

No Dataset Needed for Downstream Knowledge Benchmarking: Response Dispersion Inversely Correlates with Accuracy on Domain-specific QA

Robert L Simone II*
Columbia University

Abstract

This research seeks to obviate the need for creating QA datasets and grading (chatbot) LLM responses when comparing LLMs' knowledge in specific topic domains. This is done in an entirely end-user centric way without need for access to any inner workings of the LLM, so long as it can be prompted and given a random seed to create different generations to the same prompt. The paper does this by, for a given topic domain, defining the "response dispersion" of an LLM by repeatedly asking an LLM the same opinion question about that topic domain. Namely, the response dispersion is the count of singular values needed to explain 95% of the variance in the embedding matrix of the LLM's responses. It is found that the response dispersion is inversely correlated with accuracy on relevant QA evaluations (average spearman rank correlation stronger than $-.59$). A use-case analysis shows that when comparing two different LLMs on the same topic domain, comparing their response dispersion is a suitable replacement for comparing their QA accuracy between 74% and 89% of the time, the range depending on certain reasonable accuracy-difference tolerances that may be acceptable to an end-user in exchange for the labor being saved using response dispersion instead of QA accuracy for comparison. Two response embeddings are studied for creating the embedding matrix in this study, one is from OpenAI's APIs and one is a novel embedding, here named reference sentence similarity embeddings, that can be computed locally and performs very nearly as well in calculating response dispersion. Also in this research, a pre-existing dataset called the IRC-Wiki Trivia dataset, originally developed for trivia games, has been re-purposed, curated, and the curation, called IRC-WikiTriviaQA, is made available for the purpose of this research.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Motivation

When designing an AI-powered application that will use an LLM as part of its processing, a decision needs to be made about which LLM to use for the purpose. There are many benchmarks for comparing the capabilities of LLMs, and, other considerations held equal, it is generally preferable to use an LLM that has more knowledge about relevant topic domains than not. (Chang et al., 2024, Section 4.2) While this seems true just intuitively, there is also experimental evidence verifying this. (Liu et al., 2024, Section 2.3) showed that a model's ability to answer questions without any assistance can, in some circumstances, provide a correct answer more often than even when the answer to the question is itself a

*. robert.simione@columbia.edu

part of the prompt.¹ As stated in (Chang et al., 2024, Section 4.2), "Question-answering benchmarks have become a fundamental component in the assessment of LLMs and their overall performance [on downstream tasks]."

However, creating datasets for QA benchmarking in a particular topic domain is labor intensive since an expert first needs to create a QA dataset relevant to the topic domain and then needs to grade LLM responses against the answer key. While the percentage of questions answered correctly is useful as a measurement of an LLM's knowledge in that topic domain, the goal of the practitioner building an AI-powered application under a deadline is merely to figure out which is the best currently existing LLM to plug into his or her application. This paper introduces a methodology where the practitioner can answer this question without creating a QA benchmarking dataset yet arrive at the same conclusion quickly and cheaply. In the scenario of comparing two LLM's against each other in a particular topic domain, 74% of the time this novel methodology produces the same answer as would have been produced by creating the QA benchmark dataset and grading the LLM responses. Further, in exchange for the massive labor savings this process would give the practitioner, it is likely they would be willing to select the worse of the pair so long as it's not worse by "too much", quantified here by what will be called a "tolerance level". At a 5% tolerance this procedure produces the better or good enough LLM 82% of the time, and at 10% tolerance the LLM selected is better or good enough 89% of the time.

1.2 End-User Centric Assumptions

The procedure created is designed with certain assumptions about a working practitioner in mind. This is because while some LLMs such as Meta's LLama series of models are open-source and provide access to their weights so that activations can be analyzed directly, it's also true that many LLMs used in practice are proprietary and thus kept behind remote-access-only API endpoints where neuron-activation-analysis is not possible. Thus in designing this procedure only 3 assumptions are made:

1. The chatbot is known to use a probabilistic procedure such that responses can vary depending on a randomizer seed value. (This is true of arguably all LLMs being used today but wouldn't be true of an older chatbot like ELIZA which may have zero response dispersion but would always perform poorly on a QA benchmark dataset.)
2. This random seed can be set so that multiple distinct generations to the same prompt can be accumulated.
3. The chatbot can be asked a question from a clean context window multiple times.

All of these assumptions are valid for nearly all chatbots on the open market today. Specifically, this study tested LLMs available through OpenRouter.ai APIs, a platform on which many proprietary and open-source LLMs are available for prompting through an API endpoint.

1. "For example, GPT-3.5-Turbo's multi-document QA performance can drop by more than 20%—in the worst case, performance in 20- and 30-document settings is lower than performance without any input documents (i.e., closed-book performance; 56.1%)." (Liu et al., 2024)

These end-user centric assumptions ensure that the procedure is applicable to a wide range of LLMs, including those that are proprietary and accessible only through API endpoints, thereby broadening the procedure’s utility across different use cases.

1.3 Procedure Overview

The procedure detailed and validated in this paper is as follows:

1. Specify your topic domain, e.g. "Sports", "Movies", "Music"
2. For each LLM, ask it multiple times (in this paper 100) with different seeds to answer an opinion question about that topic domain to create a list of responses from that LLM.
3. For each list of responses, create an embedding matrix where every row is the embedding of a response from the list. (Two different embedding methods are tested in this paper.)
4. For each LLM’s embedding matrix, count how many singular values are needed to explain 95% of the variance in the matrix’s rows. This count is here named the LLM’s response dispersion for the specified topic domain.
5. The LLM with the lower response dispersion either would perform better than the other LLM on a hypothetical QA benchmark dataset 74% of the time, or it would perform within at-most 10% tolerance on the hypothetical QA benchmark of the other LLM 89% of the time.

1.4 Paper structure

The rest of this paper is structured as follows:

Section 2 motivates the study of response dispersion and its relation to QA benchmark accuracy. Subsection 2.1 describes the motivating hypothesis for why this measurement was focused on and studied with the expectation that it would correlate with QA benchmark accuracy. Subsection 2.2 defines response dispersion given an embedding matrix. Subsection 2.3 discusses the two text embeddings used and introduces a novel text embedding, reference sentence similarity embeddings, which on this task performed nearly as well as OpenAI’s `text-embedding-3-large` embeddings while being faster and cheaper and able to compute locally.

Section 3 describes how the use of response dispersion was validated as useful for the intended LLM-comparing use-case. Subsection 3.1 introduces a repurposed and curated QA dataset of trivia questions across different topic domains called `IRC-WikiTriviaQA`. Subsection 3.2 and subsection 3.3 describe how the `IRC-WikiTriviaQA` was used to find QA benchmark measurements for candidate LLMs studied for 12 different topic domains with subsection 3.2 describing how LLMs were prompted to respond to `IRC-WikiTriviaQA` and subsection 3.3 describing and validating how the LLMs’ responses were graded against the `IRC-WikiTriviaQA` answer key.

Section 4 compiles and compares the QA benchmark scores collected with the response dispersions across the various topic domains in the IRC-WikiTriviaQA dataset. The results of the use-case analysis are presented, first averaged over all categories, then a table is presented for each category ordering the models studied on their QA benchmark accuracy, and on each of the response dispersions studied.

Section 5 discusses some shortcomings and not-yet-explored directions of the current work.

2 Response Dispersion

2.1 Motivating Hypothesis

This section motivates the hypothesis that is later validated experimentally.

Probabilistic text generation is a stochastic process guided by the weights learned during training, where subsequent tokens in a response are determined by logits output by an LLM. These logits are used to define a probability distribution from which the next token of a LLM’s reply is selected. This means that different response generations to the same prompt will generate different responses.

The motivating hypothesis of this paper is that sharper contrast in the output logits of the LLM should correlate with the LLM being more sure (measured by probability) in its output, which ought to (assuming the information it was trained on is truthful) correlate to it having more factual knowledge. However, since the goal is to measure this from the point of view of an end-user of an LLM, it is not always possible to measure the logits directly, as in the case with proprietary LLMs that are accessed remotely through API endpoints. Thus this paper analyzes ways to measure how dispersed the responses of an LLM are when given the same prompt about a topic many times.

In an effort to give the latent diversity of potential responses the best opportunity to be detected, a prompt template is used that asks the LLM a generic opinion question about a topic category. The topic category is left as a variable so that different domains of discourse can be evaluated by plugging in their name into the `category` variable. In particular, the prompt is:

Here is a test for evaluating LLMs. I want to see how well you follow my instructions when constructing your response.

I want you to respond with a SINGLE WORD, and ONLY THAT. Do not add any other context, other words, notes, explanations, justifications, or objections to my phrasing of this question. Now, please tell me in a single word what is your favorite thing to discuss related to the topic category of "`{category}`". Do not respond with the "favorite", "discussions", or "`{category}`".

This was asked of each LLM studied 100 times, with different passed as an argument seeds for each ask. The explicit request to keep the answer succinct is there to help in measuring the diversity of answers by keeping most of the response, because it is easier to programmatically measure the difference in answers like ["XYZ", "XYZ", "ABC"] rather than in answers like ["I like to talk about XYZ", "XYZ is nice to discuss", "I like to talk about ABC"].

2.2 Defining Response Dispersion Using Response Embeddings

The previous subsection motivated the need to measure how dispersed responses to the prompt are when asked multiple times. Assuming you have embeddings for each response that sufficiently capture the important similarities and differences in responses to the prompt, then a straightforward way to define response dispersion is to take the embedding matrix where each row is the embedding of a response, and count how many singular values of this matrix (starting from the largest and counting in descending order) are required to explain some threshold of variation in the embeddings, say 95%.

2.3 Response Embeddings Used

Different embedding methods can be dropped-in-place for defining the Response Dispersion as above. This paper looks at two different candidate embedding methods for embedding LLM responses. One is simply to use the embeddings provided by OpenAI’s text embedding API using the model `text-embedding-3-large`, currently available over a remotely accessed API endpoint. The other embedding method is novel to this paper, here called “reference sentence similarity embeddings” and abbreviated as rss embeddings. In the use-case analysis described later, their performance is nearly indistinguishable with the `text-embedding-3-large` embeddings having a marginally better performance compared to rss embeddings; however rss embeddings have benefits in that they capture almost all the same variation while being lower dimension, they are quicker to obtain (compared to retrieving embeddings over a remote API), and are computed locally.

Given a set of sentences to be called “reference sentences” $\{r_j\}_j$, and a sentence similarity scoring method $s(\cdot, \cdot) \rightarrow [0, 1]$, then a reference sentence similarity embedding for a string t is a vector where the j -th component of the embedding of t is $s(t, r_j)$.

From now on, this paper will use a normalized edit similarity score called the normalized Indel similarity which is a special case of a normalized Levenshtein similarity score.

The reference sentences used will be all the responses to be embedded. This means that for a collection of responses $\{t_i\}_i$ the embedding matrix is going to its i, j -th component be $s(t_i, t_j)$. Thus the i -th row of the embedding matrix will be the rss embedding of t_i using all $\{t_j\}_j$ as reference sentences.

3 Validation Methodology

3.1 Introducing the IRC-WikiTriviaQA Dataset

To validate the use of response dispersion in comparing LLM’s knowledge, this paper presents a use-case analysis where the comparison of response dispersion measurements is evaluated in its suitability as a proxy for comparing between candidate LLMs’ percentage of correct answers to trivia questions, calculated on a per-category basis i.e. the result of the gold-standard human labeling assessment described in the introduction. The hand-labeled dataset used, `IRC-WikiTriviaQA`, is a repurposement and curation of the original IRC-Wiki Trivia dataset which is available at (Bertrum et al., 2012) and was released under a CC-by-SA-3.0 license (Commons). The author’s curation of the dataset used for this paper is being released under the same license at (Simione II, 2024). The author kindly requests

any users of IRC-WikiTriviaQA to cite both this paper and the original IRC-Wiki Trivia dataset.

The original dataset contains the categories "Animals", "Computers", "Food", "Geography", "History", "Movies", "Movies - Quote", "Music - Name the artist", "Music - Name the movie", "Music - Finish these lyrics", "Music", "Science", "Football", "Sport", "Religion/Mythology", "Mythology", "TV-Cartoons", and "TV" and 1671 questions. To curate the dataset, the following steps were taken:

1. Any question from the "Anime", "Videogame", "Religion/Mythology", and "Mythology" categories was dropped.
2. The category "Movies - Quote" was merged into "Movies".
3. The categories "Music - Name the movie", "Music - Name the artist", and "Music - Finish these lyrics" were merged into "Music".
4. Any question with multiple possible answers (as defined by the answer key) were dropped.
5. Everything else is otherwise left the same.

After this, the curated dataset has 1397 questions over 11 categories, broken down in the following table:

IRC-WikiTriviaQA breakdown	
Category	# of Questions
Animals	136
Computers	29
Food	218
Football	169
Geography	77
History	84
Movies	219
Music	287
Science	55
Sport	14
TV	17
TV-Cartoons	69

3.2 Prompting LLM responses to the IRC-Wiki Trivia questions

This study evaluated 10 different chat-tuned foundation models against this trivia dataset. For each trivia question in the dataset, the question and its category (given by the dataset) were variables placed into the following prompt template that was sent to each LLM studied:

Here is a test for evaluating LLMs. I want to see how well you follow my instructions when constructing your response.

I want you to respond with the answer to a ”{category}” related trivia question, and ONLY THAT. Do not add any other context or explanation. Now, please tell me the answer to the following trivia question:”{question}”

For each question, each LLM was prompted for a response once using a random seed of 0 with a temperature of 0.²

3.3 Grading the LLM responses to the IRC-Wiki Trivia questions

In total there were 13888 responses to be graded across the different questions and models.³ In order to evaluate possible automated grading methodologies, the author sampled 1000 responses from the 13888 responses and hand-graded whether, the author being informed by the trivia question and the answer key’s answer, if the sampled responses contained the answer key’s answer within it. The goal was to have the hand-graded sample be a gold standard in capturing subtleties in responses that mere string comparisons could easily miss, such as when answering the question ”Which two countries share Victoria Falls?” the answer ”zambia and zimbabwe” provided by an LLM being actually the same as the answer key’s ”zimbabwe and zambia” or that in answer the question ”In which film did Bill Murray drive an ectomobile?” the LLM’s response ”the answer is ghostbusters 1984” is marked correct against the answer key’s ”ghostbusters”. Thus each of the 1000 sampled responses was hand-checked and graded that the LLM in that case had gotten the answer right, wrong, or if it was ambiguous to the author whether the LLM’s response should be considered right or wrong then it was held out. 30 responses out of the 1000 sampled fell into this last category, and so 970 hand-checked grades were used in evaluating automated grading methodologies.

The first methodology evaluated for autograding the LLM responses was to remove punctuation from the answer key’s answer and LLM response, lowercase all letters, and check if the post-processed answer key’s answer was a substring of the post-processed LLM response. Based on the 970 hand-graded examples, this assigned the correct grade to the LLM’s response 90.5% of the time.

The second grading methodology was to grade each LLM response by sending the following prompt to GPT4 for each question, answer key answer, and LLM response:

Here is a test for evaluating LLMs. I want to see how well you follow my instructions when constructing your response.

I want you to respond with a SINGLE WORD, either ”Yes” or ”No”, and ONLY THAT. Do not add any other context, other words, notes, explanations, justifications, or objections to my phrasing of this question. Now, I am going to show you a trivia question in the category ”{category}”. I am going to show you the question, and then the answer key’s answer, and then the answer from an

2. Note the use of a specific temperature does not contradict the end-user-centric assumptions in subsection 1.2 because the end-user is not meant to be replicating this ground-truth accuracy measurement, the end-user is only intended to calculate the response dispersion.

3. One might expect 10 models * 1397 to mean there would be 13970 responses to grade, however occasionally requests would be dropped or otherwise receive some internal server error as a response. Since this was spread roughly evenly across models and question categories it will not bias the dataset.

LLM respondent. I want you to respond "Yes" if the *respondent's* response contains the correct answer. Otherwise, answer "No". Here is the question: "{question}" Here is the the answer key's answer: "{answer_key_answer}" Here is the respondent's response: "{response}" Now please respond with just Yes/No.

GPT4 successfully followed the prompt's instruction to always answer with just "Yes" or "No". GPT4's grading agreed with the author on 98.4% the hand-graded sample, so GPT4's grades are used for the rest of this paper.

3.4 Response Dispersion Use-Case Analysis Defined

For each possible tolerance parameter, every unique model-pair and topic category combination goes through the following process:

1. The response dispersion is calculated for each of the two models on that category. The model with the lower response dispersion is called "the chosen model" in this process.
2. If, within this category, the chosen model has a ground truth accuracy that is greater than the other model's ground truth accuracy minus the tolerance level, then this is scored as a success for the process.

The success % of outcomes is calculated per category, since models are only intended to be compared within a given domain of discourse, same as hand-labeled qa datasets would only be defined over a particular domain of discouse of interest.

A baseline for each category is also defined for comparison. It is calculated using a 100 iteration monte carlo simulation where in one iteration every unique pair of models is compared:

1. "The chosen model" in this case is chosen at random.
2. If, within this category, the chosen model has a ground truth accuracy that is greater than the other model's ground truth accuracy minus the tolerance level, then this is scored as a success.

The success % of outcomes for the baseline is calculated per category, averaged over the 100 iterations.

3.5 LLMs studied

This research studied 10 candidate models in particular, all of whom were queried through the Openrouter.ai API. The following table lists the Openrouter.ai model identifier (which is a canonical identifier for the model and model-version used) and the short name for the model used later in the results section of this paper.

Openrouter.ai model identifier	Short name
01-ai/yi-34b-chat	Yi-34b
anthropic/claude-3-opus	Claude3-Opus
codellama/codellama-70b-instruct	Codellama-70b
google/gemini-pro	Gemini-Pro
gpt-3.5-turbo-1106	GPT-3.5
gpt-4-1106-preview	GPT-4
meta-llama/llama-2-70b-chat	Llama2-70b
meta-llama/llama-3-70b-instruct:nitro	Llama3-70b
meta-llama/llama-3-8b-instruct:nitro	Llama3-8b
mistralai/mistral-7b-instruct	Mistral-7bv0.1
mistralai/mistral-7b-instruct:nitro	Mistral-7bv0.2
mistralai/mixtral-8x22b	Mixtral-8x22b
mistralai/mixtral-8x7b-instruct:nitro	Mixtral-8x7b

4 Results

4.1 Success % averaged over all categories

Response Dispersion by Embedding	0% tolerance	5% tolerance	10% tolerance
Reference Sentence Similarities (RSS)	71.5%	80.4%	87.2%
OpenAI <code>text-embedding-3-large</code>	73.5%	81.7%	88.5%
random choice baseline	50.9%	59.5%	67.5%

The success % averaged over all categories is graphed against all tolerance levels in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Success % of choosing the best or good-enough model at different tolerance levels, averaged over all models and topic categories

4.2 Models ranked in each category by QA Benchmark, and Response Dispersion

The following tables give details, broken down by each topic category found in IRC-WikiTriviaQA, of the accuracy of each model on the QA benchmark, of the orderings of the models given by rank dispersion calculations for both the OpenAI `text-embedding-3-large` embeddings and the RSS embeddings, and the correlations between the rankings of the models by all three metrics.

Category:Animals	
Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.59; QA-RSS -0.59; RSS-OpenAI 0.98	
QA Benchmark	1. Claude3-Opus (91.4%), 2. GPT-4 (88.6%), 3. GPT-3.5 (85.7%), 4. Gemini-Pro (82.1%), 5. Yi-34b (79.3%), 6. Mixtral-8x7b (77.9%), 7. Llama2-70b (74.3%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.1 (68.6%), 9. Mistral-7bv0.2 (67.9%), 10. Codellama-70b (11.4%)
OpenAI's <code>text-embedding-3-large</code> Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (5), 2. GPT-4 (6), 3. Mistral-7bv0.2 (15), 4. GPT-3.5 (16), 5. Mistral-7bv0.1 (25), 6. Gemini-Pro (29), 7. Llama2-70b (42), 8. Yi-34b (60), 9. Mixtral-8x7b (68), 10. Codellama-70b (81)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. GPT-4 (3), 2. Claude3-Opus (4), 3. Mistral-7bv0.2 (7), 4. GPT-3.5 (8), 5. Gemini-Pro (14), 6. Mistral-7bv0.1 (14), 7. Llama2-70b (23), 8. Yi-34b (47), 9. Mixtral-8x7b (47), 10. Codellama-70b (79)
Category:Computers	
Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.64; QA-RSS -0.64; RSS-OpenAI 0.98	
QA Benchmark	1. Claude3-Opus (86.2%), 2. GPT-4 (82.8%), 3. GPT-3.5 (82.8%), 4. Yi-34b (74.1%), 5. Llama2-70b (69.0%), 6. Mixtral-8x7b (65.5%), 7. Gemini-Pro (65.5%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.1 (58.6%), 9. Mistral-7bv0.2 (55.2%), 10. Codellama-70b (3.5%)
OpenAI's <code>text-embedding-3-large</code> Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (2), 2. GPT-4 (3), 3. Mixtral-8x7b (3), 4. GPT-3.5 (9), 5. Llama2-70b (12), 6. Mistral-7bv0.2 (12), 7. Mistral-7bv0.1 (18), 8. Gemini-Pro (23), 9. Yi-34b (58), 10. Codellama-70b (85)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (1), 2. GPT-4 (1), 3. Mixtral-8x7b (1), 4. GPT-3.5 (5), 5. Llama2-70b (5), 6. Mistral-7bv0.2 (5), 7. Mistral-7bv0.1 (9), 8. Gemini-Pro (12), 9. Yi-34b (47), 10. Codellama-70b (84)
Category:Food	
Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.54; QA-RSS -0.54; RSS-OpenAI 0.98	
QA Benchmark	1. Claude3-Opus (91.2%), 2. GPT-4 (87.7%), 3. GPT-3.5 (82.9%), 4. Mixtral-8x7b (75.4%), 5. Gemini-Pro (74.6%), 6. Yi-34b (74.2%), 7. Llama2-70b (71.5%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.1 (68.4%), 9. Mistral-7bv0.2 (65.8%), 10. Codellama-70b (1.8%)
OpenAI's <code>text-embedding-3-large</code> Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (4), 2. Mistral-7bv0.2 (5), 3. GPT-4 (6), 4. Mixtral-8x7b (7), 5. GPT-3.5 (9), 6. Mistral-7bv0.1 (14), 7. Llama2-70b (19), 8. Gemini-Pro (27), 9. Yi-34b (64), 10. Codellama-70b (82)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. Mistral-7bv0.2 (1), 2. Claude3-Opus (2), 3. GPT-4 (2), 4. Mixtral-8x7b (3), 5. GPT-3.5 (5), 6. Mistral-7bv0.1 (7), 7. Llama2-70b (10), 8. Gemini-Pro (12), 9. Yi-34b (52), 10. Codellama-70b (81)

Category:Football	
Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.79; QA-RSS -0.79; RSS-OpenAI 0.99	
QA Benchmark	1. GPT-4 (100.0%), 2. Claude3-Opus (98.8%), 3. GPT-3.5 (98.2%), 4. Gemini-Pro (95.3%), 5. Llama2-70b (91.1%), 6. Mixtral-8x7b (86.4%), 7. Yi-34b (82.0%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.2 (79.3%), 9. Mistral-7bv0.1 (77.5%), 10. Codellama-70b (4.7%)
OpenAI's <code>text-embedding-3-large</code> Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (4), 2. GPT-4 (5), 3. GPT-3.5 (6), 4. Gemini-Pro (19), 5. Mistral-7bv0.2 (23), 6. Mistral-7bv0.1 (27), 7. Llama2-70b (39), 8. Yi-34b (59), 9. Mixtral-8x7b (79), 10. Codellama-70b (83)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. GPT-4 (2), 2. Claude3-Opus (3), 3. GPT-3.5 (4), 4. Gemini-Pro (8), 5. Mistral-7bv0.2 (13), 6. Mistral-7bv0.1 (18), 7. Llama2-70b (22), 8. Yi-34b (48), 9. Mixtral-8x7b (64), 10. Codellama-70b (83)
Category:Geography	
Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.49; QA-RSS -0.49; RSS-OpenAI 0.99	
QA Benchmark	1. GPT-3.5 (93.5%), 2. Claude3-Opus (92.2%), 3. GPT-4 (90.9%), 4. Gemini-Pro (87.0%), 5. Yi-34b (86.8%), 6. Llama2-70b (84.4%), 7. Mixtral-8x7b (83.1%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.2 (80.5%), 9. Mistral-7bv0.1 (80.5%), 10. Codellama-70b (13.0%)
OpenAI's <code>text-embedding-3-large</code> Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (4), 2. GPT-4 (5), 3. Mistral-7bv0.2 (15), 4. Llama2-70b (17), 5. GPT-3.5 (18), 6. Mistral-7bv0.1 (19), 7. Gemini-Pro (20), 8. Mixtral-8x7b (26), 9. Yi-34b (67), 10. Codellama-70b (85)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (3), 2. GPT-4 (3), 3. Llama2-70b (7), 4. Mistral-7bv0.2 (7), 5. GPT-3.5 (8), 6. Mistral-7bv0.1 (8), 7. Gemini-Pro (10), 8. Mixtral-8x7b (18), 9. Yi-34b (54), 10. Codellama-70b (84)
Category:History	
Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.69; QA-RSS -0.69; RSS-OpenAI 0.99	
QA Benchmark	1. Claude3-Opus (97.6%), 2. GPT-4 (94.0%), 3. GPT-3.5 (91.7%), 4. Gemini-Pro (86.9%), 5. Yi-34b (83.1%), 6. Mixtral-8x7b (81.0%), 7. Mistral-7bv0.2 (81.0%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.1 (79.8%), 9. Llama2-70b (79.8%), 10. Codellama-70b (2.4%)
OpenAI's <code>text-embedding-3-large</code> Response Dispersion	1. GPT-4 (3), 2. Mixtral-8x7b (4), 3. Claude3-Opus (5), 4. GPT-3.5 (15), 5. Mistral-7bv0.2 (16), 6. Gemini-Pro (19), 7. Mistral-7bv0.1 (24), 8. Llama2-70b (46), 9. Yi-34b (72), 10. Codellama-70b (84)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. GPT-4 (1), 2. Mixtral-8x7b (1), 3. Claude3-Opus (2), 4. GPT-3.5 (7), 5. Mistral-7bv0.2 (7), 6. Gemini-Pro (8), 7. Mistral-7bv0.1 (14), 8. Llama2-70b (25), 9. Yi-34b (63), 10. Codellama-70b (84)
Category:Movies	
Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.55; QA-RSS -0.55; RSS-OpenAI 0.96	
QA Benchmark	1. Claude3-Opus (90.6%), 2. GPT-4 (88.3%), 3. GPT-3.5 (80.3%), 4. Gemini-Pro (70.4%), 5. Yi-34b (69.3%), 6. Mixtral-8x7b (66.4%), 7. Llama2-70b (66.4%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.1 (53.4%), 9. Mistral-7bv0.2 (52.0%), 10. Codellama-70b (17.5%)

OpenAI's text-embedding-3-large Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (5), 2. Mixtral-8x7b (5), 3. GPT-4 (6), 4. GPT-3.5 (13), 5. Mistral-7bv0.2 (20), 6. Mistral-7bv0.1 (25), 7. Gemini-Pro (27), 8. Llama2-70b (52), 9. Yi-34b (63), 10. Codellama-70b (84)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. GPT-4 (3), 2. Mixtral-8x7b (3), 3. Claude3-Opus (4), 4. GPT-3.5 (7), 5. Mistral-7bv0.2 (10), 6. Gemini-Pro (12), 7. Mistral-7bv0.1 (15), 8. Llama2-70b (31), 9. Yi-34b (52), 10. Codellama-70b (81)
Category:Music Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.1; QA-RSS -0.1; RSS-OpenAI 0.99	
QA Benchmark	1. GPT-4 (87.4%), 2. Claude3-Opus (85.6%), 3. GPT-3.5 (82.4%), 4. Yi-34b (67.2%), 5. Gemini-Pro (66.0%), 6. Llama2-70b (62.5%), 7. Mixtral-8x7b (59.8%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.2 (44.7%), 9. Mistral-7bv0.1 (44.7%), 10. Codellama-70b (4.1%)
OpenAI's text-embedding-3-large Response Dispersion	1. Mixtral-8x7b (2), 2. GPT-4 (5), 3. Mistral-7bv0.2 (5), 4. Mistral-7bv0.1 (7), 5. GPT-3.5 (13), 6. Claude3-Opus (15), 7. Gemini-Pro (26), 8. Llama2-70b (36), 9. Yi-34b (63), 10. Codellama-70b (85)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. Mixtral-8x7b (1), 2. Mistral-7bv0.2 (2), 3. GPT-4 (3), 4. Mistral-7bv0.1 (3), 5. GPT-3.5 (7), 6. Claude3-Opus (8), 7. Gemini-Pro (13), 8. Llama2-70b (21), 9. Yi-34b (52), 10. Codellama-70b (79)
Category:Science Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.71; QA-RSS -0.71; RSS-OpenAI 1.0	
QA Benchmark	1. Claude3-Opus (94.6%), 2. GPT-4 (92.5%), 3. GPT-3.5 (89.3%), 4. Gemini-Pro (87.5%), 5. Mixtral-8x7b (83.9%), 6. Yi-34b (80.0%), 7. Llama2-70b (76.8%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.2 (73.2%), 9. Mistral-7bv0.1 (73.2%), 10. Codellama-70b (1.8%)
OpenAI's text-embedding-3-large Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (3), 2. Mixtral-8x7b (3), 3. GPT-4 (7), 4. GPT-3.5 (12), 5. Mistral-7bv0.2 (18), 6. Gemini-Pro (24), 7. Mistral-7bv0.1 (24), 8. Llama2-70b (31), 9. Yi-34b (61), 10. Codellama-70b (85)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (1), 2. Mixtral-8x7b (2), 3. GPT-4 (4), 4. GPT-3.5 (7), 5. Mistral-7bv0.2 (8), 6. Gemini-Pro (12), 7. Mistral-7bv0.1 (12), 8. Llama2-70b (17), 9. Yi-34b (50), 10. Codellama-70b (85)
Category:Sport Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.81; QA-RSS -0.81; RSS-OpenAI 0.99	
QA Benchmark	1. GPT-4 (92.9%), 2. Mixtral-8x7b (85.7%), 3. Claude3-Opus (85.7%), 4. GPT-3.5 (78.6%), 5. Gemini-Pro (78.6%), 6. Yi-34b (78.6%), 7. Llama2-70b (57.1%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.2 (35.7%), 9. Mistral-7bv0.1 (35.7%), 10. Codellama-70b (21.4%)
OpenAI's text-embedding-3-large Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (6), 2. GPT-4 (7), 3. Mixtral-8x7b (12), 4. GPT-3.5 (14), 5. Llama2-70b (20), 6. Gemini-Pro (24), 7. Mistral-7bv0.2 (24), 8. Mistral-7bv0.1 (42), 9. Yi-34b (63), 10. Codellama-70b (83)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (3), 2. GPT-4 (4), 3. GPT-3.5 (6), 4. Mixtral-8x7b (6), 5. Gemini-Pro (11), 6. Llama2-70b (11), 7. Mistral-7bv0.2 (13), 8. Mistral-7bv0.1 (27), 9. Yi-34b (49), 10. Codellama-70b (82)
Category:TV	

Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.57; QA-RSS -0.57; RSS-OpenAI 1.0	
QA Benchmark	1. GPT-4 (94.1%), 2. Claude3-Opus (94.1%), 3. Mixtral-8x7b (82.3%), 4. GPT-3.5 (82.3%), 5. Llama2-70b (70.6%), 6. Yi-34b (70.6%), 7. Mistral-7bv0.2 (64.7%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.1 (64.7%), 9. Gemini-Pro (58.8%), 10. Codellama-70b (23.5%)
OpenAI’s <code>text-embedding-3-large</code> Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (5), 2. GPT-4 (11), 3. GPT-3.5 (17), 4. Mistral-7bv0.2 (26), 5. Gemini-Pro (28), 6. Mistral-7bv0.1 (31), 7. Llama2-70b (54), 8. Yi-34b (63), 9. Mixtral-8x7b (82), 10. Codellama-70b (83)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (2), 2. GPT-4 (5), 3. GPT-3.5 (8), 4. Mistral-7bv0.2 (14), 5. Gemini-Pro (15), 6. Mistral-7bv0.1 (18), 7. Llama2-70b (27), 8. Yi-34b (50), 9. Mixtral-8x7b (69), 10. Codellama-70b (83)
Category:TV-Cartoons Spearman rank correlations: QA-OpenAI -0.64; QA-RSS -0.64; RSS-OpenAI 0.98	
QA Benchmark	1. GPT-4 (87.0%), 2. Claude3-Opus (84.1%), 3. GPT-3.5 (81.2%), 4. Mixtral-8x7b (72.5%), 5. Gemini-Pro (72.5%), 6. Llama2-70b (68.1%), 7. Yi-34b (68.1%), 8. Mistral-7bv0.1 (55.1%), 9. Mistral-7bv0.2 (53.6%), 10. Codellama-70b (7.2%)
OpenAI’s <code>text-embedding-3-large</code> Response Dispersion	1. Claude3-Opus (6), 2. GPT-3.5 (6), 3. GPT-4 (7), 4. Mistral-7bv0.2 (10), 5. Llama2-70b (17), 6. Gemini-Pro (18), 7. Mistral-7bv0.1 (22), 8. Yi-34b (66), 9. Mixtral-8x7b (81), 10. Codellama-70b (84)
RSS Response Dispersion	1. GPT-3.5 (2), 2. Claude3-Opus (4), 3. GPT-4 (4), 4. Mistral-7bv0.2 (4), 5. Llama2-70b (5), 6. Gemini-Pro (8), 7. Mistral-7bv0.1 (9), 8. Yi-34b (56), 9. Mixtral-8x7b (69), 10. Codellama-70b (82)

5 Discussion and Future Work

5.1 Shortcomings

This document repurposed a trivia question dataset previously unused for QA benchmarking. While there are many already-existing QA benchmark datasets (see, for example, the long but non-exhaustive list in Wang (2022) and Chang et al. (2024, section 4)), few of them attach explicit topic categories to their respective questions. One of the rare examples to do so subset of the Quasar dataset (Dhingra et al., 2017) called `Quasar-T-dev`, which contains 132 questions over 9 topic categories (math & science 21, arts 10, language 15, food 14, movies & music 36, sports 3, general 24, history & religion 33, people & places 58; note the sum is greater than 132 questions because some questions belong in multiple categories). There are, however, some QA datasets intended for specific topic domains and so they can provide at least another data point, such as `MultiMedQA`, ”a benchmark combining six existing medical question answering datasets spanning professional medicine, research and consumer queries and a new dataset of medical questions searched online, `HealthSearchQA`”, from (Singhal et al., 2023). It is also study to dropped categories from the original IRC-Wiki Trivia dataset for more datapoints. The author originally dropped them to keep the studied categories roughly comparable in terms of representing general-knowledge trivia categories so that the averages calculated in subsection 4.1 wouldn’t be

weighted too heavily by niche topics, however that doesn't mean they wouldn't be useful datapoints to have in a larger study.

5.2 Future Directions

Since response dispersion is an automated way to gauge topic knowledge, the author feels it would be useful as another automated metric to track when finetuning LLMs for a specific task. Thus response dispersion can be used to track an LLM learning about a task. Furthermore, when incrementally learning from new data, LLMs are at risk of "catastrophic forgetting" of prior probability distributions as its weights change (van de Ven et al., 2022). The author believes and would like to see validation in the future that measuring response dispersion can be metric that guards against catastrophic forgetting of tracked topics, since an increase in response dispersion for an already-known topic should indicate a loss of certainty in the LLM's response generations about that topic.

This paper also introduces reference sentence similarity embeddings and shows that the response dispersion defined by them performs nearly as well for comparing hypothetical QA benchmarks as do the embeddings produced by OpenAI's `text-embedding-3-large` text embeddings, all while being fast to compute locally. RSS embeddings seem to make a lot of sense in any context where you are comparing one sentence against other already known relevant sentences. This strongly suggests, theoretically at least, that rss embeddings should perform well for Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG), where the task is to find documents relevant to a given user query in order to generate a relevant answer from the relevant documents.

References

- Bertrum, MaLiCiOuS, Medusa, and HiddenKnowledge. Category:Trivia questions - IRC Wiki, 2012. URL https://irc.wiki/Category:Trivia_questions.
- Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, Wei Ye, Yue Zhang, Yi Chang, Philip S. Yu, Qiang Yang, and Xing Xie. A Survey on Evaluation of Large Language Models. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, 15(3):39:1–39:45, March 2024. ISSN 2157-6904. doi: 10.1145/3641289. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3641289>.
- Creative Commons. Deed - Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported. URL <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>.
- Bhuwan Dhingra, Kathryn Mazaitis, and William W. Cohen. Quasar: Datasets for Question Answering by Search and Reading, August 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1707.03904>. arXiv:1707.03904 [cs].
- Nelson F. Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. Lost in the Middle: How Language Models Use Long Contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173, February 2024. ISSN 2307-387X. doi: 10.1162/tacl_a_00638. URL https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00638.

Robert L Simone II. No Dataset Needed Benchmarking - Resources, 2024. URL https://docs.google.com/document/d/15RVtTABCpowt0Zt5VMp718MhXDkaFGy0JHdG_KOEqNU/pub.

Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S. Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, Perry Payne, Martin Seneviratne, Paul Gamble, Chris Kelly, Abubakr Babiker, Nathanael Schärli, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Philip Mansfield, Dina Demner-Fushman, Blaise Agüera y Arcas, Dale Webster, Greg S. Corrado, Yossi Matias, Katherine Chou, Juraj Gottweis, Nenad Tomasev, Yun Liu, Alvin Rajkomar, Joelle Barral, Christopher Semturs, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620 (7972):172–180, August 2023. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-06291-2. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-023-06291-2>. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.

Gido M. van de Ven, Tinne Tuytelaars, and Andreas S. Tolias. Three types of incremental learning. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(12):1185–1197, December 2022. ISSN 2522-5839. doi: 10.1038/s42256-022-00568-3. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s42256-022-00568-3>. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.

Zhen Wang. Modern Question Answering Datasets and Benchmarks: A Survey, June 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2206.15030>. arXiv:2206.15030 [cs].