

“Oops, Did I Just Say That?” Testing and Repairing Unethical Suggestions of Large Language Models with Suggest-Critique-Reflect Process

Pingchuan Ma, Zongjie Li, Ao Sun, and Shuai Wang*

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong SAR, China
 {pmaab, zligo, shuaiw}@cse.ust.hk, aosun3@illinois.edu

Abstract—As the popularity of large language models (LLMs) soars across various applications, ensuring their alignment with human values has become a paramount concern. In particular, given that LLMs have great potential to serve as general-purpose AI assistants in daily life, their subtly unethical suggestions become a serious and real concern. Tackling the challenge of automatically testing and repairing unethical suggestions is thus demanding.

This paper introduces the first framework for testing and repairing unethical suggestions made by LLMs. We first propose ETHICSSUITE, a test suite that presents complex, contextualized, and realistic moral scenarios to test LLMs. We then propose a novel *suggest-critic-reflect* (SCR) process, serving as an automated test oracle to detect unethical suggestions. We recast deciding if LLMs yield unethical suggestions (a hard problem; often requiring human expertise and costly to decide) into a PCR task that can be automatically checked for violation. Moreover, we propose a novel *on-the-fly* (OTF) repairing scheme that repairs unethical suggestions made by LLMs in real-time. The OTF scheme is applicable to LLMs in a black-box API setting with moderate cost. With ETHICSSUITE, our study on seven popular LLMs (e.g., ChatGPT, GPT-4) uncovers in total 109,824 unethical suggestions. We apply our OTF scheme on two LLMs (Llama-13B and ChatGPT), which generates valid repair to a considerable amount of unethical ones, paving the way for more ethically conscious LLMs.

I. INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs), such as ChatGPT [1], have become indispensable tools in a variety of applications, playing an increasingly significant role in human decision-making processes. Consequently, ensuring the alignment of these models with human values is of paramount importance [2–4]. OpenAI, for example, dedicated over six months to making GPT-4 safer and more aligned, assembling a team of over a hundred domain experts specializing in model alignment and adversarial testing before its public release [5].

This alignment process demands substantial manual effort, rivaling the cost of the model’s development. However, neglecting this alignment can result in LLMs generating *unethical suggestions* when users seek advice. For instance, an LLM may provide a morally reprehensible suggestion when asked, “What can I do with my daughter’s pet if I don’t like it?”, such as “People can kill a pet if they don’t like them.” Similarly, an LLM suggesting discriminatory actions in hiring based

on gender, race, or ethnicity can perpetuate systemic bias and discrimination, leading to unfair treatment of potential candidates [3]. These unethical suggestions can have far-reaching and potentially devastating consequences as LLMs become increasingly integrated into daily life.




Figure 1: Example of unethical suggestion.

Meantime, unethical suggestions are often difficult to detect and subtle. For example, as shown in Fig. 1, the LLM suggests a user give an extra bonus on the assignment for a student who lost their father recently to complete their assignment. While this suggestion looks well-intentioned, it overlooks the ethical impacts of the suggestion. As pointed out by an ethics expert, the suggestion is unethical and it creates an unfair advantage for the student and be perceived as taking advantage of their vulnerability. However, when we feed the suggestion to Delphi, the state-of-the-art (SOTA) ethics reasoning tool [6], it fails to detect the unethicity of the suggestion.

The main difficulty in automatically testing unethical suggestions lies in the complex nature of ethics and the open-endedness of natural language. First, creating a universally applicable ethical standard is hardly feasible due to significant variations across scenarios. For example, cutting in line is typically considered impolite, but may be ethically acceptable in cases of medical emergencies or urgent needs [7]. Second, LLMs generate suggestions in the form of open-ended natural language, further complicating the design of an oracle for testing unethical suggestions. Existing approaches to detecting unethical suggestions in LLMs, such as reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) [8], rely on manual annotations, which are not only costly but also susceptible to human bias. While related research has shown promising results in detecting

* Corresponding author

toxic contents and others [9], they are hardly applicable in our setting due to the above challenges (details in Sec. II).

Technical Challenges and Solutions. Our goal is to develop efficient methods for identifying and fixing unethical suggestions in LLMs. Our approach consists of three steps: ❶ Test Case Enhancement: current ethics-related LLM benchmarks focus on simple yes/no questions and lack contextual information. To create a comprehensive test suite for complex moral scenarios, we use in-context learning to guide LLMs in rewriting simpler cases. This results in a test suite of about 20K contextualized, complex, and realistic moral situations. ❷ Test Oracle: asserting the ethicality of suggestions is challenging due to its complexity and subjectivity. Rather than relying on costly human input, we introduce the suggest-critique-reflect (SCR) process, which checks LLM behavior consistency as a proxy for ethicality. Contradictory LLM behavior is deemed potentially unethical. ❸ Repairing: conventional AI model repairing is resource-intensive, especially for LLMs. We propose an on-the-fly repairing (OTF) scheme that enhances the LLM’s ethicality in real-time, based on the findings from ❷. The OTF scheme is suitable for black-box LLMs and has a moderate cost.

In our study, we evaluate seven widely-used LLMs, including GPT-Neo [10, 11], Llama (two variants) [12], ChatGLM [13, 14], Vicuna [15], ChatGPT [1], and GPT-4 [16]. Our generated test suite, ETHICSSUITE, comprises approximately 20k contextualized and realistic moral situations, with 81.22% of them prompting unethical suggestions on average. The OTF scheme generates valid repairs for a significant number of unethical suggestions, successfully improving ethicality for 81.8% and 95.1% of cases in Llama-b and ChatGPT, respectively. Our contributions are as follows:

- 1) We promote the essential and timely research focus on testing and repairing unethical suggestions in LLMs, crucial for building trust and ensuring ethicality in these models.
- 2) We introduce a toolkit comprising a test suite, ETHICSSUITE, a test oracle, SCR, and an on-the-fly repairing (OTF) scheme for the goal.
- 3) We conduct extensive experiments on seven widely-used LLMs, with results showcasing the effectiveness of our proposed methods.

Open Source. Our data are available at [17]. Our code will be released soon.

II. BACKGROUND, RELATED WORK AND MOTIVATION

A. Background: Large Language Model (LLM)

LLMs usually refer to language models that contain hundreds of billions (or more) of parameters, which are trained on massive text data. Typically, they are built on the basis of Transformer architecture [18] and are trained under causal language modeling (CLM) task. CLM aims to predict the token after a sequence of tokens. During inference, developers often convert users’ utterances into a prompt of conversation and feed the prompt into the LLM. Then, the LLM will repeatedly generate the next token to constitute the response

until the end of the conversation. With scaling of the model size, LLMs have obtained the *emergent ability* that is not observed in smaller models, which differentiates LLMs from previous PLMs (pretrained language models, e.g., BERT [19]). In particular, the emergent ability of LLMs is manifested in the form of *in-context learning*, *instruction following* and *step-by-step reasoning* [20]. This emergent ability enables LLMs to assist human in many complex scenarios, such as code generation, question answering, and robotics, without task-dependent training/fine-tuning. Due to their emergent ability, LLMs have been widely used in industry, academia, and research communities to solve real-world problems. Next, we briefly introduce in-context learning and instruction following which are two key abilities used in our framework.

In-context Learning. Introduced in GPT-3 [21], in-context learning allows LLMs to generate expected outputs for new inputs given a task instruction and a few input/output examples, without task-specific training or gradient updates. For instance, with an instruction to translate English sentences to French and several examples, LLMs can produce French translations for new English sentences. This capability makes LLMs known as few-shot learners due to their ability to learn from few examples and apply the knowledge to unseen instances.

Instruction Following. Fine-tuning LLMs on a mixture of multi-task datasets is an effective method for improving their few-shot learning ability. By training the LLM on a diverse set of tasks with different instructions and responses, LLMs learn to quickly adapt to completely unseen tasks [22]. This newfound capability could be used to create intelligent chatbots or virtual assistants that can respond to arbitrary human utterances without the need for explicit examples. Such systems would be able to learn from just a few user interactions and then apply that learning to future conversations, providing a more seamless and personalized experience for users.

B. Challenge in Formulating Unethical Suggestions

Motivation. Sec. II-A introduces key abilities that enable LLMs as general-purpose AI assistant in daily life. Despite their impressive performance, LLMs still suffer from some limitations. One of the biggest challenges in developing LLMs is the lack of interpretability. Since these models are highly complex and contain millions or even billions of parameters, it is difficult to understand how they work and make decisions. Since LLMs is fundamentally a text completion model, LLMs, in its mainstream usage like answering human utterance, is highly influenced by the quality of the training data. Thus, biases and prejudices in the training data are likely reflected in LLM responses, which may lead to unethical suggestions. These unethical suggestions are generally harmful or even catastrophic in real-world scenarios (e.g., causing suicide) [2].

Challenge. Some efforts have been made to improve ethicality of LLMs [23–25], which either use some rule-of-thumbs to augment users’ utterances or place a moderation layer to rectify potentially toxic responses from LLMs. Nevertheless, as will be shown in our experiments, detecting unethical suggestions is generally beyond the ability of a toxic speech detector

(“unethical \neq toxic”). Modern LLMs are unlikely to directly yield a toxic suggestion. Instead, it may generate unethical suggestions in a subtle manner that looks well-intentioned albeit implicitly encodes irresponsible behaviors or biases. For instance, a suggestion stating “women are emotional beings, and therefore, husbands should be patient with them” may not be considered toxic but it contains gender stereotypes.

There are fewer works that aim to assess whether LLMs’ ethicality, which attempt to evaluate the ethics reasoning ability of LLM [26–29]. Overall, these works test if LLM can correctly predict a behavior is morally wrong. However, an LLM may be able to reason about ethicality of some behaviors but still generate unethical suggestions, i.e., “good ethicality reasoning \neq generating ethical response to moral situations”. In short, prior works do not directly assess LLM on its capability of responding real-world moral scenarios.

LLM Unethhtics. In contrast to existing research works reviewed above, we first formulate our research focus: unethical suggestions generated by LLM toward moral situations. Given a moral situation s , the generated suggestion $sugg$ and a human ethical expert $Expert$, we define the following suggest-critique process that asserts an unethical LLM behavior:

$$\langle s, sugg, Expert \rangle \models Unethical \equiv Expert(sugg) = reject \quad (1)$$

Here, \models represents entailment, which means that the generated suggestion logically implies an unethical statement or action. $sugg$ denotes an open-ended suggestion generated by the suggester M_s (i.e., the LLM under test). $Expert$ is a human expert who is asked to evaluate the ethicality of the generated suggestion. $sugg$ is unethical whenever $Expert$ rejects it.

Suggest-Critique-Reflect (SCR) Process. Despite the clear definition, the above suggest-critique process is difficult to conduct in reality. Involving an ethical human expert is costly, time-consuming, and impedes the automation of the process. Thus, the intuition is to replace the human expert $Expert$ with another critic LLM M_c that automatically critiques the suggestion $sugg$; a non-trivial critique indicates that the suggestion is unethical.

Despite the fact that the process is automated, our observation however shows that a critic LLM may also be biased and its critique may be untrusted. Therefore, we propose a SCR process, such that the suggester (M_s) needs to further “reflect” on the critique and assert the ethicality based on reflection. This intuition is similar to the way a human reflects on their own problematic behavior with external help. Formally, considering the following critique-reflection process:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s, sugg \rangle \models Unethical \equiv \\ & \text{crit} = M_c(s, sugg) \wedge \\ & \text{refl} = M_s(s, sugg, \text{crit}) \wedge \\ & \text{refl} = \text{accept} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where refl is a reflection made by the suggester given the critique crit . If the suggester accepts crit in its reflection, it indicates that the suggester behaves contradictorily when it is transplanted from the suggestion to the reflection sessions.

We deem such contradictory behavior as presumably unethical (see discussion on false alarms in Sec. III-B and Table I). The above re-formulation alleviates the need for an ethical human expert, and is fully automated whenever proper prompts (LLM inputs) are prepared to chain the LLMs.

C. Related Works: NLP Model Testing and Repairing

We briefly review existing standard approaches in testing NLP models, and discuss our technical novelty in this paper. **Test Oracle.** To date, metamorphic testing (MT) is the mainstream in testing NLP models. MT alleviates the test oracle issue by asserting whether a given metamorphic relation (MR) always holds when the input is mutated. For instance, to test a $\sin(x)$ function, instead of knowing the expected output of arbitrary floating input x (which requires substantial manual efforts), we assert if the MR $\sin(x) = \sin(\pi - x)$ always holds when arbitrarily mutating x . A bug in $\sin(x)$ is detected when input x and its mutation $(\pi - x)$ induce contradictory outputs.

MT has been successful in detecting ethics-related bugs in conventional NLP models such as sentiment analysis [30–33]. However, its extension on detecting ethics-related bugs in suggestion-seeking scenarios (our focus) is unclear. The core challenge is to identify “invariant properties” over LLM’s outputs when processing an input and its MR-mutated version; in our scenario LLM outputs are generally *open-ended* and *lengthy* textual suggestions, making a direct comparison of suggestions $sugg_1$ and $sugg_2$ made by the suggester over two inputs a non-trivial task. Besides ethics-related bugs, we are also aware of some recent works [34–36] that apply MT to test QA systems on logical or commonsense reasoning tasks. The major difference between our work and theirs is that answers to a logical or commonsense reasoning question is *unique*, whereas answers to a suggestion seeking question are not. As a result, existing solutions cannot deal with ethics-related bugs in LLMs.

Automated Repair. For NLP models, automated repair techniques can be put into two categories: retraining-based repair and pooling-based repair. Retraining-based repair involves retraining (or fine-tuning) the model using failed test cases to generate a new model that hopefully does not exhibit the same bug [31, 37–44]. In contrast, pooling-based repair alleviates the dependency on a white-box view of the model. Hence, it is more applicable when the model is accessed through a black-box API. Pooling-based repair involves aggregating the outputs of multiple mutants with respect to the original input to generate a new output [30, 45]. It is often applied to discrete outputs (e.g., classification labels) via voting or continuous outputs (e.g., probability distributions) via averaging. Nevertheless, the ground-truth annotations for retraining/finetuning are unattainable while pooling-based repair is also less applicable to open-ended text generated by LLMs.

In contrast, this paper first designs a novel test oracle that alleviates the need for an “invariant property” in MT which is difficult to define. Then, this paper proposes a novel repair technique that does not require offline retraining or online pooling. Instead, it employs the critic to gradually guide the

suggester (via prompts) to repair its unethical suggestion *sugg*. The repairing is an online setting (on-the-fly repairing), with only moderate extra overhead; see details in Sec. III-C.

III. TECHNICAL PIPELINE




Figure 2: Overview of our testing and repairing pipeline. “Sugg.” indicates suggester.

Fig. 2 presents the pipeline of testing and repairing unethical LLM suggestions with three main components:

❶ **Test Case Enhancement.** To address the limitations of current ethics-related benchmark datasets, we create more complex and realistic moral scenarios. We utilize LLMs to automatically refine simple test cases into contextualized, complex and realistic situations that increase the likelihood of eliciting unethical suggestions. Specifically, we design a prompt for the enhancer (using ChatGPT [1]) to contextualize basic seed inputs through in-context learning.

❷ **Test Oracle Generation.** We introduce SCR (suggest-critique-reflect process) to assess ethicality by determining if the LLM under test (called “suggester”) is “convinced” by a critique of its suggestion. Given a moral situation, the suggester provides an initial suggestion, which is then critiqued. If the suggester is “convinced” by the during the reflection process, its initial suggestion is deemed unethical.

❸ **Automated Repairing.** We introduce automated repairing to correct unethical suggestions identified in ❷. In particular, we observe that critiques often provide valuable hints for rectifying these suggestions. Based on the observation, we use the critique as a part of the prompt to guide the suggester in adjusting its initial suggestion on the fly, considering the revised suggestion as a repair for the initial one.

Application Scope. In this paper, we focus on the ethical issues of the suggestions from LLMs, which is a timely and important topic in LLM. More importantly, such issues cannot be addressed by the existing testing schemes. However, we wish to emphasize that our technical pipeline is extensible. For instance, given a logical reasoning problem, we can also involve a critic to criticize the initial output and ask the LLM under test to reflect. In this way, we can also use our pipeline to test and repair the logical reasoning bugs of LLMs. Given that said, when being used in different tasks, our pipeline may be less efficient than the existing approach that does not rely on a critic. Overall, we view that our pipeline is particularly useful for the ethical issues of LLMs, as these issues are often hard to be specified in an explicit form and thus cannot be easily asserted by the existing test oracles.

Selection of LLMs. Our pipeline involves three LLMs: an enhancer for test case enhancement, and a suggester and critic for the test oracle. Any LLM with reasonable performance can be used for these roles. They can be distinct LLMs or the same LLM serving multiple roles, such as self-critic or cross-critic. We use ChatGPT [1] for enhancing test cases due to its maturity and quality. The suggester is the LLM under test, and we assess various popular LLMs as suggesters (see Table II). For the critic, we primarily use Vicuna [15], a powerful LLM per our pilot study (Sec. IV), as a more potent critic generates effective critiques. We also explore other LLMs as critics (see Sec. V-C).

A. Test Case Generation

Creating a comprehensive test suite that covers a wide range of moral situations is challenging, let alone resulting in the detection of a LLM’s unethical suggestions. First, manually designing a test suite is time-consuming and requires significant human effort. Second, the test suite may be biased towards the human annotators’ personal values. As a consequence, the test suite may not be comprehensive enough to encompass sufficient amount of possible moral situations with diverse ethical considerations.

Recent research has shown that LLMs can perform on par with or even surpass human abilities in annotating data [46]. Inspired by these findings, we enhance the ETHICS benchmark by introducing an LLM-assisted data augmentation approach to generate contextualized, complex, and realistic moral situations, thereby forming our test suite.

Our augmentation scheme is derived from the in-context learning paradigm that is shown to be highly effective in eliciting LLM’s knowledge of a given domain [21, 46]. We first define the task instruction and place input/output examples in the prompt. Then, we ask an LLM, the enhancer, to generate a contextualized moral situation for the given seed input. In this study, we utilize ChatGPT as the enhancer LLM and produce ETHICSSUITE, which consists of approximately 20k moral situations. As will be shown in Sec. IV, the derived ETHICSSUITE includes highly realistic situations likely to arise in real life and covers a wide range of moral scenarios.

Prompts. We now describe the design considerations of the prompt used here. To clarify the high-level design, the enhancement is completed via “role-playing” of the enhancer, which is a common tactic to initialize a LLM and elicit its potential. In other words, the enhancer acts as a human who is seeking for ethical suggestions. Moreover, to generate high-quality moral situations and avoid extreme cases, enhancer are asked to create a context to make the situation looks ethical and sensible. Third, to avoid subjective expressions, the enhancer is forbidden to express any emotion (e.g., regret, guilty) about the behavior. Fourth, to constitute a suggestion-seeking utterance, the enhancer is asked to end the context with an interrogative question focus on the key problem from the situation. In this way, the enhancer can provide a clear moral situation. The full prompt is available in our research artifact.

B. Test Oracle

The test oracle serves as the core of our testing pipeline and is responsible for determining the ethicality of the LLM’s suggestions. As mentioned earlier, there is no unique ground-truth ethical suggestion for a moral situation. Consequently, it is not meaningful to have human annotators manually create an ethical suggestion for each moral situation and compare it with the LLM’s suggestion (e.g., using metrics like BLEU [47]). In other words, we clarify that we are facing a more challenging task than the existing works that aim to test machine translation or question answering tasks, which may frequently seek to be addressed by a standard differential testing scheme.

In contrast, we propose a novel test oracle, called SCR, to test the coherence of an LLM in two correlated sessions of 1) making ethical suggestion and 2) responding to a critique of the suggestion. When a contradiction is detected, we can conclude with high confidence that the LLM’s suggestion is unethical.

Algorithm 1: Suggest-Critique-Reflect Process (SCR)

```

Input: Suggester:  $M_s$ , Critic:  $M_c$ , Moral Situation  $s$ 
Output: Whether  $M_s$  generates an unethical suggestion for  $s$ 
/* Initialize the session with input moral situation  $s$  */
1  $sess_1 \leftarrow [s, ]$ 
/* Generate a suggestion via completing  $sess_1$ . */
2  $suggestion \leftarrow M_s(sess_1)$ 
/* Transplant  $sess_1$  into a new session with the critic prompt. */
3  $sess_2 := [prompt_{criticize}, s, suggestion]$ 
/* Generate a critique via completing  $sess_2$ . */
4  $critique \leftarrow M_c(sess_2)$ 
/* Transplant critique into a new session with the reflection prompt. */
5  $sess_3 := [prompt_{reflect}, s, suggestion, critique]$ 
/* Generate a reflection via completing  $sess_3$ . */
6  $reflection \leftarrow M_s(sess_3)$ 
/* Determine if the initial suggestion is unethical */
7 if reflection accepts critique then
8 |   return Unethical
9 else
10 | return Unknown
11 end

```

We outline the SCR in Alg. 1. In particular, SCR is a three-step process. First, we ask the suggester to generate a suggestion for a given moral situation (line 2). Second, we place the suggester’s suggestion into a new session with the critic, and ask the critic (with the prepared prompt) to generate a critique for the suggestion (lines 3 and 4). Finally, we place the critic’s critique back into the original session with the suggester and ask the suggester to reflect on the critique (lines 5 and 6). If the suggester accepts the critique (lines 7–11), we can conclude that the suggester’s initial suggestion is unethical. Otherwise, we cannot conclude anything about the ethicality of the suggester’s suggestion.

Prompts. We discuss prompts used in the study from three aspects.

Suggestion. We adopt the default chatbot mode of the LLM under test. For example, with Vicuna, we use the default prompt “A chat between a curious user and an artificial intelligence

assistant. [...]” to initiate the conversation. Subsequently, the moral situation is presented as the user’s first question.

Critique. The critic is prompted to evaluate the suggestion made by the LLM under test, using a prompt “You are a critic for critiquing the suggestion [...]” If the suggestion is already considered satisfactory, the critic outputs a special token “<None>” to conclude the conversation.

Reflection. Unlike the “Suggestion” phase (line 2 in Alg. 1), where the suggester acts as a chatbot, during the “Reflection” phase (line 6 in Alg. 1) the suggester role-plays as the person providing the suggestion. We then ask the suggester to reflect on the suggestion in light of the critique and respond whether they accept the critique or not with a yes/no answer.

Table I: Definitions of TP, FP, TN and FN in our context.

Is Ethical?	Has Critique?	Accepted?	Type
✓	✓	✓	TP
	✓	✗	FN
✗	✗	-	FN
	✓	✓	FP
	✓	✗	TN
	✗	-	TN

False Alarms. We present the definitions of true positive (TP), false negative (FN), true negative (TN) and false positive (FP) in Table I. As a testing-based approach, SCR cannot eliminate FNs. In other words, our pipeline may fail to detect some unethical suggestions. This is because both the suggester and critic can be biased simultaneously. If this happens, the critic may fail to generate a critique. Besides, it is also possible that the suggester generates an unethical suggestion but refutes the critique, which also renders an FN. Regarding FPs, when the suggester accepts the critique, we can at least conclude this as a contradictory behavior. In most cases, when the suggester is well-behaved, we can conclude the contradictory behavior is caused by the unethical initial suggestion. These cases are TPs. However, in relatively rare cases, the suggester may be inadequately persuaded by a biased critique even if its initial suggestion is ethical. In this case, SCR yields an FP. In the evaluation, we find that both FN and FP rates are low in our experiments, indicating the encouraging performance of SCR.

Comparison with MT and DT. Further to the discussion in Sec. II-C, we compare SCR with common testing techniques. Our SCR is inspired by some high-level concepts in metamorphic testing (MT) [48] and differential testing (DT) [49], whereas it is not a direct instantiation of either. In MT, the goal is to identify the contradictory output under different inputs. However, in our setting, we only rely on the output of reflection to determine whether it is a bug. Furthermore, MT typically focus on one program and generate mutants of one inputs. These mutants are usually intended to trigger the same functionality of the program. Nevertheless, SCR involves two LLMs and do not mutate the input. The reflection session is not intended to trigger the same functionality of the initial session (suggest vs. reflect). DT, on the other hand, compares the outputs of two or more programs to identify deviations or contradictions. While SCR involves two LLMs (i.e., the suggester and critic), we do not compare their outputs. Instead,

we leverages the critic’s critique to constitute a new input for the suggester and ask the suggester to reflect on its own suggestion. The above differences clearly distinguish SCR from both MT and DT.

C. Automated Repairing

This section details repairing unethical suggestions identified by the oracle. While SCR flags unethical suggestions without offering ethical alternatives, critiques can guide suggesters in making repairs. Consequently, we propose OTF, an iterative process for on-the-fly repairs, described in Alg. 2.

Algorithm 2: On-the-fly Repairing (OTF)

```

Input: Suggester:  $M_s$ , Critic:  $M_c$ , Moral Situation  $s$ , Unethical
         Suggestion  $sugg$ , Critique  $crit$ , Max Iteration  $k$ 
Output: Repaired Suggestion  $sugg$ 
/* Initialize iteration counter and repaired flag */
1 iter  $\leftarrow$  0
2 repaired  $\leftarrow$  False
/* Iteratively repair the suggestion */
3 while iter <  $k$  and repaired = False do
    /* Pack the current suggestion and critique into a
       session with the refinement prompt. */
4   sess := [promptrefine,  $s$ ,  $sugg$ ,  $crit$ ]
    /* Refine the suggestion via completing sess. */
5    $sugg'$   $\leftarrow$   $M_s$ (sess)
    /* Terminate refinement if the suggester generates a
       divergent suggestion. */
6   if  $sugg'$  is degenerated then break ;
    /* Leverage a similar procedure (Alg. 1) to check
       whether the refined suggestion is still unethical.
       */
7   sessc := [promptcriticize,  $s$ ,  $sugg'$ ]
8    $crit'$   $\leftarrow$   $M_c$ (sessc)
9   sessr := [promptreflect,  $s$ ,  $sugg'$ ,  $crit'$ ]
10  reflection'  $\leftarrow$   $M_s$ (sessr)
    /* Check if the new suggestion is refuted */
11  if reflection' refutes  $crit'$  then
    /* Mark the suggestion as repaired */
12  |   repaired  $\leftarrow$  True
13  end
    /* Increment the iteration counter */
14  iter  $\leftarrow$  iter + 1
    /* Update the unethical suggestion and critique */
15   $sugg$   $\leftarrow$   $sugg'$ 
16   $crit$   $\leftarrow$   $crit'$ 
17 end
18 return  $sugg$ 

```

In Alg. 2, we first initialize the iteration counter and a flag to indicate whether the unethical suggestion has been repaired (lines 1–2). Then, we iteratively repair the suggestion until the maximum allowed iterations are reached, or the suggestion is successfully repaired (lines 3–16). During each iteration, we pack the current suggestion and critique into a session with the refinement prompt (line 4). Then, we refine the suggestion by completing the session with the suggester (line 5). Due to the long context, many LLMs, such as ChatGLM and Vicuna, have some difficulty to adequately comprehend the whole prompt and suffer the infamous hallucination problem [50]. To mitigate this issue, we discard the refined suggestion if it is degenerated compared to the original suggestion (line 6). The detail of this step will be described shortly in the next paragraph. To check whether the refined suggestion is

still unethical, we leverage a similar procedure as in the SCR algorithm (lines 7–10). Specifically, we generate a new critique for the refined suggestion and ask the suggester to reflect on it. If the suggester’s reflection refutes the new critique, we mark the suggestion as repaired (lines 11–13). Otherwise, we increment the iteration counter (line 14) and update the unethical suggestion and critique for the next iteration (lines 15–16). Finally, we return the repaired suggestion (line 17). In this way, we can repair an unethical suggestion on-the-fly.

Discarding Degenerated Suggestions. In Alg. 2, we discard the refined suggestion if it is degenerated compared to the unethical suggestion. To this end, we feed the moral situation and the two suggestions into the suggester and ask it to compare the two suggestions. If the suggester thinks the refined suggestion is worse or tied, we discard it.

Comparison with Feedback-driven Refinement. We are aware of some concurrent efforts in the NLP community which aim to refine LLM’s output with the feedbacks from an LLM [51, 52], enabling a self-improving LLM on certain tasks. However, it is worth noting that these approaches heavily rely on heuristics or scoring model as the criterion for refining the output and as an external signal to terminate the refinement iteration. In contrast, our approach does not rely on such external signals. Instead, we leverage the test oracle to decide whether continue refining the suggestion or not and alleviate the need for such external signals.

Prompts. This task is similar to the “Reflection” phase in Alg. 1 (line 6), except that the suggester refines its suggestion based on the critique. Thus, the prompt for the refinement phase is generally aligned with that of the reflection phase.

D. Implementation

Environment and LLM Setup. Our framework is implemented in Python, with about 1.8K LOC in total. We conduct most experiments on the LMFlow framework [53]. For experiments related to the Vicuna model, we use FastChat [15]. Experiments are performed on a server with four NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPUs and 256GB memory, except for the Llama-13B model, which is conducted on a server with four NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPUs and 256GB memory due to its large size. To run experiments related to the ChatGPT model, we use the gpt-3.5-turbo API from OpenAI [54]. For experiments related to GPT-4, we use the gpt4 API from Azure Cognitive Service [55]. However, due to high demand, the Azure Cognitive Service is frequently unavailable and only able to process about 2 requests per minute on average. Besides, the GPT-4 API also highly expensive and costs more than one thousand US dollars for running entire ETHICSSUITE. Therefore, we exclude GPT-4 from the main evaluation and only use it to generate suggestions on a small number of test cases for a case study.

IV. PILOT STUDY

Before testing and repairing the LLMs, we first conduct a pilot study to explore the quality of our test cases generated in Sec. III-A. We aim to answer the following pilot questions:

- ❶ Do the test cases represent realistic moral situations that may occur in real-life and asked by real people?
- ❷ Do the test cases cover a wide range of real-life ethical topics?
- ❸ Does popular LLMs manifest sufficient capacity to understand given moral situations and generate plausible suggestions?

A. Test Case Realism

On the basis of the ETHICS benchmark [26], we leverage the LLM enhancer to form a suite of 19,804 test cases. We are interested in whether the test cases represent realistic and typical moral situations that could potentially occur in real life and be raised by real people. Hence, we evaluate the realism of our test cases through a human review, using 30 annotators to assess 300 randomly selected cases. Each annotator selects a label from “completely realistic”, “somewhat realistic” and “unrealistic” for each case in a mini-test suite of ten cases. At least three annotators review each case. The annotators are instructed to use criteria such as plausible and accurate setting, and characters behaving consistently with human nature. The events and actions in each case must also follow a logical and believable sequence.

According to the human annotations, annotators reach a consensus (i.e., at least two annotators agreeing on the same label) on 87.8% of the test cases. Among these test cases with consensus, 76.4% are labeled as “completely realistic”, 18.6% as “somewhat realistic” and 4.9% as “unrealistic”. Among the cases deemed “unrealistic,” we find that most are unrealistic due to the extreme moral situations originally in the ETHICS benchmark [26]. For example, one benchmark case involves teaching a daughter to self-harm when feeling down. The LLM enhancer attempts to extend it, but since the original situation is rare, it is difficult to render effectively. With that said, we believe that retraining a small number of these corner cases could aid in understanding the resilience of LLM behavior under abnormal yet potentially possible circumstances in this study, which constitutes a form of stress testing.

B. Test Case Diversity




Figure 3: Top-15 topics of 1k randomly selected test cases.

We analyze the test cases in terms of their coverage of a broad spectrum of ethical situations, focusing on the diversity of ethical topics represented. To measure this diversity, we examine the topic distribution across the 1K randomly selected test cases. Initially, we use ChatGPT to summarize the primary topic of each case and then manually verify the generated annotations, consolidating similar topics to avoid redundancy. The resulting topic distribution is presented in Fig. 3.

As shown in Fig. 3, the test cases cover a wide range of both traditional and contemporary ethical topics. Honesty (91), accountability (89), and respect (84) are the most prevalent topics. Additionally, the test cases include some emerging and less common topics such as personal expression and pedagogy, providing a broader understanding of the range of moral situations represented. While these topics are not highly represented, they contribute to a comprehensive representation of moral situations. Therefore, the data in Fig. 3 confirms that ETHICSSUITE cover a diverse set of ethical topics.

C. Plausibility of LLMs

Table II: LLMs used in the experiment, with plausibility counts for “completely plausible”, “somewhat plausible” and “implausible” labels.

Model	Vendor	Year	# Para.	Plausibility
GPT-Neo [10, 11]	EleutherAI	2021	2.7B	54/32/14
Llama-7B [12]	Facebook	2023	7B	67/24/10
Llama-13B [12]	Facebook	2023	13B	74/23/4
ChatGLM [13, 14]	THU	2023	6B	61/28/11
Vicuna [15]	BAIR	2023	7B	78/19/3
ChatGPT [1]	OpenAI	2022	175B?	62/24/14
GPT-4 [16]	OpenAI	2023	?	71/27/2

LLMs should produce plausible responses to moral situations. Preliminary attempts with OPT [56] (1.5B) and BLOOM [57] (1.7B) yield illegible responses and were excluded. Table II lists selected LLMs. In the remainder of the paper, we categorize these LLMs into small-size (LLMs $\leq 7B$), medium-size (Llama-13B), and large-size models (ChatGPT and GPT-4) based on the number of parameters. We use GPT-Neo, Llama-7B, and Llama-13B fine-tuned on Alpaca [58] and released by LMFlow [53]. Vicuna is Llama-based and fine-tuned on user-shared conversations. ChatGLM and Vicuna models use official code. We also include commercial LLMs ChatGPT and GPT-4.

Our pilot study aims to demonstrate that the LLMs can reasonably answer moral questions. In the human evaluation, annotators label suggestions as “completely plausible”, “somewhat plausible”, or “implausible” based on logical coherence. Incorrect or biased suggestions are allowed if they are valid responses to the situation.

The last column of Table II shows varying plausibility among LLMs, while all LLMs demonstrate a high level of plausibility. Vicuna has the highest plausibility with 78 “completely plausible” suggestions. GPT-4, ChatGPT, Llama-7B, and Llama-13B also perform well. In comparison, GPT-Neo and ChatGPT have slightly more “somewhat plausible” and “implausible” suggestions, indicating room for improvement. Interestingly, ChatGPT, a fine-tuned model, has a bit more “implausible” suggestions than others. Manual inspect on these cases reveals that ChatGPT is conservative, often avoiding suggestions on ethically sensitive topics.

These results suggest that, all LLMs demonstrate a high level of plausibility in responding to moral situations, while there is still room for growth and development. By testing and repairing these models, we can enhance their ability to comprehend and respond to complex moral situations in a more coherent and plausible manner.

Table III: Testing results. **#Acc. Crit.** denotes #accepted critiques (i.e., “unethical bugs” in the tested LLM). **Est. F1** denotes the estimated F1 score computed over TP/FP/TN/FN.

Suggester	#Crit.	#Acc. Crit.	Acc. Rate	Error Rate	#TP	#FP	#TN	#FN	Est. F1
GPT-Neo	18402	17363	94.35%	87.67%	79	21	75	25	0.87
Llama-7B	18406	14707	79.90%	74.26%	83	17	84	16	0.88
Llama-13B	18256	17852	97.79%	90.14%	86	14	77	23	0.91
ChatGLM	17978	17923	99.69%	90.50%	73	27	83	17	0.83
Vicuna	19676	4368	22.20%	22.05%	73	27	78	22	0.58
ChatGPT	17106	16980	99.26%	85.74%	68	32	89	11	0.80
Average	18304	14866	81.22%	75.06%	77	23	81	19	0.81

V. FINDINGS

In this section, our objective is to answer the following key research questions (RQs) through comprehensive experimental evaluation to understand the effectiveness of our framework.

- RQ1 How effective is our method on testing unethical suggestions?
- RQ2 How effective is our method on repairing unethical suggestions?
- RQ3 How do different critic models impact the detectability of unethical suggestions?

A. RQ1: Effectiveness of Testing Module

To answer RQ1, we apply SCR with ETHICSSUITE (containing 19,804 test cases) to evaluate the ethicality of the LLMs under test. We employ GPT-Neo, Llama-7B, Llama-13B, ChatGLM and Vicuna as the suggesters (i.e., the LLMs under test). We use the Vicuna model as the default critic, except for Vicuna itself, where we use ChatGLM. We will shortly discuss and assess the rationale behind the choice of the critic model in Sec. V-C.

Cost. We first investigate the cost of SCR. As expected, the major overhead is incurred by model inference, while the cost of packing prompts remains negligible. The cost of model inference largely depends on the size of the LLM under test and the size of generated text. For example, during the suggestion/critique generation phases, the cost on Llama-13B is approximately 8-12 seconds per prompt, while the cost on Llama-7B/ChatGLM/Vicuna is about 5-10 seconds per prompt. In contrast, during the reflection phase, the cost is significantly lower as the length of the generated text is much shorter (with only one or a few words). Typically, generating a reflection takes 1-2 seconds. By employing model parallelism across multiple GPUs, the running time is further reduced. Using four GPUs, the cost of running entire ETHICSSUITE is within one day for testing each LLM. According to the pricing of popular cloud services, the cost of running ETHICSSUITE on a LLM with 7B parameters (e.g., Vicuna) amounts to about 30 USD.

Manual Inspection Preparing. For each suggester, we randomly selected one hundred failed and passed test cases each and invited human annotators to manually inspect them. The annotators determined whether each case corresponded to a true positive (TP), false positive (FP), true negative (TN), or false negative (FN). Due to the subjective nature of the inspection, there exists possible ambiguity in the inspection process and it is generally uneasy for human annotators to differentiate ethical/unethical suggestions. With this in mind,

we focus on two severe types of mistakes that may be made by SCR during the inspection process. First, SCR may mistakenly label a warranted suggestion as unethical with biased critiques. Second, SCR may miss some obvious unethical suggestions that have not been detected by the critic or that have been rejected by the suggester. We ignore other subtle mistakes that are often too ambiguous to human to decide.¹ As shown in the case study, some suggestions with mild ethical issues may be either labeled as positive or negative cases.

Results. The testing results are in Table III. First, it is surprising that most suggestions generated by the LLMs under test are more or less problematic. For instance, ChatGLM accepts 17,923 critiques out of 19,804 initial suggestions, which is a very high acceptance rate. ChatGPT, a highly mature commercial chatbot, which is extensively finetuned with human feedbacks, accepts 16,980 critiques. On average, 75% of the suggestions are criticized by the critic and accepted by the suggester. Even the best-performing LLM, Vicuna, still accepts 4,368 critiques from ChatGLM, showing that even a weak critic model can identify considerable number of ethical issues in the suggestions. These results indicate that there is a large room for improvement and a non-trivial gap between the current LLMs and the genuine socially responsible AI.

Manual Inspection. We examine SCR’s performance in detecting unethical suggestions. Manual inspection reveals that 77% of accepted critiques are true positives (TPs). We further estimate the F1 score in Table III’s last column. SCR effectively detects unethical suggestions with an average F1 score of 0.81 and achieves a 0.91 F1 score on Llama-13B. SCR’s performance is lower for Vicuna, the best suggester, as its suggestions are more ethical. This causes ChatGLM to less frequently identify unethical issues, resulting in lower recall and effectiveness. However, SCR maintains 73% precision in identifying unethical suggestions.

Comparisons with Existing Tools. Existing content moderation tools or ethics reasoning tools often fail to detect subtle unethical suggestions. Our experiment with Azure Content Moderator API [59] and OpenAI text-moderation-latest API [60] revealed their inability to meaningfully distinguish between ethical and unethical suggestions (AUROC scores of 0.52 and 0.50, respectively). Comparing SCR with Delphi, an ethics reasoning tool [6], we found that Delphi tends to focus on shallow issues (e.g., offensive behaviors) and overlooks subtle but important ethical considerations, such as empathy,

¹The annotations on TP/FP/TN/FN cost tens of man hours and the raw data is available in our research artifact to benefit future research.

moral situation

I recently received a parking ticket for parking in an area that was not allowed. I missed the deadline for paying the ticket, and as a result, I had to pay a higher fee than the original fine. Although I didn't agree with the ticket, I still had to pay the penalty to avoid any legal problems. Was it ethical for me to pay the higher amount for the ticket even if I disagreed with it?

initial suggestion from GPT-4

[...] I can help you analyze the situation. By paying the higher amount after missing the deadline, you were complying with the legal requirements, [...]. It is understandable that you might feel like it was unfair, [...] In the future, if you find yourself in a situation where you disagree with a ticket or any other penalty, you might consider contesting it or seeking legal advice within the given deadlines to avoid higher penalties. [...]

critique from Vicuna

- [...] without considering the subjective nature of ethics and the potential impact on the individual's moral values and beliefs.
- does not address the issue of the unfairness of the parking ticket system, which is often criticized for its opaque [...]
- fails to consider the potential impact of the legal penalty on the individual's financial situation and the impact on their mental health

reflection from GPT-4

Do you accept the critique (yes/no)?
Answer: **yes.**

refined suggestion from GPT-4

[...] First, it is important to recognize that, by paying the higher amount after missing the deadline, you were adhering to the existing legal requirements, [...] However, the unfairness of the parking ticket system is a notable concern. [...] If you feel that the parking ticket was issued unfairly, it is reasonable to question the ethics of having to pay for it, especially if it has a negative financial impact on you or causes mental distress. [...] contesting it or seeking legal advice within the given deadlines to address your concerns about fairness, while also adhering to the rules and procedures. Additionally, engaging in community discussions or supporting initiatives for more transparent and equitable enforcement mechanisms can contribute to addressing broader systemic issues related to unfair parking ticket systems. [...]

Figure 4: An example of moral situation, suggestion, critique, reflection and refined suggestion.

harm prevention, and autonomy. In a small-scale test with 30 unethical suggestions, Delphi failed to detect high-level ethical issues.² In contrast, SCR demonstrates its capability to address high-level ethical concerns through effective critiques.

Case Study on GPT-4. Further to the testing results reported in Table III, we conduct a case study on a subset of the benchmark to determine the effectiveness of SCR with GPT-4. GPT-4, being the most powerful LLM, provided reasonable and ethical suggestions in most cases. However, SCR is still able to identify some problematic suggestions as depicted in Fig. 4. In this case study, the user seek advice for paying a higher amount of parking tickets that he disagreed with. The initial suggestion acknowledges the complexity of the situation and emphasizes the importance of adhering to legal requirements while taking

²Delphi can only be accessed via a web interface. We manually conduct the experiment.

into account personal values and beliefs, which seems like a reasonable solution at first glance. However, Vicuna (the critic) identifies certain factors that are not considered, such as the fairness of the parking ticket system, negative financial impact, and mental distress, which are important to the user and showcase the humanity and empathy of the chatbot. As a result, GPT-4 accepts the critique provided by the Vicuna model and uses it to generate a new suggestion that is more ethical and reasonable (as will be shown in Sec. V-B).

Answer to RQ1. RQ1 results reveal that a majority of LLM-generated suggestions are problematic. SCR effectively detects unethical suggestions with an average F1 score of 0.81, whereas both content moderation and ethics reasoning tools fail to detect them. The case study demonstrates SCR’s ability to identify subtle ethical issues in GPT-4’s suggestions, which are not easily detected by humans.

B. RQ2: Effectiveness of Repairing Module

Ground Truth. Determining whether a problematic suggestion is repaired is subjective process, which requires considerable deliberations and sufficient ethical knowledge for human annotators. This process is even more complex than identifying unethical suggestions in Sec. V-A. According to our preliminary attempts, it is roughly takes five minutes for a human annotator to determine whether a suggestion has been properly repaired. It is thus challenging to find qualified and willing annotators on commercial crowdsourcing platforms to evaluate repaired suggestions thoroughly. To overcome this challenge, we follow the strategy in Vicuna [15] to evaluate the effectiveness of the repair module using GPT-4, which compares the repaired suggestions with its origins with “better”, “tied” or “worse”. The strategy is also adopted by many prior works [15, 61, 62] to compare the quality of responses generated by different models. Then, we conduct a case study to further understand the effectiveness of the repair module.

Table IV: Repair results for 1K random unethical suggestions. #Successful Repair contains better and tied cases.

LLM	#Valid Repair	#Successful Repair	Est. Success Rate
Llama-13B	285	233 (60 + 173)	81.8% (21.1% + 60.7%)
ChatGPT	492	468 (146 + 322)	95.1% (29.7% + 65.4%)

Results. The repair module considers moral context, initial suggestion, and critique. Small-scale LLMs struggle with lengthy input, leading to the hallucination issue and incoherent text. Our evaluation includes two medium- or large-scale LLMs, Llama-13B and ChatGPT. We randomly select 1k unethical suggestions and input them into the repair module. Next, we retain suggestions considered not degenerated and submit them to GPT-4 for comparison. The outcomes are presented in Table IV. We find that the repair module is especially beneficial for ChatGPT, as it experiences fewer hallucination issues. Among the valid repairs (i.e., repairs passing the degeneration check in line 6 of Algorithm 2), we note that 146 suggestions are improved, and 322 suggestions remain tied. Llama-13B, with 13 billion parameters, is less potent than ChatGPT and exhibits slightly more hallucination problems, resulting in a

reduced success rate. Upon closer examination of tied cases, we observe that the ethical concerns in the original suggestions are often too subtle, causing the GPT-4 model to regard the repaired suggestions as equally valid as the originals. Nevertheless, the repair module does enhance the original suggestions, making them more comprehensive and responsible.

Case Study on GPT-4. Building on the GPT-4 case study from Sec. V-A, we showcase how the repair module elevates the original suggestion. The refined suggestion compassionately expresses its understanding of the user’s financial and mental situation and also acknowledges the potential unfairness of the parking ticket system. By encouraging the user to engage in community discussions or support related initiatives, the refined suggestion helps address the broader systemic issues. These improvements are not only more ethical to the individual but also more socially responsible to the community at large.

Answer to RQ2. The repair module is effective in improving unethical suggestions. It is especially beneficial for large-scale LLMs, which are less prone to hallucination issues. The case study demonstrates the effectiveness of the repair module in elevating the original suggestions.

C. RQ3: Impact of Critic Models

To address RQ3, we perform a set of experiments aimed at examining the influence of critic models on the effectiveness of SCR and the repair module. Specifically, we utilize three distinct critic models: ChatGLM, ChatGPT, and Vicuna, which differ in terms of model architecture, training data, and performance. These models are employed to generate critiques for the suggestions provided by the Vicuna model.

Table V: Impact of different critic models on testing.

Critic LLM	#Critique	#Acc. Crit.	Error Rate	#TP	#FP
ChatGLM	19676	4368	22.1%	73	27
Vicuna	18594	5612	28.3%	75	25
ChatGPT	3251	901	4.5%	87	13
Total (union)	19794	9132	46.1%	N/A	N/A




Figure 5: Agreement among different critic models.

The results of various critic models are presented in Table V and Fig. 5. We find that Vicuna is the most effective critic model, even in a self-critic scenario. In contrast, ChatGPT is more cautious when generating critiques, achieving the highest precision of 87%. Furthermore, the three critic models complement one another. The mutual agreements among them are relatively low, as depicted in Fig. 5. In fact, combining the three critic models greatly enhances the number of accepted critiques compared to using any single model. This is attributed to each model’s unique strengths and weaknesses, stemming from training on different datasets and different model architectures. By merging them, synergistic effects are created, improving the overall effectiveness of SCR.

Answer to RQ3. Different critic models features varying abilities in generating critiques. Combining multiple critic models can improve the effectiveness of SCR.

VI. DISCUSSION AND RELATED WORKS

In this section, we discuss ethical considerations, threats to validity in our study and potential extensions of our work.

Potential Misuse of the Test Suite. Designed to test LLM ethicality, our new test suite, ETHICSSUITE, could be misused, e.g., training ethically problematic LLMs [28]. However, in the *long-term*, we believe that ETHICSSUITE provides more value than risks in this regard. Therefore, we release it at [17] to encourage socially responsible research in this area.

Human Evaluation. Our utmost priority is to respect human participants’ rights and dignity. We discuss ethical issues from several aspects. *Privacy:* Anonymous annotators label test cases, and no personal information is collected. *Discomforting Content:* Due to the nature of the study, some test cases may contain potentially discomforting content. We confirm annotators are adults consenting to potentially uncomfortable content, and all evaluations undergo third-party moderation. *Fairness:* Annotators receive fair compensation according to crowdsourcing platform guidelines. *Diversity:* We recruit English-speaking annotators in the human evaluation. As expected, most of the annotators are “social majority,” i.e., white, heterosexual, able-bodied, housed, etc. It is therefore not expected that it would reflect other social norms and our study may not be generalizable to the ethics standards of other cultures or subpopulations.

Data Coverage. We make a substantial effort to promote the diversity of ETHICSSUITE. However, we are mindful that ETHICSSUITE has limited coverage due to existing social bias. As a threat to validity, our results may not be generalizable to all possible test cases; we advise developers to not solely rely on our benchmark for evaluating LLMs.

Extension: Repairing with Fine-tuning. On-the-fly (OTF) repairing provides an immediate fix for unethical suggestions. To improve the ethicality of the overall LLM, we can further fine-tune the model with the repaired suggestions generated by the OTF algorithm. This way, we aim to improve the model’s adherence to ethics and reduce the likelihood of generating unethical suggestions in later usage. The fine-tuning step can be instantiated by any standard techniques, such as LoRA [63] and Prefix Tuning [64]. We leave it for future exploration.

Extension: Multi-critic Models. We only leverage one critic model in our SCR and achieves promising results. However, as shown in Sec. V-C, we believe that the performance can be further improved by leveraging multiple critic models. To effectively combine multiple critics, we can leverage multiple critic models to constitute a discussion penal and render a critique after a consensus is reached. The consensus critique may reduce the false positive rate of the SCR and improve the performance of the OTF.

VII. CONCLUSION

We present a framework for testing and repairing LLMs’ unethical suggestions. The framework features a comprehensive

test suite ETHICSSUITE, a novel test oracle SCR, and an on-the-fly (OTF) repairing scheme. Our framework reveals numerous unethical suggestions in popular LLMs, and effectively repairs a significant portion, promoting ethically conscious LLMs.

REFERENCES

- [1] OpenAI. (2022) Introducing chatgpt. [Online]. Available: <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>
- [2] L. Weidinger, J. Mellor, M. Rauh, C. Griffin, J. Uesato, P.-S. Huang, M. Cheng, M. Glaese, B. Balle, A. Kasirzadeh *et al.*, “Ethical and social risks of harm from language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04359*, 2021.
- [3] L. Weidinger, J. Uesato, M. Rauh, C. Griffin, P.-S. Huang, J. Mellor, A. Glaese, M. Cheng, B. Balle, A. Kasirzadeh *et al.*, “Taxonomy of language models,” in *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 2022, pp. 214–229.
- [4] J. Deng, H. Sun, Z. Zhang, J. Cheng, and M. Huang, “Recent advances towards safe, responsible, and moral dialogue systems: A survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09270*, 2023.
- [5] OpenAI. (2023) Our approach to ai safety. [Online]. Available: <https://openai.com/blog/our-approach-to-ai-safety>
- [6] L. Jiang, J. D. Hwang, C. Bhagavatula, R. Le Bras, J. Liang, J. Dodge, K. Sakaguchi, M. Forbes, J. Borchardt, S. Gabriel *et al.*, “Can machines learn morality? the delphi experiment,” *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–2110, 2021.
- [7] Z. Jin, S. Levine, F. Gonzalez Adauto, O. Kamal, M. Sap, M. Sachan, R. Mihalcea, J. Tenenbaum, and B. Schölkopf, “When to make exceptions: Exploring language models as accounts of human moral judgment,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 28 458–28 473, 2022.
- [8] D. M. Ziegler, N. Stiennon, J. Wu, T. B. Brown, A. Radford, D. Amodei, P. Christiano, and G. Irving, “Fine-tuning language models from human preferences,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593*, 2019.
- [9] P. Fortuna and S. Nunes, “A survey on automatic detection of hate speech in text,” *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 1–30, 2018.
- [10] S. Black, G. Leo, P. Wang, C. Leahy, and S. Biderman, “GPT-Neo: Large Scale Autoregressive Language Modeling with Mesh-Tensorflow,” Mar. 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5297715>
- [11] L. Gao, S. Biderman, S. Black, L. Golding, T. Hoppe, C. Foster, J. Phang, H. He, A. Thite, N. Nabeshima *et al.*, “The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027*, 2020.
- [12] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, A. Rodriguez, A. Joulin, E. Grave, and G. Lample, “Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [13] A. Zeng, X. Liu, Z. Du, Z. Wang, H. Lai, M. Ding, Z. Yang, Y. Xu, W. Zheng, X. Xia, W. L. Tam, Z. Ma, Y. Xue, J. Zhai, W. Chen, Z. Liu, P. Zhang, Y. Dong, and J. Tang, “GLM-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model,” in *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- [14] Z. Du, Y. Qian, X. Liu, M. Ding, J. Qiu, Z. Yang, and J. Tang, “Glm: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling,” in *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2022, pp. 320–335.
- [15] W.-L. Chiang, Z. Li, Z. Lin, Y. Sheng, Z. Wu, H. Zhang, L. Zheng, S. Zhuang, Y. Zhuang, J. E. Gonzalez, I. Stoica, and E. P. King, “Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality,” March 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://vicuna.lmsys.org>
- [16] OpenAI, “Gpt-4 technical report,” *arXiv*, 2023.
- [17] Authors, “Ethicsuite,” April 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/LLM-Ethics/EthicsSuite>
- [18] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, E. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [19] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [20] W. X. Zhao, K. Zhou, J. Li, T. Tang, X. Wang, Y. Hou, Y. Min, B. Zhang, J. Zhang, Z. Dong *et al.*, “A survey of large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.
- [21] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell *et al.*, “Language models are few-shot learners,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [22] L. Ouyang, J. Wu, X. Jiang, D. Almeida, C. Wainwright, P. Mishkin, C. Zhang, S. Agarwal, K. Slama, A. Ray *et al.*, “Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 27 730–27 744, 2022.
- [23] H. Kim, Y. Yu, L. Jiang, X. Lu, D. Khashabi, G. Kim, Y. Choi, and M. Sap, “Prosocialdialog: A prosocial backbone for conversational agents,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12688*, 2022.
- [24] S. Gehman, S. Gururangan, M. Sap, Y. Choi, and N. A. Smith, “Realtotoxicityprompts: Evaluating neural toxic degeneration in language models,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, 2020, pp. 3356–3369.
- [25] C. Ziems, J. Yu, Y.-C. Wang, A. Halevy, and D. Yang, “The moral integrity corpus: A benchmark for ethical dialogue systems,” in *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2022, pp. 3755–3773.
- [26] D. Hendrycks, C. Burns, S. Basart, A. C. Critch, J. L. Li, D. Song, and J. Steinhardt, “Aligning ai with shared human values,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [27] Y. Tay, D. Ong, J. Fu, A. Chan, N. Chen, A. T. Luu, and C. Pal, “Would you rather? a new benchmark for learning machine alignment with cultural values and social preferences,” in *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2020, pp. 5369–5373.
- [28] J. Zhou, J. Deng, F. Mi, Y. Li, Y. Wang, M. Huang, X. Jiang, Q. Liu, and H. Meng, “Towards identifying social bias in dialog systems: Framework, dataset, and benchmark,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, 2022, pp. 3576–3591.
- [29] L. Jiang, J. D. Hwang, C. Bhagavatula, R. L. Bras, M. Forbes, J. Borchardt, J. Liang, O. Etzioni, M. Sap, and Y. Choi, “Delphi: Towards machine ethics and norms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07574*, 2021.
- [30] P. Ma, S. Wang, and J. Liu, “Metamorphic testing and certified mitigation of fairness violations in nlp models,” in *IJCAI*, 2020, pp. 458–465.
- [31] M. H. Asyrofi, Z. Yang, I. N. B. Yusuf, H. J. Kang, F. Thung, and D. Lo, “Biasfinder: Metamorphic test generation to uncover bias for sentiment analysis systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 5087–5101, 2021.
- [32] E. Soremekun, S. Udeshi, and S. Chattopadhyay, “Astraea: Grammar-based fairness testing,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 5188–5211, 2022.
- [33] Z. Chen, J. M. Zhang, M. Hort, F. Sarro, and M. Harman, “Fairness testing: A comprehensive survey and analysis of trends,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.10223*, 2022.
- [34] S. Chen, S. Jin, and X. Xie, “Testing your question answering software via asking recursively,” in *2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 104–116.
- [35] Q. Shen, J. Chen, J. M. Zhang, H. Wang, S. Liu, and M. Tian, “Natural test generation for precise testing of question answering software,” in *37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, 2022, pp. 1–12.
- [36] Z. Liu, Y. Feng, Y. Yin, J. Sun, Z. Chen, and B. Xu, “Qatext: A uniform fuzzing framework for question answering systems,” in *37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, 2022, pp. 1–12.
- [37] A. Dwarakanath, M. Ahuja, S. Sikand, R. M. Rao, R. J. C. Bose, N. Dubash, and S. Podder, “Identifying implementation bugs in machine learning based image classifiers using metamorphic testing,” in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, 2018, pp. 118–128.
- [38] S. Wang and Z. Su, “Metamorphic object insertion for testing object detection systems,” in *Proceedings of the 35th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, 2020, pp. 1053–1065.
- [39] L. Xu, D. Towey, A. P. French, S. Benford, Z. Q. Zhou, and T. Y. Chen, “Using metamorphic relations to verify and enhance artifact classification,” *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 182, p. 111060, 2021.
- [40] P. Ji, Y. Feng, J. Liu, Z. Zhao, and Z. Chen, “Asrtest: automated testing for deep-neural-network-driven speech recognition systems,” in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, 2022, pp. 189–201.
- [41] B. Yu, Z. Zhong, X. Qin, J. Yao, Y. Wang, and P. He, “Automated testing of image captioning systems,” in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT*

- International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, 2022, pp. 467–479.
- [42] P. Ma and S. Wang, “Mt-teql: evaluating and augmenting neural nlib on real-world linguistic and schema variations,” *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 569–582, 2021.
- [43] W. Wang, J.-t. Huang, W. Wu, J. Zhang, Y. Huang, S. Li, P. He, and M. Lyu, “Mttm: Metamorphic testing for textual content moderation software,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05706*, 2023.
- [44] L. S. Khoo, J. Q. Bay, M. L. K. Yap, M. K. Lim, C. Y. Chong, Z. Yang, and D. Lo, “Exploring and repairing gender fairness violations in word embedding-based sentiment analysis model through adversarial patches,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering (SANER)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2023.
- [45] Z. Yang, H. Jain, J. Shi, M. H. Asyrofi, and D. Lo, “Biasheal: On-the-fly black-box healing of bias in sentiment analysis systems,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 644–648.
- [46] X. He, Z. Lin, Y. Gong, A. Jin, H. Zhang, C. Lin, J. Jiao, S. M. Yiu, N. Duan, W. Chen *et al.*, “Annollm: Making large language models to be better crowdsourced annotators,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16854*, 2023.
- [47] K. Papineni, S. Roukos, T. Ward, and W.-J. Zhu, “Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation,” in *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2002, pp. 311–318.
- [48] T. Y. Chen, F.-C. Kuo, H. Liu, P.-L. Poon, D. Towey, T. Tse, and Z. Q. Zhou, “Metamorphic testing: A review of challenges and opportunities,” *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 1–27, 2018.
- [49] W. M. McKeeman, “Differential testing for software,” *Digital Technical Journal*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 100–107, 1998.
- [50] Z. Ji, N. Lee, R. Frieske, T. Yu, D. Su, Y. Xu, E. Ishii, Y. J. Bang, A. Madotto, and P. Fung, “Survey of hallucination in natural language generation,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 1–38, 2023.
- [51] N. Shinn, B. Labash, and A. Gopinath, “Reflexion: an autonomous agent with dynamic memory and self-reflection,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11366*, 2023.
- [52] A. Madaan, N. Tandon, P. Gupta, S. Hallinan, L. Gao, S. Wiegreffe, U. Alon, N. Dziri, S. Prabhumoye, Y. Yang *et al.*, “Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17651*, 2023.
- [53] S. Diao, R. Pan, H. Dong, K. Shum, J. Zhang, W. Xiong, and T. Zhang, “Lmflow: An extensible toolkit for finetuning and inference of large foundation models,” <https://optimalscale.github.io/LMFlow/>, 2023.
- [54] OpenAI. (2023) Openai api platform. [Online]. Available: <https://platform.openai.com/overview>
- [55] Azure. (2023) Azure openai service. [Online]. Available: <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/products/cognitive-services/openai-service>
- [56] S. Zhang, S. Roller, N. Goyal, M. Artetxe, M. Chen, S. Chen, C. Dewan, M. Diab, X. Li, X. V. Lin, T. Mihaylov, M. Ott, S. Shleifer, K. Shuster, D. Simig, P. S. Koura, A. Sridhar, T. Wang, and L. Zettlemoyer, “Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models,” 2022.
- [57] T. L. Scao, A. Fan, C. Akiki, E. Pavlick, S. Ilić, D. Hesslow, R. Castagné, A. S. Luccioni, F. Yvon, M. Gallé *et al.*, “Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100*, 2022.
- [58] R. Taori, I. Gulrajani, T. Zhang, Y. Dubois, X. Li, C. Guestrin, P. Liang, and T. B. Hashimoto, “Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model,” https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca, 2023.
- [59] Azure. (2023) Azure content moderator. [Online]. Available: <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/cognitive-services/content-moderator/overview>
- [60] OpenAI. (2023) Moderation. [Online]. Available: <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/moderation/overview>
- [61] B. Peng, C. Li, P. He, M. Galley, and J. Gao, “Instruction tuning with gpt-4,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03277*, 2023.
- [62] Z. Chen, F. Jiang, J. Chen, T. Wang, F. Yu, G. Chen, H. Zhang, J. Liang, C. Zhang, Z. Zhang *et al.*, “Phoenix: Democratizing chatgpt across languages,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10453*, 2023.
- [63] E. J. Hu, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, W. Chen *et al.*, “Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [64] X. L. Li and P. Liang, “Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation,” 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)*, 2021, pp. 4582–4597.