



# Core Task: Automatic Evaluation of LLMs (AEOLLM)

Junjie Chen, Zhumin Chu, Haitao Li, Qingyao Ai, Yiqun Liu\* Department of Computer Science & Tech., Tsinghua University chenjj826@gmail.com, aiqy@tsinghua.edu.cn



#### Motivation

• As LLMs grow popular in both academia and industry, how to effectively evaluate the capacity of LLMs becomes an increasingly critical but still challenging issue.

more

promising

• The existing LLM evaluation methods could be categorized into two groups:



==> NCTIR-18 Automatic Evaluation of LLMs (AEOLLM)



- AEOLLM has two main characteristics:
  - 1. concentrates on generative tasks
  - 2. encourages reference-free evaluation methods.





- AEOLLM has two main characteristics:
  - 1. concentrates on generative tasks
  - 2. encourages reference-free evaluation methods.

multiple-choice-format questions: easy to process, but this format differs from the real-world practical questions, which usually don't have definite answers.

generative tasks: evaluate the capacity of automatic evaluation methods in assessing open-ended responses.





• AEOLLM has two main characteristics:

1. concentrates on generative tasks

2. encourages reference-free evaluation methods.

reference-based metrics (such as Rouge and BLEU): widely used, but cannot accurately reflect the quality of the results.

the gold reference can be trained rapidly by LLMs and then become useless.





• The framework of our methodology:



• First, we choose **four subtasks** as shown in the table below:





• Third we manually annotate the answer sets for each question, which will be used as **gold standards** for evaluating the performance of different evaluation methods.



Last, we will collect evaluation results from participants and calculate consistency with manually annotated results. We will use Spearman correlation coefficient (S) and Kendall's tau (τ) as the evaluation metrics.



#### Dataset & Resources

- Summary Generation (SG): Xsum (<u>https://huggingface.co/datasets/EdinburghNLP/xsum</u>)
  - A real-world single-document news summary dataset collected from online articles by the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) and contains over 220 thousand news documents.
- Non-Factoid QA (NFQA): NF\_CATS (<u>https://github.com/Lurunchik/NF-CATS</u>)
  - A dataset contains examples of 12k natural questions divided into eight categories and doesn't have gold reference.
- Text Expansion (TE): WritingPrompts (<u>https://huggingface.co/datasets/euclaise/writingprompts</u>)
  - A large dataset of 300K human-written stories paired with writing prompts from an online forum.
- Dialogue Generation (DG): DailyDialog (<u>https://huggingface.co/datasets/daily\_dialog</u>)
  - A high-quality dataset of 13k multi-turn dialogues. The language is human-written and less noisy.





# Organizers

☑ Yiqun Liu [yiqunliu@tsinghua.edu.cn] (Tsinghua University)
☑ Qingyao Ai [aiqy@tsinghua.edu.cn] (Tsinghua University)
☑ Junjie Chen [chenjj826@gmail.com] (Tsinghua University)
☑ Zhumin Chu [chuzm19@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn] (Tsinghua University)
☑ Haitao Li [liht22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn] (Tsinghua University)





#### Schedule

- □ March 2024: Kickoff Event
- □ May 2024: Dataset release\*
- □ Jun-Dec 2024: Dry run\*
- □ Sep 2024-Feb 2025: Formal run\*
- □ Feb 1, 2025: Evaluation results return
- □ Feb 1, 2025: Task overview release (draft)
- □ Mar 1, 2025: Submission due of participant papers (draft)
- □ May 1, 2025: Camera-ready participant paper due
- □ Jun 10-13 2025: NTCIR-18 Conference
- P (\* indicates that the schedule can be different for different tasks)





#### References

[1] Rohaid Ali, Oliver Young Tang, Ian David Connolly, Patricia L Zadnik Sullivan, John H Shin, Jared S Fridley, Wael F Asaad, Deus Cielo, Adetokunbo A Oyelese, Curtis E Doberstein, et al. Performance of chatgpt and gpt-4 on neurosurgery written board examinations. medRxiv, pages 2023–03, 2023.

[2] Rui Mao, Guanyi Chen, Xulang Zhang, Frank Guerin, and Erik Cambria. Gpteval: A survey on assessments of chatgpt and gpt-4. arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12488, 2023.

[3] Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xi\_x0002\_aoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. A survey on evaluation of large language models. ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology, 2023.
[4] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In Text summarization branches out, pages 74–81, 2004.
[5] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 311–318, 2002.
[6] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675, 2019.





#### References

[7] Shashi Narayan, Shay B Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. Don't give me the details, just the sum\_x0002\_mary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.08745, 2018.

[8] Valeriia Bolotova, Vladislav Blinov, Falk Scholer, W Bruce Croft, and Mark Sanderson. A non\_x0002\_factoid question-answering taxonomy. In Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, pages 1196–1207, 2022.

[9] Angela Fan, Mike Lewis, and Yann Dauphin. Hierarchical neural story generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.04833, 2018. [10] Yanran Li, Hui Su, Xiaoyu Shen, Wenjie Li, Ziqiang Cao, and Shuzi Niu. Dailydialog: A manually labelled multi-turn dialogue dataset. arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.03957, 2017.

[11] Ann Lehman, Norm O'Rourke, Larry Hatcher, and Edward Stepanski. JMP for basic univariate and multivariate statistics: methods for researchers and social scientists. Sas Institute, 2013.

[12] Maurice G Kendall. A new measure of rank correlation. Biometrika, 30(1/2):81–93, 1938.







# Thank you!

