance on student agency. *Computers & Education* 210 (2024), 104967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104967>
- [24] Rubel Das, Antariksha Ray, Souvik Mondal, and Dipankar Das. 2016. A rule based question generation framework to deal with simple and complex sentences. In *2016 International Conference on Advances in Computing, Communications and Informatics (ICACCI)*. 542–548. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICACCI.2016.7732102>
- [25] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 4171–4186. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423>
- [26] Jesse Dodge, Maarten Sap, Ana Marasović, William Agnew, Gabriel Ilharco, Dirk Groeneveld, Margaret Mitchell, and Matt Gardner. 2021. Documenting Large Webtext Corpora: A Case Study on the Colossal Clean Crawled Corpus. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 1286–1305. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.98>
- [27] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, et al. 2024. The Llama 3 Herd of Models. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2407.21783 (July 2024), arXiv:2407.21783 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.21783>

- [28] Luis Enrico Lopez, Diane Kathryn Cruz, Jan Christian Blaise Cruz, and Charibeth Cheng. 2020. Simplifying Paragraph-level Question Generation via Transformer Language Models. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2005.01107 (May 2020), arXiv:2005.01107 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.01107> [cs.CL]
- [29] Shahul Es, Jithin James, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Steven Schockaert. 2024. RAGAs: Automated Evaluation of Retrieval Augmented Generation. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, Nikolaos Aletras and Orphee De Clercq (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, St. Julians, Malta, 150–158. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.eacl-demo.16>
- [30] Alexander Fabbri, Patrick Ng, Zhiguo Wang, Ramesh Nallapati, and Bing Xiang. 2020. Template-Based Question Generation from Retrieved Sentences for Improved Unsupervised Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 4508–4513. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.413>
- [31] Samuel Fernando and Mark Stevenson. 2008. A semantic similarity approach to paraphrase detection. In *Proceedings of the 11th annual research colloquium of the UK special interest group for computational linguistics*. 45–52.
- [32] Rudolf Franz Flesch. 1948. A new readability yardstick. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 32, 3 (1948), 221–233. <https://doi.org/10.1037/H0057532>
- [33] Shima Foolad, Kourosh Kiani, and Razieh Rastgoo. 2024. Recent Advances in Multi-Choice Machine Reading Comprehension: A Survey on Methods and Datasets. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2408.02114 (Aug. 2024), arXiv:2408.02114 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.02114> [cs.CL]
- [34] Sumam Francis and Marie-Francine Moens. 2023. Investigating better context representations for generative question answering. *Inf. Retr.* 26, 1–2 (Oct. 2023), 35 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10791-023-09420-7>
- [35] 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, et al. 2023. Gemini: A Family of Highly Capable Multimodal Models. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2312.11805 (Dec. 2023), arXiv:2312.11805 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.11805>
- [36] Rupali Goyal, Parteek Kumar, and V. P. Singh. 2024. Automated Question and Answer Generation from Texts using Text-to-Text Transformers. *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering* 49, 3 (01 Mar 2024), 3027–3041. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13369-023-01840-7>
- [37] Robert Gunning. 1952. *The Technique of Clear Writing*. McGraw–Hill, New York.
- [38] Tianyong Hao, Xinxin Li, Yulan He, Fu Lee Wang, and Yingying Qu. 2022. Recent progress in leveraging deep learning methods for question answering. *Neural Comput. Appl.* 34, 4 (Feb. 2022), 2765–2783. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-021-06748-3>
- [39] Richard Heersmink. 2024. Use of large language models might affect our cognitive skills. *Nature Human Behaviour* 8, 5 (01 May 2024), 805–806. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01859-y>
- [40] Gregory Hume, Joel Michael, Allen Rovick, and Martha Evens. 1996. Hinting as a Tactic in One-on-One Tutoring. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences* 5, 1 (1996), 23–47. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1466758>
- [41] Anubhav Jangra, Jamshid Mozafari, Adam Jatowt, and Smaranda Muresan. 2024. Navigating the Landscape of Hint Generation Research: From the Past to the Future. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2404.04728 (April 2024), arXiv:2404.04728 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.04728>
- [42] Adam Jatowt, Calvin Gehrer, and Michael Färber. 2023. Automatic Hint Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGIR International Conference on Theory of Information Retrieval (Taipei, Taiwan) (ICTIR '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 117–123. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3578337.3605119>
- [43] Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. TriviaQA: A Large Scale Distantly Supervised Challenge Dataset for Reading Comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Regina Barzilay and Min-Yen Kan (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Vancouver, Canada, 1601–1611. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P17-1147>
- [44] Gregor Jošt, Viktor Taneski, and Sašo Karakatič. 2024. The Impact of Large Language Models on Programming Education and Student Learning Outcomes. *Applied Sciences* 14, 10 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.3390/app14104115>
- [45] Daniel Jurafsky and James Martin. [n. d.]. *Speech and Language Processing Pearson New International Edition*.
- [46] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense Passage Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 6769–6781. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.550>
- [47] Wei-Jen Ko, Greg Durrett, and Junyi Jessy Li. 2019. Domain Agnostic Real-Valued Specificity Prediction. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 33, 01 (Jul. 2019), 6610–6617. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33016610>
- [48] Ekaterina Kochmar, Dung Do Vu, Robert Belfer, Varun Gupta, Iulian Vlad Serban, and Joelle Pineau. 2022. Automated Data-Driven Generation of Personalized Pedagogical Interventions in Intelligent Tutoring Systems. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education* 32, 2 (01 Jun 2022), 323–349. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00267-x>
- [49] Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. Natural Questions: A Benchmark for Question Answering Research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 7 (2019), 452–466. [https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl\\_a\\_00276](https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00276)
- [50] Md Tahmid Rahman Laskar, Jimmy Xiangji Huang, and Enamul Hoque. 2020. Contextualized Embeddings based Transformer Encoder for Sentence Similarity Modeling in Answer Selection Task. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, Nicoletta Calzolari, Frédéric B chet, Philippe Blache, Khalid Choukri, Christopher Cieri, Thierry Declerck, Sara Goggi, Hitoshi Isahara, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, H l ne Mazo, Asuncion Moreno, Jan Odijk, and Stelios Piperidis (Eds.). European Language Resources Association, Marseille, France, 5505–5514. <https://aclanthology.org/2020.lrec-1.676>
- [51] G. Harry Mc Laughlin. 1969. SMOG Grading—a New Readability Formula. *Journal of Reading* 12, 8 (1969), 639–646. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40011226>
- [52] Bruce W. Lee and Jason Lee. 2023. LFTK: Handcrafted Features in Computational Linguistics. In *Proceedings of the 18th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications (BEA 2023)*, Ekaterina Kochmar, Jill Burstein, Andrea Horbach, Ronja Laarmann-Quante, Nitin Madnani, Ana s Tack, Victoria Yaneva, Zheng Yuan, and Torsten Zesch (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.bea-1.1>
- [53] Junlong Li, Jinyuan Wang, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Hai Zhao. 2024. Self-Prompting Large Language Models for Zero-Shot Open-Domain QA. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Mexico City, Mexico, 296–310. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.17>
- [54] Xin Li and Dan Roth. 2002. Learning question classifiers. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics - Volume 1 (Taipei, Taiwan) (COLING '02)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, USA, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.3115/1072228.1072378>
- [55] Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Barcelona, Spain, 74–81. <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>
- [56] Jimmy Lin, Xueguang Ma, Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Ronak Pradeep, and Rodrigo Nogueira. 2021. Pyserini: A Python Toolkit for Reproducible Information Retrieval Research with Sparse and Dense Representations. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Virtual Event, Canada) (SIGIR '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2356–2362. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3463238>
- [57] Fengkai Liu and John Lee. 2023. Hybrid Models for Sentence Readability Assessment. In *Proceedings of the 18th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications (BEA 2023)*, Ekaterina Kochmar, Jill Burstein, Andrea Horbach, Ronja Laarmann-Quante, Nitin Madnani, Ana s Tack, Victoria Yaneva, Zheng Yuan, and Torsten Zesch (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 448–454. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.bea-1.37>
- [58] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:1907.11692 (July 2019), arXiv:1907.11692 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1907.11692>
- [59] Zhuang Liu, Kaiyu Huang, Degen Huang, and Jun Zhao. 2020. Semantics-reinforced networks for question generation. In *ECAI 2020*. IOS Press, 2078–2084.
- [60] Vaibhav Mavi, Anubhav Jangra, and Adam Jatowt. 2024. Multi-hop Question Answering. *Found. Trends Inf. Retr.* 17, 5 (2024), 457–586. <https://doi.org/10.1561/1500000102>
- [61] Jessica McBroom, Irena Koprinska, and Kalina Yacef. 2021. A Survey of Automated Programming Hint Generation: The HINTS Framework. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 54, 8, Article 172 (Oct. 2021), 27 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3469885>
- [62] Jamshid Mozafari, Abdelrahman Abdallah, Bhawna Piryani, and Adam Jatowt. 2024. Exploring Hint Generation Approaches for Open-Domain Question Answering. (Nov. 2024), 9327–9352. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.546>

- [63] Jamshid Mozafari, Afsaneh Fatemi, and Parham Moradi. 2020. A Method For Answer Selection Using DistilBERT And Important Words. In *2020 6th International Conference on Web Research (ICWR)*. 72–76. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICWR49608.2020.9122302>
- [64] Jamshid Mozafari, Afsaneh Fatemi, and Mohammad Ali Nematbakhsh. 2021. BAS: An Answer Selection Method Using BERT Language Model. *Journal of Computing and Security* 8, 2 (2021), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.22108/jcs.2021.128002.1066>
- [65] Jamshid Mozafari, Florian Gerhold, and Adam Jatowt. 2024. Using Large Language Models in Automatic Hint Ranking and Generation Tasks. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2412.01626 (Dec. 2024), arXiv:2412.01626 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.01626>
- [66] Jamshid Mozafari, Anubhav Jangra, and Adam Jatowt. 2024. TriviaHG: A Dataset for Automatic Hint Generation from Factoid Questions (*SIGIR '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2060–2070. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657855>
- [67] Jamshid Mozafari, Mohammad Ali Nematbakhsh, and Afsaneh Fatemi. 2019. Attention-based Pairwise Multi-Perspective Convolutional Neural Network for Answer Selection in Question Answering. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:1909.01059 (Sept. 2019), arXiv:1909.01059 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1909.01059>
- [68] Nikahat Mulla and Prachi Gharpure. 2023. Automatic question generation: a review of methodologies, datasets, evaluation metrics, and applications. *Prog. in Artif. Intell.* 12, 1 (Jan. 2023), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13748-023-00295-9>
- [69] Tarek Naoos, Michael J Ryan, Anton Lavrouk, Mohit Chandra, and Wei Xu. 2024. ReadMe++: Benchmarking Multilingual Language Models for Multi-Domain Readability Assessment. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Miami, Florida, USA, 12230–12266. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.682>
- [70] Minh Nguyen, K. C. Kishan, Toan Nguyen, Ankit Chadha, and Thuy Vu. 2023. Efficient Fine-Tuning Large Language Models for Knowledge-Aware Response Planning. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: Research Track: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2023, Turin, Italy, September 18–22, 2023, Proceedings, Part II* (Turin, Italy). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 593–611. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43415-0\\_35](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43415-0_35)
- [71] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, et al. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2303.08774 (March 2023), arXiv:2303.08774 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774>
- [72] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. BLEU: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) (*ACL '02*). Association for Computational Linguistics, USA, 311–318. <https://doi.org/10.3115/1073083.1073135>
- [73] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Yang, Zach DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. *PyTorch: an imperative style, high-performance deep learning library*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA.
- [74] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. 2014. GloVe: Global Vectors for Word Representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Alessandro Moschitti, Bo Pang, and Walter Daelemans (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Doha, Qatar, 1532–1543. <https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/D14-1162>
- [75] Bhawna Piryani, Jamshid Mozafari, and Adam Jatowt. 2024. ChroniClingAmericaQA: A Large-scale Question Answering Dataset based on Historical American Newspaper Pages. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (Washington DC, USA) (*SIGIR '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2038–2048. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657891>
- [76] Thomas W. Price, Yihuan Dong, Rui Zhi, Benjamin Paaßen, Nicholas Lytle, Veronica Cateté, and Tiffany Barnes. 2019. A Comparison of the Quality of Data-Driven Programming Hint Generation Algorithms. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education* 29, 3 (01 Aug 2019), 368–395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-019-00177-z>
- [77] Vasin Punyakanok, Dan Roth, and Wen-tau Yih. 2004. Natural language inference via dependency tree mapping: An application to question answering. (2004).
- [78] Libo Qin, Qiguang Chen, Xiachong Feng, Yang Wu, Yongheng Zhang, Yinghui Li, Min Li, Wanxiang Che, and Philip S. Yu. 2024. Large Language Models Meet NLP: A Survey. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2405.12819 (May 2024), arXiv:2405.12819 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.12819>
- [79] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21, 1, Article 140 (Jan. 2020), 67 pages.
- [80] Pranav Rajpurkar, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. 2018. Know What You Don't Know: Unanswerable Questions for SQuAD. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, Iryna Gurevych and Yusuke Miyao (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia, 784–789. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P18-2124>
- [81] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. Zero-Shot Text-to-Image Generation. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 139)*, Marina Meila and Tong Zhang (Eds.). PMLR, 8821–8831. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/ramesh21a.html>
- [82] Sahana Ramnath, Preksha Nema, Deep Sahni, and Mitesh M. Khapra. 2020. Towards Interpreting BERT for Reading Comprehension Based QA. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2010.08983 (Oct. 2020), arXiv:2010.08983 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2010.08983> [cs.CL]
- [83] David Rau, Hervé Déjean, Nadezhda Chirkova, Thibault Formal, Shuai Wang, Vassilina Nikoulina, and Stéphane Clinchant. 2024. BERGEN: A Benchmarking Library for Retrieval-Augmented Generation. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2407.01102 (July 2024), arXiv:2407.01102 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.01102> [cs.CL]
- [84] Siva Reddy, Danqi Chen, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. CoQA: A Conversational Question Answering Challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 7 (2019), 249–266. [https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl\\_a\\_00266](https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00266)
- [85] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 3982–3992. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1410>
- [86] Anna Rogers, Matt Gardner, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2023. QA Dataset Explosion: A Taxonomy of NLP Resources for Question Answering and Reading Comprehension. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55, 10, Article 197 (Feb. 2023), 45 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3560260>
- [87] Devendra Sachan, Mike Lewis, Mandar Joshi, Armen Aghajanyan, Wen-tau Yih, Joelle Pineau, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Improving Passage Retrieval with Zero-Shot Question Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 3781–3797. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.249>
- [88] R. J. Senter and E. A. Smith. 1967. *Automated Readability Index*. Technical Report AMRL-TR-66-220. Aerospace Medical Research Laboratories, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/AD0667273>
- [89] Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Shuaiqiang Wang, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. Is ChatGPT Good at Search? Investigating Large Language Models as Re-Ranking Agents. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 14918–14937. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.923>
- [90] Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant. 2019. CommonsenseQA: A Question Answering Challenge Targeting Commonsense Knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 4149–4158. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1421>
- [91] Harish Tayyar Madabushi and Mark Lee. 2016. High Accuracy Rule-based Question Classification using Question Syntax and Semantics. In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*, Yuji Matsumoto and Rashmi Prasad (Eds.). The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee, Osaka, Japan, 1220–1230. <https://aclanthology.org/C16-1116>
- [92] Ellen L. Usher and Frank Pajares. 2006. Sources of academic and self-regulatory efficacy beliefs of entering middle school students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 31, 2 (2006), 125–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2005.03.002>
- [93] Asahi Ushio, Fernando Alva-Manchego, and Jose Camacho-Collados. 2023. A Practical Toolkit for Multilingual Question and Answer Generation. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*, Danushka Bollegala, Ruihong Huang, and Alan Ritter (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 86–94. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-demo.8>
- [94] Sowmya Vajjala and Ivana Lučić. 2018. OneStopEnglish corpus: A new corpus for automatic readability assessment and text simplification. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, Joel Tetreault, Jill Burstein, Ekaterina Kochmar, Claudia Leacock, and Helen Yannakoudakis (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, New Orleans, Louisiana, 297–304. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W18-0535>

- [95] Cunxiang Wang, Pai Liu, and Yue Zhang. 2021. Can Generative Pre-trained Language Models Serve As Knowledge Bases for Closed-book QA?. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 3241–3251. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.251>
- [96] Jiexin Wang, Adam Jatowt, and Masatoshi Yoshikawa. 2022. ArchivalQA: A Large-scale Benchmark Dataset for Open-Domain Question Answering over Historical News Collections (*SIGIR '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3025–3035. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477495.3531734>
- [97] Luqi Wang, Kaiwen Zheng, Liyin Qian, and Sheng Li. 2022. A Survey of Extractive Question Answering. In *2022 International Conference on High Performance Big Data and Intelligent Systems (HDIS)*. 147–153. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HDIS56859.2022.9991478>
- [98] Jiannan Wu, Muyan Zhong, Sen Xing, Zeqiang Lai, Zhaoyang Liu, Wenhai Wang, Zhe Chen, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, Tong Lu, Ping Luo, Yu Qiao, and Jifeng Dai. 2024. VisionLLM v2: An End-to-End Generalist Multimodal Large Language Model for Hundreds of Vision-Language Tasks. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2406.08394 (June 2024), arXiv:2406.08394 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.08394> arXiv:2406.08394 [cs.CV]
- [99] Peng Xu, Davis Liang, Zhiheng Huang, and Bing Xiang. 2021. Attention-guided Generative Models for Extractive Question Answering. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2110.06393 (Oct. 2021), arXiv:2110.06393 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2110.06393> arXiv:2110.06393 [cs.CL]
- [100] Yi Yang, Wen-tau Yih, and Christopher Meek. 2015. WikiQA: A Challenge Dataset for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Lluís Màrquez, Chris Callison-Burch, and Jian Su (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Lisbon, Portugal, 2013–2018. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D15-1237>
- [101] Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A Dataset for Diverse, Explainable Multi-hop Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun'ichi Tsujii (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium, 2369–2380. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D18-1259>
- [102] Wenhao Yu, Dan Iter, Shuohang Wang, Yichong Xu, Mingxuan Ju, Soumya Sanyal, Chenguang Zhu, Michael Zeng, and Meng Jiang. 2023. Generate rather than Retrieve: Large Language Models are Strong Context Generators. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=fB0hRu9GZUS>
- [103] Xingdi Yuan, Tong Wang, Yen-Hsiang Wang, Emery Fine, Rania Abdelghani, Hélène Sauzéon, and Pierre-Yves Oudeyer. 2023. Selecting Better Samples from Pre-trained LLMs: A Case Study on Question Generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 12952–12965. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.820>
- [104] Ruqing Zhang, Jiafeng Guo, Lu Chen, Yixing Fan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2021. A Review on Question Generation from Natural Language Text. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 40, 1, Article 14 (Sept. 2021), 43 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3468889>
- [105] Tianyi Zhang\*, Varsha Kishore\*, Felix Wu\*, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SkeHuCVFDr>
- [106] Tiancheng Zhao, Xiaopeng Lu, and Kyusong Lee. 2021. SPARTA: Efficient Open-Domain Question Answering via Sparse Transformer Matching Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 565–575. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.47>
- [107] Chang Zong, Yuchen Yan, Weiming Lu, Jian Shao, Eliot Huang, Heng Chang, and Yueting Zhuang. 2024. Triad: A Framework Leveraging a Multi-Role LLM-based Agent to Solve Knowledge Base Question Answering. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:2402.14320 (Feb. 2024), arXiv:2402.14320 pages. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.14320> arXiv:2402.14320 [cs.CL]

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009