Self-Memory Alignment: Mitigating Factual Hallucinations with Generalized Improvement

Anonymous ACL submission

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) often struggle to align their responses with objective facts, resulting in the issue of **factual hallucinations**, which can be difficult to detect and mislead users without relevant knowledge. While post-training techniques have been employed to mitigate the issue, existing methods usually suffer from poor generalization and trade-offs in different capabilities. In this paper, we propose to address it by directly augmenting LLM's fundamental ability to precisely leverage its existing *memory*–the knowledge acquired from pre-training data. We introduce **self-memory alignment (SMA)**, which fine-tunes the model on self-generated responses to precise and simple factual questions through preference optimization. Furthermore, we construct **FactualBench**, a comprehensive and precise factual QA dataset containing 181k Chinese data spanning 21 domains, to facilitate both evaluation and training. Extensive experiments show that SMA significantly improves LLMs' overall performance, with consistent enhancement across various benchmarks concerning factuality, as well as helpfulness and comprehensive skills.



Figure 1: Previous methods on factual hallucination mitigation exhibit poor generalizability across different factuality tasks and suffer from degradations on comprehensive abilities and helpfulness, while our self-memory alignment (SMA) improves model performance on all seven benchmarks, with a significant advantage on *Avg.*

1 Introduction

Factual hallucinations occur when LLMs generate inaccurate or entirely fabricated contents in response to queries (Zhang et al., 2023b; Huang et al., 2023), which can undermine user trust in models and cause significant harm, especially when LLMs are deployed in high-stake applications (Ji et al., 2023; Ahmad et al., 2023; Kang and Liu, 2023). Furthermore, identifying hallucinations is challenging, as the fabricated contents are often presented plausibly and convincingly, making it difficult for both models and users to recognize inaccuracies (Kaddour et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023b), emphasizing the essentiality of mitigating hallucinations.

Among various approaches to mitigate factual hallucinations, from pre-training (Gardent et al., 2017; Wang, 2019) to inference time (Nakano et al., 2021; Chuang et al., 2024), post-training (Lin et al., 2024a; Tian et al., 2024) has become popular for not requiring large-scale data manipulation or additional computational complexity during runtime. Recent methods typically enhance factuality by training on open-ended questions, e.g., "Tell me a bio of `an entity`", which are broad and imprecise. They leave additional space for models to provide answers with different contents, subsequently assessed using average factual precision metrics like FActScore (Min et al., 2023). However, as shown in Figure 1, these methods lead to declines in other factuality-related tasks and trade-offs in overall performance. The poor generalization can be attributed to the biased signals from these metrics mixing accuracy with length (Wei et al., 2024). Moreover, wrong judgments on the correctness of atomic facts, which are caused by the entity ambiguity after response decomposition (Chiang and Lee, 2024; Wanner et al., 2024) and the lack of standard answers in open-ended QA, degrade training effects. The trade-offs are not alleviated with additional training on advanced abilities (Zhao et al., 2023) related to factuality under adversarial queries (Zhang et al., 2024) or complex instructions following (Lin et al., 2024a), as they are not necessary for other tasks and can lead to forgetting of acquired abilities (Ouyang et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2024b).

To address the above problems, we propose **self-memory alignment (SMA)** to reduce factual hallucinations and improve generalization across other capabilities. The key idea is to enhance LLM's precise utilization of its existing *memory*, i.e., the internalized knowledge derived from pre-training, which is a crucial factor for improving factuality (Wang et al., 2023) and a fundamental ability for LLM generation and understanding (Zhao et al., 2023). Concretely, we align the model on precise fact-seeking QA with standard answers, which is a typical task for factual hallucinations and knowledge utilization evaluation (Roberts et al., 2020; Ji et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023). The task is short-form and simple, excluding other attributes from the correctness and decoupling factuality from advanced abilities. These features help avoid the mentioned issues of methods that use imprecise open-ended QA. Rather than directly building the tuning set from external sources, which can teach LLM undesired behavior clones instead of true abilities (Gudibande et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023b) and inadvertently promote hallucinations (Huang et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2024a; Gekhman et al., 2024), we sample answers from the LLM itself and pairing correct and incorrect responses for Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023) training. The pairwise optimization is adopted for more granular bi-directional controls and better generalization (Zhang et al., 2023b; Chu et al., 2025) than Supervised Fine-tuning (SFT), which only provides uni-directional signals.

However, a large dataset with precise factual QA across diverse domains is lacking for training. Existing datasets (Yang et al., 2015; Joshi et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2018; Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) are usually outdated and fall short in fine-grained domain annotations, limiting their accuracy and diversity. To this end, we build **FactualBench**, a large-scale dataset with 181k Chinese QA data spanning 21 domains. We extract knowledge from the Internet encyclopedia, a widely used pre-training corpus (Liu et al., 2024b; Ando et al., 2024), which can be taken as existing knowledge for LLMs. Additionally, it has also been verified that incorporating pre-training data in fine-tuning helps reduce the forgetting of acquired abilities (Ouyang et al., 2022). Multiple filtering strategies are adopted to guarantee the data quality. Evaluations on the test split of FactualBench reveal that the task is challenging for LLMs. Moreover, we find that models can answer more questions correctly when afforded greater diversity, such as increasing generation temperature, providing a foundation for mitigating hallucinations through improved memory utilization.

Extensive experiments on Qwen and Baichuan demonstrate that only SMA achieves generalized improvement on FactualBench and all six other benchmarks concerning diverse factuality assessment, as well as helpfulness and other comprehensive skills. SMA obtains $4\times$ and $9\times$ increases on average, significantly surpassing the existing methods (Min et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2024a; Zhang et al., 2024). More ablation studies are performed to further investigate how different settings influence the training outcomes. Our work suggests that LLMs can experience overall enhancement solely trained on precise and simple QA, and benefit from a reboost of knowledge from the pre-training corpus.

2 Related Works

Factual hallucination mitigation. Several studies (Wang, 2019; Gardent et al., 2017) have explored mitigating hallucinations by improving the quality of pre-training data. However, processing vast datasets is time-consuming (Zhang et al., 2023b) and is not applicable for models that have completed training. Other approaches (Chuang et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2023a; Li et al., 2023c; Lee et al., 2022) focus on inference-time enhancement, yet these strategies have limited generalization due to their reliance on domain-specific data (Zhang et al., 2024), along with more difficulty generating fluent or diverse texts (Ji et al., 2023). Furthermore, methods (Nakano et al., 2021; Gou et al., 2024) that utilize retrieval-augmented (RAG) techniques introduce significant system complexity (Tian et al., 2024) and depend heavily on the quality of external knowledge bases (Zhang et al., 2023b). Additionally, post-training LLM through SFT (Elaraby et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024b) and Reinforcement Learning (Ouyang et al., 2022; Kang et al., 2024) exhibits a promising reduction in factual error rates. Recently, Tian et al. (2024); Lin et al. (2024a); Zhang et al. (2024) use preference learning on self-generated responses. They mainly focus on open-ended questions and rate responses by first adopting external models to split responses into atomic facts, then verifying each fact via RAG (Tian et al., 2024; Lin et al., 2024a) or a model fine-tuned on millions of related data (Zhang et al., 2024). This leads to significant complexity, especially when responses contain hundreds of atomic facts. In contrast, SMA targets precise QA with standard answers, simplifying verification, where no additional training or external databases are required. Moreover, the effects of these methods fail to generalize to other tasks related to factuality and lead to trade-offs in different abilities, while SMA achieves unanimous improvements on them.

Precise factual QA tasks include discriminative, multiple-choice, and generative forms, where the former two (Thorne et al., 2018; Hendrycks et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022; Mishra et al., 2024) only have a limited answer space that allows models to guess the correct answer by chance, therefore unable to accurately judge whether the corresponding knowledge is possessed. Generative datasets designed with adversarial intents (Lin et al., 2022; Cheng et al., 2023) can effectively provoke hallucinations but tend to focus on specific scenarios, limiting their capacities to reflect performance on more general questions. While large simple generative QA datasets (Yang et al., 2015; Joshi et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2018; Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) exist, they are mostly built years ago with no domain annotations. In contrast, our annotated dataset offers a comprehensive and up-to-date assessment.

3 Method

To mitigate factual hallucinations and prevent trade-offs in other abilities beyond factuality, we propose SMA to augment the model's utilization of its existing knowledge. For training and evaluation, we build FactualBench consisting of precise and simple QA data without malicious or misleading adversarial intents. In this section, we will introduce the dataset and the alignment method in detail.

3.1 FactualBench

The Internet encyclopedia is selected as the source of our dataset since it contains various factual information across domains (Wang et al., 2023; Bai et al., 2024), which is also a commonly used corpus in LLM pre-training (Liu et al., 2024b; Ando et al., 2024). Specifically, we use Baidu baike[1], a prominent encyclopedia in the Chinese community. We design a model-based pipeline to generate a large volume of data costlessly and quickly, adopting GPT4[2] (Achiam et al., 2023) and Baichuan model[3] for their strong instruction following capabilities.

During pre-construction, we observe four typical types of low-quality data. 1) Long-tailed questions with obscure and useless related knowledge. 2) Questions with multiple correct answers. This is primarily due to some imprecise terms in questions that invite subjective judgments or the existence of more valid answers beyond encyclopedia knowledge. 3) Questions with incorrect standard answers. The model may extract knowledge falsely, which becomes frequent when paragraphs are extremely long or difficult to understand. Some questions fall into this category because they are time-sensitive, but the knowledge in the encyclopedia is outdated. 4) Questions that are not self-contained. Questions containing vague pronouns or ambiguous nouns with multiple interpretations, e.g., abbreviations and names without clear contexts, will confuse answerers unless the word has the same meaning in the vast majority of cases. To guarantee the data quality, we apply several filtering strategies and few-shot prompts in the construction of the dataset.

Construction and Composition. As illustrated in Figure 2 (left), FactualBench is constructed into five steps. *1) Entry filtering*. We initially sample millions of entries from publicly available encyclopedias, ensuring broad coverage over subjects and domains. For each entry, we retain its object, view count, and brief description. To avoid generating questions on long-tailed knowledge, we set a view count threshold of 0.5M, and 89,658 entries remain after this filtering. *2) Description filtering*. The performance of the model tends to decrease as the context length increases (Liu et al., 2024a; Sun et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024). Excessively lengthy descriptions can provide superfluous information and lead to low-quality responses. Conversely, overly brief descriptions lack sufficient factual information. To balance this, we filter out descriptions shorter than 100 characters and truncate those exceeding 800 characters. 64,315 entries remain after this process. *3) Question generation*. We instruct GPT4 to generate up to three precise questions per truncated description. For each question Q_i, GPT4 is also required to provide one standard answer X_i^0

[1] https://baike.baidu.com/

[2] We use the version of gpt-4-0125-preview in this paper.

[3] https://www.baichuan-ai.com/



Figure 2: The framework of our work. **Left**: We first extract factual knowledge from the Internet encyclopedia and construct a large and comprehensive dataset, FactualBench. Several filtering strategies are adopted for higher quality. **Right**: Next, we align LLM on self-generated response pairs on FactualBench. We elicit diverse responses to the same question, verify each correctness compared to the standard answer, and sample preference pairs for training.

and three wrong answers $\{X_i^j\}_{j=1}^3$ for further evaluation and training uses. To ensure adherence to our instructions, we add two examples for few-shot prompting. A total of 192,927 QA samples are generated in this process. *4) Question classification*. A domain classifier based on Baichuan, fine-tuned on massive high-quality data, is employed to categorize all generated questions into different domains D_i. We maintain domains containing more than 500 questions and uniformly categorize the rest as *others*. *5) Question filtering*. We query GPT4 once again to filter out low-quality questions. Each question is assessed independently without the corresponding description, and GPT4 is instructed to identify whether the question falls into one of the low-quality types through step-by-step reasoning.

Finally, 181,176 questions are reserved, where assessments of 1,000 samples indicate that an approximately 86% high-quality rate is acquired. To evaluate the LLMs' ability to utilize knowledge, we randomly select a subset of questions for the test set. We do selection taking each entry (entries containing *others* domain questions are excluded) as a unit to maintain that all questions in the test set are separate from the training set, and restrict each domain to a similar number of questions. 3,462 questions are selected, and the remaining 177,714 samples form the training set. We rephrase and refine low-quality questions in the test set after selection to ensure its high quality. We present the construction prompts in Appendix A.1, a sample in Table 1, and the domain distribution in Table 2.

Question Q_i	第一台微波量子放大器是在哪一年制成的? In which year was the first microwave quantum amplifier made?
Standard Answer X_i^0	第一台微波量子放大器是在1954年制成的。 The first microwave quantum amplifier was made in 1954.
Wrong Answer X_i^1	第一台微波量子放大器是在1958年制成的。 The first microwave quantum amplifier was made in 1958.
Wrong Answer X_i^2	第一台微波量子放大器是在1960年制成的。 The first microwave quantum amplifier was made in 1960.
Wrong Answer X_i^3	第一台微波量子放大器是在1962年制成的。 The first microwave quantum amplifier was made in 1962.
Domain D_i	高新科技 high technology

Table 1: Each sample in FactualBench contains a question Q_i, a standard answer X_i^0, 3 wrong answers $\{X_i^j\}$ and a domain D_i it belongs to. The English translation is for reference. Appendix A.3 presents more examples.

Domain	中文名	Test	Training	Total
film&entertainment	影视娱乐	201	54,489	54,690
eduaction&training	教育培养	161	3,703	3,864
physics, chemistry, mathematics&biology	数理化生	201	9,189	9,390
history&traditional culture	历史国学	202	18,108	18,310
biography	人物百科	201	11,844	12,045
politics&law	政治法律	175	6,368	6,543
economics&management	经济管理	160	4,543	4,703
computer science	计算机科学	201	6,253	6,454
medical	医学	167	7,073	7,240
sociology&humanity	社会人文	199	8,503	8,702
agriculture, forestry, fisheries&allied industries	农林牧渔	153	3,728	3,881
astronomy&geography	天文地理	160	3,896	4,056
sports&tourism	运动旅游	157	4,869	5,026
digital&automotive	数码汽车	176	3,887	4,063
industrial engineering	工业工程	172	3,283	3,455
military&war	军武战争	151	2,569	2,720
slang&memes	网词网梗	151	529	680
work&life	工作生活	174	5,853	6,027
high technology	高新科技	150	310	460
religion&culture	信仰文化	150	510	660
others	其他	-	18,207	18,207
total	-	3,462	177,714	181,176

Table 2: Domain distribution of FactualBench.

Model	Acc.	Model	Acc.	Model	Acc.
Baichuan1	48.24	**Baichuan3**	67.50	**Baichuan4**	75.07
Baichuan2	55.37	**Yi-34B**	67.30	Command-R+ 104B	60.17
Qwen1.5-7B	48.87	Command-R 35B	54.30	**DeepSeek-v2 -0628 MoE-236B**	75.62
Qwen2-7B	56.27	Llama-3-70B	49.65		
Llama-3-8B	39.11	**Qwen2-72B**	73.71	GPT4	65.71

Table 3: Performance on FactualBench rated by GPT4. Models in bold are proficient in Chinese.



Figure 3: A comparison between Baichuan1 accuracy in *low temp. BO1* and *high temp. BO8*. Significant gaps in all domains demonstrate the potential of the model. Each domain is represented by its first five letters.

Evaluation. Following previous works (Liu et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2023), a model-based approach is employed to expedite the evaluation. Note that rule-based automatic metrics such as ROUGE (Lin, 2004) and BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) have been shown to exhibit significant biases in evaluation (Lou et al., 2024), we assess the correctness of the answer at a semantic-level. The verifier is supposed to focus solely on the content directly addressing the question and ignore the extraneous information. A response is considered correct only when it indeed answers the question (rather than "I don't know") and matches the standard answer. This is reasonable since the model is expected to have been trained on the relevant, frequently viewed data and should possess the necessary knowledge, and the portion of evasive answers only counts for approximately 1%, which affects the evaluation result lightly. To improve judgment accuracy, we provide several examples and instruct the verifier to offer analyses before making the final decision. GPT4 is chosen as the verifier, which achieves a 96% consistency with humans, validating the effectiveness. We present the evaluation prompt in Appendix A.2.

14 popular LLMs are evaluated on FactualBench: Baichuan series (Yang et al., 2023), Qwen series (Bai et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024a), Llama-3 series (AI@Meta, 2024), Yi (AI et al., 2024), Command-R series (Gomez, 2024a,b), DeepSeek (DeepSeek-AI, 2024), and GPT4, where we prioritize the chat/instruct versions. We list the brief results in Table 3. The accuracy (Acc.) on our test set ranges from 39.11% to 75.62%, indicating that LLMs still have deficiencies in the basic factual QA task. Detailed domain-level accuracy and additional analyses of the results can be found in Appendix A.4.

3.2 Self-Memory Alignment

For cases where the model initially provides incorrect responses, we observe that it can generate correct answers when given greater output diversity. Taking Baichuan1 as an example, we increase the response variability by increasing the generation temperature and sampling the model's responses eight times (*high temp. BO8*), contrasting with the standard inference setting (*low temp. BO1*). Given the extensive answer space in the generative task, it is statistically improbable for a model to randomly guess the correct answer, so we consider the model to possess relevant knowledge if at least one of the generated responses is correct. As illustrated in Figure 3, comparison between *BO8* and *BO1* reveals that a substantial portion of the model's capabilities remains underutilized, indicating an untapped potential in the memory. This also verifies the feasibility of building pairs on self-generated responses. Some specific cases are provided in Appendix A.5.

To stimulate the potential and enhance the knowledge utilization of models, we propose self-memory alignment (SMA) that aligns models on self-generated responses to precise and simple QA through preference learning. As shown in Figure 2 (right), the alignment includes three phases. *1) Diversity Sampling.* For each question Q_i in FactualBench training set $\mathcal{D}^{\text{train}}$, we sample n responses from the model π in higher diversity by increasing generation configurations such as temperature, top-p, and top-k. *2) Reference-Based Verification.* The collected candidate responses are then provided to a verifier model, together with the standard answer X_i^0 from FactualBench. The verifier evaluates the responses after carefully analyzing, which acts as a judge function $\mathcal{J}$ to output 1 or 0 indicating correctness or not. Each evaluation result is formatted in a consistent manner to facilitate subsequent classification. *3) Pairs Construction.* We classify all responses according to their correctness, discarding those with uncertain evaluation results (due to verifier failing in instruction following or low-quality of questions), and construct a set as follows:

$$\{(\text{Prompt } Q_i, \text{Chosen } A_i^c, \text{Rejected } A_i^r)\}, \quad (1)$$

which is under the following constraint conditions:

$$(Q_i, X_i^0) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\text{train}}; A_i^c, A_i^r \sim \pi(\cdot|Q_i); \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{J}(Q_i, A_i^c, X_i^0) = 1; \mathcal{J}(Q_i, A_i^r, X_i^0) = 0. \quad (3)$$

However, different questions can contribute significantly varying numbers of preference pairs (= correct count × incorrect count). To balance this disparity, we randomly down-sample up to m pairs for each question, which compose the tuning set.

In this way, we can quickly generate a tuning set $\mathcal{D}^{\text{tuning}}$ containing massive data without human intervention. Then fine-tune the model on the tuning data through preference learning, DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023), whose loss is defined as follows:

$$-E\left[\log \sigma(\beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(A_i^c|Q_i)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(A_i^c|Q_i)} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_\theta(A_i^r|Q_i)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(A_i^r|Q_i)})\right], \quad (4)$$

where $(Q_i, A_i^c, A_i^r) \sim \mathcal{D}^{\text{tuning}}$, π_θ is the optimal model initialized in model π before optimization, while π_{ref} is the frozen π. σ denotes the sigmoid function, and β is a hyperparameter.

4 Experiments

In this section, we present the training results using SMA. Comparison with the other three baselines validates our effectiveness, and more ablation studies are conducted to investigate how our detailed settings influence the training outcomes.

4.1 Settings

We use Qwen2-7B-Instruct (Yang et al., 2024a) and Baichuan1-Chat as experimental base models. To have a comparable training computation with baselines, we randomly sample a small split from the FactualBench training set, containing 24k samples, which we denote as *(small)*. Since the verification can be costly and time-consuming frequently visiting GPT4 through API, we adopt weaker models, Qwen and Baichuan, as verifiers respectively to accelerate the process. These models still have acceptable judgment accuracy since standard answers are also provided. For each question, we sample $n = 8$ responses from the model and reserve up to $m = 8$ preference pairs for the tuning set. We set top-k=50, top-p=0.9, temperature=1.4 for Qwen2, and temperature=1.2 for Baichuan1. Training details are provided in Appendix B.

For baselines, we select FLAME (Lin et al., 2024a), FactTune-FS (Tian et al., 2024), and Self-Eval-SKT (Zhang et al., 2024), all of which aim to enhance factuality. These methods involve training on open-ended questions and additional attention on instruct-following queries (Köpf et al., 2023) in Lin et al. (2024a) or adversarial questions (Lin et al., 2022) in Zhang et al. (2024). We reproduce their training procedures on Qwen2 and Baichuan1 adhering to the settings in their original papers.

We use FactualBench to evaluate factuality on precise and simple QA, with more benchmarks assessing factuality across different tasks: TruthfulQA (Lin et al., 2022) and HalluQA (Cheng et al., 2023) for generative tasks and factuality to adversarial questions, CMMLU (Li et al., 2023a) for multiple-choice task, and HaluEval (Li et al., 2023b) for discriminative task. Additionally, we adopt AlignBench (Liu et al., 2023) containing 8 sub-tasks for comprehensive advanced abilities and AlpacaEval (Li et al., 2023d) for helpfulness to reflect the broader impact of training beyond factuality. We report the average score (out of 10) for AlignBench, the win rate (%) against the base model for AlpacaEval, and the accuracy (%) for the rest. Since Self-Eval-SKT uses partial data from TruthfulQA, we report the accuracy on the rest of the data for this method. We calculate *Avg.* averaging performance on those benchmarks, where the AlignBench score is multiplied by 10 to align with other metrics, and AlpacaEval is excluded due to its relative metric. More details about the benchmarks are provided in Appendix C.

4.2 Main Results

We present model performance on benchmarks after training in Table 4, where we also include training results using SMA on full FactualBench training set *(full)* to further utilize our dataset, which achieves better results. SMA is the only one to achieve unanimous improvement across all benchmarks, including all sub-tasks in AlignBench. In contrast, the other three baselines show decreased performance not only on factuality-related tasks but also on advanced skills and helpfulness, highlighting the difficulty in generalization of these methods and the effectiveness of SMA. Specifically, SMA achieves 2.22 and 3.90 improvement in $Avg.$ on Qwen2 and Baichuan1 respectively, 4× and 9× to the best baselines. Moreover, SMA achieves the best results on almost all benchmarks, except for TruthfulQA, HalluQA, and AlpacaEval, where

Model	**FactualBench** (gen.)	**TruthfulQA** (gen.)	**HalluQA** (gen.)	**CMMLU** (mc.)	**HaluEval** (disc.)	**AlignBench**	–Prof. Knowledge	–Mathematics	–Fundamental Lang.	–Logical Reasoning	–Understanding	–Writing	–Role Play	–Open-ended	**AlpacaEval** (helpful)	**ΔAvg.**
								QWEN2-7B-INSTRUCT								
Base	56.27	52.75	46.44	80.85	52.30	6.69	6.62	6.65	6.51	5.07	6.76	7.15	7.59	7.46	50.00	-
FLAME	55.20	50.43	50.00	80.12	51.66	6.80	6.59	6.22	6.60	**5.83**	6.78	7.31	**7.85**	7.72	**68.32**	-0.02
FactTune-FS	56.24	54.47	50.44	80.12	50.81	6.49	6.35	6.37	6.32	5.14	6.31	6.77	7.49	7.45	48.51	+0.24
Self-Eval-SKT	53.32	**57.99**	**50.67**	80.25	49.43	6.44	6.40	6.67	6.27	5.08	6.17	6.84	7.09	7.10	50.87	+0.09
SMA (small)	**58.81**	54.47	49.78	**82.15**	**54.00**	**6.96**	**6.63**	**6.94**	**6.94**	5.56	**6.93**	**7.43**	7.84	**7.92**	58.26	**+2.22**
								BAICHUAN1-CHAT								
Base	48.24	30.23	32.00	48.85	50.35	5.03	5.34	2.71	5.57	3.20	5.86	6.32	6.33	6.63	50.00	-
FLAME	51.16	29.62	32.00	49.33	**51.28**	5.21	5.80	2.85	5.65	**3.43**	**6.05**	6.21	6.38	**7.00**	**56.46**	+0.92
FactTune-FS	50.43	31.95	30.89	48.94	50.93	4.29	4.56	2.17	4.12	2.51	4.98	5.45	5.76	6.37	52.24	-0.66
Self-Eval-SKT	48.41	**36.11**	33.33	49.24	50.29	4.83	5.37	2.76	5.09	3.39	5.57	5.75	5.84	6.11	54.84	+0.95
SMA (small)	**57.37**	33.78	**38.44**	**50.13**	50.63	**5.30**	**5.92**	**3.02**	**5.66**	3.37	5.97	**6.53**	**6.55**	6.79	54.84	**+3.90**
SMA (full)	58.29	35.86	38.89	50.92	52.05	5.38	6.25	3.03	5.76	3.55	6.12	6.52	6.36	6.79	63.99	+4.97

Table 4: Performance on benchmarks reflecting factuality, helpfulness, and comprehensive abilities. We mark the decreased results in red, and the best results in **bold** (better results of SMA(full) in underline). Sub-tasks of AlignBench are listed in abbreviation. Domain-level accuracy on FactualBench is shown in Appendix D.1

Self-Eval-SKT and FLAME benefit more from in-domain training. Notably, changes on FactualBench reveal that SMA stimulates partial potential in model memory, while baselines show limited improvement and even declines, which indicates that training on imprecise open-ended questions with average precision metrics offers limited gains in the model's utilization of specific factual knowledge.

4.3 Ablation Studies

More ablation studies are conducted to further validate the effectiveness of our settings. Detailed results are shown in Appendix D.2.

Ablation on data sources. Our method adopts self-generated responses to align models, denoted as *self*. In addition, we validate more data sources. The standard answers and wrong answers from the dataset generated by GPT4 are denoted as *dataset*. Model responses given the reference descriptions are denoted as *w/ desc.*, which are generally correct since standard answers are contained in descriptions. We also train Qwen on responses generated by *Baichuan*. For SFT, a single label is selected per question. Training results are shown in Table 5.

Training on self-generated data yields better results for both DPO and SFT. While SFT on ground truth data (*dataset* and *w/ desc.*) improves performance on FactualBench, it leads to sharp declines on other tasks, which can be attributed to learning on responses with extremely different styles, short and concise, from the model itself. For DPO, training on *dataset* or other model's responses can still achieve competitive results. However, it is crucial to have chosen and rejected in the same distribution to prevent reward hacking (Shekhar et al., 2024).

Loss	Chosen	Rejected	FactualBench	Alignbench	AlpacaEval	ΔAvg.
			QWEN2-7B-INSTRUCT			
SFT	self	-	55.43	6.63	44.22	-0.66
SFT	Baichuan	-	49.97	4.98	15.03	-13.61
SFT	dataset	-	50.38	3.56	7.20	-23.22
DPO	self	self	**58.81**	**6.96**	**58.26**	**+2.22**
DPO	Baichuan	Baichuan	58.17	6.71	39.19	+0.45
DPO	dataset	dataset	55.75	6.50	36.06	-0.65
			BAICHUAN1-CHAT			
SFT	self	-	51.33	5.04	37.58	+1.29
SFT	w/ desc.	-	55.63	4.47	36.96	-5.69
SFT	dataset	-	55.86	3.73	26.65	-10.18
DPO	self	self	**58.29**	**5.38**	**63.99**	**+4.97**
DPO	w/ desc.	self	18.17	4.07	32.80	-13.67
DPO	dataset	self	5.40	3.28	19.07	-21.56
DPO	dataset	dataset	49.08	4.82	39.07	-1.40

Table 5: Results after training on different data sources.

Ablation on loss functions. We choose DPO for its fine-grained bi-directional signals, and SFT training is conducted for effectiveness comparison. Beyond SFT on a single label per question (*single label*), we also explore SFT the model on all correct answers (*all labels*). Moreover, existing researches suggest that fusing DPO with SFT loss can help mitigate overoptimization on rejected labels (He et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024c), which we denote as *SFT+DPO*. Furthermore, additional SFT training before DPO on the tuning set is supposed to reduce distribution shift issues and thus help training (Xu et al., 2024), which we denote as *SFT then DPO*.



Figure 4: Changes of Baichuan1 alignment with Qwen2-72B-Instruct on four benchmarks after training.

Loss	FactualBench	AlignBench	AlpacaEval	ΔAvg.
BAICHUAN1-CHAT				
SFT (single label)	51.33	5.04	37.58	+1.29
SFT (all labels)	52.37	5.03	31.06	+0.32
DPO (small)	57.37	5.30	54.84	+3.90
DPO (full)	**58.29**	**5.38**	**63.99**	**+4.97**
SFT then DPO	54.74	5.07	54.53	+4.03
SFT + DPO	57.16	5.13	63.91	+4.09

Table 6: Results after training on different losses.

All training is conducted on self-generated data.

The comparison between DPO and SFT shows that preference data will lead to greater improvement, even for *DPO (small)* with less tuning data than *SFT (single label)*, confirming that unidirectional signal is indeed insufficient for our task. Additionally, the difference between SFT on *single label* and *all labels* demonstrates that more labels for the same question in SFT will not enhance training effectiveness. Moreover, neither *SFT then DPO* nor *SFT+DPO* outperforms DPO. Since the data are sampled from the model itself, there is little distribution shift and a low likelihood of having reward hacking solely on rejected labels during training, emphasizing the stability of our method.

Furthermore, we argue that models obtain better representation ability after DPO. Huh et al. (2024) has found that the representation alignment degree, measured by mutual nearest-neighbor metric[4], increases with performance. We calculate Baichuan1 alignment with Qwen2-72B-Instruct (Yang et al., 2024a), which serves as a strong representation function, on several benchmarks and present the results in Figure 4. The DPO model achieves higher accuracy and deeper alignment with Qwen2-72B than both the base and SFT models, indicating a better representation ability is achieved.

Ablation on tuning data sizes. A noticeable performance gap exists between the model trained on *small* split and the one trained on *full* split, motivating an exploration of the training efficacy of

[4]We introduce its definition and calculation in Appendix E



Figure 5: Improvement increases at a logarithmic rate with the training data size of DPO expanding.

different tuning data sizes. We present the overall improvement of Baichuan1, measured by Δ*Avg.*, after DPO on different volumes of training questions in Figure 5. The improvement continues to increase (in logarithmic rate) as the size of preference pairs expands, stressing the benefit of a larger dataset, while early training with our method already improves the overall performance effectively.

5 Conclusion

We propose self-memory alignment (SMA) to mitigate factual hallucinations and achieve generalized improvement in model performance. We select precise and simple factual QA as our training task and align models on self-generated preference data to enhance the model's ability to utilize its memory. A large-scale, multi-domain dataset FactualBench is constructed from the Internet encyclopedia for training and evaluation. Extensive experiments show that SMA significantly improves model performance across diverse tasks concerning factuality, helpfulness, and comprehensive advanced skills, which suggests that simply training on precise factual QA related to pre-training knowledge has the potential for the overall improvement of the model.

Limitations

Although extensive experiments and ablation studies across diverse benchmarks validate the effectiveness of our method, certain limitations require further improvement.

Validations on additional models. We primarily conduct training and evaluations on Qwen2-Instruct and Baichuan1-Chat models. However, it remains unclear whether our method can achieve similar effects on models with different properties, such as pre-trained models without any alignment training, models that are proficient in languages other than Chinese, and models with larger parameter sizes and stronger base abilities. Further validation across these diverse models would help assess the broader applicability of our method.

Alignment with more algorithms. The improvement curve observed in Figure 5 exhibits an approximate logarithmic growth with diminishing marginal returns, and the model gains half of the improvement during the early training period. This suggests a potential in our training dataset for yielding further enhancement with thorough exploitation, such as adopting algorithms that are closer to online learning, including Proximal Policy Optimization (Schulman et al., 2017) and iterative DPO algorithms (Xiong et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2024).

Hallucination mitigation in broader contexts. Factual Hallucinations occur not only in closed-book tasks, as discussed in this paper, but also in open-book tasks. These include text reading comprehension and text summarization tasks, which require the model's utilization of knowledge within the provided context instead of the model's existing knowledge. We propose to investigate more different tasks to verify whether the improvement on the model derived from our method can have a broader generalization.

Ethics Statement

All experiments and analyses in this study are conducted for research purposes, aiming to enhance the factuality, robustness, and trustworthiness of LLMs and mitigate factual hallucinations. We collect data from the Internet following their license and only for research use.

The data source we use to build FactualBench is a publicly available Internet encyclopedia, which may contain information related to specific individuals, places, or sensitive physiological or medical content. Yet all the information is well-known, and we extract it without the intention to violate privacy or safety policies. Despite our efforts to ensure higher quality, the dataset could still contain inaccuracies or outdated information, which means that it should not be considered a golden knowledge base in any case and should only be adopted for research purposes.

The other six benchmarks in this study are well-established, and we use them to assess the capabilities of different models and methods in line with their original purpose.

References

Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.

Muhammad Aurangzeb Ahmad, Ilker Yaramis, and Taposh Dutta Roy. 2023. Creating trustworthy llms: Dealing with hallucinations in healthcare ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01463*.

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. 2024. Yi: Open foundation models by 01.ai. *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.04652.

AI@Meta. 2024. Llama 3 model card. *https://github.com*.

Kenichiro Ando, Satoshi Sekine, and Mamoru Komachi. 2024. Wikisqe: A large-scale dataset for sentence quality estimation in wikipedia. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 17656–17663.

Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*.

Yuelin Bai, Xinrun Du, Yiming Liang, Yonggang Jin, Junting Zhou, Ziqiang Liu, Feiteng Fang, Mingshan

Chang, Tianyu Zheng, Xincheng Zhang, et al. 2024. Coig-cqia: Quality is all you need for chinese instruction fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18058*.

Qinyuan Cheng, Tianxiang Sun, Wenwei Zhang, Siyin Wang, Xiangyang Liu, Mozhi Zhang, Junliang He, Mianqiu Huang, Zhangyue Yin, Kai Chen, et al. 2023. Evaluating hallucinations in chinese large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03368*.

Cheng-Han Chiang and Hung-yi Lee. 2024. Merging facts, crafting fallacies: Evaluating the contradictory nature of aggregated factual claims in long-form generations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05629*.

Tianzhe Chu, Yuexiang Zhai, Jihan Yang, Shengbang Tong, Saining Xie, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Sergey Levine, and Yi Ma. 2025. Sft memorizes, rl generalizes: A comparative study of foundation model post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17161*.

Yung-Sung Chuang, Yujia Xie, Hongyin Luo, Yoon Kim, James R. Glass, and Pengcheng He. 2024. Dola: Decoding by contrasting layers improves factuality in large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.

DeepSeek-AI. 2024. Deepseek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model. *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.04434.

Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Rohan Taori, Tianyi Zhang, Ishaan Gulrajani, Jimmy Ba, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. Alpacafarm: A simulation framework for methods that learn from human feedback. *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.14387.

Mohamed Elaraby, Mengyin Lu, Jacob Dunn, Xueying Zhang, Yu Wang, Shizhu Liu, Pingchuan Tian, Yuping Wang, and Yuxuan Wang. 2023. Halo: Estimation and reduction of hallucinations in open-source weak large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11764*.

Claire Gardent, Anastasia Shimorina, Shashi Narayan, and Laura Perez-Beltrachini. 2017. Creating training corpora for nlg micro-planning. In *55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2017*, pages 179–188. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL).

Zorik Gekhman, Gal Yona, Roee Aharoni, Matan Eyal, Amir Feder, Roi Reichart, and Jonathan Herzig. 2024. Does fine-tuning llms on new knowledge encourage hallucinations? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05904*.

Aidan Gomez. 2024a. Command r: Retrieval-augmented generation at production scale. *https://cohere.com*.

Aidan Gomez. 2024b. Introducing command r+: A scalable llm built for business. *https://cohere.com*.

Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Yujiu Yang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2024. CRITIC: large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.

Arnav Gudibande, Eric Wallace, Charlie Snell, Xinyang Geng, Hao Liu, Pieter Abbeel, Sergey Levine, and Dawn Song. 2023. The false promise of imitating proprietary llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15717*.

Shangmin Guo, Biao Zhang, Tianlin Liu, Tianqi Liu, Misha Khalman, Felipe Llinares, Alexandre Ramé, Thomas Mesnard, Yao Zhao, Bilal Piot, Johan Ferret, and Mathieu Blondel. 2024. Direct language model alignment from online AI feedback. *CoRR*, abs/2402.04792.

Qianyu He, Jie Zeng, Qianxi He, Jiaqing Liang, and Yanghua Xiao. 2024. From complex to simple: Enhancing multi-constraint complex instruction following ability of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15846*.

Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.

Jian Hu, Xibin Wu, Zilin Zhu, Xianyu, Weixun Wang, Dehao Zhang, and Yu Cao. 2024. Openrlhf: An easy-to-use, scalable and high-performance rlhf framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11143*.

Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. 2023. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232*.

Minyoung Huh, Brian Cheung, Tongzhou Wang, and Phillip Isola. 2024. Position: The platonic representation hypothesis. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*. OpenReview.net.

Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38.

Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611.

Jean Kaddour, Joshua Harris, Maximilian Mozes, Herbie Bradley, Roberta Raileanu, and Robert McHardy.

2023. Challenges and applications of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10169*.

Haoqiang Kang and Xiao-Yang Liu. 2023. Deficiency of large language models in finance: An empirical examination of hallucination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15548*.

Katie Kang, Eric Wallace, Claire Tomlin, Aviral Kumar, and Sergey Levine. 2024. Unfamiliar finetuning examples control how language models hallucinate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05612*.

Andreas Köpf, Yannic Kilcher, Dimitri von Rütte, Sotiris Anagnostidis, Zhi-Rui Tam, Keith Stevens, Abdullah Barhoum, Nguyen Minh Duc, Oliver Stanley, Richárd Nagyfi, et al. 2023. Openassistant conversations-democratizing large language model alignment. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 47669–47681.

Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, et al. 2019. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:453–466.

Nayeon Lee, Wei Ping, Peng Xu, Mostofa Patwary, Pascale N Fung, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2022. Factuality enhanced language models for open-ended text generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:34586–34599.

Haonan Li, Yixuan Zhang, Fajri Koto, Yifei Yang, Hai Zhao, Yeyun Gong, Nan Duan, and Timothy Baldwin. 2023a. Cmmlu: Measuring massive multitask language understanding in chinese. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09212*.

Junyi Li, Xiaoxue Cheng, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023b. Halueval: A large-scale hallucination evaluation benchmark for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6449–6464.

Kenneth Li, Oam Patel, Fernanda Viégas, Hanspeter Pfister, and Martin Wattenberg. 2023c. Inference-time intervention: eliciting truthful answers from a language model. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 41451–41530.

Tianle Li, Ge Zhang, Quy Duc Do, Xiang Yue, and Wenhu Chen. 2024. Long-context llms struggle with long in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02060*.

Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023d. Alpacaeval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/alpaca_eval.

Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.

Sheng-Chieh Lin, Luyu Gao, Barlas Oguz, Wenhan Xiong, Jimmy Lin, Scott Yih, and Xilun Chen. 2024a. Flame : Factuality-aware alignment for large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, pages 115588–115614. Curran Associates, Inc.

Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252.

Yong Lin, Hangyu Lin, Wei Xiong, Shizhe Diao, Jianmeng Liu, Jipeng Zhang, Rui Pan, Haoxiang Wang, Wenbin Hu, Hanning Zhang, et al. 2024b. Mitigating the alignment tax of rlhf. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 580–606.

Nelson F Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. 2024a. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173.

Tianyu Liu, Yizhe Zhang, Chris Brockett, Yi Mao, Zhifang Sui, Weizhu Chen, and William B Dolan. 2022. A token-level reference-free hallucination detection benchmark for free-form text generation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6723–6737.

Xiao Liu, Xuanyu Lei, Shengyuan Wang, Yue Huang, Zhuoer Feng, Bosi Wen, Jiale Cheng, Pei Ke, Yifan Xu, Weng Lam Tam, et al. 2023. Alignbench: Benchmarking chinese alignment of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.18743*.

Yang Liu, Jiahuan Cao, Chongyu Liu, Kai Ding, and Lianwen Jin. 2024b. Datasets for large language models: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18041*.

Zhihan Liu, Miao Lu, Shenao Zhang, Boyi Liu, Hongyi Guo, Yingxiang Yang, Jose Blanchet, and Zhaoran Wang. 2024c. Provably mitigating overoptimization in rlhf: Your sft loss is implicitly an adversarial regularizer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16436*.

I Loshchilov. 2017. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*.

Renze Lou, Kai Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. 2024. Large language model instruction following: A survey of progresses and challenges. *Computational Linguistics*, pages 1–10.

Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxi Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Wei Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023.

Factscore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 12076–12100. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Abhika Mishra, Akari Asai, Vidhisha Balachandran, Yizhong Wang, Graham Neubig, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2024. Fine-grained hallucination detection and editing for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06855*.

Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, et al. 2021. Webgpt: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09332*.

Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744.

Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318.

Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. Direct preference optimization: your language model is secretly a reward model. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 53728–53741.

Adam Roberts, Colin Raffel, and Noam Shazeer. 2020. How much knowledge can you pack into the parameters of a language model? In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 5418–5426.

John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.

Shivanshu Shekhar, Shreyas Singh, and Tong Zhang. 2024. See-dpo: Self entropy enhanced direct preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04712*.

Jiankai Sun, Chuanyang Zheng, Enze Xie, Zhengying Liu, Ruihang Chu, Jianing Qiu, Jiaqi Xu, Mingyu Ding, Hongyang Li, Mengzhe Geng, et al. 2023. A survey of reasoning with foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11562*.

James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. 2018. Fever: A large-scale dataset for fact extraction and verification. In *2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL HLT 2018*, pages 809–819. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL).

Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Huaxiu Yao, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Fine-tuning language models for factuality. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.

Cunxiang Wang, Xiaoze Liu, Yuanhao Yue, Xiangru Tang, Tianhang Zhang, Cheng Jiayang, Yunzhi Yao, Wenyang Gao, Xuming Hu, Zehan Qi, et al. 2023. Survey on factuality in large language models: Knowledge, retrieval and domain-specificity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07521*.

Hongmin Wang. 2019. Revisiting challenges in data-to-text generation with fact grounding. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 311–322.

Miriam Wanner, Benjamin Van Durme, and Mark Dredze. 2024. Dndscore: Decontextualization and decomposition for factuality verification in long-form text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.13175*.

Jerry Wei, Chengrun Yang, Xinying Song, Yifeng Lu, Nathan Hu, Dustin Tran, Daiyi Peng, Ruibo Liu, Da Huang, Cosmo Du, et al. 2024. Long-form factuality in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18802*.

Wei Xiong, Hanze Dong, Chenlu Ye, Ziqi Wang, Han Zhong, Heng Ji, Nan Jiang, and Tong Zhang. 2024. Iterative preference learning from human feedback: Bridging theory and practice for RLHF under kl-constraint. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*. OpenReview.net.

Shusheng Xu, Wei Fu, Jiaxuan Gao, Wenjie Ye, Weilin Liu, Zhiyu Mei, Guangju Wang, Chao Yu, and Yi Wu. 2024. Is DPO superior to PPO for LLM alignment? A comprehensive study. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*. OpenReview.net.

Aiyuan Yang, Bin Xiao, Bingning Wang, Borong Zhang, Ce Bian, Chao Yin, Chenxu Lv, Da Pan, Dian Wang, Dong Yan, et al. 2023. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305*.

An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zhihao Fan. 2024a. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*.

Yi Yang, Wen-tau Yih, and Christopher Meek. 2015. Wikiqa: A challenge dataset for open-domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2015 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 2013–2018.

Yuqing Yang, Ethan Chern, Xipeng Qiu, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2024b. Alignment for honesty. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 38: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2024, NeurIPS 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, December 10 - 15, 2024*.

Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. 2018. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2369–2380.

Xiaoying Zhang, Baolin Peng, Ye Tian, Jingyan Zhou, Lifeng Jin, Linfeng Song, Haitao Mi, and Helen Meng. 2024. Self-alignment for factuality: Mitigating hallucinations in llms via self-evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024*, pages 1946–1965. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Yue Zhang, Leyang Cui, Wei Bi, and Shuming Shi. 2023a. Alleviating hallucinations of large language models through induced hallucinations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15710*.

Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, et al. 2023b. Siren's song in the ai ocean: a survey on hallucination in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01219*.

Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2023. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46595–46623.

A More Details of FactualBench

In this section, we will introduce more details of our dataset, FactualBench, including prompts used for generation and evaluation, more examples of data in FactualBench, LLMs performance on FactualBench and related analyses.

A.1 Prompts in Construction

Figure 6 shows the complete prompt we use in *Question Generation* stage, and Figure 7 shows an English translation version. We include two manually written examples as few-shots and insert the target object with its description in the position marked in orange.

Figure 8 shows the complete prompt we use in *Question Filtering* stage, and Figure 9 shows an English translation version. We list four types of low-quality cases and required GPT4 to judge whether the question falls into one. The question under judgment should be placed in the position marked in red.

A.2 Prompt in Evaluation

Figure 10 shows the complete prompt we use when evaluating the correctness of a response, and Figure 11 shows an English translation version. We include five judging examples that cover the situations of answering correctly, answering incorrectly, and refusing to answer. The verifier is supposed to show its analysis before providing the judgment. The question, standard answer, and model's candidate answer should be placed in the position marked in green.

A.3 More Examples in FactualBench

We list one example of each domain (exclude *others*) in FactualBench in Table 7, 8, 9. We provide English translations for reference only, and the questions are highlighted in blue.

A.4 Detailed Benchmark Results

We benchmark 14 LLMs on our FactualBench dataset: Baichuan1 (closed), Baichuan2 (closed), Qwen1.5-7B-Chat (open), Qwen2-7B-Instruct (open), Llama-3-8B-Instruct (open), Baichuan3 (closed), Yi-34B-Chat (open), Command-R-35B (open), Llama-3-70B-Instruct (open), Qwen2-72B-Instuct (open), Baichuan4 (closed), Command-R-plus-104B (open), DeepSeek-v2-0628 MoE-236B (open), GPT4-0125-preview (closed), among which DeepSeek and GPT4 are queried from API and others are run locally. We use the recommended generation configuration and code on huggingface[5] to generate responses, and we set max-new-tokens and max-length configuration large enough to ensure that models can complete all their responses to questions.

We present the performance of 14 LLMs on our FactualBench at a domain level using a heatmap in Figure 12. The first column presents the overall accuracy of the model, and the last line shows the average accuracy of all 14 models. We arrange domains from left to right in descending order of the average accuracy. Each domain is represented by its first five letters.

It is evident from the figure that as the number of model parameters increases, there is a corresponding upward trend in accuracy, while models with proficiency in Chinese demonstrate superior performance compared to those primarily proficient in English with approximate parameter numbers, which are aligned with our expectations. Additionally, we have identified two key findings: **1) The performance of the same model can vary significantly across various domains**; **2) Different models share a consistency in relative ability on different domains**. Specifically, models tend to share similar domains where they achieve higher (or lower) accuracy, and there is no domain where one model excels (ranking in the top five accuracy domains) while another performs poorly (ranking in the bottom five accuracy domains). Interestingly, the film&entertainment domain constitutes the largest portion of all data, but models exhibit the lowest accuracy among all domains.

We attribute the phenomenon to two possible primary factors. Firstly, the type of knowledge required varies across different domains. Secondly, the distribution of training data across these domains is uneven. These two factors contribute to the varying difficulty of tasks in different domains, and the differing levels of mastery that LLMs have over the knowledge pertinent to each domain, respectively.

A.5 LLMs Responses in High Temp.

We present illustrative examples of model responses, including one instance from Baichuan1 on a test case (Table 10) and two examples from Qwen2-7B-Instruct on training cases (Table 11). For clarity, we provide English translations of key response details within square brackets ([]). The examples reveal that while Baichuan1 produces incorrect answers to questions under a low-temperature configuration, it can sometimes generate more correct responses to them under a high-temperature configuration. Similarly, Qwen2 exhibits substantial variation in its responses under the high-temperature setting.

[5] https://huggingface.co/

Question generation

我将提供给你一个对象和相关的参考文档，请针对对象提出最多{提问个数：3}个事实性问题。要求每个问题都具有唯一且准确的答案，避免答案模糊或存在争议，避免涉及主观判断的问题和时效性问题，要求答案可以在参考文档中直接找到。要求提问的问题表达清晰，问题中的名词指代明确，不需要依赖参考文档即可理解问题内容。对每个问题，给出1 个标准答案和3 个具有干扰性的错误答案。
下面是两个例子：

【对象】：{示例对象1}
【参考文档】：{关于示例对象1的百科内容简介}
【问题1】：{针对示例对象1提出的示例问题1}
【标准答案】：{示例问题1标准答案}
【错误答案1】：{示例问题1错误答案1}
【错误答案2】：{示例问题1错误答案2}
【错误答案3】：{示例问题1错误答案3}

【对象】：{示例对象2}
【参考文档】：{关于示例对象2的百科内容简介}
【问题1】：{针对示例对象2提出的示例问题2}
【标准答案】：{示例问题2标准答案}
【错误答案1】：{示例问题2错误答案1}
【错误答案2】：{示例问题2错误答案2}
【错误答案3】：{示例问题2错误答案3}

对于以下的对象和参考文档，使用同样的格式生成问题、答案。
【对象】：{对象：百科词条对象}
【参考文档】：{文档：百科简介}

Figure 6: Prompt used to generate questions.

Question generation

I will provide you with an object and its related reference description. Please generate up to {Question number: 3} factual questions about the object. Each question should have a unique and accurate answer, avoiding vague or contentious answers, subjective judgments, and time-sensitive. The answer should be directly found in the reference description. The question should be clearly expressed, with unambiguous noun references, and should not rely on the reference description for understanding. For each question, provide one standard answer and three misleading wrong answers.
Here are two examples:

[Object]: {Example Object 1}
[Reference Description]: {Brief introduction to Example Object 1}
[Question 1]: {Example question 1 related to Example Object 1}
[Standard Answer]: {Standard answer to Example question 1}
[Wrong Answer 1]: {Wrong answer 1 to Example question 1}
[Wrong Answer 2]: {Wrong answer 2 to Example question 1}
[Wrong Answer 3]: {Wrong answer 3 to Example question 1}

[Object]: {Example Object 2}
[Reference Description]: {Brief introduction to Example Object 2}
[Question 1]: {Example question 2 related to Example Object 2}
[Standard Answer]: {Standard answer to Example question 2}
[Wrong Answer 1]: {Wrong answer 1 to Example question 2}
[Wrong Answer 2]: {Wrong answer 2 to Example question 2}
[Wrong Answer 3]: {Wrong answer 3 to Example question 2}

For the following object and reference description, generate questions and answers in the same format.
[Object]: {Object: Encyclopedia Entry Object}
[Reference Description]: {Description: Encyclopedia Description}

Figure 7: Prompt used to generate questions (English translation).

Question filtering

User:你是一个评估专家，下面需要你对一个问题的质量进行判断。
我会给你一个事实性知识问答问题, 你需要从以下几个方面分析这个问题，最终回答问题是【优质】还是【非优质】。
如果这个问题内存在代词指代不清，或无法明确理解问题含义，请回复【非优质】。
如果问题的答案不唯一，请回复【非优质】。
如果问题是时效性问题，且没有给出具体的背景时间点，请回复【非优质】。
如果问题没有以上情况，请回复【优质】。
请一步步思考，并在最后给出你的判断：【优质】或【非优质】。注意将你的最终判断写在中括号【】中!

Assistant:明白了，我会按照你的要求和规则进行判断。

User:问题是：
{待评价问题}
请给出你的判断：

Figure 8: Prompt used to filter out low-quality questions.

Question filtering

User: You are an evaluation expert, and you need to assess the quality of a question.
I will provide you with a factual knowledge question, and you need to analyze the question from the following aspects to determine whether the question is of [High Quality] or [Low Quality].
If the question contains unclear pronoun references or cannot be clearly understood, please respond with [Low Quality].
If the answer to the question is not unique, please respond with [Low Quality].
If the question is time-sensitive and does not provide a specific time limitation, please respond with [Low Quality].
If none of the above situations apply, please respond with [High Quality].
Please think through the question step by step and give your final judgment as [High Quality] or [Low Quality]. Be sure to put your final judgment in square brackets []!

Assistant: Understood. I will follow your requirements and rules for evaluation.

User: The question is:
{Question to be evaluated}
Please provide your judgment:

Figure 9: Prompt used to filter out low-quality questions (English translation).

Answer evaluation

给定一个问题以及对应的参考答案，根据参考答案和你掌握的知识，对候选答案是否回答正确进行评价。请注意，问题可能不具有唯一答案，此时只要候选答案言之成理即可。如果候选答案符合参考答案或言之成理，请回答【正确】；如果候选答案与参考答案矛盾或没有回答问题，请回答【错误】，并给出你的分析过程。下面是五个例子：

【问题】：百川智能创始人王小川在什么时间与茹立云联合创立了该公司?
【参考答案】：百川智能创始人王小川于2023年4月10日与茹立云联合创立了该公司。
【候选答案】：王小川与茹立云于2023年4月共同创立了百川智能公司。
【评价】：根据参考答案，百川智能于2023年4月10日创立，候选答案认为是2023年4月创立，符合参考答案。【正确】

【问题】：《采桑子·清明后三日作》是哪位诗人创作的?
【参考答案】：《采桑子·清明后三日作》是诗人龙榆生创作的。
【候选答案】：《采桑子·清明后三日作》是清代词人蒋春霖创作的一首词。
【评价】：根据参考答案，《采桑子·清明后三日作》是由诗人龙榆生创作，候选答案认为是蒋春霖创作，与参考答案矛盾。【错误】

【问题】：李白的代表作有哪些?
【参考答案】：李白的代表作有《望庐山瀑布》《行路难》《蜀道难》《将进酒》《早发白帝城》《黄鹤楼送孟浩然之广陵》等。
【候选答案】：李白的代表作有《将进酒》《静夜思》《庐山谣》《早发白帝城》《赠汪伦》《望庐山瀑布》《行路难》《夜泊牛渚怀古》《登金陵凤凰台》《送友人》等。
【评价】：李白有许多代表作，答案不唯一，候选答案中的诗的确均为李白所写，言之成理。【正确】

【问题】：哈蒂·温斯顿的主要作品有哪些?
【参考答案】：哈蒂·温斯顿的主要作品有《灵书妙探第一季》。
【候选答案】：哈蒂·温斯顿（Hedy Lamarr）的主要作品有《Ecstasy》（1933年），《Algiers》（1938年），《Samson and Delilah》（1949年）等。
【评价】：哈蒂·温斯顿有许多作品，答案不唯一，但候选答案中的作品不是哈蒂·温斯顿的作品。【错误】

【问题】：吴之番在哪次战斗中牺牲的?
【参考答案】：吴之番在清顺治二年八月二十六日的战斗中牺牲，这是嘉定三屠的一部分。
【候选答案】：对不起，我找不到关于"吴之番"的相关牺牲信息。这可能是因为您提供的信息有误或者该人物并不存在。
【评价】：根据参考答案，吴之番在顺治二年八月二十六日的战斗中牺牲，候选答案没有回答问题。【错误】

下面是你需要评价的内容，请使用同样的格式给出评价。
【问题】：{问题}
【参考答案】：{参考答案}
【候选答案】：{候选答案}
【评价】：

Figure 10: Prompt used to evaluate candidate answers to questions.

Answer evaluation

Given a question and its corresponding standard answer, evaluate whether the candidate answer correctly addresses the question based on the standard answer and your knowledge. Please note that the question may not have only one unique answer; in such cases, as long as the candidate answer is reasonable, it is acceptable. If the candidate answer aligns with the reference answer or is reasonable, please respond with [Correct]; if the candidate answer contradicts the reference answer or does not answer the question, please respond with [Incorrect], and provide your analysis. Here are five examples:

[Question]: When did Wang Xiaochuan, the founder of Baichuan Inc., co-found the company with Ru Liyun?
[Standard Answer]: Wang Xiaochuan co-founded Baichuan Inc. with Ru Liyun on April 10, 2023.
[Candidate Answer]: Wang Xiaochuan and Ru Liyun co-founded Baichuan Inc. in April 2023.
[Evaluation]: According to the standard answer, Baichuan Inc. was founded on April 10, 2023. The candidate answer states it was founded in April 2023, which aligns with the reference answer. [Correct]

[Question]: Which poet created "Cai Sang Zi · Qing Ming Hou San Ri Zuo"?
[Standard Answer]: "Cai Sang Zi · Qing Ming Hou San Ri Zuo" was created by the poet Long Yusheng.
[Candidate Answer]: "Cai Sang Zi · Qing Ming Hou San Ri Zuo" was created by the Qing Dynasty poet Jiang Chunlin.
[Evaluation]: According to the reference answer, "Cai Sang Zi · Qing Ming Hou San Ri Zuo" was created by Long Yusheng, while the candidate answer claims it was created by Jiang Chunlin, which contradicts the reference answer. [Incorrect]

[Question]: What are the representative works of Li Bai?
[Standard Answer]: Li Bai's representative works include "Wang Lu Shan Pu Bu", "Xing Lu Nan", "Shu Dao Nan", "Qiang Jin Jiu", "Zao Fa Bai Di Cheng", and "Huang He Lou Song Meng Hao Ran Zhi Guang Ling", etc.
[Candidate Answer]: Li Bai's representative works include "Qiang Jin Jiu", "Jing Ye Si", "Lu Shan Yao", "Zao Fa Bai Di Cheng", "Zeng Wang Lun", "Wang Lu Shan Pu Bu", "Xing Lu Nan", "Ye Bo Niu Zhu Huai Gu", "Deng Jin Ling Feng Huang Tai", and "Song You Ren", etc.
[Evaluation]: Li Bai has many representative works, and the answer is not unique. The poems listed in the candidate answer are indeed all written by Li Bai, which is reasonable. [Correct]

[Question]: What are the main works of Hattie Winston?
[Standard Answer]: Hattie Winston's main work is "Castle" (Season one).
[Candidate Answer]: Hedy Lamarr's main works include "Ecstasy" (1933), "Algiers" (1938), and "Samson and Delilah" (1949), etc.
[Evaluation]: Hattie Winston has many works, and the answer is not unique. However, the works listed in the candidate answer are not by Hattie Winston. [Incorrect]

[Question]: In which battle did Wu Zhifan sacrifice?
[Standard Answer]: Wu Zhifan was sacrificed in the battle on August 26, the second year of the Shunzhi reign, which was part of the Jiadin Santu.
[Candidate Answer]: Sorry, I cannot find any information related to Wu Zhifan's sacrifice. This may be due to incorrect information you provided or because this person does not exist.
[Evaluation]: According to the standard answer, Wu Zhifan was sacrificed in the battle on August 26, the second year of the Shunzhi reign, but the candidate answer did not answer the question. [Incorrect]

Here is the content you need to evaluate, and please use the same format to provide your evaluation.
[Question]: {Question}
[Standard Answer]: {Standard Answer}
[Candidate Answer]: {Candidate Answer}
[Evaluation]:

Figure 11: Prompt used to evaluate candidate answers to questions (English translation).

Question	韩国电影《人狼》是由哪位导演执导的? Who directed the Korean movie 'Inrang'?	河北师范大学最早起源于哪两所学校? Which two schools did Hebei Normal University first originate from?
Standard Answer	电影《人狼》是由金知云执导的。 The movie 'Inrang' is directed by Kim Jee-woon.	河北师范大学最早起源于顺天府学堂和北洋女师范学堂。 Hebei Normal University originated from Shuntianfu Official School and Beiyang Women's Normal School.
Wrong Answer1	电影《人狼》是由姜栋元执导的。 The movie 'Inrang' is directed by Kang Dong Won.	河北师范大学最早起源于河北师范学院和河北教育学院。 Hebei Normal University originated from Hebei Normal Institute and Hebei Institute of Education.
Wrong Answer2	电影《人狼》是由韩孝周执导的。 The movie 'Inrang' is directed by Han Hyo Joo.	河北师范大学最早起源于河北职业技术师范学院和汇华学院。 Hebei Normal University originated from Hebei Vocational and Technical Normal College and Huihua College.
Wrong Answer3	电影《人狼》是由郑雨盛执导的。 The movie 'Inrang' is directed by Jung Woo Sung.	河北师范大学最早起源于北京大学和清华大学。 Hebei Normal University originated from Peking University and Tsinghua University.
Domain	影视娱乐 film&entertainment	教育培养 education&training
Question	苯丙氨酸的化学式是什么? What is the chemical formula for phenylalanine?	谥号是在什么时期开始的? When did posthumous titles begin?
Standard Answer	苯丙氨酸的化学式是C9H11NO2。 The chemical formula for phenylalanine is C9H11NO2.	谥号始于西周。 The posthumous title began in the Western Zhou Dynasty.
Wrong Answer1	苯丙氨酸的化学式是C8H11NO2。 The chemical formula for phenylalanine is C8H11NO2.	谥号始于东周。 The posthumous title began in the Eastern Zhou Dynasty.
Wrong Answer2	苯丙氨酸的化学式是C9H10NO2。 The chemical formula for phenylalanine is C9H10NO2.	谥号始于秦朝。 The posthumous title began in the Qin Dynasty.
Wrong Answer3	苯丙氨酸的化学式是C9H11NO3。 The chemical formula for phenylalanine is C9H11NO3.	谥号始于汉朝。 The posthumous title began in the Han Dynasty.
Domain	数理化生 physics, chemistry, mathematics&biology	历史国学 history&traditional culture
Question	中国电影"第六代导演"之一王小帅的电影处女作是什么? What is the debut film of Wang Xiaoshuai, one of the "sixth generation directors" of Chinese cinema?	法律关系的构成要素有哪些? What are the constituent elements of legal relationships?
Standard Answer	王小帅的电影处女作是《冬春的日子》。 Wang Xiaoshuai's debut film is 'THE DAYS'.	法律关系的构成要素有三项:法律关系主体,法律关系内容,法律关系客体。 There are three elements that make up a legal relationship: the subject of the legal relationship, the content of the legal relationship, and the object of the legal relationship.
Wrong Answer1	王小帅的电影处女作是《扁担姑娘》。 Wang Xiaoshuai's debut film is 'So Close to Paradise'.	法律关系的构成要素有三项:法律关系主体,法律关系形式,法律关系客体。 There are three elements that make up a legal relationship: the subject of the legal relationship, the form of the legal relationship, and the object of the legal relationship.
Wrong Answer2	王小帅的电影处女作是《十七岁的单车》。 Wang Xiaoshuai's debut film is 'Beijing Bicycle'.	法律关系的构成要素有三项:法律关系主体,法律关系内容,法律关系方式。 There are three elements that make up a legal relationship: the subject of the legal relationship, the content of the legal relationship, and the method of the legal relationship.
Wrong Answer3	王小帅的电影处女作是《青红》。 Wang Xiaoshuai's debut film is 'Shanghai Dreams'.	法律关系的构成要素有三项:法律关系主体,法律关系内容,法律关系目标。 There are three elements that make up a legal relationship: the subject of the legal relationship, the content of the legal relationship, and the objective of the legal relationship.
Domain	人物百科 biography	政治法律 politics&law

Table 7: More examples in FactualBench (part 1).

Question	国家金融监督管理总局是在哪一年揭牌的? In which year was the Chinese National Financial Supervisory Administration unveiled?	MemCache是由谁开发的? Who developed MemCache?
Standard Answer	国家金融监督管理总局是在2023年揭牌的。 The Chinese National Financial Supervisory Administration was unveiled in 2023.	MemCache是由LiveJournal的Brad Fitzpatrick开发的。 MemCache was developed by Brad Fitzpatrick from LiveJournal.
Wrong Answer1	国家金融监督管理总局是在2022年揭牌的。 The Chinese National Financial Supervisory Administration was unveiled in 2022.	MemCache是由Facebook的Mark Zuckerberg开发的。 MemCache was developed by Mark Zuckerberg from Facebook.
Wrong Answer2	国家金融监督管理总局是在2021年揭牌的。 The Chinese National Financial Supervisory Administration was unveiled in 2021.	MemCache是由Google的Larry Page开发的。 MemCache was developed by Larry Page from Google.
Wrong Answer3	国家金融监督管理总局是在2020年揭牌的。 The Chinese National Financial Supervisory Administration was unveiled in 2020.	MemCache是由Microsoft的Bill Gates开发的。 MemCache was developed by Bill Gates from Microsoft.
Domain	经济管理 economics&management	计算机科学 computer science
Question	瑞舒伐他汀的主要作用部位是哪里? What is the main site of action of rosuvastatin?	“枫丹白露”这个名字的原义是什么? What is the original meaning of ’Fontainebleau’?
Standard Answer	瑞舒伐他汀的主要作用部位是肝。 The main site of action of rosuvastatin is the liver.	“枫丹白露”的法文原义为“美丽的泉水”。 The original French meaning of "Fontainebleau" is "beautiful spring water".
Wrong Answer1	瑞舒伐他汀的主要作用部位是心脏。 The main site of action of rosuvastatin is the heart.	“枫丹白露”的法文原义为“宏伟的宫殿”。 The original French meaning of "Fontainebleau" is "magnificent palace".
Wrong Answer2	瑞舒伐他汀的主要作用部位是肾脏。 The main site of action of rosuvastatin is the kidney.	“枫丹白露”的法文原义为“狩猎的行宫”。 The original French meaning of "Fontainebleau" is "hunting palace".
Wrong Answer3	瑞舒伐他汀的主要作用部位是胃。 The main site of action of rosuvastatin is the stomache.	“枫丹白露”的法文原义为“古老的城堡”。 The original French meaning of "Fontainebleau" is "ancient castle".
Domain	医学 medical	社会人文 sociology&humanity
Question	竹笋原产于哪里? Where do bamboo shoots originate from?	更新世是由哪位地质学家创用的? Which geologist named the Pleistocene epoch?
Standard Answer	竹笋原产于中国。 Bamboo shoots originate from China.	更新世是由英国地质学家莱伊尔创用的。 The Pleistocene was named by British geologist Lyell.
Wrong Answer1	竹笋原产于日本。 Bamboo shoots originate from Japan.	更新世是由英国地质学家福布斯创用的。 The Pleistocene was named by British geologist Forbes.
Wrong Answer2	竹笋原产于印度。 Bamboo shoots originate from India.	更新世是由美国地质学家莱伊尔创用的。 The Pleistocene was named by American geologist Lyell.
Wrong Answer3	竹笋原产于泰国。 Bamboo shoots originate from Thailand.	更新世是由中国地质学家莱伊尔创用的。 The Pleistocene was named by Chinese geologist Lyell.
Domain	农林牧渔 agriculture, forestry, fisheries&allied industries	天文地理 astronomy&geography

Table 8: More examples in FactualBench (part 2).

Question	新奥尔良鹈鹕队在哪一年正式宣布球队改名为鹈鹕队? In which year did the New Orleans Pelicans officially announce their name change to the Pelicans?	宾利汽车公司是在哪一年创办的? In which year was BentleyMotors Limited founded?
Standard Answer	新奥尔良鹈鹕队在2013年正式宣布球队改名为鹈鹕队。 The New Orleans Pelicans officially announced their name change to the Pelicans in 2013.	宾利汽车公司是在1919年创办的。 BentleyMotors Limited was founded in 1919.
Wrong Answer1	新奥尔良鹈鹕队在2012年正式宣布球队改名为鹈鹕队。 The New Orleans Pelicans officially announced their name change to the Pelicans in 2012.	宾利汽车公司是在1920年创办的。 BentleyMotors Limited was founded in 1920.
Wrong Answer2	新奥尔良鹈鹕队在2014年正式宣布球队改名为鹈鹕队。 The New Orleans Pelicans officially announced their name change to the Pelicans in 2014.	宾利汽车公司是在1918年创办的。 BentleyMotors Limited was founded in 1918.
Wrong Answer3	新奥尔良鹈鹕队在2015年正式宣布球队改名为鹈鹕队。 The New Orleans Pelicans officially announced their name change to the Pelicans in 2015.	宾利汽车公司是在1921年创办的。 BentleyMotors Limited was founded in 1921.
Domain	运动旅游 sports&tourism	数码汽车 digital&automotive
Question	隔离开关主要用于什么? What is the main use of disconnectors?	鸦片战争是在哪一年开始的? In which year did the Opium War begin?
Standard Answer	隔离开关主要用于隔离电源、倒闸操作、用以连通和切断小电流电路。 Disconnectors are mainly used for isolating power sources, switching operations, and connecting and disconnecting small current circuits.	鸦片战争是在1840年开始的。 The Opium War begin in 1840.
Wrong Answer1	隔离开关主要用于调节电压。 Disconnectors are mainly used to regulate voltage.	鸦片战争是在1842年开始的。 The Opium War begin in 1842.
Wrong Answer2	隔离开关主要用于转换电流。 Disconnectors are mainly used to convert current.	鸦片战争是在1839年开始的。 The Opium War begin in 1839.
Wrong Answer3	隔离开关主要用于存储电能。 Disconnectors are mainly used for storing electrical energy.	鸦片战争是在1841年开始的。 The Opium War begin in 1841.
Domain	工业工程 industrial engineering	军武战争 military&war
Question	买了佛冷这个词是来源于哪首歌曲? What song does the meme 'Mai Le Fo Leng' come from?	苏荷酒吧是在哪一年诞生的? In which year was Soho Bar founded?
Standard Answer	买了佛冷这个词是来源于歌曲《I Love Poland》。 The meme 'Mai Le Fo Leng' comes from "I love Poland"	苏荷酒吧是在2003年诞生的。 Soho Bar was founded in 2003.
Wrong Answer1	买了佛冷这个词是来源于歌曲《I Love China》。 The meme 'Mai Le Fo Leng' comes from "I love China"	苏荷酒吧是在2000年诞生的。 Soho Bar was founded in 2000.
Wrong Answer2	买了佛冷这个词是来源于歌曲《I Love America》。 The meme 'Mai Le Fo Leng' comes from "I love America"	苏荷酒吧是在2005年诞生的。 Soho Bar was founded in 2005.
Wrong Answer3	买了佛冷这个词是来源于歌曲《I Love England》。 The meme 'Mai Le Fo Leng' comes from "I love England"	苏荷酒吧是在2010年诞生的。 Soho Bar was founded in 2010.
Domain	网词网梗 slang&memes	工作生活 work&life
Question	视觉识别系统VI是什么的缩写? What words is VI (a Vision System) abbreviation for?	风水业内公认的"龙脉之源"是哪里? Where is the recognized "source of dragon veins" in chinese feng shui?
Standard Answer	视觉识别系统是Visual Identity的缩写。 VI abbreviation for Visual Identity.	风水业内公认的"龙脉之源"是昆仑山。 The "source of dragon veins" in chinese feng shui is Kunlun Mountain.
Wrong Answer1	视觉识别系统是Visual Information的缩写。 VI abbreviation for Visual Information.	风水业内公认的"龙脉之源"是长江。 The "source of dragon veins" in chinese feng shui is Yangtze River.
Wrong Answer2	视觉识别系统是Visual Interface的缩写。 VI abbreviation for Visual Interface.	风水业内公认的"龙脉之源"是黄河。 The "source of dragon veins" in chinese feng shui is the Yellow River.
Wrong Answer3	视觉识别系统是Visual Interaction的缩写。 VI abbreviation for Visual Interface.	风水业内公认的"龙脉之源"是太湖。 The "source of dragon veins" in chinese feng shui is the Taihu Lake.
Domain	高新科技 high technology	信仰文化 religion&culture

Table 9: More examples in FactualBench (part 3).



Figure 12: Performance on FactualBench at domain level. We prioritize the chat/instruct version of these models.

Baichuan1-Chat		
Test split: 黄眉大王在《西游记》中最后是被谁降伏的? [标准答案：弥勒佛] Who ultimately subdued King Huangmei in *Journey to the West?* [Standard Answer: **Maitreya Buddha**]		
low temp.	孙悟空[Sun WuKong]。	✗
high temp.	哪吒[Ne Zha]\n黄眉大王,第七十四回“长庚传报魔头狠小圣战败母夜叉”中,红孩儿的叔叔被孙悟空、沙僧和护法伽蓝保着唐僧战败	✗
	孙悟空[Sun WuKong]。第十九回\n云栈洞悟空收八戒\n浮屠山玄奘受心经	✗
	弥勒佛祖[Maitreya Buddha]。黄眉大王是头目级妖怪,手下也有不少妖将,他趁孙悟空不在的时候捉了唐僧(其实是假冒的),后来弥勒佛祖亲自来了之后黄眉大王现出了原形。	✓

Table 10: Baichuan1 responses to a test case under low temperature and high temperature.

Qwen2-7B-Instruct		
Training split: 在《魔兽世界》中，牛头人在英语环境下被称为什么? [标准答案：Tauren] What is the shu'halo referred to as in English in *World of Warcraft?* [Standard Answer: **Tauren**]		
high temp.	在《魔兽世界》这个虚构的系列游戏设定下，牛头人这一种族在其英语环境下被称为Tauren。在该游戏背景故事中，牛头人们以他们的力量、荣耀概念的坚持和原生氏族形式的生活方式而著称，并被认为是艾泽拉斯这个主世界上的坚韧守护者之一。	✓
	在《魔兽世界》这个游戏中，牛头人种族在英语环境下被称为"Ogres"。但通常提到的牛头人应该指的是魔兽系列中的半神牛头人阵营，他们的正式名字叫作"High Hill Ogres"（山顶族）和"Grim Guor'gan Orges"（灰烬游侠），但也经常用"orcs"（食人魔）的统称来指代。这可能产生了一些混淆。正确而且具体的称呼应该是“Ogres”还是依据特定的情境下更加复杂的名称描述如"Hill Gazelle" 或"Mountain Goliaths" （具体根据《魔兽世界》的不同版本与时间而有所不同）。但在普通讨论或玩家交流中，“Ogres”是最常见的称呼方法。	✗
	在《魔兽世界》这个虚构的世界里，牛头人在这个英文环境下被称为Trolls。但在另一个文化背景中，特别是指真实生活中的非洲塞米诺尔人族裔时，他们被称为Touaregs或者Berbers，但这并不是《魔兽世界》中所使用的名称。在该游戏中，牛头人们属于暗夜elves 的一种原住民，有自己的文化、语言和领袖，并在游戏的剧情中有很重要的地位。	✗
Training split: 哪个法甲球队在1992/93赛季获得了法甲球队历史上首个欧洲冠军联赛冠军? [标准答案：马赛] Which *Ligue 1* football club won the first *UEFA* Champions League championship in *Ligue 1* history in the 1992/93 season? [Standard Answer: **Olympique de Marseille (OM)**]		
high temp.	在1992/93赛季获得法甲球队历史上首个欧洲冠军联赛（当时称为欧洲冠军杯）冠军的球队是马赛[OM] 足球俱乐部。	✓
	在1992/93赛季，意大利的AC米兰队[A.C. Milan from Italy] 在当年的欧洲冠军联赛中获得了历史性的首个欧洲冠军，而不是法甲球队。不过，有一支法甲球队在后来成功夺得了欧洲冠军联赛冠军，那便是法国球队马赛足球俱乐部，在1993/94赛季获得了其历史上首个也是至今唯一的欧洲冠军联赛冠军（以及后来所谓的"五冠王"）。	✗
	1992/93赛季获得欧洲冠军联赛（当时的赛事名称为欧洲冠军杯）冠军的是荷兰的阿贾克斯队[AFC Ajax from the Netherlands]，并非任何法甲球队。所以答案是：没有法甲球队在这个赛季获得过这个荣誉。	✗

Table 11: Qwen2-7B-Instruct responses to training cases under high temperature.

B Training Details

We complete all our training based on OpenRLHF (Hu et al., 2024) framework, on 8 H800-80G NVIDIA GPUs, using AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov, 2017) and cosine scheduler. Learning rate is set to be $2e-6$ for SFT training, $1e-6$ for DPO training, and $1e-6$ DPO + $1e-7$ SFT when fusing two loss functions together. Only 1 epoch is trained on tuning set, the batch size is set 128, the DPO β is set 0.1, the weight decay is set $1e-4$ in all conditions. We list sizes of all our tuning data in main experiments and ablation studies in Table 12. For SFT loss, a question is considered to be valid if the model correctly answers at least one time; While for DPO loss, a question is considered to be valid if it receives both correct and incorrect answers from the model. As for baselines, we reproduce their methods following settings in their papers.

C Evaluation Details

We choose 6 other open-source benchmarks to evaluate model's enhancement comprehensively. Models are required to respond to the questions or instructions in zero-shot condition and under default generation configuration. Official metrics are reported for all, and for model-based evaluation processes, we all choose GPT4 as evaluator.

TruthfulQA (Lin et al., 2022) is an English benchmark to measure whether a language model is truthful in generating answers. It contains 817 questions covering 38 domains. The questions are designed to cause imitative falsehoods which are due to a false belief or misconception. We use the generative part of TruthfulQA and adopt GPT4 to evaluate the response correctness.

HalluQA (Cheng et al., 2023) is a benchmark to measure hallucination in Chinese LLM. It contains 450 meticulously designed adversarial questions covering various domains to test imitative falsehoods of the model and factual knowledge. Still, we use the generative part and its official prompt to evaluate the answer.

CMMLU (Li et al., 2023a) is a Chinese multiple-choice benchmark similar to MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021), comprising 67 topics with massive questions. We use the official script and code to evaluate the model's accuracy on the task.

HaluEval (Li et al., 2023b) is a large collection of generated and human-annotated English hallucinated samples to evaluate the performance of LLM on recognizing hallucinations. It is a discriminative task that requires the model to judge whether a response contains hallucination or not. We use the official prompt and only test on 10,000 samples from the QA part. The evaluation is based on string matching (e.g. "Yes" or "No") and if the model's judgment does not match any pattern, it will be considered as a wrong judgment.

AlignBench (Liu et al., 2023) is a Chinese benchmark for evaluating LLMs' alignment skills. It contains 683 instructions on 8 different tasks, including professional knowledge, mathematics, fundamental language ability, logical reasoning, advanced Chinese understanding, writing ability, task-oriented role play, and open-ended question. We use its official prompt format to evaluate answers in a model-based way.

AlpacaEval (Li et al., 2023d) is a benchmark based on the AlpacaFarm (Dubois et al., 2023) evaluation set, which tests the model's instruction following ability. It contains 805 samples on different instructions, and calculates the winning rate against a base model. It has been used to indicate model's helpfulness in previous work (Lin et al., 2024a). In our experiments, the model before training is selected as the base model.

D Detailed Experiment Results

In this section, we will provide more detailed results of the main experiments and ablation studies. Domain-level accuracy on FactualBench is presented in heatmaps, and performance on other benchmarks and sub-tasks of AlignBench is listed in tables.

D.1 Main Experiments

We present the performance of Qwen2-7B-Instruct and Baichuan1-Chat after training through our method and the other three baselines on FactualBench at domain-level in Figure 13 and Figure 14, respectively. The first column presents the overall accuracy of the model and we arrange domains from left to right in the same order as Figure 12. Each domain is represented by its first 5 letters.

D.2 Ablation Studies

For the ablation study on data sources, we present models performance on 7 benchmarks in Table 13, on 8 sub-tasks of AlignBench in Table 14, and domain-level accuracy on FactualBench in Figure 15, Figure 16.

Loss	Split	Chosen	Rejected	# Valid Questions	# Labels/Pairs
Qwen2-7B-Instruct					
SFT	small	self	-	16,845	16,845
SFT	small	Baichuan	-	15,489	15,489
SFT	small	dataset	-	24,000	24,000
DPO	small	self	self	11,485	85,041
DPO[1]	small	Baichuan	Baichuan	12,949	96,737
DPO	small	dataset	dataset	72,000	72,000
Baichuan1-Chat					
SFT (single label)	full	self	-	115,798	115,798
SFT (all labels)	full	self	-	115,798	489,357
SFT	full	w/ desc.	-	177,714	177,714
SFT	full	dataset	-	177,714	177,714
DPO (small)[1]	small	self	self	12,949	96,737
DPO (full)[2]	full	self	self	98,805	743,333
DPO	full	w/ desc.	self	177,714	881,932
DPO	full	dataset	self	177,714	881,932
DPO	full	dataset	dataset	177,714	533,142
SFT then DPO[2]	full	self	self	98,805	743,333
SFT + DPO[2]	full	self	self	98,805	743,333

Table 12: Sizes of all our tuning data. Data with the same superscript [1,2] are exactly the same.

For the ablation study on loss functions, we present Baichuan performance on 7 benchmarks in Table 15, on 8 sub-tasks of AlignBench in Table 16, and domain-level accuracy on FactualBench in Figure 17.

E Mutual Nearest-Neighbor Metric

For two models with representations f, g, the mutual k-nearest neighbor metric measures the average overlap of their respective nearest neighbor sets (Huh et al., 2024). According to the original definition, define $x_i \sim \mathcal{X}$ as a sample from the data distribution $\mathcal{X}$. $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{b}$ is a mini-batch sampled from this data distribution. Two models f and g extract features $\phi_i = f(x_i)$ and $\psi_i = g(x_i)$. The collections of these features are denoted as $\Phi = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, ..., \phi_b\}$ and $\Psi = \{\psi_1, \psi_2, ..., \psi_b\}$. Then we compute the respective nearest neighbor sets $S(\phi_i)$ and $S(\psi_i)$ for each x_i under the representations f and g:

$$d_{knn}(\phi_i, \Phi \backslash \phi_i) = S(\phi_i); \quad (5)$$

$$d_{knn}(\psi_i, \Psi \backslash \psi_i) = S(\psi_i), \quad (6)$$

where d_{knn} returns the set of indices of its k-nearest neighbors. Then we measure its average intersection via

$$m_{\text{NN}}(\phi_i, \psi_i) = \frac{1}{k}|S(\phi_i) \cap S(\psi_i)|, \quad (7)$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the size of the intersection. We use the hidden state of the last layer to represent the extracted feature of a prompt, and following the original paper (Huh et al., 2024), we set $k = 10$ and $b = 1,000$ (we take all data points if the total size of the data is less than $1,000$). We apply l_2 normalization to the features, then use the inner product kernel to measure the distance between two features. The alignment of two models is measured by $\frac{1}{b}\Sigma_{i=1}^{b} m_{\text{NN}}(\phi_i, \psi_i)$.



Figure 13: Qwen2-7B-Instruct performance on FactualBench after different training methods.



Figure 14: Baichuan1-Chat performance on FactualBench after different training methods.

Loss	Chosen	Rejected	FactualBench	TruthfulQA	HalluQA	CMMLU	HaluEval	AlignBench	AlpacaEval	ΔAvg.
					QWEN2-7B-INSTRUCT					
SFT	self	-	55.43	50.31	45.56	80.22	53.70	6.63	44.22	-0.66
SFT	Baichuan	-	49.97	29.87	24.67	77.49	42.05	4.98	15.03	-13.61
SFT	dataset	-	50.38	19.58	21.11	79.85	9.69	3.56	7.20	-23.22
DPO	self	self	**58.81**	**54.47**	**49.78**	**82.15**	**54.00**	**6.96**	**58.26**	**+2.22**
DPO	Baichuan	Baichuan	58.17	53.86	46.67	80.14	52.26	6.71	39.19	+0.45
DPO	dataset	dataset	55.75	52.14	46.22	80.77	51.70	6.50	36.06	-0.65
					BAICHUAN1-CHAT					
SFT	self	-	51.33	31.46	30.00	48.78	**55.73**	5.04	37.58	+1.29
SFT	w/ desc.	-	55.63	**36.60**	27.11	51.39	10.40	4.47	36.96	-5.69
SFT	dataset	-	55.86	21.30	22.44	49.58	12.40	3.73	26.65	-10.18
DPO	self	self	**58.29**	35.86	**38.89**	**50.92**	52.05	**5.38**	**63.99**	**+4.97**
DPO	w/ desc.	self	18.17	13.10	9.33	48.05	48.57	4.07	32.80	-13.67
DPO	dataset	self	5.40	3.92	1.56	46.85	40.10	3.28	19.07	-21.56
DPO	dataset	dataset	49.08	28.89	19.78	50.70	54.89	4.82	39.07	-1.40

Table 13: Performance on 7 benchmarks in data sources ablation study. We mark the best results in **bold**.

Loss	Chosen	Rejected	Professional Knowledge	Mathe-matics	Fundamental Language Ability	Logical Reasoning	Advanced Chinese Understanding	Writing Ability	Task-oriented Role Play	Open-ended Question
					Qwen2-7B-Instruct					
SFT	self	-	**6.74**	6.40	**7.04**	4.90	6.50	7.09	7.35	7.50
SFT	Baichuan	-	5.26	3.72	5.88	3.41	5.31	5.60	5.59	6.42
SFT	dataset	-	4.47	3.29	4.50	3.37	5.29	1.92	2.73	3.32
DPO	self	self	6.63	**6.94**	6.94	**5.56**	**6.93**	**7.43**	**7.84**	**7.92**
DPO	Baichuan	Baichuan	6.44	6.37	6.85	5.29	7.26	7.21	7.45	7.74
DPO	dataset	dataset	6.10	6.36	6.76	4.70	6.59	7.23	7.64	7.07
					Baichuan1-Chat					
SFT	self	-	5.78	2.59	5.47	3.30	5.66	6.11	6.25	6.58
SFT	w/ desc.	-	5.02	2.68	4.96	2.92	5.67	5.32	5.00	5.74
SFT	dataset	-	4.48	2.62	4.79	2.75	5.08	3.24	3.77	3.76
DPO	self	self	**6.25**	**3.03**	**5.76**	**3.55**	**6.12**	**6.52**	**6.36**	**6.79**
DPO	w/ desc.	self	3.62	1.93	4.88	2.63	4.47	5.81	5.53	5.34
DPO	dataset	self	1.77	1.95	4.13	2.58	3.71	5.04	5.14	2.55
DPO	dataset	dataset	4.67	2.60	5.53	3.30	5.50	6.40	6.17	6.00

Table 14: Performance on 8 sub-tasks of AlignBench in data sources ablation study. We mark the best results in **bold**.



Figure 15: Qwen2-7B-Instruct performance on FactualBench after training on different data sources.



Figure 16: Baichuan1-Chat performance on FactualBench after training on different data sources.

Loss	FactualBench	TruthfulQA	HalluQA	CMMLU	HaluEval	AlignBench	AlpacaEval	ΔAvg.
				BAICHUAN1-CHAT				
SFT (single label)	51.33	31.46	30.00	48.78	**55.73**	5.04	37.58	+1.29
SFT (all labels)	52.37	28.76	26.44	50.15	53.90	5.03	31.06	+0.32
DPO (small)	57.37	33.78	38.44	50.13	50.63	5.30	54.84	+3.90
DPO (full)	**58.29**	35.86	**38.89**	**50.92**	52.05	**5.38**	**63.99**	**+4.97**
SFT then DPO	54.74	**37.33**	36.67	50.72	54.02	5.07	54.53	+4.03
SFT + DPO	57.16	34.76	38.22	50.78	52.31	5.13	63.91	+4.09

Table 15: Performance on 7 benchmarks in loss functions ablation study. We mark the best results in **bold**.

Loss	Professional Knowledge	Mathe-matics	Fundamental Language Ability	Logical Reasoning	Advanced Chinese Understanding	Writing Ability	Task-oriented Role Play	Open-ended Question
				BAICHUAN1-CHAT				
SFT (single label)	5.78	2.59	5.47	3.30	5.66	6.11	6.25	6.58
SFT (all labels)	5.46	2.88	5.60	3.25	5.57	6.19	6.17	6.63
DPO (small)	5.92	3.02	5.66	3.37	5.97	**6.53**	**6.55**	6.79
DPO (full)	**6.25**	**3.03**	**5.76**	**3.55**	**6.12**	6.52	6.36	6.79
SFT then DPO	5.57	2.66	5.53	3.01	6.00	6.33	6.32	6.92
SFT + DPO	5.60	2.79	5.57	3.16	6.05	6.17	6.41	**7.16**

Table 16: Performance on 8 sub-tasks of AlignBench in loss functions ablation study. We mark the best results in **bold**.



Figure 17: Baichuan1-Chat performance on FactualBench after training using different loss functions.