

G-EVAL: NLG Evaluation using GPT-4 with Better Human Alignment

Yang Liu Dan Iter Yichong Xu
Shuohang Wang Ruochen Xu Chenguang Zhu

Microsoft Cognitive Services Research
{*yaliu10, iterdan, yicxu, shuowa, ruox, chezhu*}@microsoft.com

Abstract

The quality of texts generated by natural language generation (NLG) systems is hard to measure automatically. Conventional reference-based metrics, such as BLEU and ROUGE, have been shown to have relatively low correlation with human judgments, especially for tasks that require creativity and diversity. Recent studies suggest using large language models (LLMs) as reference-free metrics for NLG evaluation, which have the benefit of being applicable to new tasks that lack human references. However, these LLM-based evaluators still have lower human correspondence than medium-size neural evaluators. In this work, we present G-EVAL, a framework of using large language models with chain-of-thoughts (CoT) and a form-filling paradigm, to assess the quality of NLG outputs. We experiment with two generation tasks, text summarization and dialogue generation. We show that G-EVAL with GPT-4 as the backbone model achieves a Spearman correlation of 0.514 with human on summarization task, outperforming all previous methods by a large margin. We also propose analysis on the behavior of LLM-based evaluators, and highlight the potential concern of LLM-based evaluators having a bias towards the LLM-generated texts.

1 Introduction

Evaluating the quality of natural language generation systems is a challenging problem even when large language models can generate high-quality and diverse texts that are often indistinguishable from human-written texts (Ouyang et al., 2022). Traditional automatic metrics, such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), ROUGE (Lin, 2004), and METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005), are widely used for NLG evaluation, but they have been shown to have relatively low correlation with human judgments, especially for open-ended generation tasks.

Moreover, these metrics require associated reference output, which is costly to collect for new tasks.

Recent studies propose directly using LLMs as reference-free NLG evaluators (Fu et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023). The idea is to use the LLMs to score the candidate output based on its generation probability without any reference target, under the assumption that the LLMs have learned to assign higher probabilities to high-quality and fluent texts. However, the validity and reliability of using LLMs as NLG evaluators have not been systematically investigated. In addition, meta-evaluations show that these LLM-based evaluators still have lower human correspondence than medium-size neural evaluators (Zhong et al., 2022). Thus, there is a need for a more effective and reliable framework for using LLMs for NLG evaluation.

In this paper, we propose G-EVAL, a framework of using LLMs with chain-of-thoughts (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022) to evaluate the quality of generated texts in a form-filling paradigm. By only feeding the Task Introduction and the Evaluation Criteria as a prompt, we ask LLMs to generate a CoT of detailed Evaluation Steps. Then we use the prompt along with the generated CoT to evaluate the NLG outputs. The evaluator output is formatted as a form. Moreover, the probabilities of the output rating tokens can be used to refine the final metric. We conduct extensive experiments on three meta-evaluation benchmarks of two NLG tasks: text summarization and dialogue generation. The results show that G-EVAL can outperform existing NLG evaluators by a large margin in terms of correlation with human evaluations. Finally, we conduct analysis on the behavior of LLM-based evaluators, and highlight the potential issue of LLM-based evaluator having a bias towards the LLM-generated texts.

To summarize, our main contributions in this paper are:




Figure 1: The overall framework of G-EVAL. We first input Task Introduction and Evaluation Criteria to the LLM, and ask it to generate a CoT of detailed Evaluation Steps. Then we use the prompt along with the generated CoT to evaluate the NLG outputs in a form-filling paradigm. Finally, we use the probability-weighted summation of the output scores as the final score.

1. LLM-based metrics generally outperform reference-based and reference-free baseline metrics in terms of correlation with human quality judgments, especially for open-ended and creative NLG tasks, such as dialogue response generation.
2. LLM-based metrics are sensitive to the instructions and prompts, and chain-of-thought can improve the performance of LLM-based evaluators by providing more context and guidance.
3. LLM-based metrics can provide a more fine-grained continuous score by re-weighting the discrete scores by their respective token probabilities.
4. LLM-based metrics have a potential issue of preferring LLM-generated texts over human-written texts, which may lead to the self-reinforcement of LLMs if LLM-based metrics are used as the reward signal for improving themselves.

2 Method

G-EVAL is a prompt-based evaluator with three main components: 1) a prompt that contains the definition of the evaluation task and the desired evaluation criteria, 2) a chain-of-thoughts (CoT) that is a set of intermediate instructions generated by the LLM describing the detailed evaluation steps, and 3) a scoring function that calls LLM and calculates the score based on the probabilities of the return tokens.

Prompt for NLG Evaluation The prompt is a natural language instruction that defines the evaluation task and the desired evaluation criteria. For example, for text summarization, the prompt can be:

You will be given one summary written for a news article. Your task is to rate the summary on one metric.

Please make sure you read and understand these instructions carefully. Please keep this document open while reviewing, and refer to it as needed.

The prompt should also contain customized eval-

uation criteria for different NLG tasks and, such as coherence, conciseness, or grammar. For example, for evaluating coherence in text summarization, we add the following content to the prompt:

Evaluation Criteria:

Coherence (1-5) - the collective quality of all sentences. We align this dimension with the DUC quality question of structure and coherence whereby "the summary should be well-structured and well-organized. The summary should not just be a heap of related information, but should build from sentence to sentence to a coherent body of information about a topic."

Auto Chain-of-Thoughts for NLG Evaluation

The chain-of-thoughts (CoT) is a sequence of intermediate representations that are generated by the LLM during the text generation process. For evaluation tasks, some criteria need a more detailed evaluation instruction beyond the simple definition, and it is time-consuming to manually design such evaluation steps for each task. We find that LLM can generate such evaluation steps by itself. The CoT can provide more context and guidance for the LLM to evaluate the generated text, and can also help to explain the evaluation process and results. For example, for evaluating coherence in text summarization, we add a line of "Evaluation Steps:" to the prompt and let LLM to generate the following CoT automatically:

1. Read the news article carefully and identify the main topic and key points.
2. Read the summary and compare it to the news article. Check if the summary covers the main topic and key points of the news article, and if it presents them in a clear and logical order.
3. Assign a score for coherence on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest based on the Evaluation Criteria.

Scoring Function The scoring function calls the LLM with the designed prompt, auto CoT, the input context and the target text that needs to be evaluated. Unlike GPTScore (Fu et al., 2023) which uses the conditional probability of generating the target text as an evaluation metric, G-EVAL directly

performs the evaluation task with a form-filling paradigm. For example, for evaluating coherence in text summarization, we concatenate the prompt, the CoT, the news article, and the summary, and then call the LLM to output a score from 1 to 5 for each evaluation aspect, based on the defined criteria.

However, we notice this direct scoring function has two issues:

1. For some evaluation tasks, one digit usually dominates the distribution of the scores, such as 3 for a 1 - 5 scale. This may lead to the low variance of the scores and the low correlation with human judgments.
2. LLMs usually only output integer scores, even when the prompt explicitly requests decimal values. This leads to many ties in evaluation scores which do not capture the subtle difference between generated texts.

To address these issues, we propose using the probabilities of output tokens from LLMs to normalize the scores and take their weighted summation as the final results. Formally, given a set of scores (like from 1 to 5) predefined in the prompt $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$, the probability of each score $p(s_i)$ is calculated by the LLM, and the final score is:

$$score = \sum_{i=1}^n p(s_i) \times s_i \quad (1)$$

This method obtains more fine-grained, continuous scores that better reflect the quality and diversity of the generated texts.

3 Experiments

Following Zhong et al. (2022), we meta-evaluate our evaluator on three benchmarks, SummEval, Topical-Chat and QAGS, of two NLG tasks, summarization and dialogue response generation.

3.1 Implementation Details

We use OpenAI’s GPT family as our LLMs, including GPT-3.5 (text-davinci-003) and GPT-4. For GPT-3.5, we set decoding temperature to 0 to increase the model’s determinism. For GPT-4, as it does not support the output of token probabilities, we set ‘ $n = 20, temperature = 1, top_p = 1$ ’ to sample 20 times to estimate the token probabilities. We use G-EVAL-4 to indicate G-EVAL with GPT-4

Metrics	Coherence		Consistency		Fluency		Relevance		AVG	
	ρ	τ	ρ	τ	ρ	τ	ρ	τ	ρ	τ
ROUGE-1	0.167	0.126	0.160	0.130	0.115	0.094	0.326	0.252	0.192	0.150
ROUGE-2	0.184	0.139	0.187	0.155	0.159	0.128	0.290	0.219	0.205	0.161
ROUGE-L	0.128	0.099	0.115	0.092	0.105	0.084	0.311	0.237	0.165	0.128
BERTScore	0.284	0.211	0.110	0.090	0.193	0.158	0.312	0.243	0.225	0.175
MOVERSscore	0.159	0.118	0.157	0.127	0.129	0.105	0.318	0.244	0.191	0.148
BARTScore	0.448	0.342	0.382	0.315	0.356	0.292	0.356	0.273	0.385	0.305
UniEval	<u>0.575</u>	<u>0.442</u>	<u>0.446</u>	<u>0.371</u>	<u>0.449</u>	<u>0.371</u>	<u>0.426</u>	<u>0.325</u>	<u>0.474</u>	<u>0.377</u>
GPTScore	0.434	–	0.449	–	0.403	–	0.381	–	0.417	–
G-EVAL-3.5	0.440	0.335	0.386	0.318	0.424	0.347	0.385	0.293	0.401	0.320
- Probs	0.359	<i>0.313</i>	0.361	<i>0.344</i>	0.339	<i>0.323</i>	0.327	<i>0.288</i>	0.346	<i>0.317</i>
G-EVAL-4	0.582	0.457	0.507	0.425	0.455	0.378	0.547	0.433	0.514	0.418
- Probs	0.560	<i>0.472</i>	0.501	<i>0.459</i>	0.438	<i>0.408</i>	0.511	<i>0.444</i>	0.502	<i>0.446</i>
- CoT	0.564	0.454	0.493	0.413	0.403	0.334	0.538	0.427	0.500	0.407

Table 1: **Summary**-level Spearman (ρ) and Kendall-Tau (τ) correlations of different metrics on SummEval benchmark. G-EVAL without probabilities (*italicized*) should not be considered as a fair comparison to other metrics on τ , as it leads to many ties in the scores. This results in a higher Kendall-Tau correlation, but it does not fairly reflect the true evaluation ability. More details are in Section 4.

as the backbone model, and G-EVAL-3.5 to indicate G-EVAL with GPT-3.5 as the backbone model. Example prompts for each task are provided in the Appendix.

3.2 Benchmarks

We adopt three meta-evaluation benchmarks to measure the correlation between G-EVAL and human judgments.

SummEval (Fabbri et al., 2021) is a benchmark that compares different evaluation methods for summarization. It gives human ratings for four aspects of each summary: fluency, coherence, consistency and relevance. It is built on the CNN/DailyMail dataset (Hermann et al., 2015)

Topical-Chat (Mehri and Eskenazi, 2020) is a testbed for meta-evaluating different evaluators on dialogue response generation systems that use knowledge. We follow (Zhong et al., 2022) to use its human ratings on four aspects: naturalness, coherence, engagingness and groundedness.

QAGS (Wang et al., 2020) is a benchmark for evaluating hallucinations in the summarization task. It aims to measure the consistency dimension of summaries on two different summarization datasets.

3.3 Baselines

We evaluate G-EVAL against various evaluators that achieved state-of-the-art performance.

BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2019) measures the similarity between two texts based on the contextualized embedding from BERT (Devlin et al., 2019).

MoverScore (?) improves BERTScore by adding soft alignments and new aggregation methods to obtain a more robust similarity measure.

BARTScore (Yuan et al., 2021) is a unified evaluator which evaluate with the average likelihood of the pretrained encoder-decoder model, BART (Lewis et al., 2020). It can predict different scores depending on the formats of source and target.

FactCC and **QAGS** (Kryściński et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020) are two evaluators that measure the factual consistency of generated summaries. FactCC is a BERT-based classifier that predicts whether a summary is consistent with the source document. QAGS is a question-answering based evaluator that generates questions from the summary and checks if the answers can be found in the source document.

USR (Mehri and Eskenazi, 2020) is evaluator that assess dialogue response generation from different perspectives. It has several versions that assign different scores to each target response.

UniEval (Zhong et al., 2022) is a unified evaluator that can evaluate different aspects of text generation as QA tasks. It uses a pretrained T5 model

(Raffel et al., 2020) to encode the evaluation task, source and target texts as questions and answers, and then computes the QA score as the evaluation score. It can also handle different evaluation tasks by changing the question format.

GPTScore (Fu et al., 2023) is a new framework that evaluates texts with generative pre-training models like GPT-3. It assumes that a generative pre-training model will assign a higher probability of high-quality generated text following a given instruction and context. Unlike G-EVAL, GPTScore formulates the evaluation task as a conditional generation problem instead of a form-filling problem.

3.4 Results for Summarization

We adopt the same approach as Zhong et al. (2022) to evaluate different summarization metrics using summary-level Spearman and Kendall-Tau correlation. The first part of Table 1 shows the results of metrics that compare the semantic similarity between the model output and the reference text. These metrics perform poorly on most dimensions. The second part shows the results of metrics that use neural networks to learn from human ratings of summary quality. These metrics have much higher correlations than the similarity-based metrics, suggesting that they are more reliable for summarization evaluation.

In the last part of Table 1 which corresponds to GPT-based evaluators, GPTScore also uses GPTs for evaluating summarization texts, but relies on GPT’s conditional probabilities of the given target. G-EVAL substantially surpasses all previous state-of-the-art evaluators on the SummEval benchmark. G-EVAL-4 achieved much higher human correspondence compared with G-EVAL-3.5 on both Spearman and Kendall-Tau correlation, which indicates that the larger model size of GPT-4 is beneficial for summarization evaluation. G-EVAL also outperforms GPTScore on several dimension, demonstrating the effectiveness of the simple form-filling paradigm.

3.5 Results for Dialogue Generation

We use the Topical-chat benchmark from Mehri and Eskenazi (2020) to measure how well different evaluators agree with human ratings on the quality of dialogue responses. We calculate the Pearson and Spearman correlation for each turn of the dialogue. Table 2 shows that similarity-based metrics have good agreement with humans on how engaging and grounded the responses

are, but not on the other aspects. With respect to the learning-based evaluators, before G-EVAL, UniEval predicts scores that are most consistent with human judgments across all aspects.

As shown in the last part, G-EVAL also substantially surpasses all previous state-of-the-art evaluator on the Topical-Chat benchmark. Notably, the G-EVAL-3.5 can achieve similar results with G-EVAL-4. This indicates that this benchmark is relatively easy for the G-EVAL model.

3.6 Results on Hallucinations

Advanced NLG models often produce text that does not match the context input (Cao et al., 2018), and recent studies find even powerful LLMs also suffer from the problem of hallucination. This motivates recent research to design evaluators for measuring the consistency aspect in summarization (Kryściński et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Cao et al., 2020; Durmus et al., 2020). We test the QAGS meta-evaluation benchmark, which includes two different summarization datasets: CNN/DailyMail and XSum (Narayan et al., 2018). Table 3 shows that BARTScore performs well on the more extractive subset (QAGS-CNN), but has low correlation on the more abstractive subset (QAGS-Xsum). UniEval has good correlation on both subsets of the data.

On average, G-EVAL-4 outperforms all state-of-the-art evaluators on QAGS, with a large margin on QAGS-Xsum. G-EVAL-3.5, on the other hand, failed to perform well on this benchmark, which indicates that the consistency aspect is sensitive to the LLM’s capacity. This result is consistent with Table 1.

4 Analysis

Will G-EVAL prefer LLM-based outputs?

One concern about using LLM as an evaluator is that it may prefer the outputs generated by the LLM itself, rather than the high-quality human-written texts. To investigate this issue, we conduct an experiment on the summarization task, where we compare the evaluation scores of the LLM-generated and the human-written summaries. We use the dataset collected in Zhang et al. (2023), where they first ask freelance writers to write high-quality summaries for news articles, and then ask annotators to compare human-written summaries and LLM-generated summaries (using GPT-3.5, text-davinci-003).

Metrics	Naturalness		Coherence		Engagingness		Groundedness		AVG	
	r	ρ	r	ρ	r	ρ	r	ρ	r	ρ
ROUGE-L	0.176	0.146	0.193	0.203	0.295	0.300	0.310	0.327	0.243	0.244
BLEU-4	0.180	0.175	0.131	0.235	0.232	0.316	0.213	0.310	0.189	0.259
METEOR	0.212	0.191	0.250	0.302	0.367	0.439	0.333	0.391	0.290	0.331
BERTScore	0.226	0.209	0.214	0.233	0.317	0.335	0.291	0.317	0.262	0.273
USR	0.337	0.325	0.416	0.377	0.456	0.465	0.222	0.447	0.358	0.403
UniEval	0.455	0.330	0.602	0.455	0.573	0.430	0.577	0.453	0.552	0.417
G-EVAL-3.5	0.532	0.539	0.519	0.544	0.660	0.691	0.586	0.567	0.574	0.585
G-EVAL-4	0.549	0.565	0.594	0.605	0.627	0.631	0.531	0.551	0.575	0.588

Table 2: Turn-level Spearman (ρ) and Kendall-Tau (τ) correlations of different metrics on Topical-Chat benchmark.

The dataset can be divided in three categories: 1) human-written summaries that are rated *higher* than GPT-3.5 summaries by human judges, 2) human-written summaries that are rated *lower* than GPT-3.5 summaries by human judges, and 3) human-written summaries and GPT-3.5 summaries are rated *equally* good by human judges. We use G-EVAL-4 to evaluate the summaries in each category, and compare the averaged scores. ¹

The results are shown in Figure 2. We can see that, G-EVAL-4 assigns higher scores to human-written summaries when human judges also prefer human-written summaries, and assigns lower scores when human judges prefer GPT-3.5 summaries. However, G-EVAL-4 always gives higher scores to GPT-3.5 summaries than human-written summaries, even when human judges prefer human-written summaries. We propose two potential reasons for this phenomenon:

1. NLG outputs from high-quality systems are in natural difficult to evaluate. The authors of the original paper found that inter-annotator agreement on judging human-written and LLM-generated summaries is very low, with Krippendorff’s alpha at 0.07.
2. G-EVAL may have a bias towards the LLM-generated summaries because the model could share the same concept of evaluation criteria during generation and evaluation.

Our work should be considered as a preliminary study on this issue, and more research is needed to fully understand the behavior of LLM-based

¹We use G-EVAL-4 in this experiment, because its superiority in evaluating summarization tasks. Although it has different distribution with with GPT-3.5, the two LLMs should share similar behaviors in terms of text generation.




Figure 2: Averaged G-EVAL-4’s scores for human-written summaries and GPT-3.5 summaries, divided by human judges’ preference.

evaluators to reduce its inherent bias towards LLM-generated text. We highlight this concern in the context that LLM-based evaluators may lead to self-reinforcement of LLMs if the evaluation score is used as a reward signal for further tuning. And this could result in the over-fitting of the LLMs to their own evaluation criteria, rather than the true evaluation criteria of the NLG tasks.

The Effect of Chain-of-Thoughts We compare the performance of G-EVAL with and without chain-of-thoughts (CoT) on the SummEval benchmark. Table 1 shows that G-EVAL-4 with CoT has higher correlation than G-EVAL-4 without CoT on all dimensions, especially for *fluency*. This suggests that CoT can provide more context and guidance for the LLM to evaluate the generated text, and can also help to explain the evaluation process and results.

The Effect of Probability Normalization We compare the performance of G-EVAL with and without probability normalization on the SummEval benchmark. Table 1 shows that, on Kendall-Tau correlation, G-EVAL-4 with probabilities is

Metrics	QAGS-CNN			QAGS-XSUM			Average		
	r	ρ	τ	r	ρ	τ	r	ρ	τ
ROUGE-2	0.459	0.418	0.333	0.097	0.083	0.068	0.278	0.250	0.200
ROUGE-L	0.357	0.324	0.254	0.024	-0.011	-0.009	0.190	0.156	0.122
BERTScore	0.576	0.505	0.399	0.024	0.008	0.006	0.300	0.256	0.202
MoverScore	0.414	0.347	0.271	0.054	0.044	0.036	0.234	0.195	0.153
FactCC	0.416	0.484	0.376	0.297	0.259	0.212	0.356	0.371	0.294
QAGS	0.545	-	-	0.175	-	-	0.375	-	-
BARTScore	0.735	0.680	0.557	0.184	0.159	0.130	0.459	0.420	0.343
CTC	0.619	0.564	0.450	0.309	0.295	0.242	0.464	0.430	0.346
UniEval	0.682	0.662	0.532	0.461	0.488	0.399	0.571	0.575	0.465
G-EVAL-3.5	0.477	0.516	0.410	0.211	0.406	0.343	0.344	0.461	0.377
G-EVAL-4	0.631	0.685	0.591	0.558	0.537	0.472	0.599	0.611	0.525

Table 3: Pearson (r), Spearman (ρ) and Kendall-Tau (τ) correlations of different metrics on QAGS benchmark.

inferior to G-EVAL-4 without probabilities on SummEval. We believe this is related to the calculation of Kendall-Tau correlation, which is based on the number of concordant and discordant pairs. Direct scoring without probabilities can lead to many ties, which are not counted as either concordant or discordant. This may result in a higher Kendall-Tau correlation, but it does not reflect the model’s true capacity of evaluating the generated texts. On the other hand, probability normalization can obtain more fine-grained, continuous scores that better capture the subtle difference between generated texts. This is reflected by the higher Spearman correlation of G-EVAL-4 with probabilities, which is based on the rank order of the scores.

The Effect of Model Size We compare the performance of G-EVAL with different model sizes on the SummEval and QAGS benchmarks. Table 1 and Table 3 show that G-EVAL-4 has higher correlation than G-EVAL-3.5 on most dimensions and datasets, except for `engagingness` and `groundedness` on the Topical-Chat benchmark. This demonstrates that larger model size can improve the performance of G-EVAL, especially for more challenging and complex evaluation tasks, such as `consistency` and `relevance`.

5 Related Work

Ngram-based Metrics Ngram-based metrics refer to the scores for evaluating the NLG models by measuring the lexical overlap between a generated text and a reference text. BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) is the most widely used metric for machine translation evaluation, which calculates the geometric mean of modified n-gram precision and a brevity

penalty. ROUGE (Lin, 2004) is a recall-oriented metric for summarization evaluation, which measures the n-gram overlap between a generated summary and a set of reference summaries. It has been shown that more than 60% of recent papers on NLG only rely on ROUGE or BLEU to evaluate their systems (Kasai et al., 2021). However, these metrics fail to measure content quality (Reiter and Belz, 2009) or capture syntactic errors (Stent et al., 2005), and therefore do not reflect the reliability of NLG systems accurately.

Embedding-based Metrics Embedding-based metrics refer to the scores for evaluating the NLG models by measuring the semantic similarity between a generated text and a reference text based on the word or sentence embeddings. WMD (Kusner et al., 2015) is a metric that measures the distance between two texts based on the word embeddings. BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2019) measures the similarity between two texts based on the contextualized embedding from BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). MoverScore (?) improves BERTScore by adding soft alignments and new aggregation methods to obtain a more robust similarity measure. (Clark et al., 2019) propose a metric that evaluates multi-sentence texts by computing the similarity between the generated text and the reference text based on the sentence embeddings.

Task-specific Evaluators Task-specific metrics refer to the scores for evaluating the NLG models by measuring the quality of the generated texts based on the specific task requirements. For example, summarization tasks need to assess the `consistency` of the generated sum-

maries (Kryściński et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Cao et al., 2020; Durmus et al., 2020), and dialogue response generation tasks need to assess the coherence of the generated responses (Dziri et al., 2019; Ye et al., 2021). However, these metrics are not generalizable to other NLG tasks, and they are not able to measure the overall quality of the generated texts.

Unified Evaluators Recently, some evaluators have been developed to assess text quality from multiple dimensions by varying the input and output contents (Yuan et al., 2021) or the model variants (Mehri and Eskenazi, 2020) they use. UniEval (Zhong et al., 2022) is a unified evaluator that can evaluate different aspects of text generation as QA tasks. By changing the question format, it can handle different evaluation tasks.

LLM-based Evaluators Fu et al. (2023) propose GPTScore, a new framework that evaluated texts with generative pre-training models like GPT-3. It assumes that a generative pre-training model will assign a higher probability of high-quality generated text following a given instruction and context. Wang et al. (2023) conduct a preliminary survey of using ChatGPT as a NLG evaluator. Kocmi and Federmann (2023) proposed to use GPT models for evaluating machine translation tasks.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose G-EVAL, a framework of using LLM with chain-of-thoughts (CoT) to evaluate the quality of generated texts. We conduct extensive experiments on two NLG tasks, text summarization and dialogue generation, and show that G-EVAL can outperform state-of-the-art evaluators and achieve higher human correspondence. We also propose preliminary analysis on the behavior of LLM-based evaluators, and highlight the potential issue of LLM-based evaluator having a bias towards the LLM-generated texts. We hope our work can inspire more research on using LLMs for NLG evaluation, and also raise awareness of the potential risks and challenges of using LLMs as evaluators.

References

- Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, pages 65–72.
- Meng Cao, Yue Dong, Jiapeng Wu, and Jackie Chi Kit Cheung. 2020. Factual error correction for abstractive summarization models. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6251–6258.
- Ziqiang Cao, Furu Wei, Wenjie Li, and Sujian Li. 2018. Faithful to the original: Fact aware neural abstractive summarization. In *thirty-second AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*.
- Elizabeth Clark, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Noah A Smith. 2019. Sentence mover’s similarity: Automatic evaluation for multi-sentence texts. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2748–2760.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186.
- Esin Durmus, He He, and Mona Diab. 2020. Feqa: A question answering evaluation framework for faithfulness assessment in abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5055–5070.
- Nouha Dziri, Ehsan Kamalloo, Kory Mathewson, and Osmar R Zaiane. 2019. Evaluating coherence in dialogue systems using entailment. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 3806–3812.
- Alexander R Fabbri, Wojciech Kryściński, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir Radev. 2021. Summeval: Re-evaluating summarization evaluation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:391–409.
- Jinlan Fu, See-Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. 2023. Gptscore: Evaluate as you desire. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04166*.
- Karl Moritz Hermann, Tomas Kocisky, Edward Grefenstette, Lasse Espeholt, Will Kay, Mustafa Suleyman, and Phil Blunsom. 2015. Teaching machines to read and comprehend. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28.

- Jungo Kasai, Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Lavinia Dunagan, Jacob Morrison, Alexander R Fabbri, Yejin Choi, and Noah A Smith. 2021. Bidimensional leaderboards: Generate and evaluate language hand in hand. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04139*.
- Tom Kocmi and Christian Federmann. 2023. Large language models are state-of-the-art evaluators of translation quality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.14520*.
- Wojciech Kryściński, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2020. Evaluating the factual consistency of abstractive text summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9332–9346.
- Matt Kusner, Yu Sun, Nicholas Kolkin, and Kilian Weinberger. 2015. From word embeddings to document distances. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 957–966. PMLR.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*, pages 7871–7880. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81.
- Shikib Mehri and Maxine Eskenazi. 2020. Ustr: An unsupervised and reference free evaluation metric for dialog generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00456*.
- Shashi Narayan, Shay B Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Don’t give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1797–1807.
- 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.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21:1–67.
- Ehud Reiter and Anja Belz. 2009. An investigation into the validity of some metrics for automatically evaluating natural language generation systems. *Computational Linguistics*, 35(4):529–558.
- Amanda Stent, Matthew Marge, and Mohit Singhai. 2005. Evaluating evaluation methods for generation in the presence of variation. In *Proceedings of the 6th international conference on Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing*, pages 341–351.
- Alex Wang, Kyunghyun Cho, and Mike Lewis. 2020. Asking and answering questions to evaluate the factual consistency of summaries. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5008–5020.
- Jiaan Wang, Yunlong Liang, Fandong Meng, Haoxiang Shi, Zhixu Li, Jinan Xu, Jianfeng Qu, and Jie Zhou. 2023. Is chatgpt a good nlg evaluator? a preliminary study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04048*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903*.
- Zheng Ye, Liucun Lu, Lishan Huang, Liang Lin, and Xiaodan Liang. 2021. Towards quantifiable dialogue coherence evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2718–2729.
- Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. Bartscore: Evaluating generated text as text generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*.
- Tianyi Zhang, Faisal Ladhak, Esin Durmus, Percy Liang, Kathleen McKeown, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. [Benchmarking large language models for news summarization](#).
- Wei Zhao, Maxime Peyrard, Fei Liu, Yang Gao, Christian M Meyer, and Steffen Eger. 2019. Moverscore: Text generation evaluating with contextualized embeddings and earth mover distance. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 563–578.
- Ming Zhong, Yang Liu, Da Yin, Yuning Mao, Yizhu Jiao, Pengfei Liu, Chenguang Zhu, Heng Ji, and

Jiawei Han. 2022. Towards a unified multi-dimensional evaluator for text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07197*.

A Example Prompts

Evaluate Coherence in the Summarization Task

You will be given one summary written for a news article.

Your task is to rate the summary on one metric.

Please make sure you read and understand these instructions carefully. Please keep this document open while reviewing, and refer to it as needed.

Evaluation Criteria:

Coherence (1-5) - the collective quality of all sentences. We align this dimension with the DUC quality question of structure and coherence whereby "the summary should be well-structured and well-organized. The summary should not just be a heap of related information, but should build from sentence to sentence to a coherent body of information about a topic."

Evaluation Steps:

- 1. Read the news article carefully and identify the main topic and key points.*
- 2. Read the summary and compare it to the news article. Check if the summary covers the main topic and key points of the news article, and if it presents them in a clear and logical order.*
- 3. Assign a score for coherence on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest based on the Evaluation Criteria.*

Example:

Source Text:

{{Document}}

Summary:

{{Summary}}

Evaluation Form (scores ONLY):

- Coherence:

Evaluate Engagingness in the Dialogue Generation Task

You will be given a conversation between two individuals. You will then be given one potential response for the next turn in the conversation. The response concerns an interesting fact, which will be provided as well.

Your task is to rate the responses on one metric.

Please make sure you read and understand these instructions carefully. Please keep this document open while reviewing, and refer to it as needed.

Evaluation Criteria:

Engagingness (1-3) Is the response dull/interesting?

- A score of 1 (dull) means that the response is generic and dull.*
- A score of 2 (somewhat interesting) means the response is somewhat interesting and could engage you in the conversation (e.g., an opinion, thought)*
- A score of 3 (interesting) means the response is very interesting or presents an interesting fact*

Evaluation Steps:

1. Read the conversation, the corresponding fact and the response carefully.
2. Rate the response on a scale of 1-3 for engagingness, according to the criteria above.
3. Provide a brief explanation for your rating, referring to specific aspects of the response and the conversation.

Example:

Conversation History:

{{Document}}

Corresponding Fact:

{{Fact}}

Response:

{{Response}}

Evaluation Form (scores ONLY):

- Engagingness:

Evaluate Hallucinations

Human Evaluation of Text Summarization Systems:

Factual Consistency: Does the summary untruthful or misleading facts that are not supported by the source text?

Source Text:

{{Document}}

Summary:

{{Summary}}

Does the summary contain factual inconsistency?

Answer: