

SelectIT: Selective Instruction Tuning for Large Language Models via Uncertainty-Aware Self-Reflection

Liangxin Liu¹ Xuebo Liu^{1*} Derek F. Wong² Dongfang Li¹
Ziyi Wang¹ Baotian Hu¹ Min Zhang¹

¹Institute of Computing and Intelligence, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, China

²NLP²CT Lab, Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Macau
l1iangxin967@gmail.com, {liuxuebo,hubaotian,zhangmin2021}@hit.edu.cn
derekfw@um.edu.mo, {crazyofapple,ziyiwang676}@gmail.com

Abstract

Instruction tuning (IT) is crucial to tailoring large language models (LLMs) towards human-centric interactions. Recent advancements have shown that the careful selection of a small, high-quality subset of IT data can significantly enhance the performance of LLMs. Despite this, common approaches often rely on additional models or data sets, which increases costs and limits widespread adoption. In this work, we propose a novel approach, termed *SelectIT*, that capitalizes on the foundational capabilities of the LLM itself. Specifically, we exploit the intrinsic uncertainty present in LLMs to more effectively select high-quality IT data, without the need for extra resources. Furthermore, we introduce a novel IT dataset, the *Selective Alpaca*, created by applying SelectIT to the Alpaca-GPT4 dataset. Empirical results demonstrate that IT using Selective Alpaca leads to substantial model ability enhancement. The robustness of SelectIT has also been corroborated in various foundation models and domain-specific tasks. Our findings suggest that longer and more computationally intensive IT data may serve as superior sources of IT, offering valuable insights for future research in this area. Data, code, and scripts are freely available at <https://github.com/Blue-Raincoat/SelectIT>.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have attracted much attention due to their impressive capabilities in following instructions and solving intricate problems (Touvron et al., 2023b,a; Achiam et al., 2023; Penedo et al., 2023). A crucial aspect of enhancing LLMs’ performance is instruction tuning (IT), which involves the supervised adjustment of LLMs using pairs of instructional data, essential for refining the models’ ability to accurately respond to human instructions. Recent groundbreaking research, such as the LIMA (Zhou et al.,




Figure 1: Existing advanced data selection strategies rely heavily on external models or data sets; however, SelectIT effectively overcomes this limitation.

2023), highlights the critical importance of instructional data quality over quantity. Contrary to the approach of merely increasing the dataset size, a carefully selected, smaller dataset of higher quality can significantly improve LLMs’ performance.

Despite the emergence of various methods for selecting high-quality data, these methods often rely on external resources and limit broader implementation. *External Model*: Chen et al. (2023a); Liu et al. (2023) propose the employment of closed-source LLMs to evaluate or rank IT data. To circumvent the closed-source limitations, Li et al. (2023a,b); Kung et al. (2023) recommend the adoption of fine-tuned open-source LLMs, which will necessitate increased computational resource expenditure. *External Data*: Cao et al. (2023) split all mixed data into several bins and fully trained the models to evaluate different indicators of high-quality IT data. Despite these advancements, the challenge of conducting precise and efficient high-quality data selection without external resources remains unresolved.

We introduce *SelectIT*, a novel approach designed to enhance IT data selection by fully leveraging the foundation model itself, eliminating the need for external resources. SelectIT employs dif-

*Corresponding Author

ferent grain uncertainty of LLMs: token, sentence, and model, which can effectually improve the accuracy of IT data selection. We first use the foundation model itself to rate the IT data from 1 to K based on the uncertainty of various tokens. Next, we use sentence-level uncertainty to improve the rating process by exploiting the effect of different prompts on LLMs. At a higher model level, we utilize the uncertainty between different LLMs, enabling a collaborative decision-making process for IT data selection. By applying SelectIT to the original Alpaca, we curate a compact and superior IT dataset, termed *Selective Alpaca*.

Experimental results show that SelectIT outperforms existing high-quality data selection methods, improving LLaMA-2’s performance on the open-instruct benchmark (Wang et al., 2023). Further analysis reveals that SelectIT can effectively discard abnormal data and tends to select longer and more computationally intensive IT data. The primary contributions of SelectIT are as follows:

- We propose SelectIT, a novel IT data selection method which exploits the uncertainty of LLMs without using additional resources.
- We introduce a novel IT dataset, Selective Alpaca, by selecting the high-quality IT data from the Alpaca-GPT4 dataset.
- SelectIT can substantially improve the performance of LLMs across a variety of foundation models and domain-specific tasks.
- Our analysis suggests that longer and more computationally intensive IT data may be more effective, offering a new perspective on the characteristics of optimal IT data.

2 Related Work

Instruction Tuning Dataset Recent empirical research highlights the substantial benefits of fine-tuning LLMs on specialized datasets containing instructions and responses, significantly enhancing their generalization capabilities and responsiveness to new questions (Chung et al., 2022; Longpre et al., 2023; Honovich et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2023). FLAN (Wei et al., 2022a) reformulates traditional natural language processing tasks as instructions formats, thereby improving model performance. Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023; Peng et al., 2023a) exemplifies the effectiveness of merging a select set of manual instruction seeds with advanced LLMs,

like text-davinci-003 or GPT-4, to compile a comprehensive dataset. Similarly, Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023) leverages 70,000 conversations from ChatGPT interactions, benefiting from the diverse data types and structures within these dialogues. WizardLM (Xu et al., 2023a) introduces a novel approach by using LLMs to automatically generate open-domain instructions of varying complexities, achieving controlled instructional difficulty variation. However, LIMA (Zhou et al., 2023) demonstrates that only 1K high-quality IT data can match or exceed the performance of LLMs fine-tuned on larger IT datasets, presenting a promising direction for future research.

Instruction Data Selection The recognition of IT data quality’s superiority over quantity in the context of instruction tuning is well-established, yet the efficient and precise identification of high-quality data continues to be a challenging frontier for research. One straightforward approach is utilizing the closed-source advanced LLMs for IT data evaluation and selection (Chen et al., 2023a; Liu et al., 2023). To circumvent the constraints associated with closed-source, some researchers opt to fine-tune LLMs directly to select high-quality IT data (Li et al., 2023b; Kung et al., 2023). Instruction Mining (Cao et al., 2023), involves training multiple models to derive various metrics, using statistical regression to develop a data quality assessment framework. Li et al. (2023a) propose training a specialized model and utilizing two unique, condition-based losses on this for a comprehensive IT data selection. Additionally, Wu et al. (2023) explore where data selection is informed by the similarity of samples within the embedding space of a fine-tuned model. However, the methods described above depend, to varying degrees, on supplementary datasets, the use of closed-source models, or open-source models that have been specially fine-tuned, which results in increased consumption of resources and limits the broader impact.

3 Our SelectIT Method

Utilizing advanced LLMs for the sample evaluation is a widely adopted approach in the IT data selection (Chen et al., 2023a; Li et al., 2023b; Liu et al., 2023). Given an IT dataset D containing a sample $S = (\text{input } X, \text{response } Y)$, a designated rating prompt RP , and the LLMs M , the goal is to leverage both RP and S to prompt M to assign an evaluation $Score$ to the sample S on a scale from




Figure 2: The overall framework of SelectIT.

1 to K . A higher score typically signifies superior IT data *Quality*.

$$Quality \propto Score \in [1, K] = M(RP, S) \quad (1)$$

While existing methods (Chen et al., 2023a; Cao et al., 2023) are adept at identifying high-quality samples, they often over-rely on external resources. To address these challenges, we introduce SelectIT, a strategy that capitalizes on the internal uncertainty of LLMs to efficiently select high-quality IT data. SelectIT incorporates three grains of sample evaluation modules: token, sentence, and model-level self-reflections, which effectively improve the reliability of IT data selection. The comprehensive framework of SelectIT is depicted in Figure 2.

3.1 Token-level Self-Reflection

Numerous studies have demonstrated that foundation models exhibit robust capabilities for next-token prediction during their pre-training phase (Touvron et al., 2023b,a). Yet, this predictive strength is frequently underutilized in evaluating IT data quality. In SelectIT, we adopt a similar idea to evaluate IT data. Specifically, we calculate the

next-token (from 1 to K) probability based on the rating prompt RP and sample S . The score token with the highest probability is then considered as the sample’s quality.

$$S^{base} = \arg \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} P'_k = \left(\frac{e^{P_k}}{\sum_{j=1}^K e^{P_j}} \right) \quad (2)$$

where P_k and P'_k mean the probability and softmax probability of token k . K means the number of scores to be considered.

The probability distribution among score tokens reflects the internal uncertainty of LLMs on sample evaluation. The higher $P'_{S^{base}}$, the more confidence of LLMs, which is not well exploited in Equation 2. To capture this subtle difference, we introduce the token-level self-reflection (Token-R), which uses the distribution between tokens that reflect the internal uncertainty of LLMs, to enhance the credibility of quality assessment. Specifically, we assess the average disparity between the predicted S^{base} token and the other, where the greater the disparity, the more the confidence of LLMs. This disparity is then utilized to refine the original S^{base} ,

resulting in a token-level score S^{token} .

$$S^{token} = S^{base} \times \underbrace{\frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^K |P'_i - P'_{S^{base}}|}_{\text{Uncertainty}} \quad (3)$$

3.2 Sentence-level Self-Reflection

Different prompts can significantly affect outputs of LLMs (Kung et al., 2023; Peng et al., 2023b), introducing uncertainty into IT data evaluation at the sentence level. To make better use of this uncertainty to bolster the reliability of our method, we implement sentence-level self-reflection (Sentence-R). Building upon Token-R, we devise K semantically similar rating prompts $\{RP_0, RP_1, \dots, RP_K\}$ to obtain a series of quality scores $\{S_0^{token}, S_1^{token}, \dots, S_K^{token}\}$ based on a given sample S . We calculate the average of these scores to represent the overall quality of sample S , because of the importance of incorporating assessments from diverse prompts. Additionally, we use the standard deviation to quantify the LLMs’ uncertainty to rating prompt; a higher standard deviation suggests greater sensitivity to prompt variation, while a lower standard deviation indicates more consistent and confident quality ratings by LLMs (Zhou et al., 2020). By integrating a holistic sample evaluation with the quantification of model uncertainty, we derive the sentence-level score S^{sent} , offering a more nuanced and reliable measure of IT data quality.

$$S^{sent} = \frac{\text{Avg}\{S_i^{token}\}_{i=1}^K}{1 + \alpha \times \text{Std}\{S_i^{token}\}_{i=1}^K} \quad (4)$$

where $\text{Avg}\{\cdot\}$ and $\text{Std}\{\cdot\}$ respectively denote the mean and standard deviation of S_i^{token} , K means the number of rating prompts RP . Moreover, we use the uncertainty factor α to control for the impact of the uncertainty of LLMs on overall scores.

3.3 Model-level Self-Reflection

A sample affirmed by multiple foundation models can truly be deemed as high-quality. Different foundation models have different quality assessments of the sample, which introduce model-level uncertainty. To maximize the utilization of this uncertainty, we introduce model-level self-reflection (Model-R). This strategy is in harmony with our principles, as it leverages the capabilities of existing open-source models without the need for additional resources or the complexities associated with fine-tuning. However, the challenge lies in the

diverse capabilities of various LLMs and determining how to reasonably combine their sample evaluation based on their performance. It is widely acknowledged that the capabilities of LLMs tend to increase with their parameter count (Hendrycks et al., 2021). Thus, we suggest using the parameter count of LLMs as an initial metric for assessing their capabilities to properly weight sample quality scores. Given N foundation models with parameter counts $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_N\}$ and their respective sentence-level scores for a sample S being $\{S_0^{sent}, S_1^{sent}, \dots, S_N^{sent}\}$, we formulate the model-level score S^{model} to reflect a comprehensive evaluation of sample quality.

$$\text{Quality} \propto S^{model} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\theta_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N \theta_j} \times S_i^{sent} \right) \quad (5)$$

where N means the number of the foundation models. We use S^{model} as the final evaluation of sample S in SelectIT. The higher S^{model} , the better sample quality. We sort the samples in descending order based on their S^{model} and then select the top-ranked samples as high-quality data.

3.4 Selective Alpaca

We apply SelectIT to the widely-used Alpaca-GPT4 (Peng et al., 2023a). Specifically, we use the most popular LLaMA-2 (7B, 13B, 70B) as our foundation models and set the hyper-parameters $K = 5$, which decides the range of LLMs rating in Token-R and the number of rating prompts in Sentence-R. We finally select the top 20% as the high-quality data and obtain a novel IT dataset called *Selective Alpaca*.

4 Experiments

4.1 Setups

Benchmark To gain a more comprehensive understanding of the capabilities of LLMs, we evaluate our approach in diverse downstream tasks (Wang et al., 2023; Ivison et al., 2023). *Factual knowledge*: We use the Massive Multitask Language Understanding dataset (MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021)) to assess the factual knowledge of LLMs and report 5-shot results. *Reasoning*: We evaluate the reasoning abilities of LLMs using two widely utilized datasets: the Grade School Math dataset (GSM (Cobbe et al., 2021)) and Big-Bench-Hard (BBH (Suzgun et al., 2022)) with the CoT setting (Wei et al., 2022b). *Multilinguality*: we assess this ability by TyDiQA, a multilingual

| ID | System | External | | MMLU | BBH | GSM | TydiQA | CodeX | AE | Overall | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| | | Model | Data | | | | | | | AVG | Δ (\uparrow) |
| <i>Base Model: LLaMA-2-7B</i> | | | | <i>Implemented Existing Method</i> | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Alpaca-GPT4 | | | 46.2 | 39.2 | 15.0 | 43.3 | 27.8 | 33.7 | 34.3 | - |
| 2 | LIMA | ✗ | ✓ | 45.8 | 38.5 | 14.0 | 45.5 | 24.2 | 33.1 | 33.5 | -0.7 |
| 3 | 1 + AlpaGasus | ✓ | ✗ | 46.8 | 39.2 | 14.5 | 48.4 | 26.5 | 34.6 | 35.0 | +0.8 |
| 4 | 1 + Q2Q | ✓ | ✗ | 46.7 | 39.8 | 16.5 | 45.5 | 28.1 | 35.1 | 35.3 | +1.1 |
| 5 | 1 + Instruction Mining | ✓ | ✓ | 47.0 | 40.0 | 16.5 | 47.8 | 29.6 | 34.4 | 35.9 | +1.7 |
| | | | | <i>Our Proposed Method (Individual)</i> | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 1 + Token-R | ✗ | ✗ | 47.7 | 38.7 | 15.0 | 48.6 | 28.0 | 35.3 | 35.5 | +1.3 |
| 7 | 1 + Sentence-R | ✗ | ✗ | 46.7 | 39.9 | 16.5 | 48.9 | 27.8 | 34.5 | 35.7 | +1.5 |
| 8 | 1 + Model-R | ✗ | ✗ | 47.5 | 38.0 | 16.5 | 45.9 | 28.7 | 35.6 | 35.4 | +1.2 |
| | | | | <i>Our Proposed Method (All)</i> | | | | | | | |
| 9 | SelectIT (6 + 7 + 8) | ✗ | ✗ | 47.7 | 40.8 | 17.5 | 47.8 | 29.8 | 35.4 | 36.5 | +2.3 |
| <i>Base Model: LLaMA-2-13B</i> | | | | <i>Implemented Existing Method</i> | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Alpaca-GPT4 | | | 55.7 | 47.3 | 31.0 | 49.1 | 41.8 | 46.5 | 45.2 | - |
| 11 | LIMA | ✗ | ✓ | 54.6 | 48.3 | 29.5 | 51.2 | 34.4 | 43.6 | 43.6 | -1.6 |
| 12 | 10 + AlpaGasus | ✓ | ✗ | 54.1 | 49.3 | 32.0 | 52.6 | 39.3 | 47.5 | 45.8 | +0.6 |
| 13 | 10 + Q2Q | ✓ | ✗ | 55.3 | 48.5 | 34.0 | 50.8 | 42.3 | 47.7 | 46.4 | +1.2 |
| 14 | 10 + Instruction Mining | ✓ | ✓ | 55.5 | 49.7 | 33.0 | 51.2 | 41.5 | 46.1 | 46.2 | +1.0 |
| | | | | <i>Our Proposed Method (Individual)</i> | | | | | | | |
| 15 | 10 + Token-R | ✗ | ✗ | 55.3 | 47.9 | 31.0 | 53.8 | 40.8 | 46.2 | 45.8 | +0.6 |
| 16 | 10 + Sentence-R | ✗ | ✗ | 55.2 | 48.5 | 34.0 | 54.2 | 41.5 | 47.3 | 46.8 | +1.6 |
| 17 | 10 + Model-R | ✗ | ✗ | 55.5 | 47.2 | 33.5 | 53.0 | 42.2 | 47.1 | 46.4 | +1.2 |
| | | | | <i>Our Proposed Method (All)</i> | | | | | | | |
| 18 | SelectIT (15 + 16 + 17) | ✗ | ✗ | 55.5 | 50.1 | 34.5 | 54.4 | 43.2 | 48.2 | 47.7 | +2.5 |

Table 1: The overall results on IT. ‘‘Codex’’ and ‘‘AE’’ mean HumanEval and AlpacaEval benchmark respectively.

question-answering benchmark that encompasses 11 diverse languages, with the gold-passage setup. *Coding*: We evaluate this ability using the HumanEval dataset (Chen et al., 2021) and report pass@10 results with a temperature of 0.8. *Open-ended generation*: We utilize AlpacaEval (Dubois et al., 2023), which employs GPT-4 to effectively assess model outputs. This can evaluate whether the text produced by LLMs aligns with humans.

Implementation Details We use LLaMA-2 as our testbed. We fine-tune it for 3 epochs, with a batch size of 128. We use Adam with $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$, and the cosine learning rate scheduler starts from $2e-5$, and decays to 0. we opted for a 4096 input length because it can show the best performance of LLMs. We employ the beam = 4 for decoding. We set the temperature parameter to 0.8 and the top-p sampling parameter to 0.9 to improve the originality of the output text while ensuring the accuracy and relevance of the content.

Baselines The compared baselines are:

- **Alpaca-GPT4** (Peng et al., 2023a) is a widely-used IT dataset that implements a self-instruct method to autonomously generate instructions by the advanced GPT4.

- **LIMA** (Zhou et al., 2023) primarily consists of 1K manually crafted high-quality instructional data, which can better stimulate the alignment capability of LLMs.
- **AlpaGasus** (Chen et al., 2023a) involves utilizing the robust ChatGPT to score and select data from the original Alpaca dataset.
- **Q2Q** (Li et al., 2023a) operates by training a precursor model, determining the quality of the IT data based on the two different loss values within this model.
- **Instruction Mining** (Cao et al., 2023) entails fitting data features and loss values to derive a formula for assessing data quality.

4.2 Main Results

We focus on the discussion of LLaMA-2-13B because both 7B and 13B models exhibit similar trends in Table 1. System (10) shows the vanilla IT on LLMs with the original Alpaca. By using the data selection strategies, the ability of LLMs has a moderate enhancement in Systems (12) to (14). Additionally, we can use S^{base} as the input for Equations 4 and 5 to construct individual methods of Sentence-R and Model-R. Systems (15) to




Figure 3: Comparison of reasoning ability of LLMs with different proportions of Alpaca.

(17) illustrate that applying each submodule of SelectIT incrementally enhances LLMs’ performance, rivaling contemporary advanced methods.

Most remarkably, SelectIT markedly boosts LLaMA-2’s performance compared to vanilla IT in the System (18). This enhancement is particularly evident in the computational and reasoning tasks on the BBH and GSM benchmarks, compared to other IT data selection strategies. This may be attributed to the characteristics of selected data by SelectIT, and we will analyze this phenomenon in a later section. These gains in reasoning ability also positively impact the coding proficiency of LLMs. The improvement of LLMs on the TydiQA dataset is also obvious enough, which shows that SelectIT can effectively eliminate similar samples and retain sufficient diversity in multilingual aspects.

5 Analysis

We aim to answer the research questions through the following experiments:

- How to select high-quality data in SelectIT?
- Is SelectIT adaptable to various models and domains?
- What are the advantages of Selective Alpaca?

5.1 Abalation Study of SelectIT

Effect of IT Data Quantity While SelectIT already excels at assessing and ranking samples effectively, selecting an appropriate number of samples in a redundant dataset remains a crucial aspect of our method. We divide the Alpaca dataset into multiple subsets ranging from 10% to 100% based on SelectIT’s evaluation and evaluate the reasoning ability of LLMs which is the SelectIT mainly enhances. As illustrated in Figure 3, compared to the full dataset, we observe that LLMs achieve optimal performance using only 20% of the data. Although the LLaMA-2-7B datasets of 20% and 40%

| K | LLaMA-2-7B | | LLaMA-2-13B | | Overall |
|-----|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | BBH | GSM | BBH | GSM | |
| 3 | 40.1 | 17.5 | 49.6 | 34.0 | 35.3 |
| 5 | 40.8 | 17.5 | 50.1 | 34.5 | 35.7 |
| 7 | 41.2 | 18.0 | 49.5 | 34.0 | 35.7 |
| 9 | 40.5 | 17.0 | 50.3 | 34.0 | 35.5 |

Table 2: Effect of different K on LLMs’ performance

| ID | Individual Method | Unique (%) | Overall (%) |
|----|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| 6 | Token-R | 6.18 | 17.83 |
| 7 | Sentence-R | 40.81 | 63.98 |
| 8 | Model-R | 7.37 | 23.08 |

Table 3: The relationship between the SelectIT and the individual selection strategy. Sentence-R plays the most significant impact on the final rating of the IT data.

displayed similar capabilities, the former required less fine-tuning time and computational resources. Hence, we opt for the 20% for implementing the SelectIT on the Alpaca dataset.

Effect of K K is a critical parameter for our method, impacting not only the range of scores assigned by the LLMs but also the number of rating prompts. We set $K = 3, 5, 7, 9$ and apply the SelectIT algorithm for sample selection within the Alpaca to get different subset datasets. The results in Table 3 indicate that variations in the value of K have a minimal impact on the overall performance of the LLMs. This is attributed to our multi-granularity self-reflection mechanism, which effectively enhances the accuracy and stability of sample selection. Although the model achieves competitive performance at K values of 5 and 7, to minimize resource consumption, we set $K = 5$ as the default value in SelectIT.

Effect of Different Reflection Strategy We analyze the relationship between individual selection strategies and SelectIT, from the following two aspects. We first account for the number of high-quality data that only can be selected by a specific selection strategy, referred to as unique selection. Secondly, we calculate the percentage of the samples selected by individual selection strategies in Selective Alpaca, called overall selection. As shown in Table 3, Sentence-R plays the most important role in the final SelectIT strategy which also aligns with the model’s performance reported in Table 1, showing the rationality of our proposed uncertainty-aware self-reflection methods.

| Datasets | Datasets | MMLU | BBH | GSM | Tydiqa | CodeX | AE | Overall | |
|-------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | AVG | Δ (\uparrow) |
| LLaMA-2-7B | Alpaca-GPT4 | 46.2 | 39.2 | 15.0 | 43.3 | 27.8 | 33.7 | 34.2 | - |
| | Selective Alpaca | 47.7 | 40.8 | 17.5 | 47.8 | 29.8 | 35.4 | 36.5 | +2.3 |
| LLaMA-2-13B | Alpaca-GPT4 | 55.7 | 47.3 | 31.0 | 49.1 | 41.8 | 46.5 | 45.2 | - |
| | Selective Alpaca | 55.5 | 50.1 | 34.5 | 54.4 | 43.2 | 48.2 | 47.7 | +2.5 |
| Mistral-7B | Alpaca-GPT4 | 52.5 | 51.7 | 33.5 | 51.1 | 54.7 | 43.1 | 47.8 | - |
| | Selective Alpaca | 56.9 | 53.7 | 36.0 | 49.3 | 55.3 | 44.3 | 49.3 | +1.5 |

Table 4: The overall results on IT of different LLMs.

| Method | Size | En \Rightarrow De | | De \Rightarrow En | | Zh \Rightarrow En | | En \Rightarrow Zh | | AVG | |
|-------------------------------|------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | COMET | BLEU | COMET | BLEU | COMET | BLEU | COMET | BLEU | COMET | BLEU |
| <i>SoTA Models</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NLLB | 54B | 86.5 | 34.5 | 78.9 | 26.9 | 70.7 | 16.6 | 78.9 | 27.4 | 78.8 | 26.3 |
| GPT-3.5 | - | 87.0 | 34.4 | 85.5 | 33.1 | 82.9 | 26.6 | 87.0 | 44.9 | 85.6 | 34.8 |
| GPT-4 | - | 87.4 | 35.4 | 85.6 | 33.9 | 82.8 | 27.2 | 87.5 | 44.0 | 85.8 | 35.1 |
| <i>Existing Method</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LLaMA-2 | 7B | 76.4 | 19.0 | 82.7 | 30.4 | 75.0 | 18.2 | 71.8 | 17.0 | 76.5 | 21.1 |
| TIM | 7B | 74.2 | 20.6 | 77.7 | 24.3 | 79.5 | 23.4 | 84.9 | 37.2 | 79.1 | 26.4 |
| SWIE | 7B | 82.4 | 27.2 | 83.0 | 30.5 | 76.5 | 21.3 | 80.6 | 31.2 | 80.6 | 27.6 |
| BigTranslate | 13B | 78.8 | 21.5 | 80.7 | 23.4 | 74.3 | 14.2 | 81.3 | 28.6 | 78.8 | 21.9 |
| Bayling | 13B | 82.7 | 25.6 | 83.0 | 27.3 | 77.7 | 20.1 | 84.6 | 37.9 | 82.0 | 27.8 |
| <i>Our Implemented Method</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ALMA | 7B | 85.0 | 29.9 | 83.9 | 30.0 | 79.2 | 22.7 | 84.8 | 36.3 | 83.2 | 29.7 |
| w/ SelectIT | 7B | 85.2 | 30.2 | 84.1 | 30.4 | 80.0 | 24.2 | 85.3 | 37.3 | 83.7 | 30.5 |
| ALMA | 13B | 85.2 | 31.0 | 84.2 | 30.9 | 80.0 | 25.0 | 85.5 | 39.2 | 83.7 | 31.5 |
| w/ SelectIT | 13B | 85.8 | 31.7 | 84.6 | 31.4 | 80.3 | 25.4 | 86.1 | 40.4 | 84.2 | 32.2 |

Table 5: The overall results on machine translation LLMs.

5.2 Robustness across Models and Domains

Various Foundation Models Although Selective Alpaca achieved impressive improvements in LLaMA-2, applying it to other foundation models remains a challenging task. To address this, we apply Selective Alpaca on the Mistral-7B foundation model due to its superior performance (Jiang et al., 2023) and present our results on the open-instruct benchmark alignment with the above test configuration. As depicted in Table 4, although Selective Alpaca is selected by the LLaMA-2 models, it is also applicable to the Mistral-7B and improves its capabilities across various tasks, especially on MMLU, BBH, and GSM benchmarks. This experiment fully demonstrates the flexibility of SelectIT which does not rely on a specific foundation model for data selection and the universality of Selective Alpaca which can effectively improve the capabilities of different series or scale LLMs.

Various Domain-specific Tasks Machine translation (MT) is a representative domain-specific task of LLMs (Liu et al., 2019, 2021b,c,a; Ding et al., 2021b; Wang et al., 2022; Li et al., 2022). Previous works, such as TIM (Zeng et al., 2023),

SWIE (Chen et al., 2023b), BigTranslate (Yang et al., 2023), and Bayling (Zhang et al., 2023) have already demonstrated significant improvements with LLMs, but they usually use redundant translation training datasets. In this section, we investigate the impact of training data quality on MT. We select the powerful MT LLM ALMA as our backbone model (Xu et al., 2023b). For the training data, we choose representative language pairs: German \Leftrightarrow English and Chinese \Leftrightarrow English from WMT’17 to WMT’20 human-written test datasets and development and test sets from Flores-200, resulting in a total of 30K training examples and use the test data of the corresponding language pair in WMT’22 as test datasets. We finally select 6K high-quality for LORA fine-tuning by SelectIT.

Table 5 shows that SelectIT consistently improves the translation performance of ALMA. Specifically, SelectIT mainly focuses on improving the translation from English to other languages, possibly because ALMA itself has strong English capabilities, which makes it difficult to improve. These results indicate that SelectIT is a versatile method that is effective for IT data selection and applicable to domain-specific tasks.

| Method | LLaMA-2 | | ALMA | | Δ (\uparrow) |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| | 7B | 13B | 7B | 13B | |
| Full Dataset | 34.3 | 45.2 | 29.7 | 31.5 | - |
| w/ Random (Full) | 34.1 | 45.1 | 29.3 | 31.0 | -1.2 |
| w/ Random (Unselected) | 34.6 | 44.3 | 29.1 | 31.2 | -1.5 |
| w/ Length | 35.5 | 47.1 | 30.1 | 31.8 | +3.8 |
| w/ SelectIT | 36.5 | 47.7 | 30.5 | 32.2 | +6.3 |

Table 6: Comparison with selection variants.




Figure 4: Instruction embeddings representations of different selection strategies after T-SNE dimensionality reduction. The red and green points are representations of full Alpaca datasets and selected data respectively.

5.3 Insights of Selective Data Curation

Different Selection Strategies This part compares three different selection strategies, namely, randomly selecting 20% in the full Alpaca, randomly selecting 20% in the unselected dataset, and selecting 20% data based on sample length (Zhao et al., 2024), with our SelectIT in the IT and MT experiments. As shown in Table 6, the random-based strategies show certain performance degradation and the random selection in the unselected dataset is even worse, which reflects the effectiveness of our method from the side. Selection based on sample length is a simple approach to defining high-quality data, but it does not take into account the content of IT data, resulting in the limited performance of LLMs. SelectIT can significantly improve the abilities of LLMs.

Data Representation Analysis This part investigates the relationship between the Selective Alpaca and the original datasets from a representation perspective. We follow Gao et al. (2024) to utilize the outputs of the last layer corresponding to the last token in the input sequence as sample representations. Subsequently, we employ T-SNE (Hinton and Roweis, 2002) for dimensionality reduction, mapping high-dimensional embeddings onto a 2D space. Figure 4 displays the intermediate representations generated by the full and Selective Alpaca respectively. It is observable that it is difficult for randomly selected data to distinguish abnormal data far from the center, making it challenging to




Figure 5: Left: The average length of samples. Right: The proportion of calculation type.

define high-quality IT data. However, the majority of Selective Alpaca are concentrated around the central point, indicating that our dataset predominantly contains high-quality data near the center and effectively discards abnormal data distanced from the center which is a finding that strongly supports the conclusion of Table 6.

Data Characteristic Analysis We analyze the Selective Alpaca from the following two perspectives, to explore why our dataset is better than the original dataset and its variants. Firstly, as shown in Figure 5, the length of instructions from the Selective Alpaca is significantly longer than those in the Alpaca dataset and AlpacaGasus which is selected by ChatGPT. This implies that, with the same amount of data, our dataset contains more information, aligned with the results in Table 6. Secondly, by using ChatGPT to examine IT data types, we find a substantial increase in the proportion of computational problems in Selective Alpaca. This indicates that Selective Alpaca tends to select high-quality mathematical data, providing a solid explanation for the observed improvement in the reasoning abilities of LLMs as demonstrated in Table 1. Appendix A.1 shows the case study of comparing the Selective Alpaca with AlpacaGasus.

6 Conclusion

This paper introduces a novel data selection strategy, SelectIT, for LLM instruction tuning, which uses LLM uncertainty to efficiently identify high-quality IT data without requiring additional resources. SelectIT includes three types of self-reflection: token, sentence, and model, which can individually and jointly improve the performance of IT data selection. By applying SelectIT to the Alpaca-GPT4 dataset, we introduce a compact and strong IT dataset, called Selective Alpaca. Different models and domain tasks demonstrate the

effectiveness of SelectIT. Our analysis reveals that SelectIT effectively excludes abnormal data and tends to select longer and calculational data.

Limitation

This paper could be further strengthened as follows:

- **Instruction Data Quantity:** Our findings suggest that prioritizing the top 20% of high-quality data optimizes results for Alpaca. Future studies might explore adjusting this threshold based on the data quality in different datasets to enhance performance. Additionally, it would be beneficial to further explore the incorporation of unselected data using curriculum learning (Liu et al., 2020; Zhan et al., 2021; Ding et al., 2021a).
- **Models at Different Scales:** Our analysis is currently limited to models smaller than 30B parameters due to computational constraints. Investigating the efficacy of Selective Alpaca on larger-scale LLMs, ranging from 30B to 70B parameters, could provide valuable insights into the method’s scalability and applicability across various model sizes.
- **Diversity of Foundation Models:** The study exclusively employs the LLaMA-2 as the foundational model for data selection. Broadening the scope to include alternative foundation models, such as Mistral, may reveal more nuanced data selection strategies and improve overall effectiveness.
- **Expansion to Additional Instruction Datasets:** Although SelectIT has been applied to the Alpaca dataset due to its widespread adoption, extending this methodology to incorporate other instruction tuning datasets could offer substantial advantages to the broader LLM research community.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. *Gpt-4 technical report*. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2303.08774.
- Yihan Cao, Yanbin Kang, and Lichao Sun. 2023. *Instruction mining: High-quality instruction data selection for large language models*. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2307.06290.
- Lichang Chen, Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Kalpa Gunaratna, Vikas Yadav, Zheng Tang, Vijay Sriniwasan, Tianyi Zhou, Heng Huang, et al. 2023a. *Alpapasus: Training a better alpaca with fewer data*. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2307.08701.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. *Evaluating large language models trained on code*. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2107.03374.
- Yijie Chen, Yijin Liu, Fandong Meng, Yufeng Chen, Jinan Xu, and Jie Zhou. 2023b. *Improving translation faithfulness of large language models via augmenting instructions*. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12674*.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. *Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality*.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. *Scaling instruction-finetuned language models*. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2210.11416.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. *Training verifiers to solve math word problems*. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2110.14168.
- Liang Ding, Longyue Wang, Xuebo Liu, Derek F. Wong, Dacheng Tao, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2021a. *Progressive multi-granularity training for non-autoregressive translation*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 2797–2803, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Liang Ding, Longyue Wang, Xuebo Liu, Derek F. Wong, Dacheng Tao, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2021b. *Understanding and improving lexical choice in non-autoregressive translation*. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Rohan Taori, Tianyi Zhang, Ishaan Gulrajani, Jimmy Ba, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. *Alpaca-farm: A simulation framework for methods that learn from human feedback*.
- Pengzhi Gao, Zhongjun He, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2024. *Towards boosting many-to-many multilingual machine translation with large language models*. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2401.05861.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. *Measuring massive multitask language understanding*. In *9th International Conference on*

- Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Geoffrey E. Hinton and Sam T. Roweis. 2002. [Stochastic neighbor embedding](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 15 [Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS 2002, December 9-14, 2002, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada]*, pages 833–840. MIT Press.
- Or Honovich, Thomas Scialom, Omer Levy, and Timo Schick. 2022. [Unnatural instructions: Tuning language models with \(almost\) no human labor](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2212.09689.
- Hamish Ivison, Yizhong Wang, Valentina Pyatkin, Nathan Lambert, Matthew Peters, Pradeep Dasigi, Joel Jang, David Wadden, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [Camels in a changing climate: Enhancing lm adaptation with tulu 2](#).
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2310.06825.
- Po-Nien Kung, Fan Yin, Di Wu, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. 2023. [Active instruction tuning: Improving cross-task generalization by training on prompt sensitive tasks](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2311.00288.
- Ming Li, Yong Zhang, Zhitao Li, Jiu Hai Chen, Lichang Chen, Ning Cheng, Jianzong Wang, Tianyi Zhou, and Jing Xiao. 2023a. [From quantity to quality: Boosting llm performance with self-guided data selection for instruction tuning](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2308.12032.
- Xian Li, Ping Yu, Chunting Zhou, Timo Schick, Luke Zettlemoyer, Omer Levy, Jason Weston, and Mike Lewis. 2023b. [Self-alignment with instruction back-translation](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2308.06259.
- Zhaocong Li, Xuebo Liu, Derek F. Wong, Lidia S. Chao, and Min Zhang. 2022. [Consistl: Modeling consistency in transfer learning for low-resource neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, page 8383–8394, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wei Liu, Weihao Zeng, Keqing He, Yong Jiang, and Junxian He. 2023. [What makes good data for alignment? a comprehensive study of automatic data selection in instruction tuning](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2312.15685.
- Xuebo Liu, Houtim Lai, Derek F. Wong, and Lidia S. Chao. 2020. [Norm-based curriculum learning for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 427–436, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuebo Liu, Longyue Wang, Derek F. Wong, Liang Ding, Lidia S. Chao, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2021a. [On the complementarity between pre-training and back-translation for neural machine translation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 2900–2907, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuebo Liu, Longyue Wang, Derek F. Wong, Liang Ding, Lidia S. Chao, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2021b. [On the copying behaviors of pre-training for neural machine translation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 4265–4275, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xuebo Liu, Longyue Wang, Derek F. Wong, Liang Ding, Lidia S. Chao, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2021c. [Understanding and improving encoder layer fusion in sequence-to-sequence learning](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Xuebo Liu, Derek F. Wong, Yang Liu, Lidia S. Chao, Tong Xiao, and Jingbo Zhu. 2019. [Shared-private bilingual word embeddings for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3613–3622, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, et al. 2023. [The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2301.13688.
- Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. 2023. [The refinedweb dataset for falcon llm: outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2306.01116.
- Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Pengcheng He, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023a. [Instruction tuning with gpt-4](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2304.03277.
- Keqin Peng, Liang Ding, Qihuang Zhong, Li Shen, Xuebo Liu, Min Zhang, Yuanxin Ouyang, and Dacheng Tao. 2023b. [Towards making the most of ChatGPT for machine translation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5622–5633, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhiqing Sun, Yikang Shen, Qinhong Zhou, Hongxin Zhang, Zhenfang Chen, David Cox, Yiming Yang, and Chuang Gan. 2023. [Principle-driven self-alignment of language models from scratch with minimal human supervision](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2305.03047.

- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. **Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them.** *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2210.09261.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. **Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model.** https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023a. **Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models.** *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2302.13971.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023b. **Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models.** *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2307.09288.
- Yizhong Wang, Hamish Ivison, Pradeep Dasigi, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, David Wadden, Kelsey MacMillan, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. **How far can camels go? exploring the state of instruction tuning on open resources.**
- Zhijun Wang, Xuebo Liu, and Min Zhang. 2022. **Breaking the representation bottleneck of Chinese characters: Neural machine translation with stroke sequence modeling.** In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6473–6484, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. 2022a. **Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners.** In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022b. **Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models.** *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Shengguang Wu, Keming Lu, Benfeng Xu, Junyang Lin, Qi Su, and Chang Zhou. 2023. **Self-evolved diverse data sampling for efficient instruction tuning.** *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2311.08182.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. 2023a. **Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions.** *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2304.12244.
- Haoran Xu, Young Jin Kim, Amr Sharaf, and Hany Hassan Awadalla. 2023b. **A paradigm shift in machine translation: Boosting translation performance of large language models.**
- Wen Yang, Chong Li, Jiajun Zhang, and Chengqing Zong. 2023. **Bigtranslate: Augmenting large language models with multilingual translation capability over 100 languages.** *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18098*.
- Jiali Zeng, Fandong Meng, Yongjing Yin, and Jie Zhou. 2023. **Tim: Teaching large language models to translate with comparison.** *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2307.04408.
- Runzhe Zhan, Xuebo Liu, Derek F. Wong, and Lidia S. Chao. 2021. **Meta-curriculum learning for domain adaptation in neural machine translation.** *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(16):14310–14318.
- Shaolei Zhang, Qingkai Fang, Zhuocheng Zhang, Zhengrui Ma, Yan Zhou, Langlin Huang, Mengyu Bu, Shangdong Gui, Yunji Chen, Xilin Chen, and Yang Feng. 2023. **Bayling: Bridging cross-lingual alignment and instruction following through interactive translation for large language models.** *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.10968*.
- Hao Zhao, Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, and Nicolas Flammarion. 2024. **Long is more for alignment: A simple but tough-to-beat baseline for instruction fine-tuning.**
- Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srinu Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, et al. 2023. **Lima: Less is more for alignment.** *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2305.11206.
- Yikai Zhou, Baosong Yang, Derek F. Wong, Yu Wan, and Lidia S. Chao. 2020. **Uncertainty-aware curriculum learning for neural machine translation.** In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6934–6944, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Appendix

A.1 Case Study

As demonstrated in Table 6, we illustrate the selection tendencies of SelectIT in contrast to AlpaGasus, which leverages advanced ChatGPT for data selection. In samples 1 to 4, SelectIT shows a preference for instruction tuning data containing intricate mathematical problems that contribute to improving the reasoning skills of the LLMs. On the contrary, AlpaGasus frequently chooses IT data in samples 5 to 7 that primarily offer solutions to queries or lack coherent reasoning, which might limit its effectiveness.















| Sample 1 | SelectSFT vs. AlpaGasus | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Input: Compute the value of the following equation: $4+4/4$.</p> <p>Response: The value of the equation $4 + 4/4$ is 5. According to the order of operations, division must be done before addition, so the equation can be rewritten as $4 + (4/4)$, which simplifies to $4 + 1 = 5$.</p> | Included  | Discarded  |
| Sample 2 | | |
| <p>Input: Compute the derivative of $2x^2 + 5x$.</p> <p>Response: The formula for the derivative of a function is: $f'(x) = d/dx(f(x))$ Using this formula, let's differentiate the function $f(x) = 2x^2 + 5x$ with respect to x. $d/dx(2x^2 + 5x) = d(2x^2)/dx + d(5x)/dx$. Recall that the derivative of x^n is $nx^{(n-1)}$. Applying this to the first term: $d(2x^2)/dx = 2 * d(x^2)/dx = 2 * 2x = 4x$. And the derivative of $k*x$, where k is a constant, is k. Applying this to the second term: $d(5x)/dx = 5$. Therefore, the derivative of $2x^2 + 5x$ is: $f'(x) = 4x + 5$.</p> | Included  | Discarded  |
| Sample 3 | | |
| <p>Input: Find the solution to the quadratic equation: $3x^2 + 7x - 4 = 0$</p> <p>Response: The given quadratic equation is $3x^2 + 7x - 4 = 0$. We can solve this equation using the quadratic formula: $x = (-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}) / 2a$. Here, $a = 3$, $b = 7$, and $c = -4$. Plugging these values into the quadratic formula, we have: $x = [-7 \pm \sqrt{7^2 - 4 * 3 * -4}] / (2 * 3) = [-7 \pm \sqrt{73}] / 6$. So, the solutions to the quadratic equation are: $x = (-7 + \sqrt{73}) / 6$ and $x = (-7 - \sqrt{73}) / 6$.</p> | Included  | Discarded  |
| Sample 4 | | |
| <p>Input: Variable x is defined as "$4x + 2y = 10$". Find the value of x.</p> <p>Response: Given the equation $4x + 2y = 10$, there are infinitely many solutions for the value of x, depending on the value of y. In other words, the value of x is dependent on the value of y. However, it is still possible to express x in terms of y. To do so, we can rearrange the equation to solve for x: $4x + 2y = 10$ $4x = 10 - 2y$ $x = (10 - 2y)/4$ So, according to the equation, the value of x is $(10 - 2y)/4$. Without knowing the specific value of y, it is not possible to determine the exact value of x.</p> | Included  | Discarded  |
| Sample 5 | | |
| <p>Input: Calculate the volume of a cylinder with a radius of 10 cm and a height of 5 cm.</p> <p>Response: The volume of the cylinder is 785 cm³.</p> | Discarded  | Included  |
| Sample 6 | | |
| <p>Input: Summarize the paragraph into a sentence: When buying furniture, it's important to take into account the overall look and feel of the space. That means that you should ask yourself if the pieces you are selecting are a good match for the existing furnishings as well as what you imagine the overall style to be.</p> <p>Response: It's essential to consider the overall aesthetic of the space and ensure the furniture matches the existing furnishings and desired style when purchasing furniture.</p> | Discarded  | Included  |
| Sample 7 | | |
| <p>Input: Render a 3D model of a house.</p> <p>Response: I'd love to create a 3D model fro you! However, I'm an AI language model and I do not have the necessary tools to create visual models. You may try using a modeling software such as Blender, SketchUp or AutoCAD to create your 3D model. If you don't know how to get started, you may find numerous online tutorials to guide you through the process.</p> | Discarded  | Included  |

Figure 6: Examples of instruction tuning data selected by SelectIT or AlpaGasus.