

---

# From Crowdsourced Data to High-Quality Benchmarks: Arena-Hard and BenchBuilder Pipeline

---

Tianle Li\*   Wei-Lin Chiang\*   Evan Frick   Lisa Dunlap   Tianhao Wu  
Banghua Zhu   Joseph E. González   Ion Stoica  
UC Berkeley

## Abstract

The rapid evolution of language models has necessitated the development of more challenging benchmarks. Current static benchmarks often struggle to consistently distinguish between the capabilities of different models and fail to align with real-world user preferences. On the other hand, live crowd-sourced platforms like the Chatbot Arena collect a wide range of natural prompts and user feedback. However, these prompts vary in sophistication and the feedback cannot be applied offline to new models. In order to ensure that benchmarks keep up with the pace of LLM development, we address how one can evaluate benchmarks on their ability to confidently separate models and their alignment with human preference. Under these principles, we developed BenchBuilder, a living benchmark that filters high-quality prompts from live data sources to enable offline evaluation on fresh, challenging prompts. BenchBuilder identifies seven indicators of a high-quality prompt, such as the requirement for domain knowledge, and utilizes an LLM annotator to select a high-quality subset of prompts from various topic clusters. The LLM evaluation process employs an LLM judge to ensure a fully automated, high-quality, and constantly updating benchmark. We apply BenchBuilder on prompts from the Chatbot Arena to create Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1: 500 challenging user prompts from a wide range of tasks. Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 offers 3x tighter confidence intervals than MT-Bench and achieves a state-of-the-art 89.1% agreement with human preference rankings, all at a cost of only \$25 and without human labelers. The BenchBuilder pipeline enhances evaluation benchmarks and provides a valuable tool for developers, enabling them to extract high-quality benchmarks from extensive data with minimal effort.

## 1 Introduction

The proliferation of Large Language Models (LLMs) has spurred advancements, leading to models trained on vast datasets with significantly enhanced capabilities. However, this innovation also presents challenges in designing effective evaluation benchmarks. Many existing benchmarks [45, 34, 4, 11, 3, 16] are unable to keep up with the rapidly advancing capabilities of these models, becoming saturated and unable to differentiate between state-of-the-art models. Additionally, many benchmarks are designed for automatic evaluation with restrictive prompts, such as close-ended or multiple-choice questions, which do not accurately reflect a model’s performance in real-world interactions. Recent developments in benchmark evaluation [50, 38] have made it feasible to evaluate more open-ended prompts, yet generating high-quality prompts at scale remains challenging. Furthermore, static

---

\*Equal contribution. Correspondence to: Tianle Li (tianleli@berkeley.edu), Wei-Lin Chiang (weichi-ang@berkeley.edu)

benchmarks are prone to over-fitting and potential test leakage over time, reducing their effectiveness in ranking models.

To address these issues, an effective benchmark must confidently differentiate model capabilities, reflect real-world human interactions, and update frequently to stay relevant and avoid overfitting. Live crowdsourced evaluation platforms, like the Chatbot Arena [9], address some of these concerns by collecting real-world user prompts with preference labels. However, without quality control, these platforms can include low-quality prompts that do not adequately differentiate top models.

In this work, we introduce BenchBuilder, a data pipeline designed to automatically build high-quality benchmarks from live crowdsourced data source such as the Chatbot Arena. BenchBuilder identifies diverse benchmark prompts that can confidently separate model performance. It uses seven key indicators of high-quality prompts, such as specificity and domain knowledge, and employs an LLM to annotate prompts for these indicators. The resulting benchmark, Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1, uses an LLM judge [51] to estimate human preference against a baseline model, making BenchBuilder and Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 a fully automated system. We further explore how to measure the quality of benchmarks by introducing metrics to assess a benchmark’s ability to confidently separate models and its agreement with human preferences. Comparing Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 to current leading benchmarks such as AlpacaEval [38] and MT-Bench [51], we demonstrate that Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 offers significantly stronger separability with tighter confidence intervals. Additionally, Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 achieves 89.1% agreement with Chatbot Arena rankings, making it an excellent predictor of downstream performance. Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 provides a cost-effective and informative evaluation benchmark, and the BenchBuilder pipeline serves as a valuable tool for developers seeking to automatically generate high-quality benchmarks from vast data sources.

To summarize, our work makes the following contributions:

1. We propose a novel data curation pipeline, BenchBuilder, to automatically construct high-quality benchmarks from crowdsourced data.
2. We propose metrics to capture desired properties in a benchmark, and validate Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 achieves significantly better separability and agreement than existing benchmarks.
3. We open-source both the Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 benchmark and BenchBuilder pipeline<sup>1</sup>.

## 2 Related works

**LLM benchmarks.** We briefly review widely used LLM benchmarks. Most existing benchmarks are static and ground-truth-based (e.g., multi-choice question answering). They cover a wide range of domains, including math, science, coding, and reasoning. Common ones include MMLU [16], MATH [17], GSM-8K [10], HumanEval [7], DROP [12], BigBench [37], Hel-laSwag [49], AGIEval [52], GPQA [35], as well as comprehensive collection like HELM [26]. Many have considered task-based evaluation such as IFEval [53], SWE-Bench [22], or AgentBench [28]. As LLMs become widely adopted in open-ended scenarios involving interaction with humans (e.g., chatbot), many have considered human evaluation using domain experts or crowd raters such as Amazon Mechanical Turk [23, 46] to examine models’ response quality. As an alternative to human labeling, previous work has shown that LLM-as-a-judge can be effective human preference proxies (e.g., AlpacaFarm [14], MT-bench [51], AlpacaEval [25]).

**Benchmark leakage.** A fundamental limitation of static benchmarks is the potential risk of test set leakage (i.e., contamination). Existing works [6, 36, 48, 39] have suggested a growing risk of contamination, which undermines the reliability of benchmarks over time, motivating the need for benchmarks that are more frequently updated.

**Live benchmarks.** DynaBench [24] identifies these challenges and recommends creating living and continuously evolving benchmarks. Recent works LiveCodeBench [19], R2E [20], as well as the community based live evaluation, Chatbot Arena [9]. However, none of these focus on developing a pipeline for automatic benchmark curation.

---

<sup>1</sup>Our code is available at: <https://github.com/lm-sys/arena-hard-auto>

### 3 How do you measure benchmarks?

Given a benchmark consists of a dataset  $D$  of prompts and scoring function  $f$  to measure the performance of model  $\pi_i$  on prompt  $p$ , we outline two key properties that an LLM chatbot benchmark approximating human preference should possess to provide a meaningful measurement of capabilities between models:

1. **Separability:** the benchmark should separate models with high confidence.
2. **Alignment with Human Preference:**  $f$  should agree with human preference.

While previous works have focused on alignment, separability is also a crucial consideration when comparing models of similar quality (e.g., different checkpoints from the same training run). However, achieving high-confidence separability is challenging due to limitations in prompt design and inherent variances in LLM evaluations. Overly simplistic prompts fail to distinguish between models, while the randomness in human and LLM judgments leads to inconsistent predictions. As a result, it is often difficult to confidently determine if a model’s apparent performance reflects a genuine difference in capability or merely noisy observations, highlighting a need for methods to verify whether a benchmark can reliably separate similar models.

Statistical measures like Pearson [33] and Spearman Correlations, commonly used in benchmarks such as AlpacaEval [25] to measure correlation to human preference ranking, may fail to adequately address model separability and ranking instability. In addition, these measures only provide a coarse signal of ranking correlation without quantifying the magnitude of performance differences between model pairs.

To address these issues, we develop three novel metrics: *Separability with Confidence*, *Agreement with Confidence*, and *Pair Rank Brier Score*.

**Separability with Confidence** quantifies the benchmark’s confidence by measuring its consistency in predicting the winner of a model pair across random seeds through bootstrapping. This is done by calculating the percentage of model pairs that have non-overlapping confidence intervals of their benchmark scores. A higher percentage indicates that the benchmark is more confident in distinguishing between the performance of different models, as the confidence intervals of their scores do not overlap.

**Agreement with Confidence Interval** measures how well benchmarks A and B confidently distinguish between two models with the same ordering. Given two models  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  to be evaluated on A and B, we assign the following scores:

1. If both A and B can confidently separate  $\pi_1, \pi_2$ , we assign a score of 1 if the rankings match across A and B, otherwise -1.
2. If either A or B cannot separate  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  with confidence, we assign a score of 0.

The final agreement score across models is the average score across all unique model pairs. An agreement score of 1 implies that benchmark A confidently agrees with benchmark B on the preference of every unique model pair. Conversely, a score of -1 indicates that A confidently disagrees with B on every unique model pair.

**Pair Rank Brier Score** further assesses an LLM benchmark’s capability to predict the ranking of a pair of competing models by rewarding confidence in correct predictions while penalizing confidence when incorrect. Consider two models  $\pi_1 > \pi_2$  with disparate quality. Although two benchmarks A and B predict the same ranking  $\pi_1 > \pi_2$ , they predict  $P(\pi_1 > \pi_2)$  as .60 and .90, respectively (undetectable by Spearman correlation). These benchmarks would result in very different Brier scores, reflecting their ability to quantify the magnitude of performance difference between the models. If both benchmarks give the wrong prediction of the winner, we prefer the benchmark with a less confident prediction. Brier score weighs a benchmark’s accuracy and its ability to quantify the appropriate level of uncertainty in its predictions.

For each model pair, the benchmark’s forecast probability  $f(\pi_i < \pi_j)$  can be estimated as  $P(f(\pi_i) < f(\pi_j))$  with  $f(\pi_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$  and  $f(\pi_j) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_j, \sigma_j^2)$ , where  $\mu_i$  and  $\sigma_i^2$  are the bootstrapped mean and variance by evaluating multiple times. The Brier Score Loss is then calculated over the benchmark’s prediction for each model pair with respect to the ground truth probability, where Brier




Figure 1: **BenchBuilder Pipeline.** Starting with a live data source of crowdsourced user prompts, we first cluster their embeddings to form topic clusters. An LLM annotator then assigns quality scores based on the required skills. Clusters with low quality scores are filtered out, and we sample from the remaining high-quality clusters to create a diverse and challenging dataset of benchmark prompts.

Score is defined as  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\{i,j\}} (f(\pi_j < \pi_i) - O(\pi_j < \pi_i))^2$ , where  $N$  is the number of model pairs and  $O$  is the ground truth outcome.

Separability with Confidence, Agreement with Confidence Interval, and Pair Rank Brier Score each provide useful perspectives for evaluating the effectiveness of LLM benchmarks. However, no single metric is intended to be individually sufficient. Ultimately, these metrics are complementary and should be considered together holistically. We claim that together, these metrics offer a robust framework for assessing benchmark performance, balancing the need for clear differentiation with alignment to human preferences.

## 4 The BenchBuilder Pipeline and Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 Dataset

### 4.1 BenchBuilder: A pipeline for converting messy data into high-quality benchmarks

BenchBuilder automatically extracts diverse, high quality prompts from a dataset of 200,000 user queries collected via Chatbot Arena. This is done by assigning a quality score to each prompt and by sampling prompts with a high quality score evenly across a wide range of topics. An outline of our data creation pipeline is shown in Figure 1.

#### Key Prompt Qualities

- **Specificity:** Does the prompt ask for a specific, well-defined output without leaving any ambiguity?
- **Domain Knowledge:** Does the prompt test the AI’s knowledge and understanding in a specific domain or set of domains?
- **Complexity:** Does the prompt have multiple components, variables, or levels of depth and nuance?
- **Problem-Solving:** Does the prompt require active problem-solving: analyzing and clearly defining the problem and systematically devising and implementing a solution?
- **Creativity:** Does the prompt require a creative approach or solution?
- **Technical Accuracy:** Does the prompt require an answer with a high degree of technical accuracy, correctness and precision?
- **Real-world Application:** Does the prompt relate to real-world applications?

To discover high quality prompts, we define seven qualities of a prompt which signify the skills required to successfully answer, including specificity, domain knowledge, complexity, and more shown in the figure above. These qualities are used by an LLM annotator to assign a “quality score” to a given prompt  $p$ , which indicates how many of the above qualities are seen in  $p$ . Full instruction prompt is in Section 11.

To ensure that the filtered prompts represent a wide range of tasks, we adopt a topic modeling pipeline in BERTopic by first converting each prompt with OpenAI’s embedding model (text-embedding-3-small [32]), reducing dimension with UMAP, and using a hierarchical-based clustering algorithm (HDBSCAN) to identify clusters which are then summarized using GPT-4-Turbo [30].

As some topic clusters contain mostly trivial or ill defined prompt like “hi”, we select the topic clusters with mean quality score  $\geq 6$  out of 7 and sample prompts equally across each of these clusters. The resulting dataset consists of mostly well-defined, technical problem-solving queries as required in the above key criteria. Dataset statistics and further description of the filtering process used for Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 along are in the following section.

## 4.2 Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1: A set of challenging, high-quality prompts from Chatbot Arena

We utilize the BenchBuilder pipeline to create Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1, a set of 500 high-quality prompts taken from 200,000 prompts from Chatbot Arena, an open source platform for LLM evaluation. We first remove any duplicate prompts, multi-turn conversations, or non-English conversations, and obtain over 4,000 topic clusters and 75,000 queries covering a wide range of domains.

Then, we use the GPT-3.5-Turbo as judge to assign a “quality score” to each prompt and remove prompts which either have a score  $< 5$  or which belong to a topic cluster with a mean score  $< 3$ . We present the statistics in Table 1. Notably, around 18% out of 75,000 queries are higher quality according to GPT-3.5-Turbo. We then use GPT-4-Turbo as judge to assign a quality score and ensuring the quality of the remaining prompts, resulting with over 500 high quality clusters. We randomly sample 500 prompts from these clusters, creating Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1. Additionally, we confirm our final dataset does not contain any personally identifiable information or offensive content.

In Figure 2, we show examples of topic clusters ranging from low to high mean scores provided by GPT-3.5-Turbo. We can observe clusters with higher scores often correlate to challenging topics or tasks for LLMs like game development or mathematical proofs. On the other hand, clusters with lower scores point to trivial or ambiguous questions like "Flirty Texting Strategies". We present several example prompts and their respective topic cluster below.

### Cluster 1: Greetings and Well-Being Inquiry (Mean Score: 2.7)

Yo, what up my brother (Qualities: None)

### Cluster 2: US Presidents Query (Mean Score: 3.2)

Who was the president of the US in 1975 (Qualities: Specificity, Domain-Knowledge, Technical Accuracy, Real-World)

### Cluster 3: Physics Problem Solving (Mean Score: 5.0)

A 50,000 kg airplane initially flying at a speed of 60.0 m/s accelerates at 5.0 m/s<sup>2</sup> for 600 meters. What is its velocity after this acceleration? What is the net force that caused this acceleration? (Qualities: Specificity, Domain-Knowledge, Complexity, Problem-Solving, Technical Accuracy, Real-World)

### Cluster 4: OpenCV Image Processing Technique (Mean Score: 5.5)

you are given a task to detect number of faces in each frame of any video using pytorch and display the number in the final edited video. (Qualities: All)

To see whether “quality score” assigned during BenchBuilder’s pipeline correlates with separability and agreement, we sample 50 prompts per score and compare the responses from GPT-4 and Llama-2-70b-Chat [43], with GPT-4-Turbo as judge. In Figure 4 (Left), we observe a strong correlation

between high potential score and the win-rate of GPT-4-Turbo over Llama-2-70b-Chat. A similar trend is also observed in other model pairs such as Claude Sonnet vs Haiku and Mistral-Large [40] vs Mistral [21].

Since qualities assigned by GPT-4-Turbo are critical to ensure the final prompt selection is high-quality, we verified its accuracy as annotator. We construct “ground truth” labels for 200 randomly sampled queries by collecting majority votes from GPT-4o [31], Claude-3-Opus [2], and Gemini-1.5-Pro [39]. GPT-4-Turbo has 85.6% accuracy against “ground truth” labels, validating its ability as annotator.




Figure 2: Mean score of various topic clusters in descending order. Higher-scoring clusters correlate to challenging topics, while lower scores indicate trivial or ambiguous questions. A more complete topic cluster plot is in Figure 6.




Figure 3: Comparison between MT-bench and Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1. The latter offers significantly better separability between models and tighter confidence intervals. GPT-4-0314 has no variance in Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 because it is the anchor model.




Figure 4: Win-rate of three model pairs (GPT-4-0613 vs Llama-2-70b-chat, Claude-3-Sonnet-20240229 vs Claude-3-Haiku-20240307, and Mistral-Large vs Mistral-8x7b-Instruct-v0.1) over “quality score”. We randomly sample 50 queries for each quality score 0-7 and bootstrap a win-rate and confidence interval between model pairs on each score interval of 2. We observe a similar trend of win-rate between model pairs becomes increasingly separable as the quality score increases.

## 5 Evaluation with LLM-as-a-Judge

Evaluating models on challenging queries such as Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 is a non-trivial task. Most queries involve deep domain knowledge and problem solving skills, requiring expert-level judgment to evaluate the answer quality. Unfortunately, it is prohibitively expensive and time consuming to use

Quality Score	1+	2+	3+	4+	5+	6+	7+
% of queries	95.4	83.5	61.9	48.7	33.8	17.9	0.2

Qualities	Specificity	Domain-knowledge	Complexity	Problem-solving	Creativity	Tech. Accuracy	Real-world
% of queries	57.3	63.4	35.0	34.9	26.1	39.0	87.9

Table 1: First row is the percentage of queries with quality scores of the column or more in 75K Chatbot Arena data assigned by GPT-3.5-Turbo. Second row is the percentage of queries in 75K Chatbot Arena labeled by GPT-3.5-Turbo with each of the 7 qualities.

	Chatbot Arena	MT Bench	AlpacaEval 2.0 LC	Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1
Confidence Agreement	N/A	26.1%	81.2%	<b>89.1%</b>
Separability	85.8%	22.6%	83.2%	<b>87.4%</b>
Spearman Correlation	N/A	91.3%	90.8%	<b>94.1%</b>
Brier Score	N/A	0.09	0.11	<b>0.069</b>
Real-world	Yes	Mixed	Mixed	Yes
Freshness	Live	Static	Static	Frequent Updates
Eval cost per model	very high	\$10	\$10	\$25
Prompts per model	10000+	160	800	1000

Table 2: We use a set of top-20 models<sup>1</sup> on Chatbot Arena (2024/04/13) that are also present on the AlpacaEval leaderboard to calculate separability and agreement per benchmark. We consider the human preference ranking by Chatbot Arena (English only) as the reference to calculate agreement.

human judges. Following LLM-as-a-Judge [51] and AlpacaFarm [14], we employ LLM-as-a-judge framework to approximate human preference.

To obtain a score for model  $\pi_i$  on prompt  $p$ , we consider the pairwise comparison setup against a strong baseline model  $\pi_{base}$  (GPT-4-0314) and employ a strong judge model (e.g., GPT-4-Turbo or Gemini-1.5-Pro) to measure preference. We obtain a score for each output  $\pi_i(p)$  by asking the judge to rank its preference of  $\pi_i(p)$  or  $\pi_{base}(p)$  on a Likert scale [27] (1 = prefers  $\pi_i(p)$  much less than  $\pi_{base}(p)$ , 5 = prefers  $\pi_i(p)$  much more than  $\pi_{base}(p)$ ). This way, a model will be penalized more in big losses than small losses, which we find to be effective in separating models. We also employ chain-of-thought (CoT) [47] to prompt the LLM judge to generate its own answer first before giving judgments. The full judge prompt can be found in Section 11.

To avoid potential position bias, we adopt a two-game setup – per query we swap the models on the first and second position. This results in 1000 judgments per model evaluation. Following Chatbot Arena, we adopt the Bradley-Terry [5] model to produce model’s the final model scores. We aggregate all pairwise comparisons to the baseline model for all models and bootstrapping the comparisons to retrieve a bootstrapped confidence interval of all models’ win-rate against the baseline, producing a ordered ranking of all models by their win-rates.

## 6 Experimental Results

### 6.1 Setup and Baselines

To compare Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1’s *separability* and *alignment with humans* against other widely used benchmarks, MT-Bench [51] and AlpacaEval 2.0 Length Controlled [13], we obtain 95% confidence interval of model performances via applying 100 rounds of bootstrapping on judgment results for each benchmark. For AlpacaEval, we use pre-existing results from their repository. We obtain MT-Bench judgment with no modification to their recommended evaluation setup. For Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1, we employ the system proposed in section 5 by choosing gpt-4-0314 as baseline model for pairwise comparison.

<sup>1</sup>gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09, claude-3-opus-20240229, claude-3-sonnet-20240229, gpt-4-0314 [29], gpt-4-0613, mistral-large-2402, qwen1.5-72b-chat [41], mistral-medium, claude-2.0, gpt-3.5-turbo-0613, claude-2.1, gemini-pro [15], mixtral-8x7b-instruct-v0.1, gpt-3.5-turbo-0314, yi-34b-chat [1], tulu-2-dpo-70b [18], dbrx-instruct-preview [42], vicuna-33b [8], starling-lm-7b-alpha [54], llama-2-70b-chat

Model	GPT4-T	Claude3-Opus	Gemini1.5-Pro	Llama3-70B	Ensemble-as-Judges
Confidence Agreement	89.1%	66.7%	84.8%	65.6%	<b>91.5%</b>
Separability	87.4%	83.68%	82.11%	81.6%	<b>89.5%</b>
Spearman Correlation	94.1%	77.0%	95.2%	70.5%	<b>96.5%</b>
Brier Score	0.069	0.170	<b>0.064</b>	0.196	0.065

Table 3: Statistics of Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 with four LLM different judges: GPT4-T (gpt-4-1106-preview), Claude-3-Opus, Gemini1.5-Pro (gemini-1.5-pro-0514), Llama3-70B (llama-3-70b-instruct). We compare rankings produced by these judges against Chatbot Arena (English) ranking (as of 2024/04/13). We observe GPT-4T and Gemini1.5-Pro have higher agreement than Claude-3-Opus and Llama-3-70B. Furthermore, the ensemble of GPT4-T and Gemini1.5-Pro shows even higher agreement.

Model	Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1	Random Sample 1	Random Sample 2
Confidence Agreement	<b>84.2%</b>	57.5%	66.1%
Separability	<b>80.5%</b>	74.7%	76.3%
Spearman Correlation	<b>94.7%</b>	64.7%	72.5%
Brier Score	<b>0.069</b>	0.215	0.162

Table 4: We compare Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 with two sets of 500 prompts randomly sampled from 75K Chatbot Arena user queries. We evaluate the set of top-20 models and compare various statistics across. Each prompt is judged only once by positioning the baseline answer first.

In order to compare these benchmarks fairly, we use a set of top-20 models<sup>1</sup> on Chatbot Arena [9] (2024/04/13) that are also presented on AlpacaEval leaderboard (2024/04/13) as ground truth for human preferences on the model ranking orders. In subsection 6.3, we individually compare Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 to Chatbot Arena within a more similar distribution of user queries. We compute separability using 95% confidence intervals and consider the human preference ranking by Chatbot Arena as the reference to calculate agreement, Spearman correlation, and Pair Rank Brier Score across AlpacaEval, MT-Bench, and Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1.

## 6.2 Separability and Agreement Across Benchmarks

In Table 2, Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 shows the highest separability (87.4%) against widely adopted LLM benchmarks and offers highest agreement (89.1%) to Chatbot Arena at \$25 cost. In Figure 3, we show Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 offers significantly stronger separability against MT Bench with tighter confidence intervals. With only 500 prompts, Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 achieve impressive alignment to and even higher separability than Chatbot Arena Ranking, which constitutes for approximately 1 million real-world human preferences.

Notably, we observe a significant gap between MT-bench’s Spearman Correlation (91.3%) and confidence agreement (22.6%) to Chatbot Arena, an example where Spearman Correlation fails to account for variance of the rankings, and hence cannot adequately measure important ranking granularity of top LLMs. We present a visual comparison between Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 and MT-Bench in Figure 3, highlighting Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1’s improved separability.

## 6.3 Comparing to a similar distribution of human preference

We set Chatbot Arena Category Hard Prompts (English) as ground truth reference. Chatbot Arena Category Hard Prompt is a human preference ranking leaderboard based on votes from a harder subset of 200,000+ prompts extracted from over 1 million Chatbot Arena queries using a similar method as BenchBuilder. In Table 5, we show Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 achieving an overall higher alignment (92.0% Confidence Agreement) to human preferences.

## 6.4 Comparing to Random Subsets of Arena

To further verify BenchBuilder pipeline’s ability to select high-quality prompts, we compare Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 to two sets of 500 randomly selected prompts from the 75,000 user queries prior to pipeline extraction. We compare their ranking preferences of the set of top-20 models produced by GPT-4-1106-Preview as judge. In Table 4, we observe Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 is significantly better



Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1	
Confidence Agreement	92.0%
Spearman Correlation	96.4%
Brier Score	0.055

Table 5: We compare Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 (gpt-4-1106-preview as judge) to Chatbot Arena Category Hard Prompt (English) on the same set of top-20 models\*. By comparing Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 to a similar distribution of queries from Chatbot Arena, we obtain even higher alignment to human preferences.

than both random baselines, verifying BenchBuilder’s effectiveness at selecting superior prompts for a LLM benchmark.

### 6.5 Ensemble-as-Judges

We study four popular LLMs<sup>2</sup> as judge on Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1. We statistically compare their ranking preference of the set of top-20 models<sup>1</sup> to the Chatbot Arena Leaderboard in Table 3. Out of the four judges, GPT-4-1106-Preview has the highest separability and agreement to human ranking preference. We also observe GPT-4-1106-Preview and Gemini-1.5-Pro have much higher agreement than Claude-3-Opus and Llama-3-70b-instruct, with more than 20% improvement.

We also experiment combining GPT-4-1106-Preview and Gemini-1.5-Pro as an ensemble judge by combining their judgment results. This achieves an even higher separability and agreement to human ranking preference, with agreement reaching 91.5%, demonstrating effectiveness of judging LLMs with Ensemble-as-Judges.

## 7 Limitations

Although our data source comes from diverse distributions, we acknowledge possible biases within our pipeline. For example, the 7 qualities we defined might not be all-encompassing and could potentially bias towards a limited distribution of prompts, such as technical fields. Further, prompt selection process could be biased by LLM annotators. Additionally, for model evaluation, we are employing LLMs as judges, who are known to suffer from verbosity bias [51, 13]. In Table 7, we present how verbosity can effect LLM as Judge on Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1. We also acknowledge potential self-bias in LLM judges (e.g., GPT-4 Judge prefers GPT-4 answers) in Table 3. Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 also does not evaluate multi-turn or non-English interactions.

In the future, we plan to further the exploration of a more generalized and diverse set of prompt qualities, establishing a pipeline to systematically produce benchmark across a more comprehensive and inclusive distribution of prompts while maintaining high separability and alignment to humans. Additionally, we believe our approach of utilizing LLM-as-a-judge can be improved, such as developing a system of Ensemble-as-Judges, similar to Judges with Jury [44], to reduce biases and improve correlation.

## 8 Conclusions

We introduced BenchBuilder, a data curation pipeline that transforms crowdsourced data into high-quality benchmarks by seven key qualities. This pipeline enables building challenging and evolving benchmarks which is crucial for evaluating today’s advanced language models. Our evaluation metrics, including separability and agreement with confidence, provide a comprehensive assessment of benchmarks. We show the resulting benchmark, Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1, significantly improves separability and alignment with human preferences over existing benchmarks, achieving 89.1% agreement with Chatbot Arena rankings at only \$25 per evaluation. We expect Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 to be useful for LLM developers to evaluate their models with confidence and BenchBuilder to be a valuable tool for developers seeking to extract high-quality benchmark from vast amounts of data with minimal human effort.

<sup>2</sup>GPT-4-1106-Preview, Claude-3-Opus-20240229, Gemini-1.5-Pro-0514, and Llama-3-70b-instruct

## 9 Acknowledgment

We thank Matei Zaharia, Yann Dubois, Anastasios Angelopoulos, Lianmin Zheng, Lewis Tunstall, Nathan Lambert, Xuechen Li, Naman Jain, Ying Sheng, Maarten Grootendorst for their valuable feedback. We thank Siyuan Zhuang and Dacheng Li for the valuable review and debug of the code. We thank Microsoft AFMR for Azure OpenAI credits support. We also thank Together.ai & Anyscale for open model endpoint support.

## References

- [1] 01. AI, :, Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, Kaidong Yu, Peng Liu, Qiang Liu, Shawn Yue, Senbin Yang, Shiming Yang, Tao Yu, Wen Xie, Wenhao Huang, Xiaohui Hu, Xiaoyi Ren, Xinyao Niu, Pengcheng Nie, Yuchi Xu, Yudong Liu, Yue Wang, Yuxuan Cai, Zhenyu Gu, Zhiyuan Liu, and Zonghong Dai. Yi: Open foundation models by 01.ai, 2024.
- [2] Anthropic. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku. [https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model\\_Card\\_Claude\\_3.pdf](https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model_Card_Claude_3.pdf), 2024. (Accessed on 06/05/2024).
- [3] Johan Bos and Katja Markert. Recognising textual entailment with logical inference. In Raymond Mooney, Chris Brew, Lee-Feng Chien, and Katrin Kirchhoff, editors, *Proceedings of Human Language Technology Conference and Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 628–635, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, October 2005. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [4] Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. In Lluís Màrquez, Chris Callison-Burch, and Jian Su, editors, *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 632–642, Lisbon, Portugal, September 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [5] Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3/4):324–345, 1952.
- [6] Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramer, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Ulfar Erlingsson, et al. Extracting training data from large language models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 2633–2650, 2021.
- [7] 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. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [8] 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. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%\* chatgpt quality, March 2023.
- [9] Wei-Lin Chiang, Lianmin Zheng, Ying Sheng, Anastasios Nikolas Angelopoulos, Tianle Li, Dacheng Li, Hao Zhang, Banghua Zhu, Michael Jordan, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Chatbot arena: An open platform for evaluating llms by human preference, 2024.
- [10] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- [11] Bill Dolan and Chris Brockett. Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases. In *Third international workshop on paraphrasing (IWP2005)*, 2005.
- [12] Dheeru Dua, Yizhong Wang, Pradeep Dasigi, Gabriel Stanovsky, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. Drop: A reading comprehension benchmark requiring discrete reasoning over paragraphs. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2368–2378, 2019.
- [13] Yann Dubois, Balázs Galambosi, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. Length-controlled alpacaeval: A simple way to debias automatic evaluators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04475*, 2024.
- [14] Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Rohan Taori, Tianyi Zhang, Ishaan Gulrajani, Jimmy Ba, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. AlpacaFarm: A simulation framework for methods that learn from human feedback, 2023.
- [15] Team Gemini, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.

- [16] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [17] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [18] Hamish Ivison, Yizhong Wang, Valentina Pyatkin, Nathan Lambert, Matthew Peters, Pradeep Dasigi, Joel Jang, David Wadden, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Camels in a changing climate: Enhancing lm adaptation with tulu 2, 2023.
- [19] Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. Livecodebench: Holistic and contamination free evaluation of large language models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07974*, 2024.
- [20] Naman Jain, Manish Shetty, Tianjun Zhang, King Han, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. R2e: Turning any github repository into a programming agent environment. In *ICML*, 2024.
- [21] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L lio Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th ophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mixtral of experts, 2024.
- [22] Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. Swe-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [23] Marzena Karpinska, Nader Akoury, and Mohit Iyyer. The perils of using Mechanical Turk to evaluate open-ended text generation. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1265–1285, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [24] Douwe Kiela, Max Bartolo, Yixin Nie, Divyansh Kaushik, Atticus Geiger, Zhengxuan Wu, Bertie Vidgen, Grusha Prasad, Amanpreet Singh, Pratik Ringshia, Zhiyi Ma, Tristan Thrush, Sebastian Riedel, Zeerak Waseem, Pontus Stenetorp, Robin Jia, Mohit Bansal, Christopher Potts, and Adina Williams. Dynabench: Rethinking benchmarking in nlp. *NAACL*, 2021.
- [25] Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models. [https://github.com/tatsu-lab/alpaca\\_eval](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/alpaca_eval), 2023.
- [26] Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, et al. Holistic evaluation of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09110*, 2022.
- [27] Rensis Likert. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of psychology*, 1932.
- [28] Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan Yang, Shudan Zhang, Xiang Deng, Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Chenhui Zhang, Sheng Shen, Tianjun Zhang, Yu Su, Huan Sun, Minlie Huang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Agentbench: Evaluating llms as agents, 2023.
- [29] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [30] OpenAI. New models and developer products announced at devday. <https://openai.com/blog/new-models-and-developer-products-announced-at-devday>, 2023. (Accessed on 06/05/2024).
- [31] OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>, 2024. (Accessed on 06/05/2024).
- [32] OpenAI. New embedding models and api updates. <https://openai.com/index/new-embedding-models-and-api-updates/>, 2024. (Accessed on 06/05/2024).
- [33] Karl Pearson. Note on regression and inheritance in the case of two parents. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 58:240–242, 1895.
- [34] Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. *EMNLP*, 2016.
- [35] David Rein, Betty Li Hou, Asa Cooper Stickland, Jackson Petty, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Julien Dirani, Julian Michael, and Samuel R. Bowman. Gpqa: A graduate-level google-proof q&a benchmark, 2023.
- [36] Oscar Sainz, Jon Campos, Iker Garc a-Ferrero, Julen Etxaniz, Oier Lopez de Lacalle, and Eneko Agirre. NLP evaluation in trouble: On the need to measure LLM data contamination for each benchmark. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 10776–10787, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [37] Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [38] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model. [https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford\\_alpaca](https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca), 2023.
- [39] Gemini Team, Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Andrew Dai, Katie Millican, Ethan Dyer, Mia Glaese, Thibault Sottiaux, Benjamin Lee, Fabio Viola, Malcolm Reynolds, Yuanzhong Xu, James Molloy, Jilin Chen, Michael Isard, Paul Barham, Tom Hennigan, Ross McIlroy, Melvin Johnson, Johan Schalkwyk, Eli Collins, Eliza Rutherford, Erica Moreira, Kareem Ayoub, Megha Goel, Clemens Meyer, Gregory Thornton, Zhen Yang, Henryk Michalewski, Zaheer Abbas, Nathan Schucher, Ankesh Anand, Richard Ives, James Keeling, Karel Lenc, Salem Haykal, Siamak Shakeri, Pranav Shyam, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Roman Ring, Stephen Spencer, Eren Sezener, Luke Vilnis, Oscar Chang, Nobuyuki Morioka, George Tucker, Ce Zheng, Oliver Woodman, Nithya Attaluri, Tomas Kocisky, Evgenii Eltyshev, Xi Chen, Timothy Chung, Vittorio Selo, Siddhartha Brahma, Petko Georgiev, Ambrose Slone, Zhenkai Zhu, James Lottes, Siyuan Qiao, Ben Caine, Sebastian Riedel, Alex Tomala, Martin Chadwick, Juliette Love, Peter Choy, Sid Mittal, Neil Houlsby, Yunhao Tang, Matthew Lamm, Libin Bai, Qiao Zhang, Luheng He, Yong Cheng, Peter Humphreys, Yujia Li, Sergey Brin, Albin Cassirer, Yingjie Miao, Lukas Zilka, Taylor Tobin, Kelvin Xu, Lev Proleev, Daniel Sohn, Alberto Magni, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Isabel Gao, Santiago Ontanon, Oskar Bunyan, Nathan Byrd, Abhanshu Sharma, Biao Zhang, Mario Pinto, Rishika Sinha, Harsh Mehta, Dawei Jia, Sergi Caelles, Albert Webson, Alex Morris, Becca Roelofs, Yifan Ding, Robin Strudel, Xuehan Xiong, Marvin Ritter, Mostafa Dehghani, Rahma Chaabouni, Abhijit Karmarkar, Guangda Lai, Fabian Mentzer, Bibo Xu, YaGuang Li, Yujing Zhang, Tom Le Paine, Alex Goldin, Behnam Neyshabur, Kate Baumli, Anselm Levskaya, Michael Laskin, Wenhao Jia, Jack W. Rae, Kefan Xiao, Antoine He, Skye Giordano, Lakshman Yagati, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Paul Natsev, Sanjay Ganapathy, Fangyu Liu, Danilo Martins, Nanxin Chen, Yunhan Xu, Megan Barnes, Rhys May, Arpi Vezer, Junhyuk Oh, Ken Franko, Sophie Bridgers, Ruizhe Zhao, Boxi Wu, Basil Mustafa, Sean Sechrist, Emilio Parisotto, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Chris Larkin, Chenjie Gu, Christina Sorokin, Maxim Krikun, Alexey Guseynov, Jessica Landon, Romina Datta, Alexander Pritzel, Phoebe Thacker, Fan Yang, Kevin Hui, Anja Hauth, Chih-Kuan Yeh, David Barker, Justin Mao-Jones, Sophia Austin, Hannah Sheahan, Parker Schuh, James Svensson, Rohan Jain, Vinay Ramasesh, Anton Briukhov, Da-Woon Chung, Tamara von Glehn, Christina Butterfield, Priya Hakra, Matthew Wiethoff, Justin Frye, Jordan Grimstad, Beer Changpinyo, Charline Le Lan, Anna Bortsova, Yonghui Wu, Paul Voigtlaender, Tara Sainath, Shane Gu, Charlotte Smith, Will Hawkins, Kris Cao, James Besley, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Mark Omernick, Colin Gaffney, Gabriela Surita, Ryan Burnell, Bogdan Damoc, Junwhan Ahn, Andrew Brock, Mantas Pajarskas, Anastasia Petrushkina, Seb Noury, Lorenzo Blanco, Kevin Swersky, Arun Ahuja, Thi Avrahami, Vedant Misra, Raoul de Liedekerke, Mariko Iinuma, Alex Polozov, Sarah York, George van den Driessche, Paul Michel, Justin Chiu, Rory Blevins, Zach Gleicher, Adrià Recasens, Alban Rrustemi, Elena Gribovskaya, Aurko Roy, Wiktor Gworek, Sébastien M. R. Arnold, Lisa Lee, James Lee-Thorp, Marcello Maggioni, Enrique Piqueras, Kartikeya Badola, Sharad Vikram, Lucas Gonzalez, Anirudh Baddepudi, Evan Senter, Jacob Devlin, James Qin, Michael Azzam, Maja Trebacz, Martin Polacek, Kashyap Krishnakumar, Shuo yiin Chang, Matthew Tung, Ivo Penchev, Rishabh Joshi, Kate Olszewska, Carrie Muir, Mateo Wirth, Ale Jakse Hartman, Josh Newlan, Sheleem Kashem, Vijay Bolina, Elahe Dabir, Joost van Amersfoort, Zafarali Ahmed, James Cobon-Kerr, Aishwarya Kamath, Arnar Mar Hrafnkelsson, Le Hou, Ian Mackinnon, Alexandre Frechette, Eric Noland, Xiance Si, Emanuel Taropa, Dong Li, Phil Crone, Anmol Gulati, Sébastien Cevey, Jonas Adler, Ada Ma, David Silver, Simon Tokumine, Richard Powell, Stephan Lee, Kiran Vodrahalli, Samer Hassan, Diana Mincu, Antoine Yang, Nir Levine, Jenny Brennan, Mingqiu Wang, Sarah Hodgkinson, Jeffrey Zhao, Josh Lipschultz, Aedan Pope, Michael B. Chang, Cheng Li, Laurent El Shafey, Michela Paganini, Sholto Douglas, Bernd Bohnet, Fabio Pardo, Seth Odoom, Mihaela Rosca, Cicero Nogueira dos Santos, Kedar Soparkar, Arthur Guez, Tom Hudson, Steven Hansen, Chulayuth Asawaroengchai, Ravi Addanki, Tianhe Yu, Wojciech Stokowiec, Mina Khan, Justin Gilmer, Jaehoon Lee, Carrie Grimes Bostock, Keran Rong, Jonathan Caton, Pedram Pejman, Filip Pavetic, Geoff Brown, Vivek Sharma, Mario Lučić, Rajkumar Samuel, Josip Djolonga, Amol Mandhane, Lars Lowe Sjösund, Elena Buchatskaya, Elspeth White, Natalie Clay, Jiepu Jiang, Hyeontaek Lim, Ross Hemsley, Zeynep Cankara, Jane Labanowski, Nicola De Cao, David Steiner, Sayed Hadi Hashemi, Jacob Austin, Anita Gergely, Tim Blyth, Joe Stanton, Kaushik Shivakumar, Aditya Siddhant, Anders Andreassen, Carlos Araya, Nikhil Sethi, Rakesh Shivanna, Steven Hand, Ankur Bapna, Ali Khodaei, Antoine Miech, Garrett Tanzer, Andy Swing, Shantanu Thakoor, Lora Aroyo, Zhufeng Pan, Zachary Nado, Jakub Sygnowski, Stephanie Winkler, Dian Yu, Mohammad Saleh, Loren Maggiore, Yamini Bansal, Xavier Garcia, Mehran Kazemi, Piyush Patil, Ishita Dasgupta, Iain Barr, Minh Giang, Thais Kagohara, Ivo Danihelka, Amit Marathe, Vladimir Feinberg, Mohamed Elhawaty, Nimesh Ghelani, Dan Horgan, Helen Miller, Lexi Walker, Richard Tanburn, Mukarram Tariq, Disha Shrivastava, Fei Xia, Qingze Wang,

Chung-Cheng Chiu, Zoe Ashwood, Khuslen Baatarsukh, Sina Samangoei, Raphaël Lopez Kaufman, Fred Alcober, Axel Stjerngren, Paul Komarek, Katerina Tsihlias, Anudhyan Boral, Ramona Comanescu, Jeremy Chen, Ruibo Liu, Chris Welty, Dawn Bloxwich, Charlie Chen, Yanhua Sun, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Matthew Mauger, Xerxes Dotiwalla, Vincent Hellendoorn, Michael Sharman, Ivy Zheng, Krishna Haridasan, Gabe Barth-Maroon, Craig Swanson, Dominika Rogozińska, Alek Andreev, Paul Kishan Rubenstein, Ruoxin Sang, Dan Hurt, Gamaleldin Elsayed, Renshen Wang, Dave Lacey, Anastasija Ilić, Yao Zhao, Adam Iwanicki, Alejandro Lince, Alexander Chen, Christina Lyu, Carl Lebsack, Jordan Griffith, Meenu Gaba, Paramjit Sandhu, Phil Chen, Anna Koop, Ravi Rajwar, Soheil Hassas Yeganeh, Solomon Chang, Rui Zhu, Soroush Radpour, Elnaz Davoodi, Ving Ian Lei, Yang Xu, Daniel Toyama, Constant Segal, Martin Wicke, Hanzhao Lin, Anna Bulanova, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, Nemanja Rakićević, Pablo Sprechmann, Angelos Filos, Shaobo Hou, Víctor Campos, Nora Kassner, Devendra Sachan, Meire Fortunato, Chimeize Iwuanyanwu, Vitaly Nikolaev, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Sadegh Jazayeri, Mani Varadarajan, Chetan Tekur, Doug Fritz, Misha Khalman, David Reitter, Kingshuk Dasgupta, Shourya Sarcar, Tina Ornduff, Javier Snaider, Fantine Huot, Johnson Jia, Rupert Kemp, Nejc Trdin, Anitha Vijayakumar, Lucy Kim, Christof Angermueller, Li Lao, Tianqi Liu, Haibin Zhang, David Engel, Somer Greene, Anaïs White, Jessica Austin, Lilly Taylor, Shereen Ashraf, Dangyi Liu, Maria Georgaki, Irene Cai, Yana Kulizhskaya, Sonam Goenka, Brennan Saeta, Ying Xu, Christian Frank, Dario de Cesare, Brona Robenek, Harry Richardson, Mahmoud Alnahlawi, Christopher Yew, Priya Ponnampalli, Marco Tagliasacchi, Alex Korchemnyy, Yelin Kim, Dinghua Li, Bill Rosgen, Kyle Levin, Jeremy Wiesner, Praseem Banzal, Praveen Srinivasan, Hongkun Yu, Çağlar Ünlü, David Reid, Zora Tung, Daniel Finchelstein, Ravin Kumar, Andre Elisseeff, Jin Huang, Ming Zhang, Ricardo Aguilar, Mai Giménez, Jiawei Xia, Olivier Dousse, Willi Gierke, Damion Yates, Komal Jalan, Lu Li, Eri Latorre-Chimoto, Duc Dung Nguyen, Ken Durden, Praveen Kallakuri, Yaxin Liu, Matthew Johnson, Tomy Tsai, Alice Talbert, Jasmine Liu, Alexander Neitz, Chen Elkind, Marco Selvi, Mimi Jasarevic, Livio Baldini Soares, Albert Cui, Pidong Wang, Alek Wenjiao Wang, Xinyu Ye, Krystal Kallarackal, Lucia Loher, Hoi Lam, Josef Broder, Dan Holtmann-Rice, Nina Martin, Bramandia Ramadhana, Mrinal Shukla, Sujoy Basu, Abhi Mohan, Nick Fernando, Noah Fiedel, Kim Paterson, Hui Li, Ankush Garg, Jane Park, DongHyun Choi, Diane Wu, Sankalp Singh, Zhishuai Zhang, Amir Globerson, Lily Yu, John Carpenter, Félix de Chaumont Quitry, Carey Radebaugh, Chu-Cheng Lin, Alex Tudor, Prakash Shroff, Drew Garmon, Dayou Du, Neera Vats, Han Lu, Shariq Iqbal, Alex Yakubovich, Nilesh Tripuraneni, James Manyika, Haroon Qureshi, Nan Hua, Christel Ngani, Maria Abi Raad, Hannah Forbes, Jeff Stanway, Mukund Sundararajan, Victor Ungureanu, Colton Bishop, Yunjie Li, Balaji Venkatraman, Bo Li, Chloe Thornton, Salvatore Scellato, Nishesh Gupta, Yicheng Wang, Ian Tenney, Xihui Wu, Ashish Shenoy, Gabriel Carvajal, Diana Gage Wright, Ben Bariach, Zhuyun Xiao, Peter Hawkins, Sid Dalmia, Clement Farabet, Pedro Valenzuela, Quan Yuan, Ananth Agarwal, Mia Chen, Wooyeol Kim, Brice Hulse, Nandita Dukkkipati, Adam Paszke, Andrew Bolt, Kiam Choo, Jennifer Beattie, Jennifer Prendki, Harsha Vashisht, Rebeca Santamaria-Fernandez, Luis C. Cobo, Jarek Wilkiewicz, David Madras, Ali Elqursh, Grant Uy, Kevin Ramirez, Matt Harvey, Tyler Liechty, Heiga Zen, Jeff Seibert, Clara Huiyi Hu, Andrey Khorlin, Maigo Le, Asaf Aharoni, Megan Li, Lily Wang, Sandeep Kumar, Norman Casagrande, Jay Hoover, Dalia El Badawy, David Soergel, Denis Vnukov, Matt Miecznikowski, Jiri Simsa, Praveen Kumar, Thibault Sellam, Daniel Vlasic, Samira Daruki, Nir Shabat, John Zhang, Guolong Su, Jiageng Zhang, Jeremiah Liu, Yi Sun, Evan Palmer, Alireza Ghaffarkhah, Xi Xiong, Victor Cotruta, Michael Fink, Lucas Dixon, Ashwin Sreevatsa, Adrian Goedeckemeyer, Alek Dimitriev, Mohsen Jafari, Remi Crocker, Nicholas FitzGerald, Aviral Kumar, Sanjay Ghemawat, Ivan Philips, Frederick Liu, Yannie Liang, Rachel Sterneck, Alena Repina, Marcus Wu, Laura Knight, Marin Georgiev, Hyo Lee, Harry Askham, Abhishek Chakladar, Annie Louis, Carl Crous, Hardie Cate, Dessie Petrova, Michael Quinn, Denese Owusu-Afriyie, Achintya Singhal, Nan Wei, Solomon Kim, Damien Vincent, Milad Nasr, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Reiko Tojo, Shawn Lu, Diego de Las Casas, Yuchung Cheng, Tolga Bolukbasi, Katherine Lee, Saaber Fatehi, Rajagopal Ananthanarayanan, Miteyan Patel, Charbel Kaed, Jing Li, Shreyas Rammohan Belle, Zhe Chen, Jaclyn Konzelmann, Siim Pöder, Roopal Garg, Vinod Koverkathu, Adam Brown, Chris Dyer, Rosanne Liu, Azade Nova, Jun Xu, Alanna Walton, Alicia Parrish, Mark Epstein, Sara McCarthy, Slav Petrov, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Jeffrey Dean, and Oriol Vinyals. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context, 2024.

- [40] Mistral AI team. Au large. <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-large/>, 2024. (Accessed on 06/05/2024).
- [41] Qwen Team. Introducing qwen1.5, February 2024.
- [42] The Mosaic Research Team. Introducing dbrx: A new state-of-the-art open llm. <https://www.databricks.com/blog/introducing-dbrx-new-state-art-open-llm/>, 2024. (Accessed on 06/05/2024).
- [43] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.

- [44] Pat Verga, Sebastian Hofstatter, Sophia Althammer, Yixuan Su, Aleksandra Piktus, Arkady Arkhangorodsky, Minjie Xu, Naomi White, and Patrick Lewis. Replacing judges with juries: Evaluating llm generations with a panel of diverse models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18796*, 2024.
- [45] Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. 2019. In the Proceedings of ICLR.
- [46] Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13484–13508, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [47] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models, 2023.
- [48] Shuo Yang, Wei-Lin Chiang, Lianmin Zheng, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Rethinking benchmark and contamination for language models with rephrased samples, 2023.
- [49] Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800, 2019.
- [50] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-bench and chatbot arena. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2023.
- [51] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric P. Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [52] Wanjun Zhong, Ruixiang Cui, Yiduo Guo, Yaobo Liang, Shuai Lu, Yanlin Wang, Amin Saied, Weizhu Chen, and Nan Duan. Agieval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06364*, 2023.
- [53] Jeffrey Zhou, Tianjian Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Siddhartha Brahma, Sujoy Basu, Yi Luan, Denny Zhou, and Le Hou. Instruction-following evaluation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07911*, 2023.
- [54] Banghua Zhu, Evan Frick, Tianhao Wu, Hanlin Zhu, and Jiantao Jiao. Starling-7b: Improving llm helpfulness & harmlessness with rlaiif, November 2023.

## 10 Appendix

Judge	Model Name	Win Rate	Average Token #	
	gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09*	82.6	-1.8/+1.6	662
	gpt-4-0125-preview*	78.0	-2.2/+2.4	619
	claude-3-opus-20240229	60.4	-3.3/+2.4	541
	gpt-4-0314	50.0	-0.0/+0.0	423
	claude-3-sonnet-20240229	46.8	-2.1/+2.2	552
	claude-3-haiku-20240307	41.5	-2.8/+2.5	505
	llama-3-70b-instruct	41.1	-2.5/+2.4	583
	gpt-4-0613	37.9	-2.2/+2.0	354
	mistral-large-2402	37.7	-1.9/+2.6	400
	mixtral-8x22b-instruct-v0.1	36.4	-2.7/+2.9	430
	Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	36.1	-2.5/+2.2	474
	command-r-plus	33.1	-2.1/+2.2	541
	mistral-medium	31.9	-2.3/+2.4	485
	mistral-next	27.4	-2.1/+1.7	297
	gpt-3.5-turbo-0613	24.8	-1.6/+2.0	401
	claude-2.0	24.0	-2.5/+2.5	295
	dbx-instruct	23.9	-1.4/+1.5	415
	Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1	23.4	-2.3/+1.7	457
	gpt-3.5-turbo-0125	23.3	-2.2/+2.3	329
	Yi-34B-Chat	23.1	-1.8/+2.0	611
	Starling-LM-7B-beta	23.0	-1.9/+2.2	530
	claude-2.1	22.8	-1.6/+2.1	290
	Snorkel-Mistral-PairRM-DPO	20.7	-2.2/+1.5	564
	llama-3-8b-instruct	20.6	-2.5/+1.8	585
	gpt-3.5-turbo-1106	18.9	-1.6/+2.1	285
	gpt-3.5-turbo-0301	18.1	-1.7/+1.2	334
	gemini-1.0-pro	17.8	-1.7/+1.7	322
	command-r	17.0	-1.9/+1.7	432
	tulu-2-dpo-70b	15.0	-1.4/+1.2	550
	Starling-LM-7B-alpha	12.8	-1.4/+1.4	483
	mistral-7b-instruct-v0.2	12.6	-1.6/+1.3	541
	Llama-2-70b-chat-hf	11.6	-1.6/+1.4	595
	vicuna-33b-v1.3	8.6	-1.3/+1.0	451
	gemma-7b-it	7.5	-1.1/+1.2	378
	Llama-2-7b-chat-hf	4.6	-0.8/+0.8	561
	gemma-2b-it	3.0	-0.6/+0.7	369

Table 6: Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 Leaderboard (baseline: GPT-4-0314). \*GPT-4-Turbo’s high score can be due to the GPT-4 judge favoring GPT-4 outputs.

Judge	Model Name	Win Rate	Average Token #
<b>GPT-4-1106-Preview</b>	gpt-3.5-turbo-0125-detailed	29.86	421
	gpt-3.5-turbo-0125-chatty	23.89	361
	gpt-3.5-turbo-0125	23.2	328
<b>Claude-3-Opus</b>	gpt-3.5-turbo-0125-detailed	40.78	421
	gpt-3.5-turbo-0125-chatty	28.49	375
	gpt-3.5-turbo-0125	27.97	328

Table 7: Length Bias Comparison Between GPT and Claude as Judge. Prompt for detailed: “You are a helpful assistant who thoroughly explains things with as much detail as possible.”, prompt for chatty: “You are a helpful assistant who is chatty.”, and default prompt: “You are a helpful assistant.”

Model Name	Win Rate	Average Token #
gpt-3.5-turbo-0125-1	23.05	328
gpt-3.5-turbo-0125-2	22.93	328
gpt-3.5-turbo-0125-3	22.75	328

Table 8: Variances between 3 separate runs of Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 on gpt-3.5-turbo’s performance using GPT-4-1106-Preview as judge.




Figure 5: Above is the predicted model predicted probability against the bootstrapped arena “ground truth” probability (jittered to show clusters). While both Alpaca eval and Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 have large clusters around (0,0) and (1,1) signifying good forecasting, Arena-Hard-Auto v0.1 has lighter clusters on (0,1) and (1,0), if any, revealing less overconfidence. MT Bench has heavy tails along the top and bottom, revealing underconfidence. However, none of these benchmarks show an “ideal”  $y=x$  curve (with dense ends) expected with a perfectly calibrated forecast, signifying room for future research.






Figure 6: A more complete selection of mean scores of various topic clusters in descending order.

## 11 Prompts

### Prompt Quality Systems Instruction:

Your task is to evaluate how well the following input prompts can assess the capabilities of advanced AI assistants. For the input prompt, please analyze it based on the following 7 criteria. For each criteria, make sure to explain before determine whether the input satisfy it.

1. Specificity: Does the prompt ask for a specific, well-defined output without leaving any ambiguity? This allows the AI to demonstrate its ability to follow instructions and generate a precise, targeted response.
2. Domain Knowledge: Does the prompt test the AI's knowledge and understanding in a specific domain or set of domains? The prompt must demand the AI to have a strong prior knowledge or mastery of domain-specific concepts, theories, or principles.
3. Complexity: Does the prompt have multiple components, variables, or levels of depth and nuance? This assesses the AI's capability to handle complex, multi-faceted problems beyond simple queries.
4. Problem-Solving: Does the prompt require active problem-solving: analyzing and clearly defining the problem and systematically devising and implementing a solution? Note active problem-solving is not simply reciting facts or following a fixed set of instructions.
5. Creativity: Does the prompt require a creative approach or solution? This tests the AI's ability to generate novel ideas tailored to the specific needs of the request or problem at hand.
6. Technical Accuracy: Does the prompt require an answer with a high degree of technical accuracy, correctness and precision? This assesses the reliability and truthfulness of the AI's outputs.
7. Real-World Application: Does the prompt relate to real-world applications? This tests the AI's ability to provide practical and actionable information that could be implemented in real-life scenarios.

After analyzing the input prompt based on these criteria, you must list the criteria numbers that the prompt satisfies in the format of a Python array. For example, "Criteria Satisfied: [1, 2, 4, 6, 7]".

### LLM-Judge System Instruction

Please act as an impartial judge and evaluate the quality of the responses provided by two AI assistants to the user prompt displayed below. You will be given assistant A's answer and assistant B's answer. Your job is to evaluate which assistant's answer is better.

Begin your evaluation by generating your own answer to the prompt. You must provide your answers before judging any answers.

When evaluating the assistants' answers, compare both assistants' answers with your answer. You must identify and correct any mistakes or inaccurate information.

Then consider if the assistant's answers are helpful, relevant, and concise. Helpful means the answer correctly responds to the prompt or follows the instructions. Note when user prompt has any ambiguity or more than one interpretation, it is more helpful and appropriate to ask for clarifications or more information from the user than providing an answer based on assumptions. Relevant means all parts of the response closely connect or are appropriate to what is being asked. Concise means the response is clear and not verbose or excessive.

Then consider the creativity and novelty of the assistant's answers when needed. Finally, identify any missing important information in the assistants' answers that would be beneficial to include when responding to the user prompt.

After providing your explanation, you must output only one of the following choices as your final verdict with a label:

1. Assistant A is significantly better: `[[A>>B]]`
2. Assistant A is slightly better: `[[A>B]]`
3. Tie, relatively the same: `[[A=B]]`
4. Assistant B is slightly better: `[[B>A]]`
5. Assistant B is significantly better: `[[B>>A]]`

Example output: "My final verdict is tie: `[[A=B]]`".

## 12 Additional Examples

**User:** Use ABC notation to write a melody in the style of a folk tune.

**GPT-4:**

```
X:1 T:Untitled Folk Tune M:4/4 L:1/8
K:G|:G2A2|B2A2|G2E2|D4|E2F2|G2F2|E2C2|B,4|A2B2|c2B2|A2F2|E4|D2E2|F2E2|D2B,2|C4:|
```

**GPT-3.5-Turbo:** Sure! Here's a simple melody in the style of a folk tune written in ABC notation:

```
X:1 T:Folk Tune M:4/4 L:1/4 K:C
CDE|FGA|BAG|FED| CDE|FGA|BAG|c2z| CDE|FGA|BAG|FED| CDE|FGA|BAG|c2z||
```

This melody is in the key of C major and consists of four measures. Feel free to modify it or add more sections to create your own folk tune!

**Judgement:** My own answer to the prompt would be:

```
X:1 T:My Folk Melody M:3/4 L:1/8
K:D A2|:d2f2a2|b2a2f2|e2d2B2|A4F2| G2A2B2|A2G2F2|E2D2F2|1D6:|2D4A2|
|:d2f2a2|b2a2f2|e2c2A2|B4A2| G2A2B2|A2G2F2|E2D2F2|1D6:|2D4||
```

This melody is in the key of D major, has a 3/4 time signature, and is structured in a typical AAB form common in folk music. It uses a range of an octave, which is typical for folk tunes that need to be easily singable.

Now, let's evaluate the responses from Assistant A and Assistant B.

**Assistant A's Answer:** Assistant A provides a melody in ABC notation that is coherent and follows the structure of a folk tune. The melody is in 4/4 time, which is common for folk music, and it is in the key of G major. The melody has a two-part form (indicated by the repeat signs |: and :|), which is typical in folk music. The range of the melody is appropriate for a folk tune, and the rhythm is simple and repetitive, which is characteristic of the genre.

**Assistant B's Answer:** Assistant B also provides a melody in ABC notation that is coherent and could be considered in the style of a folk tune. The melody is in 4/4 time and the key of C major. The melody consists of four measures repeated twice, which is a simple structure that could be found in folk music. However, Assistant B's melody is less traditional in its form compared to Assistant A's, as it does not have a distinct A and B section, which is more common in folk tunes. Additionally, the use of "z" for a half-measure rest is less typical in folk tunes, which usually have a more continuous melodic line.

**Comparison:** Both assistants provided melodies that could be considered folk tunes. Assistant A's melody has a more traditional structure with a clear A and B section, while Assistant B's melody is simpler and does not follow the traditional AAB or AB form. Assistant A's melody is also more detailed in terms of the ABC notation, providing a full eight-measure section that is repeated, which gives a more complete sense of the tune. Assistant B's melody is correct in its notation but is more basic and less representative of a traditional folk tune structure.

In terms of helpfulness, relevance, and conciseness, both assistants provided relevant and concise answers. However, Assistant A's answer is slightly more helpful due to the more traditional structure of the provided melody.

Creativity and novelty are not particularly applicable in this context, as the task is to create a melody in a traditional style rather than to innovate. Both assistants showed an understanding of the folk tune style, but Assistant A's answer aligns more closely with traditional folk structures.

There are no significant mistakes or inaccurate information in either assistant's answers. However, Assistant B's use of the rest "z" in a folk tune is less conventional.

My final verdict is: Assistant A is slightly better: [[A>B]].

**User:** Can you come up with a 12 bar chord progression in C that works in the Lydian mode?

**GPT-4:** Sure! In the Lydian mode, the chords are built on the scale degrees of the Lydian scale. Here's a 12-bar chord progression in C Lydian:

Cmaj7	Dmaj7	Em7	F#m7b5
Cmaj7	Dmaj7	Em7	F#m7b5
Cmaj7	Dmaj7	Em7	Cmaj7

This progression uses the I, II, iii, and iv° chords of the C Lydian mode.

**GPT-3.5-Turbo:** Certainly! Here's a 12-bar chord progression in C that works in the Lydian mode:

Cmaj7 | Cmaj7 | Cmaj7 | Cmaj7 | Fmaj7 | Fmaj7  
| Cmaj7 | Cmaj7 | G7 | Fmaj7 | Cmaj7 | G7 |

In this progression, the Cmaj7 chords establish the tonality in C Lydian, while the Fmaj7 and G7 chords add some tension and movement. Feel free to experiment with different voicings and rhythms to make it your own!

**Judgement:** Assistant B is significantly better: [[B>>A]].