
KoBALT: KOREAN BENCHMARK FOR ADVANCED LINGUISTIC TASKS

Hyopil Shin Seoul National University hpshin@snu.ac.kr	Sangah Lee Seoul National University sanalee@snu.ac.kr	Dongjun Jang Seoul National University qwer4107@snu.ac.kr	Wooseok Song Seoul National University semojak@snu.ac.kr
Jaeyoon Kim Seoul National University toscour345@snu.ac.kr	Chaeyoung Oh Seoul National University nyong10@snu.ac.kr	Hyemi Jo Seoul National University huimei6361@snu.ac.kr	Youngchae Ahn Seoul National University estelle1026@snu.ac.kr
Sihyun Oh Seoul National University osthepublic@snu.ac.kr	Hyohyeong Chang Seoul National University mipiw3842@snu.ac.kr	Sunkyoung Kim LG AI Research sunkyoung.kim@lgresearch.ai	
Jinsik Lee LG AI Research jinsik.lee@lgresearch.ai			

ABSTRACT

We introduce KoBALT (Korean Benchmark for Advanced Linguistic Tasks), a comprehensive linguistically-motivated benchmark comprising 700 multiple-choice questions spanning 24 phenomena across five linguistic domains: syntax, semantics, pragmatics, phonetics/phonology, and morphology. KoBALT is designed to advance the evaluation of large language models (LLMs) in Korean, a morphologically rich language, by addressing the limitations of conventional benchmarks that often lack linguistic depth and typological grounding. It introduces a suite of expert-curated, linguistically motivated questions with minimal n-gram overlap with standard Korean corpora, substantially mitigating the risk of data contamination and allowing a more robust assessment of true language understanding. Our evaluation of 20 contemporary LLMs reveals significant performance disparities, with the highest-performing model achieving 61% general accuracy but showing substantial variation across linguistic domains - from stronger performance in semantics (66%) to considerable weaknesses in phonology (31%) and morphology (36%). Through human preference evaluation with 95 annotators, we demonstrate a strong correlation between KoBALT scores and human judgments, validating our benchmark’s effectiveness as a discriminative measure of Korean language understanding. KoBALT addresses critical gaps in linguistic evaluation for typologically diverse languages and provides a robust framework for assessing genuine linguistic competence in Korean language models.

1 Introduction

Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) have been remarkable, particularly following the emergence of increasingly sophisticated LLMs with varying architectures, parameter scales [Shoeybi et al., 2020, OpenAI et al., 2024], and training objectives [DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025a, Brown et al., 2020]. These recent models demonstrate impressive capabilities across various linguistic tasks, and many models approach or surpass human-level performance on specific benchmarks. However, in terms of multilingual capabilities including the Korean language, there remains a gap in assessing the true linguistic capabilities of them, which are not adequately captured in recent knowledge-intensive

and challenging benchmarks based on translated and repurposed materials without sufficient involvement of linguistic knowledge.

There are two streams of benchmarks that are linguistically motivated. A traditional stream comprises benchmarks such as BLiMP [Warstadt et al., 2019], Holmes [Waldis et al., 2024], and SyntaxGym [Gauthier et al., 2020]. However, these benchmarks were built with highly controlled sentences, which fall short in evaluating models’ advanced linguistic ability in multiple domains: phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Another stream consists of benchmarks sourced from the linguistic olympiad (Sánchez et al. [2024], Goyal and Dan [2025], Bean et al. [2024]). This type of benchmarks merely focus on evaluating complex deductive reasoning based on linguistic data in a puzzle-like manner, whose results are apart from the model’s linguistic competence on multiple levels of individual languages. Moreover, when it comes to Korean language, many of existing benchmarks have additional problems that they are constructed via translations of English benchmarks, which reduces their validity on the model competence.

We introduce KoBALT (Korean Benchmark for Advanced Linguistic Tasks), comprising 700 linguistically motivated multiple-choice questions spanning 24 distinct linguistic phenomena across five fundamental domains: syntax (300), semantics (215), pragmatics (81), phonetics/phonology (62), and morphology (42). Unlike most existing Korean benchmarks, KoBALT features original, linguist-crafted test items with minimal n-gram overlap with common Korean training corpora (bigrams <8.6%, trigrams <0.7%), mitigating data contamination concerns. We evaluate 20 contemporary LLMs on KoBALT, including both proprietary (Claude 3.7, GPT-4o) and open-source models (LLaMA, Mistral, Qwen). Our results reveal significant performance disparities, with the highest-performing model (Claude 3.7 Sonnet) achieving 61% accuracy overall, with notable performance variations across linguistic domains. Models generally demonstrate greater proficiency in semantics (66%) compared to phonology (31%) and morphology (36%). To ensure KoBALT’s validity that our dataset’s evaluation results correlate with actual human preferences for certain models, we conduct a human preference evaluation involving 95 annotators. Through Bradley-Terry analysis of their judgments on model responses, we demonstrate a strong correlation between KoBALT scores and human evaluations ($r=0.638$ for the best-performing model), confirming our benchmark as an effective and discriminative measure of Korean language understanding.

KoBALT is a challenging benchmark designed to elicit and evaluate the deep and sophisticated linguistic capabilities of large language models (LLMs) by integrating linguistic expertise from human experts with the generative capacities of LLMs. By thoroughly reflecting the structural and typological properties of language, KoBALT not only enables fine-grained assessment of Korean, but also serves as a reference framework for constructing linguistically rigorous benchmarks in other languages.

2 Related Work

2.1 Benchmarks for Linguistic Evaluation

The evaluation of language models (LMs) has undergone a significant shift from task-oriented benchmarks to linguistically grounded diagnostics. Early frameworks such as GLUE and SuperGLUE [Wang et al., 2018, 2019] established standard NLP tasks—natural language inference (NLI), question answering, and classification—but were rapidly saturated, limiting their ability to distinguish models with genuine linguistic understanding from those leveraging superficial pattern recognition or dataset-specific cues.

In response, broader-scale benchmarks like MMLU [Hendrycks et al., 2020] and BIG-Bench [Srivastava et al., 2022] expanded task coverage across domains. While these benchmarks substantially broadened task coverage, their emphasis on encyclopedic knowledge often limited the depth of linguistic evaluation. These limitations have led to the development of linguistically-targeted resources such as BLiMP [Warstadt et al., 2019], which focuses on minimal-pair diagnostics for core linguistic phenomena, and Holmes [Waldis et al., 2024], which extends this approach by covering a wider range of linguistic subfields. SyntaxGym [Gauthier et al., 2020] introduced psycholinguistically inspired templates to test syntactic generalization, while domain-specific evaluations such as PUB [Sravanthi et al., 2024] target core pragmatic phenomena including implicature, presupposition, reference, and deixis. MultiPragEval [Park et al., 2024a] further expands pragmatic evaluation through multilingual tasks based on Grice’s Cooperative Principle, while PhonologyBench [Suvarna et al., 2024] evaluates models’ ability to generalize phonological rules.

A distinct methodological approach has emerged through benchmarks conceptualizing linguistics as a domain for complex reasoning. Works such as Linguini [Sánchez et al., 2024], IOLBench [Goyal and Dan, 2025], and LINGOLY [Bean et al., 2024] leverage problem formats derived from linguistics olympiads, emphasizing deductive reasoning through tasks like unseen language translation, cognate identification, and graphophonemic transcription. While these tasks pose meaningful challenges, they tend to assess general reasoning rather than internalized linguistic knowledge relevant to natural language processing.

Our work diverges from these approaches by introducing problem sets that simultaneously assess linguistic knowledge and reasoning capabilities within the specific context of Korean language phenomena. Additionally, we establish empirical validation of our benchmark’s ecological validity by demonstrating correlation between benchmark performance and human preference judgments—a methodological contribution absent in most previous linguistic evaluation frameworks.

2.2 Korean Benchmarks

The landscape of Korean language benchmarks exhibits notable limitations in comprehensiveness, methodological rigor, and linguistic specificity. KLUE [Park et al., 2021], conceptualized as a Korean analog to GLUE, inherits the limitations of its predecessor by focusing on conventional NLP tasks that inadequately assess complex linguistic reasoning. Similarly, the Ko-H5 benchmark from Open Ko-LLM Leaderboard [Park et al., 2024b] relies primarily on translated English datasets, failing to capture language-specific linguistic phenomena unique to Korean.

KoBEST [Jang et al., 2022] represents a more linguistically-informed approach, comprising five tasks adapted from English benchmarks but designed by Korean linguists. However, its restricted scope—focusing primarily on word sense disambiguation and polarity classification—provides insufficient coverage of Korean’s rich morphosyntactic, phonological, and pragmatic characteristics. This narrow assessment scope significantly limits its utility as a comprehensive measure of Korean linguistic competence.

Recent benchmarks have attempted broader coverage but encounter methodological limitations. Hae-Rae Bench [Son et al., 2024] emphasizes lexical knowledge and cultural understanding but relies heavily on crowdsourced content and existing quiz show materials, introducing potential data contamination while lacking systematic linguistic framework. CLiCK [Kim et al., 2024] presents an ambiguous categorization of linguistic phenomena and directly extracts questions from standardized Korean examinations, raising serious concerns regarding both theoretical coherence and training data overlap.

These limitations collectively highlight three pervasive issues in existing Korean benchmarks: (1) overreliance on translated or repurposed content rather than originally developed materials; (2) insufficient engagement of linguistic expertise in benchmark construction; and (3) inadequate coverage of language-specific phenomena across core linguistic subfields. Our benchmark addresses these limitations through a comprehensive approach constructed entirely by native Korean linguists without reliance on existing sources or machine translation. By systematically evaluating models across diverse linguistic domains through complex reasoning tasks, KoBALT provides a more robust assessment framework specifically designed to capture the nuanced characteristics of Korean language.

3 KoBALT: Korean Benchmark for Advanced Linguistic Tasks

KoBALT comprises 700 theoretically motivated, linguist-crafted multiple-choice questions designed to systematically assess language models’ competence over 24 linguistic phenomena across five fundamental domains of linguistics, namely *Syntax*, *Semantics*, *Pragmatics*, *Phonetics and Phonology*, and *Morphology*. Each question presents ten choices, challenging models to demonstrate both linguistic knowledge and reasoning capabilities. The benchmark was meticulously developed through a structured methodology that involved seven linguistically trained annotators who constructed, validated, and refined the set of questions according to rigorous criteria. The sample questions of our benchmark is illustrated in Table 1

The data construction followed an expert-driven approach guided by five central methodological principles:

Comprehensive Linguistic Coverage: To establish a taxonomically valid representation of Korean linguistic phenomena, we conducted a systematic analysis of educational frameworks including the Standard Curriculum for Korean Language (both L1 and L2 variants) and high-stakes assessment instruments (Korean Language Test, Test Of Proficiency In Korean, College Scholastic Ability Test, and Public Service Examination). Analyzing these, we identified distinct linguistic phenomena often addressed in Korean language education, categorized them into topics in each linguistic domain, and supplemented them with additional phenomena characteristic of the Korean language based on theoretical consideration. Through this process, we established a comprehensive taxonomic structure encompassing 24 distinct linguistic phenomena distributed across five domains.

Structural and Lexical Diversity: To mitigate potential confounds from question format bias, we implemented deliberate variation in question structures within each phenomenon category. While maintaining the basic 10-choice question format, we employed diverse question types to prevent model overfitting to specific question patterns. Our question sets include multiple strategies which require models to solve various tasks such as cloze-style completion, grammaticality judgment, minimal pair contrast, and context interpretation.

Domain	Ling. Phenomenon	Sample Question
Morphology	Part of Speech & Morphemes	<p>문제: 문장 내에서 '들'이 조사로서 사용되지 않은 경우는? (Question: In which case is '들' not used as a particle in a sentence?)</p> <p>정답: 너희'들' 빨래는 다 널었니? (Answer: Did you[plural] hang all the laundry?)</p> <p>오답: 어서'들' 오세요. 외 9개 (Incorrect: Please[plural] come in quickly. plus 9 other options)</p>
Syntax	Embedded Clauses	<p>문제: 다음 문장은 서술어가 여러 개 있는 복합문이다. 이중 안긴 문장의 서술어의 자릿수가 1개인 것은? (Question: The following sentences are complex sentences with multiple predicates. Which one has an embedded clause with a one-place predicate?)</p> <p>정답: 고객님의 점선을 따라서 편안한 숙소로 가세요. (Answer: Sir/Madam, please follow the dotted line to the comfortable accommodation.)</p> <p>오답: 우리가 휴양지에 갔다는 사실을 말하지 말아 줘. 외 9개 (Incorrect: Please don't tell anyone the fact that we went to the resort. plus 9 other options)</p>
Phonetics & Phonology	Phonological Alternation	<p>지문: <보기> 값[갑] (Text: <Example> 값[갑] - price/value [gap])</p> <p>문제: <보기>의 예시에서 나타난 음운 현상이 나타나지 않는 것을 고르시오. (Question: Choose the word where the phonological phenomenon shown in the example does not occur.)</p> <p>정답: 깎다 (Answer: to cut/trim [kkakkda])</p> <p>오답: 외곡; 읊고; 값; 맑게; 넓다; 낫; 훑고; 밝지; 묶고 (Incorrect: one-track [oegot]; reciting [eulpgo]; value [gap]; clearly [malge]; wide [neopda]; soul [neokk]; scanning [heultgo]; brightly [balkji]; thin [mulggo])</p>
Semantics	Semantic Concord Between Predicates and Arguments	<p>지문: 연휴도 끝나가는 시점이라, [회사1]로 출근한 동료는 거의 볼 수 없었다. [구내 식당]에도, [탕비실]에도, 또 평소엔 말 디딜 틈 하나 없던 [휴게실]에도 인적이 끊겨 한산하다. [집1]에서 [회사2]까지, 또 [회사3]에서 [집2]까지 이동하는 시간을 고려하면 밀린 일이 많지 않은 이상 합리적인 선택이라고 생각한다. (Text: As the holiday was coming to an end, I could hardly see colleagues who came to [company1], [Cafeteria], [pantry], and even [lounge] that is usually too crowded to step in, are all empty and quiet. Considering the commute time from [home1] to [company2], and from [company3] to [home2], I think it's a reasonable choice unless there's a lot of pending work.)</p> <p>문제: 다음 지문의 괄호 중 의미적 역할이 가장 유사한 것들로 구성된 선지를 고르시오. (Question: Choose the option that consists of bracketed terms with the most similar semantic roles.)</p> <p>정답: [회사1], [탕비실], [휴게실] (Answer: [company1], [pantry], [lounge])</p> <p>오답: [구내 식당], [탕비실], [집1] 외 9건 (Incorrect: [cafeteria], [pantry], [home1] plus 9 other options)</p>
Pragmatics	Implicature	<p>문제: 갑의 질문에 대해 을의 대답을 통해 긍정/부정을 판단할 수 있는 예가 아닌 것은? (Question: Which is NOT an example where you can determine affirmation/negation from B's answer to A's question?)</p> <p>정답: 갑: 따님은 공부를 잘 하나요? / 을: 애가 머리는 저를 안 닦고 애엄마를 닦았어요. (Answer: A: Does your daughter study well? / B: The child takes after her mother's intelligence, not mine.)</p> <p>오답: 갑: 영화 좋아하세요? / 을: 전 활동적인 취미가 좋더라고요. 외 9건 (Incorrect: A: Do you like movies? / B: I prefer more active hobbies. plus 9 other options)</p>

Table 1: Sample Questions from KoBALT




Figure 1: Distribution of samples across linguistic domains in KoBALT

Naturalness and Representativeness: All materials were carefully crafted to reflect the linguistic intuition and real-world usage of the Korean language while maintaining precise control over target phenomena. In terms of lexical diversity, annotators incorporated vocabulary from multiple difficulty levels, referencing the vocabulary grading data from the National Institute of Korean Language (NIKL) to ensure balanced representation across all complexity tiers.¹ Further, all questions were cross-examined by multiple annotators to validate their grammaticality, naturalness, clarity, and accurate representation of the target phenomenon.

Use of Linguistic Knowledge and World Knowledge: Our question sets were designed to evaluate models based on their accurate knowledge of linguistic phenomena and proper reasoning skills rather than random guesses. For this, KoBALT utilizes a 10-choice format, which provides a broader range of distracting options, increasing the difficulty of the whole benchmark and lowering the probability of mistakenly overestimating the model’s competence based on random guesses. Further, we intentionally include some questions requiring the models to utilize both their linguistic knowledge and world knowledge. This is inevitable for proper assessment of linguistic knowledge in some phenomena such as hypernymy and other semantic relations.

3.1 Assigning Difficulty Levels

To provide a meaningful categorization of questions for better analysis, we classified our benchmark items into three difficulty levels in a post hoc manner based on the performance patterns of leading models, from the easiest (Level 1) to the hardest (Level 3). We selected four high-performing models as difficulty indicators: Claude-3.7-Sonnet, Claude-3.5-Sonnet, GPT-4o, and DeepSeek-V3. Questions were assigned to difficulty categories using the following criteria:

- Level 1 (Easy): All four selected models answered correctly
- Level 2 (Intermediate): Two or three models answered correctly
- Level 3 (Hard): Zero or one model answered correctly

¹The data is licensed under Korea Open Government License (BY-NC-ND). (URL: https://korean.go.kr/front/reportData/reportDataView.do?mn_id=207&report_seq=1160)

Level	# of Questions
1 (Easy)	182
2 (Intermediate)	220
3 (Hard)	298

Table 2: Distribution of Questions in 3 Difficulty Levels

This classification approach leverages the collective performance of diverse state-of-the-art models to establish a robust difficulty scale. Since these four models represent the current upper boundary of performance, this categorization should remain relevant for evaluating both current and future models. The resulting distribution of questions across difficulty levels is presented in Table 2.

3.2 Syntax (300 Questions)

Our syntax component represents the largest subset of the benchmark, covering five phenomena fundamental to Korean syntactic structure: *Agreement*, *Argument Structure and Valency*, *Embedded Clauses*, *Ellipsis*, and *Scrambling*. The first three are selected based on grammar taught in Korean secondary education and constructions frequently featured in Korean language proficiency assessments. In contrast, *Ellipsis* and *Scrambling* are included to capture Korean-specific syntactic patterns, such as flexible word order and omitted constituents, which are not explicitly covered in the high school curriculum but are common in real-world usage.

Agreement(Agr) focuses on syntactic dependencies between grammatical elements, including subject-verb agreement, honorific agreement, negative polarity item (NPI) licensing, tense–aspect alignment, and voice alternations involving passive and causative constructions. Korean exhibits a rich honorific system where verbal forms and particles reflect social relationships between discourse participants, resulting in agreement patterns that differ from those found in many Indo-European languages. Questions require models to detect agreement violations and infer their causes, group expressions that share the same type of agreement pattern, and actively manipulate sentence structure—such as through voice alternation—to preserve grammatical agreement.

Argument Structure and Valency(ASV) examines knowledge of predicate-argument relationships, focusing on valency and case realization. In Korean, case interpretation is often complicated by the omission of case markers, the presence of auxiliary particles, and flexible word order. Questions assess models’ ability to determine the valency of predicates and to identify the grammatical roles of constituents such as subjects, objects, and obligatory adjuncts.

Embedded Clauses(EC) evaluates comprehension of complex clausal structures, primarily focusing on embedded clauses. Korean embedded clauses reflect typologically distinctive properties, including head-final structure and highly productive clause transformation strategies that allow embedded predicates to be realized in a wide range of syntactic functions. Questions require models to identify whether a sentence contains an embedded clause, determine the grammatical role of a constituent within the embedded clause, and classify the function of the embedded clause itself.

Ellipsis(Elp) focuses on Korean-specific grammatical omission patterns. Korean permits extensive null arguments whose referents must be recovered from discourse context, posing significant challenges for computational models. Questions assess models’ ability to recover elided content, distinguish between grammatical and ungrammatical ellipsis, and determine whether omission alters the original meaning of the sentence..

Scrambling(Scr) focuses on Korean’s relatively free word order phenomena, where arguments can appear in multiple positions without altering grammatical relations. Questions require models to identify natural word orders, detect ungrammatical scrambling, and determine whether a given constituent can be felicitously inserted into specific syntactic positions.

3.3 Semantics (215 Questions)

Our semantics component addresses seven phenomena central to meaning construction in Korean: *Semantic Concord between Predicates and Arguments*, *Rhetorical Expressions*, *Ambiguity*, *Semantic Relationships between Words*, *Nominal Classifiers*, *Conjunctions*, and *Inter-sentence Semantic Relationship*. These categories reflect semantic features that are frequently tested in Korean language proficiency assessments. In establishing this classification scheme, we consider both the classification widely used in linguistic theory and the step-by-step process by which lexical items combine to form sentence-level meaning.

Semantic Concord between Predicates and Arguments(SCPA) examines thematic role assignment, and semantic concord between predicates and their arguments. Korean predicates impose specific semantic constraints on arguments,

including animacy requirements, intentionality features, and scalar properties that must be satisfied for well-formedness. Questions assess models’ ability to detect predicate-argument incompatibility and assign correct thematic roles.

Rhetorical Expressions(RE) targets non-literal language usage including metaphor, irony, hyperbole, and idiomatic expressions. Korean employs culturally-specific figurative expressions and conventionalized rhetorical patterns that require both linguistic and cultural knowledge for correct interpretation. Questions assess models’ ability to recognize figurative meaning and appropriately select rhetorical devices.

Ambiguity(Amb) focuses on lexical, structural, and scope ambiguities in Korean. Questions require detecting sentence-level ambiguity and identifying multiple possible interpretations, as well as analyzing the source of ambiguity and proposing appropriate disambiguation strategies.

Semantic Relationships between Words(SRW) assesses understanding of lexical semantic relations including synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, and semantic frames. Korean exhibits specialized taxonomic relationships encoded through compound formation. Questions test models’ ability to identify semantic relationships, recognize incompatible semantic features, and categorize lexical items according to shared semantic properties.

Numeral Classifiers(NC) evaluates knowledge of Korean’s extensive classifier system, where numeric expressions require specific classifier morphemes based on semantic properties of the quantified noun. Questions require models to select appropriate numeral classifiers for given referents within context.

Conjunctions(Conj) examines semantic properties of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions that signal logical entailment, temporal order, and causal relations at the sentence-to-sentence level. Korean conjunctions encode fine-grained distinctions in temporal overlap, causality strength, and conditionality that must be precisely interpreted. Questions assess whether models can select conjunctions that naturally connect given sentences, infer appropriate continuations based on a provided sentence and conjunction, and judge whether the rhetorical effect of a conjunction is accurately described.

Inter-sentence Semantic Relationship(ISR) focuses on the use of phrases, clauses, or sentences that contributes to maintaining coherence across a discourse. Questions evaluate models’ ability to select the most contextually appropriate unit (e.g., phrase, clause, or sentence) to complete a passage, as well as to perform higher-level operations such as sentence ordering, removal of semantically irrelevant content, or judgment of logical consistency within the overall discourse.

3.4 Pragmatics (81 Questions)

Our pragmatics component addresses five phenomena central to contextual language interpretation: *Implicature*, *Speech Acts*, *Conversational Principles and Discourse Strategy*, *Deixis and Reference*, and *Inter-person Relationship*. Unlike other domains, our selection on pragmatic phenomena is based on the taxonomy of the field’s academic research, as pragmatic competence is typically acquired through communicative experience and is rarely covered in explicit curricula or standardized assessments.

We select *Implicature*, *Speech Acts*, and *Deixis and Reference* as core phenomena widely discussed in pragmatic theory. To capture the models’ discourse-level interpretation, we add *Conversational Principles and Discourse Strategy*. Lastly, we include *Inter-person Relationship* to reflect a distinctive feature of Korean, where the same sentential meaning can take different forms depending on interpersonal relationships.

Implicature(Impl) assesses understanding of implied meanings beyond literal semantic content. Utterances involving conversational implicature often reflect cultural and conventional norms, and implicature in Korean likewise exhibits culture-specific characteristics. Questions require models to recover the implied meaning of certain utterance in a given conversation, while some ask to choose a proper utterance when given a surrounding context and the intended meaning.

Speech Acts(SA) evaluates comprehension of speech acts, including statement, expressive, promise, question, directive/command and proposing. Korean employs grammatical markers, politeness forms, and a rich system of rhetorical questions, all of which play a crucial role in the interpretation of indirect speech acts and speaker intentions. Questions test models’ ability to identify speech act types indicating the intent of the speaker, recognize indirect speech act and pair certain utterances with same speech act types based on given utterances.

Conversational Principles and Discourse Strategy(CPDS) examines models’ knowledge on speakers’ various discourse strategies including adherence or violation of various conversational principles for certain intents. Questions assess recognition of intentional violation on certain conversational maxims, and interpretation of certain pragmatic and metapragmatic signals and their hidden intents behind them based on given conversations.

Deixis and Reference(DR) focuses on context-dependent reference expressions, including personal, spatial, temporal, and social deixis. Korean employs multiple demonstrative systems, specialized social deictic markers, and complex referential expressions sensitive to social relations. Questions test models’ ability to resolve referential expressions, track referents across discourse, and interpret deictic terms relative to contextual parameters.

Inter-person Relationship(IPR) assesses understanding of Korean’s elaborate social indexing system, including honorifics, address terms, and speech level markers that reflect social relationships between discourse participants. Questions require models to infer social relationships from linguistic forms.

3.5 Phonetics and Phonology (62 Questions)

Our phonetics and phonology component covers four phenomena fundamental to Korean sound patterns: *Phonological Alternation*, *Phonological Constraints*, *Basic Articulatory Phonetics*, and *Suprasegmental Features*. Among these, *Phonological Alternation*, *Phonological Constraints*, and *Suprasegmental Features* fall under phonology and are selected with reference to the Korean secondary school curriculum and Korean language proficiency assessments. In contrast, *Basic Articulatory Phonetics* corresponds to phonetics. Among phenomena addressed in phonetics, we include only articulatory aspects, as they are most compatible with text-based evaluation using language models.

Phonological Alternation(PA) examines systematic sound changes including substitution, deletion, contraction, and insertion. Substitution includes fortition, syllable-final neutralization and assimilation. Deletion encompasses consonant cluster simplification and vowel deletion. Contraction involves aspiration and vowel contraction. Insertion covers /n/-insertion and the use of the interfix -s- (known as Sai-siot in Korean). Questions require models to understand the concept of phonological alternation and to determine whether a given word undergoes a specific type of alternation.

Phonological Constraints(PC) focuses on permissible sound sequences in Korean, incorporating phonotactic, syllabic and word-level constraints. Questions require models to determine whether a word conforms to certain types of constraints and to assess the correctness of general descriptive statements about phonotactic patterns in Korean.

Basic Articulatory Phonetics(AP) evaluates understanding of speech sound production. Questions cover major articulatory distinctions such as place of articulation (e.g., bilabial, dental, palatal, velar, glottal) and manner of articulation (e.g., stops, affricates, fricatives, nasals, laterals), as well as additional features such as aspiration (unaspirated vs. aspirated), continuancy (continuant vs. non-continuant), and sonority (sonorant vs. obstruent).

Suprasegmental Features(SF) examines prosodic elements in Korean that crucially contributes to the meaning of an utterance, including vowel length distinctions (long vs. short), types of interrogatives, sentence-final endings, and intonation patterns. Questions assess models’ ability to identify vowel length or intonation contours and to determine the sentence type based on prosodic cues and sentence-final endings.

3.6 Morphology (42 Questions)

Our morphology component examines three phenomena fundamental to the internal structure of words of Korean: *Word Formation*, *Verbal Conjugation*, and *Part-of-Speech and Morphemes*. These categories reflect frequently tested features of Korean morphology in Korean language proficiency assessments. Each category is designed to address a distinct and non-overlapping aspect of morphological knowledge—ranging from how words are formed, to how they are grammatically inflected, to how they are structurally categorized.

Word Formation(WF) focuses on two core morphological processes: derivation and compounding. Korean exhibits rich morphological variation, requiring a thorough analysis of root forms and affix positions. Questions require models to recover original morphemes from surface forms, classify compound words by structural or semantic composition, and judge whether the resulting words are morphologically well-formed.

Verbal Conjugation(VC) examines morphological patterns in the inflection of Korean verbs and adjectives, focusing on how stems and endings combine and change during conjugation. Korean exhibits both regular and irregular conjugation patterns, with irregular forms involving systematic but non-standard changes to verb stems and endings. Questions require models to recover base forms from inflected expressions, classify verbs and adjectives by conjugation pattern, and judge the morphological validity of derived forms based on stem-affix interactions.

Part of Speech and Morphemes(PoSM) addresses part-of-speech classification and morpheme-level analysis. Questions assess models’ ability to determine the part of speech of a given word and classify each morpheme into the appropriate morphological type.

4 Model Performances on KoBALT

4.1 Evaluation

Using KoBALT, we evaluate the competence on Korean language of 20 LLMs across various model families including open-source and proprietary ones.




Figure 2: Example prompt used for model response generation. Models were instructed to select from ten possible choices after analyzing the linguistic task. The strict output format facilitated automated evaluation of model responses.

Model For open-source models, we select LLaMA 3.1 8B Instruct [Grattafiori et al., 2024], LLaMA 3.3 70B Instruct², Mistral 7B Instruct [Jiang et al., 2023], Ministral 8B Instruct³, Mistral Small 3.1 24B Instruct [AI, 2025], Gemma 2 9B Instruct [Team et al., 2024], Gemma 3 27B Instruct [Team et al., 2025], Qwen 2.5 7B Instruct, Qwen 2.5 32B Instruct, Qwen 2.5 72B Instruct [Yang et al., 2024], Aya Expanse 8B, and Aya Expanse 32B [Dang et al., 2024]. For closed-source models, we evaluate GPT-4o [OpenAI et al., 2024], Claude 3.5 Sonnet [Anthropic, 2024], Claude 3.7 Sonnet [Anthropic, 2025], C4ai Command A 03 [Cohere et al., 2025], DeepSeek V3⁴ and DeepSeek V3 XL⁵ [DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025b].

Prompt The prompt used for response generation is illustrated in Figure 2. Models are required to provide its answer after a reasoning step.

Implementation Detail To ensure reproducibility, we control temperature=0.0 for proprietary models, and set do_sample=False for open-source models. We control response length by setting max_new_tokens=2048 in all cases. 3 of A100 GPUs are used in evaluating dataset with 70B-72B series models, 2 for 27B-32B models and one for the other small models. It took 8 hours for LLaMA 3.3 70B, and much shorter for smaller models.

Metric Since the prompt explicitly requires the models to provide their answer in the format *The answer is [Answer Choice]*, we extract the [Answer Choice] portion using regular expressions and compare it with the gold label. A prediction is considered correct if the extracted answer matches the gold label exactly, and incorrect otherwise. Accuracy—defined as the proportion of correctly predicted instances among the total number of questions—is reported as our primary evaluation metric.

General analysis. The evaluation results on KoBALT are illustrated in Table 3. The best performing model was Claude-3.7-Sonnet-20250219, which scored 0.61. Overall, the cutoff point emerges around 0.4 in the average score. All proprietary models and Deepseek-V3 exceed 0.4, with Deepseek-V3 (fp8) scoring 0.43 at the lowest. In contrast, all open-source models, except for Deepseek-V3, scored below 0.4, with Qwen2.5-72B scoring the highest at 0.37. The general trend observed is as follows: model performance improved with increasing model size (100B+ > 70B > 32B > 8B), but tended to decline as the granularity of linguistic unit in question increased, with the most prevalent pattern being: Semantics > Pragmatics > Syntax > Morphology > Phonetics/Phonology. For more detailed analysis in terms of each linguistic phenomenon, refer to Figure 3

Analysis by model scale. In general, larger models outperform smaller models. In 14 out of 24 linguistic phenomena, average performance was ranked as follows: 8B < 32B < 70B < 100B+. Among the ten exceptions, seven phenomena still align with the general trend, with a single reversal between adjacent sizes: 72B < 32B in four cases and 100B+ < 70B in three cases. The remaining three outliers are associated with Korean-specific linguistic features (verbal conjugation in Morphology, ellipsis in Syntax) or areas that require information less accessible to text-based models (place/manner of articulation in Phonology).

Analysis by linguistic domain Examining model performances across linguistic domains reveals distinctive patterns. Most models demonstrated stronger capabilities in Semantics (with Claude 3.5 Sonnet achieving 65% in average and

²<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct>

³<https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Ministral-8B-Instruct-2410>

⁴DeepSeek-V3-0324, evaluated using fp8 precision via Together API.

⁵unsloth/DeepSeek-V3-0324-GGUF/UD-Q2_K_XL, evaluated using 2.71-bit quantization via llama.cpp.

Model	Average	Syntax	Semantics	Pragmatics	Morphology	Phonetics
GPT-4o	0.44	0.45	0.55	0.40	0.17	0.26
C4ai-command-a-03	0.36	0.30	0.52	0.36	0.24	0.18
Claude-3-5-sonnet	0.52	0.52	0.65	0.51	0.36	0.24
Claude-3-7-sonnet	0.61	0.66	0.66	0.64	0.36	0.31
DeepSeek-V3-XL	0.47	0.49	0.56	0.42	0.24	0.29
DeepSeek-V3	0.43	0.41	0.57	0.42	0.26	0.23
Qwen2.5-32B	0.30	0.23	0.49	0.28	0.21	0.11
Qwen2.5-72B	0.37	0.33	0.51	0.37	0.24	0.18
Qwen2.5-7B	0.19	0.14	0.33	0.11	0.19	0.06
Aya-expans-32b	0.25	0.21	0.40	0.12	0.10	0.16
Aya-expans-8b	0.19	0.15	0.33	0.11	0.12	0.06
Gemma-2-9b	0.21	0.17	0.34	0.15	0.12	0.11
Gemma-3-27b	0.35	0.30	0.53	0.27	0.24	0.11
Llama-3.1-8B	0.17	0.13	0.26	0.12	0.10	0.11
Llama-3.3-70B	0.32	0.25	0.50	0.35	0.17	0.15
Ministral-8B	0.17	0.11	0.29	0.15	0.10	0.11
Mistral-7B-v0.3	0.12	0.11	0.16	0.11	0.14	0.06
Mistral-Small-24B	0.32	0.27	0.49	0.30	0.21	0.11

Table 3: Performance of language models across linguistic domains in KoBALT

44% at its lowest as seen in Table 3 and 5 respectively) but struggled significantly with Phonetics and Phonology tasks (where even top models fell below 45%, as evidenced in Table 7).

This performance disparity challenges traditional linguistic assumptions, which typically associate higher levels of abstraction with increased processing complexity. As shown in Table 4, model performances on Syntax (Claude 3.5 Sonnet: 52.6%) were generally robust but still trailed Semantics. Similarly, results on Pragmatics in Table 6 reveal moderate performance (Claude 3.5 Sonnet: 51.0%), while Morphology in Table 8 indicates models tend to face more struggles on the domain (with most models below 50%).

One possible explanation for this pattern is that semantic, pragmatic, and syntactic processing may benefit from the basic training process of LLMs. Unlike humans, these models are trained via auto-regressive next-token prediction on massive text corpora, which naturally emphasizes contextual relationships between tokens. This training paradigm appears to effectively support higher-level abstract understanding required in these domains.

The pronounced difficulties in Phonetics/Phonology (Table 7) and Morphology (Table 8) likely stem from multiple factors: these areas often require explicit linguistic rules that may be underrepresented in text-based training data; they frequently involve specialized terminologies; and they deal with fine-grained language units (sounds, morphemes) that may be less directly captured in text representations. Additionally, the text-centric nature of pretraining datasets might lead to uneven knowledge distribution across linguistic levels, with particular gaps in speech-related phenomena that might benefit from audio training data.

These analyses are supported by the observation that models tend to perform better in areas that closely align with characteristics of the training data. Certain linguistic phenomena, such as *Implicature* and *Conversational Principles and Discourse Strategy* in Pragmatics (Table 6), as well as *Word Formation* and *Part-of-Speech and Morpheme* (Table 8), appear particularly relevant to the types of data typically leveraged during training. Considering that large language models are trained through instruction tuning to capture user intentions and enhance conversational abilities, models’ aptitude in pragmatics is somewhat predictable. Likewise, traditional NLP tasks such as part-of-speech tagging are likely to contribute to models’ morpheme-level understanding by providing clues for morphological analysis. These tasks may assist models to identify a word’s grammatical category, grasp the relationship among its constituent morphemes, and derive word-internal structure. Based on the agglutinative nature of Korean, in which grammatical morphemes are affixed to convey additional meaning, one plausible generalization is that morphological patterns can be deduced when the root is retained after derivation or inflection, allowing models to trace word-internal structure.

In contrast, the models struggled with metalinguistic abstraction involving Korean-specific patterns, as reflected in the following areas: *Ellipsis* in Syntax (< 55%, in Table 4), *Ambiguity* in Semantics (<49%, in Table 5), *Deixis and Reference* in Pragmatics (<36%, in Table 6), *Verbal Conjugation* in Morphology (<34%, in Table 8), and *Phonological Constraints* in Phonetics and Phonology (<30%, in Table 7). This might stem from the distinct pattern of the language in use, such as frequent usage of Korean-specific lexical items like unique terms of address and reference, seen in *Deixis and Reference*. Other Korean-specific patterns also seem to cause difficulties to the models, as seen in *Verbal Conjugation* in Morphology where verbs displaying both regular and irregular conjugating patterns are tackled. With subword tokenization, models may struggle with forming a correct morphological paradigm that captures irregular variations and suppletions, which are distinct from base and regular word-forms and thus challenging to explain by systematic rule application on shared subword tokens.

Model	Agreement	Arg. Structure	Embedded Clauses	Scrambling	Ellipsis
Aya-expanse-32b	0.26	0.19	0.17	0.33	0.27
Aya-expanse-8b	0.14	0.22	0.07	0.33	0.09
C4ai-command-a-03	0.35	0.24	0.33	0.33	0.18
Qwen2.5-32B	0.27	0.23	0.21	0.33	0.00
Qwen2.5-72B	0.50	0.21	0.26	0.33	0.27
Qwen2.5-7B	0.19	0.13	0.10	0.00	0.18
Claude-3-5-sonnet	0.58	0.46	0.53	0.67	0.27
Claude-3-7-sonnet	0.70	0.55	0.78	0.67	0.36
DeepSeek-V3-XL	0.51	0.41	0.60	0.67	0.09
DeepSeek-V3	0.54	0.33	0.36	0.67	0.09
Gemma-2-9b	0.24	0.09	0.15	0.33	0.18
Gemma-3-27b	0.35	0.28	0.30	0.00	0.00
GPT-4o	0.44	0.45	0.52	0.00	0.18
Llama-3.1-8B	0.17	0.09	0.12	0.00	0.18
Llama-3.3-70B	0.31	0.19	0.23	0.33	0.27
Ministral-8B	0.16	0.11	0.05	0.33	0.09
Mistral-7B-v0.3	0.13	0.14	0.05	0.33	0.09
Mistral-Small-24B	0.36	0.21	0.22	0.00	0.36

Table 4: Performance of language models on Syntax categories

5 Do Results on KoBALT Align with Human Preferences?

5.1 Human Preference Evaluation

5.2 Result

As our practical goal lies in investigating if the models with stronger knowledge correlate with how native speakers perceive the models, we conducted a human preference evaluation. We adopt Chatbot Arena style evaluation Chiang et al. [2024] for a carefully selected subset of our dataset. The overall process of this stage is illustrated in Figure 4.

From KoBALT, we sampled 99 problems representing each linguistic phenomenon. We selected 3 questions per each topic, considering the difficulty levels. We additionally selected 1-2 questions from some categories containing relatively more questions: *Phonological Alternation* (Phonetics and Phonology), *Semantic Concord between Argument and Predicates* (Semantics), *Agreement, Argument Structure and Valency*, and *Embedded Clauses* (Syntax). For some phenomena which lacked questions in some difficulty levels, we sampled one from adjacent levels.

The questions were then rephrased into human-like queries to control the effect of unnecessary factors other than accuracy and factuality, such as response length [Li et al., 2024], number of facts [Oh et al., 2024], formatting, and repetition [Hosking et al., 2024].

We leveraged responses from four large language models: two proprietary (Claude-3.5-Sonnet and GPT-4o) and two open-source (Qwen-2.5-72B and LLaMA-3.3-70B). Models were selected based on representativeness, performance, and parameter size. We gathered 95 participants (54 linguistics majors, 41 non-linguistics majors) who provided their preference votes over response pairs.

Model	Ambiguity	Semantic Relations	Semantic Concord	Rhetorical Expr.	Numeral Classifiers	Inter-sent. Relations	Conjunctions
Aya-expanse-32b	0.04	0.46	0.48	0.43	0.48	0.24	0.54
Aya-expanse-8b	0.04	0.32	0.48	0.43	0.44	0.10	0.25
C4ai-command-a-03	0.22	0.61	0.60	0.54	0.52	0.33	0.71
Qwen2.5-32B	0.11	0.64	0.53	0.50	0.44	0.38	0.75
Qwen2.5-72B	0.22	0.61	0.55	0.61	0.44	0.38	0.67
Qwen2.5-7B	0.26	0.39	0.40	0.14	0.30	0.14	0.63
Claude-3-5-sonnet	0.44	0.79	0.63	0.46	0.78	0.57	0.88
Claude-3-7-sonnet	0.48	0.75	0.65	0.57	0.70	0.52	0.92
DeepSeek-V3-XL	0.30	0.61	0.58	0.57	0.63	0.43	0.75
DeepSeek-V3	0.33	0.54	0.65	0.57	0.56	0.43	0.83
Gemma-2-9b	0.19	0.32	0.35	0.39	0.33	0.29	0.54
Gemma-3-27b	0.33	0.64	0.60	0.50	0.41	0.38	0.75
GPT-4o	0.41	0.57	0.62	0.46	0.67	0.33	0.71
Llama-3.1-8B	0.00	0.36	0.38	0.36	0.26	0.10	0.17
Llama-3.3-70B	0.22	0.64	0.57	0.57	0.41	0.33	0.67
Minstral-8B	0.15	0.29	0.43	0.25	0.26	0.19	0.25
Mistral-7B-v0.3	0.04	0.25	0.17	0.18	0.22	0.10	0.13
Mistral-Small-24B	0.19	0.64	0.53	0.50	0.41	0.33	0.75

Table 5: Performance of language models on Semantics categories

Model	Implicature	Speech Acts	Conv. Principles	Relationship ID	Deixis
Aya-expanse-32b	0.14	0.09	0.24	0.00	0.06
Aya-expanse-8b	0.09	0.09	0.29	0.00	0.00
C4ai-command-a-03	0.55	0.32	0.41	1.00	0.00
Qwen2.5-32B	0.41	0.23	0.35	0.67	0.06
Qwen2.5-72B	0.55	0.36	0.35	1.00	0.06
Qwen2.5-7B	0.18	0.05	0.12	0.00	0.12
Claude-3-5-sonnet	0.68	0.45	0.65	1.00	0.12
Claude-3-7-sonnet	0.77	0.64	0.71	1.00	0.35
DeepSeek-V3-XL	0.50	0.45	0.71	0.33	0.00
DeepSeek-V3	0.55	0.45	0.65	0.33	0.00
Gemma-2-9b	0.09	0.14	0.41	0.00	0.00
Gemma-3-27b	0.32	0.18	0.59	0.00	0.06
GPT-4o	0.55	0.36	0.59	0.67	0.00
Llama-3.1-8B	0.09	0.14	0.29	0.00	0.00
Llama-3.3-70B	0.45	0.32	0.41	0.33	0.18
Minstral-8B	0.14	0.14	0.29	0.00	0.06
Mistral-7B-v0.3	0.14	0.18	0.12	0.00	0.00
Mistral-Small-24B	0.45	0.23	0.53	0.00	0.00

Table 6: Performance of language models on Pragmatics categories

6 Interface and Instruction Used in Human Preference Collection

The full instruction given to human participants is illustrated in Figure 5, whose English translation is given in Figure 6:

Model	Phonological Con- str.	Phonol. Alternation	Suprasegmental	Basic Articul. Pho- netics
Aya-expanse-32b	0.00	0.21	0.14	0.29
Aya-expanse-8b	0.00	0.09	0.14	0.00
C4ai-command-a-03	0.07	0.18	0.14	0.43
Qwen2.5-32B	0.14	0.09	0.14	0.14
Qwen2.5-72B	0.14	0.18	0.14	0.29
Qwen2.5-7B	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.29
Claude-3-5-sonnet	0.14	0.26	0.14	0.43
Claude-3-7-sonnet	0.29	0.35	0.14	0.29
DeepSeek-V3-XL	0.21	0.29	0.29	0.43
DeepSeek-V3	0.14	0.26	0.14	0.29
Gemma-2-9b	0.14	0.12	0.14	0.00
Gemma-3-27b	0.21	0.12	0.00	0.00
GPT-4o	0.21	0.26	0.43	0.14
Llama-3.1-8B	0.14	0.09	0.14	0.14
Llama-3.3-70B	0.00	0.18	0.43	0.00
Ministral-8B	0.14	0.06	0.00	0.43
Mistral-7B-v0.3	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.29
Mistral-Small-24B	0.07	0.18	0.00	0.00

Table 7: Performance of language models on Phonetics & Phonology categories

Model	Word Formation	Verbal Conjugation	POS & Morphemes
Aya-expanse-32b	0.09	0.08	0.13
Aya-expanse-8b	0.09	0.08	0.25
C4ai-command-a-03	0.27	0.17	0.25
Qwen2.5-32B	0.18	0.25	0.25
Qwen2.5-72B	0.27	0.17	0.25
Qwen2.5-7B	0.14	0.33	0.13
Claude-3-5-sonnet	0.45	0.17	0.38
Claude-3-7-sonnet	0.41	0.17	0.50
DeepSeek-V3-XL	0.36	0.08	0.13
DeepSeek-V3	0.36	0.08	0.25
Gemma-2-9b	0.14	0.08	0.13
Gemma-3-27b	0.32	0.25	0.00
GPT-4o	0.27	0.00	0.13
Llama-3.1-8B	0.14	0.00	0.13
Llama-3.3-70B	0.14	0.25	0.13
Ministral-8B	0.09	0.00	0.25
Mistral-7B-v0.3	0.14	0.25	0.00
Mistral-Small-24B	0.27	0.17	0.13

Table 8: Performance of language models on Morphology categories

6.1 Results on Human Preference Evaluation

Bradley–Terry Model To aggregate 51 528 pairwise votes, we employed the Bradley–Terry (BT) model. For two systems i and j , the win probability is $\Pr(i \gg j) = \beta_i / (\beta_i + \beta_j)$. Iterative maximum likelihood yields a *normalized BT score* $\hat{\beta}$ for each system.

Overall and Domain-level Rankings The result is analyzed by the Bradley–Terry model, which produces a comparative ranking from pairwise games as mentioned before. Table 9 reports the aggregate Bradley–Terry scores:

Domain	Syntax					Semantics							Pragmatics					Phonetics/Phonology				Morphology			Average
Phenomena	Agr	ASV	EC	Elp	Ser	SCPA	RE	Amb	SRW	NC	Conj	ISR	Impl	SA	CPDS	DR	IPR	PA	PC	BAP	SF	WF	VC	POSM	
GPT-4o	0.44	0.45	0.52	0.18	0.00	0.62	0.46	0.41	0.57	0.67	0.71	0.33	0.55	0.36	0.59	0.00	0.67	0.26	0.21	0.14	0.43	0.27	0.00	0.12	0.44
C4ai-command-a-03	0.35	0.24	0.33	0.18	0.33	0.60	0.54	0.22	0.61	0.52	0.71	0.33	0.55	0.32	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.18	0.07	0.43	0.14	0.27	0.17	0.25	0.36
Claude-3.5-sonnet	0.58	0.46	0.53	0.27	0.67	0.63	0.46	0.44	0.79	0.78	0.88	0.57	0.68	0.45	0.65	0.12	1.00	0.26	0.14	0.43	0.14	0.45	0.17	0.38	0.52
Claude-3.7-sonnet	0.70	0.55	0.78	0.36	0.67	0.65	0.57	0.48	0.75	0.70	0.92	0.52	0.77	0.64	0.71	0.35	1.00	0.35	0.29	0.29	0.14	0.41	0.17	0.50	0.61
DeepSeek-V3-XL	0.51	0.41	0.60	0.09	0.67	0.58	0.57	0.30	0.61	0.63	0.75	0.43	0.50	0.45	0.71	0.00	0.33	0.29	0.21	0.43	0.29	0.36	0.08	0.12	0.47
DeepSeek-V3	0.54	0.33	0.36	0.09	0.67	0.65	0.57	0.33	0.54	0.56	0.83	0.43	0.55	0.45	0.65	0.00	0.33	0.26	0.14	0.29	0.14	0.36	0.08	0.25	0.43
Qwen2.5-72B	0.27	0.23	0.21	0.00	0.33	0.53	0.50	0.11	0.64	0.44	0.75	0.38	0.41	0.23	0.35	0.06	0.67	0.09	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.18	0.25	0.25	0.30
Qwen2.5-72B	0.50	0.21	0.26	0.27	0.33	0.55	0.61	0.22	0.61	0.44	0.67	0.38	0.55	0.36	0.35	0.06	1.00	0.18	0.14	0.29	0.14	0.27	0.17	0.25	0.37
Qwen2.5-7B	0.19	0.12	0.10	0.18	0.00	0.40	0.14	0.26	0.39	0.30	0.62	0.14	0.18	0.05	0.12	0.12	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.14	0.33	0.12	0.19
Aya-expans-32b	0.26	0.19	0.17	0.27	0.33	0.48	0.43	0.04	0.46	0.48	0.54	0.24	0.14	0.09	0.24	0.06	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.29	0.14	0.09	0.08	0.12	0.25
Aya-expans-8b	0.14	0.22	0.07	0.09	0.33	0.48	0.43	0.04	0.32	0.44	0.25	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.09	0.08	0.25	0.19
Gemma-2-9b	0.24	0.09	0.15	0.18	0.33	0.35	0.39	0.19	0.32	0.33	0.54	0.29	0.09	0.14	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.14	0.00	0.14	0.14	0.08	0.12	0.21
Gemma-3-27b	0.35	0.28	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.60	0.50	0.33	0.64	0.41	0.75	0.38	0.32	0.18	0.59	0.06	0.00	0.12	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.32	0.25	0.00	0.35
Llama-3.1-8B	0.17	0.09	0.12	0.18	0.00	0.38	0.36	0.00	0.36	0.26	0.17	0.10	0.09	0.14	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.00	0.12	0.17
Llama-3.3-70B	0.31	0.19	0.23	0.27	0.33	0.57	0.57	0.22	0.64	0.41	0.67	0.33	0.45	0.32	0.41	0.18	0.33	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.14	0.25	0.12	0.32
Ministral-8B	0.16	0.11	0.05	0.09	0.33	0.43	0.25	0.15	0.29	0.26	0.25	0.19	0.14	0.14	0.29	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.14	0.43	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.25	0.17
Mistral-7B-v0.3	0.13	0.14	0.05	0.09	0.33	0.17	0.18	0.04	0.25	0.22	0.12	0.10	0.14	0.18	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.14	0.25	0.00	0.12
Mistral-Small-24B	0.36	0.21	0.22	0.36	0.00	0.53	0.50	0.19	0.64	0.41	0.75	0.33	0.45	0.23	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.17	0.12	0.32

Figure 3: Accuracy per each linguistic phenomena




Figure 4: Human preference evaluation process utilizing the Online Live Chatbot Area concept

Claude-3.5-Sonnet leads with $\hat{\beta} = 1.650$, followed by **GPT-4o** (1.018), **Qwen-2.5-72B** (0.878), and **Llama-3.3-70B** (0.514).⁶ Overall, we confirm that the models’ quantitative performance (accuracy on KoBALT) closely mirrors human evaluators’ qualitative preferences. Table 9 breaks these scores down by five major linguistic domains. Generally, the rankings appeared similar to the overall rank (Claude-3.5-Sonnet > GPT-4o > Qwen-2.5-72B > LLaMA-3.3-70B), but with two notable exceptions. In Semantics, Qwen-2.5-72B (0.991) surpasses GPT-4o (0.840), and a similar downward shift in preference appears in Pragmatics domains where all models had excelled on the original benchmark. This pattern is especially pronounced for GPT-4o, indicating that high benchmark scores do not always lead to top qualitative impressions.

Domain	Claude	GPT-4o	Qwen	Llama
Overall	1.650	1.018	0.878	0.514
Syntax	1.710	1.072	0.780	0.514
Semantics	1.681	0.840	0.991	0.559
Pragmatics	1.769	0.998	0.808	0.506
Phonetics/Phonology	1.520	1.121	0.962	0.441
Morphology	1.368	1.285	0.888	0.492

Table 9: Overall Bradley–Terry scores by linguistic domain(↑ better).

Correlation with KoBALT accuracy Phenomenon–level accuracy correlates positively with BT scores: $r = 0.638$ (Claude-3.5-Sonnet), 0.632 (GPT-4o), and 0.570 for both Qwen-2.5-72B and Llama-3.3-70B (* $p < .01$; Table 10).

⁶Ninety-five annotators produced 51 528 comparisons; a “no difference” vote awarded 0.5 point to each side.

한국어 지식 모델 평가

실험 안내

당신은 지금부터 한국어 지식에 관한 질문에 대한 *거대언어모델의 답변 2개*를 살펴보고, 그 중 *선호하는 답변*을 고르는 실험을 진행하게 됩니다.

하나의 페이지에는 다음과 같은 정보가 주어집니다:

- 한국어 지식에 관한 질문
- 해당 질문에 대한 *거대언어모델의 답변 A*
- 해당 질문에 대한 *거대언어모델의 답변 B*
- 실제 정답

본인이 거대언어모델에게 해당 질문을 물어본다는 가정 하에, 답변 A와 답변 B 중 어떤 답변을 받기를 더 선호하는지 판단하여 아래 3개의 상자 중 하나를 선택해주시면 됩니다.

1 답변 A가 더 좋다 2 답변 B가 더 좋다 3 차이가 없다

선호도에 대해 판단할 때에는 아래의 요소들을 종합적으로 고려하여 주관적으로 선지를 골라주시면 됩니다:

- 내용 측면**
정확성, 질문 관련성, 유용성, 부가정보 활용 여부, 무해성 등
- 구성 측면**
포맷 정돈 여부, 제한 준수 여부, 목적 명시 정도, 문법성, 길이, 문장 간의 연결성 등
- 태도 측면**
공감하는/친근한/쾌활한 답변, 입장 지지, 한계 인정, 공손함, 상호작용 지향, 권위성 등
- 기타**
위에 제시된 3개 이외에 다른 측면을 고려해서 골라주셔도 됩니다.

여러분의 주관적인 판단이 중요합니다!

Figure 5: Screenshot of the full instruction given to participants in human preference collection stage.

Model	Correlation	<i>p</i> -value	<i>n</i>
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	0.638	0.001	24
GPT-4o	0.632	0.001	24
Llama-3.3-70B	0.570	0.004	24
Qwen-2.5-72B	0.570	0.004	24

Table 10: Pearson correlation between phenomenon-level accuracy and BT score.

Thus higher benchmark accuracy generally predicts stronger human preference, although the gap between GPT-4o and Qwen remains modest.

Pairwise Preference by Response Correctness We compare BT scores when both models are correct (O and O) versus when both are incorrect (X and X). As shown in Table 11, Claude-3.5-Sonnet is preferred most strongly in both settings (BT = 1.650 if both correct; BT = 1.414 if both wrong). Interestingly, GPT-4o and LLaMA-3.3-70B improve their relative standing on the “both wrong” condition, suggesting that their errors are perceived as less confusing than those of their peers.

One-Correct Scenario When exactly one model’s answer is correct, we compute each model’s win rate. Table 12 shows that Qwen-2.5-72B leads at 92.1%, followed by Claude-3.5-Sonnet at 91.5%. GPT-4o and LLaMA-3.3-70B record 87.7% and 82.0%, respectively, indicating that Qwen’s correct responses are the most persuasive.

Qualitative Observations Through a qualitative analysis, we discovered three major findings. First, although Claude leads on every major phenomenon, *Ambiguity* occasionally reverse the order of GPT-4o and Qwen. Second, preference

Full Instruction of Human Preference Test

Model Evaluation on Korean Linguistic Knowledge

User:
 Given the following two answers from LLMs about Korean language, you should choose one answer you prefer. Information provided are as follows:

1. A question on Korean language
2. Response from model A
3. Response from model B
4. Correct answer choice

Suppose you are the user who is asking the question, and decide which answer you would prefer. Choose one option from the following three choices.

1. Response A is better
2. Response B is better
3. There is no difference between the two responses.

Please consider various factors comprehensively, such as:

- *Content:* accuracy, relevance, usefulness, use of additional information, harmlessness
- *Composition:* formatting, adherence to the query, clear statement of its goal, grammaticality, length, cohesiveness
- *Tone:* Relating/Friendly/Lively tone, stance, admittance of its limitation, politeness, openness, authoritativeness
- *Others:* You can make your decision according to other elements you regard as significant

Please keep in mind that your subjective view matters to us.

Figure 6: Example prompt used for model response generation. Models were instructed to select from ten possible choices after analyzing the linguistic task. The strict output format facilitated automated evaluation of model responses.

Rank	Model	O&O	X&X
0	Claude-3.5-Sonnet	1.650	1.414
1	GPT-4o	0.718	1.046
2	Qwen-2.5-72B	1.339	1.036
3	LLaMA-3.3-70B	0.266	0.582

Table 11: BT scores when both models are correct (O&O) or both incorrect (X&X).

gaps enlarge on easier items: when accuracy nears a ceiling, raters seem to rely on secondary cues — answer length, politeness, style — making features unrelated to the response accuracy more decisive. Understanding which stylistic properties sway human judgement in this saturation regime needs to be dealt with in future study. Finally, Even after eliminating its ten malformed outputs, Qwen remains third, indicating high persuasive power when its answers are well-formed.

7 Discussion and Conclusion

We presented KoBALT, a benchmark of 700 linguist-crafted questions across 24 linguistic phenomena in Korean, designed to evaluate LLMs’ linguistic competence with minimal training data overlap. Our evaluation of 20 LLMs showed that even the best-performing model (Claude 3.7 Sonnet) achieved only 61% accuracy, with performance generally declining from semantics to phonetics/phonology across all models. Human preference evaluation with 95

Rank	Model	Win_Rate (%)
0	Qwen-2.5-72B	92.1
1	Claude-3.5-Sonnet	91.5
2	GPT-4o	87.7
3	LLaMA-3.3-70B	82.0

Table 12: Win rates when only one model’s answer is correct.

annotators demonstrated significant correlation between benchmark scores and human judgments ($r = 0.638$ for top models), validating KoBALT’s effectiveness as a measure of Korean linguistic competence. The difficulty-stratified question set provides a framework for analyzing both current and future models. Our work addresses the need for linguistically-motivated evaluation in typologically diverse languages. The main contributions of this work are as follows:

- We introduce **KoBALT**, a comprehensive Korean benchmark dataset for assessing advanced linguistic knowledge across five domains, featuring high-quality linguist-crafted questions targeting 24 distinct linguistic phenomena.
- We provide systematic evaluation of 20 LLMs on KoBALT, revealing significant limitations in Korean linguistic competence even among state-of-the-art models and identifying patterns of strength and weakness across linguistic domains.
- We establish the ecological validity of our benchmark through human preference evaluation, demonstrating strong alignment between KoBALT scores and Korean native speakers’ judgments of model performance.

Limitations

As our dataset is constructed in Korean, our dataset has limitations in evaluating models in other languages, especially English. Thus, the accuracy result and its correlation with human preference demonstrated in our paper are not guaranteed to be appropriate for other unilingual models. Moreover, our level system is based on model performance. This is based on our intuition that the powerful proprietary and open-source models could be the proper indicators to diagnose the difficulties of the questions. However, in further research, it should be conducted to establish a reliable level system in terms of humans and models. Lastly, in the human preference evaluation, we only considered 4 models, two for open-source and two for proprietary ones, considering the workload of the participants in the test. These are few considering the number of models being used in the quantitative accuracy result. The experiment with an enlarged setting should be conducted in further research.

8 Ethics Statement

In the data construction process, we carefully inspected all materials to not include any harmful or biased statements, real-world names, privacy invasions, or statements invoking any possible harassment over certain ethnic or religious groups. Our dataset is openly available and free of harmful content. The Human Preference Evaluation in this study was conducted based on the Chatbot Arena-style evaluation. This method determines the ranking of model responses through anonymous votes collected via an online platform. Due to uncertainty within our institution regarding whether this method falls under IRB review requirements, we conducted an internal ethics review prior to proceeding with the preference evaluation in this format. Currently, several online platforms, including Huggingface, are available for evaluating human preferences for LLMs.

References

- Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.08053>.
- OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny

- Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kopic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rameev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayarvigiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>.
- DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Bei Feng, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Qu, Hui Li, Jianzhong Guo, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, J. L. Cai, Jiaqi Ni, Jian Liang, Jin Chen, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Meng Li, Miaojuan Wang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruyi Chen, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shengfeng Ye, Shiyu Wang, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, S. S. Li, Shuang Zhou, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, T. Wang, Wangding Zeng, Wanjia Zhao, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, W. L. Xiao, Wei An, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xianzu Wang, Xinxia Shan, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yuan Ou, Yudian Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yunfan Xiong, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Y. X. Zhu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yaohui Li, Yi Zheng, Yuchen Zhu, Yunxian Ma, Ying Tang, Yukun Zha, Yuting Yan, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhiyu Wu, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Zizheng Pan, Zhen Huang, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, and Zhen Zhang. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning, 2025a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.12948>.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165>.
- Alex Warstadt, Alicia Parrish, Haokun Liu, Anhad Mohananey, Wei Peng, Sheng-Fu Wang, and Samuel R. Bowman. Blimp: The benchmark of linguistic minimal pairs for english. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:377–392, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:208527435>.

- Andreas Waldis, Yotam Perlitz, Leshem Choshen, Yufang Hou, and Iryna Gurevych. Holmes Recorder a benchmark to assess the linguistic competence of language models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:1616–1647, 2024. doi:10.1162/tacl_a_00718. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.tacl-1.88/>.
- Jon Gauthier, Jennifer Hu, Ethan Wilcox, Peng Qian, and Roger Levy. Syntaxgym: An online platform for targeted evaluation of language models. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 70–76, 2020.
- Eduardo Sánchez, Belen Alastruey, Christophe Ropers, Pontus Stenetorp, Mikel Artetxe, and Marta R. Costa-jussà. Linguini: A benchmark for language-agnostic linguistic reasoning, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.12126>.
- Satyam Goyal and Soham Dan. Iolbench: Benchmarking llms on linguistic reasoning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.04249>.
- Andrew M. Bean, Simi Hellsten, Harry Mayne, Jabez Magomere, Ethan A. Chi, Ryan Chi, Scott A. Hale, and Hannah Rose Kirk. Lingoly: A benchmark of olympiad-level linguistic reasoning puzzles in low-resource and extinct languages. *ArXiv*, abs/2406.06196, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:270371891>.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In *BlackboxNLP@EMNLP*, 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:5034059>.
- Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. Superglue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems. *ArXiv*, abs/1905.00537, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:143424870>.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Xiaodong Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *ArXiv*, abs/2009.03300, 2020. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:221516475>.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R. Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, Agnieszka Kluska, Aitor Lewkowycz, Akshat Agarwal, Alethea Power, Alex Ray, Alex Warstadt, Alexander W. Kocurek, Ali Safaya, Ali Tazarv, Alice Xiang, Alicia Parrish, Allen Nie, Aman Hussain, Amanda Askell, Amanda Dsouza, Ambrose Slone, Ameet Rahane, Anantharaman S. Iyer, Anders Andreassen, Andrea Madotto, Andrea Santilli, Andreas Stuhlmüller, Andrew M. Dai, Andrew La, Andrew Kyle Lampinen, Andy Zou, Angela Jiang, Angelica Chen, Anh Vuong, Animesh Gupta, Anna Gottardi, Antonio Norelli, Anu Venkatesh, Arash Gholamidavoodi, Arfa Tabassum, Arul Menezes, Arun Kirubakaran, Asher Mullokandov, Ashish Sabharwal, Austin Herrick, Avia Efrat, Aykut Erdem, Ayla Karakacs, B. Ryan Roberts, Bao Sheng Loe, Barret Zoph, Bartłomiej Bojanowski, Batuhan Ozyurt, Behnam Hedayatnia, Behnam Neyshabur, Benjamin Inden, Benno Stein, Berk Ekmekci, Bill Yuchen Lin, Blake Stephen Howald, Bryan Orinon, Cameron Diao, Cameron Dour, Catherine Stinson, Cedrick Argueta, C’esar Ferri Ram’irez, Chandan Singh, Charles Rathkopf, Chenlin Meng, Chitta Baral, Chiyu Wu, Chris Callison-Burch, Chris Waites, Christian Voigt, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Potts, Cindy Ramirez, Clara E. Rivera, Clemencia Siro, Colin Raffel, Courtney Ashcraft, Cristina Garbacea, Damien Sileo, Daniel H Garrette, Dan Hendrycks, Dan Kilman, Dan Roth, Daniel Freeman, Daniel Khashabi, Daniel Levy, Daniel Mosegu’i Gonz’alez, Danielle R. Perszyk, Danny Hernandez, Danqi Chen, Daphne Ippolito, Dar Gilboa, David Dohan, David Drakard, David Jurgens, Debajyoti Datta, Deep Ganguli, Denis Emelin, Denis Kleyko, Deniz Yuret, Derek Chen, Derek Tam, Dieuwke Hupkes, Diganta Misra, Dilyar Buzan, Dimitri Coelho Mollo, Diyi Yang, Dong-Ho Lee, Dylan Schrader, Ekaterina Shutova, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Elad Segal, Eleanor Hagerman, Elizabeth Barnes, Elizabeth Donoway, Ellie Pavlick, Emanuele Rodolà, Emma Lam, Eric Chu, Eric Tang, Erkut Erdem, Ernie Chang, Ethan A. Chi, Ethan Dyer, Ethan J. Jerzak, Ethan Kim, Eunice Engefu Manyasi, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Fanyue Xia, Fatemeh Siar, Fernando Mart’inez-Plumed, Francesca Happ’e, François Chollet, Frieda Rong, Gaurav Mishra, Genta Indra Winata, Gerard de Melo, Germán Kruszewski, Giambattista Parascandolo, Giorgio Mariani, Gloria Xinyue Wang, Gonzalo Jaimovitch-L’opez, Gregor Betz, Guy Gur-Ari, Hana Galijasevic, Hannah Kim, Hannah Rashkin, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Harsh Mehta, Hayden Bogar, Henry Shevlin, Hinrich Schutze, Hiromu Yakura, Hongming Zhang, Hugh Mee Wong, Ian Ng, Isaac Noble, Jaap Jumelet, Jack Geissinger, John Kernion, Jacob Hilton, Jaehoon Lee, Jaime Fernández Fisac, James B. Simon, James Koppel, James Zheng, James Zou, Jan Koco’n, Jana Thompson, Janelle Wingfield, Jared Kaplan, Jarema Radom, Jascha Narain Sohl-Dickstein, Jason Phang, Jason Wei, Jason Yosinski, Jekaterina Novikova, Jelle Bosscher, Jennifer Marsh, Jeremy Kim, Jeroen Taal, Jesse Engel, Jesujoba Oluwadara Alabi, Jiacheng Xu, Jiaming Song, Jillian Tang, Jane W Waweru, John Burden, John Miller, John U. Balis, Jonathan Batchelder, Jonathan Berant, Jorg Frohberg, Jos Rozen, José Hernández-Orallo, Joseph Boudeman, Joseph Guerr, Joseph Jones, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, Joshua S. Rule, Joyce Chua, Kamil Kanclerz, Karen Livescu, Karl Krauth, Karthik Gopalakrishnan, Katerina Ignatyeva, Katja Markert, Kaustubh D. Dhole, Kevin Gimpel, Kevin Omondi, Kory Wallace Mathewson, Kristen Chiafullo, Ksenia Shkaruta, Kumar Shridhar, Kyle McDonell,

- Kyle Richardson, Laria Reynolds, Leo Gao, Li Zhang, Liam Dugan, Lianhui Qin, Lidia Contreras-Ochando, Louis-Philippe Morency, Luca Moschella, Luca Lam, Lucy Noble, Ludwig Schmidt, Luheng He, Luis Oliveros Col'on, Luke Metz, Lutfi Kerem cSenel, Maarten Bosma, Maarten Sap, Maartje ter Hoeve, Maheen Farooqi, Manaal Faruqui, Mantas Mazeika, Marco Baturan, Marco Marelli, Marco Maru, Maria Jose Ram'irez Quintana, Marie Tolkiehn, Mario Giulianelli, Martha Lewis, Martin Potthast, Matthew L. Leavitt, Matthias Hagen, Mátyás Schubert, Medina Baitemirova, Melody Arnaud, Melvin McElrath, Michael A. Yee, Michael Cohen, Michael Gu, Michael Ivanitskiy, Michael Starritt, Michael Strube, Michal Swkedrowski, Michele Bevilacqua, Michihiro Yasunaga, Mihir Kale, Mike Cain, Mimeo Xu, Mirac Suzgun, Mitch Walker, Monica Tiwari, Mohit Bansal, Moin Aminnaseri, Mor Geva, Mozdeh Gheini, T. MukundVarma, Nanyun Peng, Nathan A. Chi, Nayeon Lee, Neta Gur-Ari Krakover, Nicholas Cameron, Nicholas Roberts, Nick Doiron, Nicole Martinez, Nikita Nangia, Niklas Deckers, Niklas Muennighoff, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Niveditha Iyer, Noah Constant, Noah Fiedel, Nuan Wen, Oliver Zhang, Omar Agha, Omar Elbaghdadi, Omer Levy, Owain Evans, Pablo Antonio Moreno Casares, Parth Doshi, Pascale Fung, Paul Pu Liang, Paul Vicol, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Peiyuan Liao, Percy Liang, Peter Chang, Peter Eckersley, Phu Mon Htut, Pinyu Hwang, P. Milkowski, Piyush S. Patil, Pouya Pezeshkpour, Priti Oli, Qiaozhu Mei, Qing Lyu, Qinlang Chen, Rabin Banjade, Rachel Etta Rudolph, Raefer Gabriel, Rahel Habacker, Ramon Risco, Raphael Milliere, Rhythm Garg, Richard Barnes, Rif A. Saurous, Riku Arakawa, Robbe Raymaekers, Robert Frank, Rohan Sikand, Roman Novak, Roman Sitelew, Ronan Le Bras, Rosanne Liu, Rowan Jacobs, Rui Zhang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Ryan Chi, Ryan Lee, Ryan Stovall, Ryan Teehan, Rylan Yang, Sahib Singh, Saif Mohammad, Sajant Anand, Sam Dillavou, Sam Shleifer, Sam Wiseman, Samuel Gruetter, Samuel R. Bowman, Samuel S. Schoenholz, Sanghyun Han, Sanjeev Kwatra, Sarah A. Rous, Sarik Ghazarian, Sayan Ghosh, Sean Casey, Sebastian Bischoff, Sebastian Gehrmann, Sebastian Schuster, Sepideh Sadeghi, Shadi S. Hamdan, Sharon Zhou, Shashank Srivastava, Sherry Shi, Shikhar Singh, Shima Asaadi, Shixiang Shane Gu, Shubh Pachchigar, Shubham Toshniwal, Shyam Upadhyay, Shyamolima Debnath, Siamak Shakeri, Simon Thormeyer, Simone Melzi, Siva Reddy, Sneha Priscilla Makini, Soo-Hwan Lee, Spencer Bradley Torene, Sriharsha Hatwar, Stanislas Dehaene, Stefan Divic, Stefano Ermon, Stella Biderman, Stephanie Lin, Stephen Prasad, Steven T Piantadosi, Stuart M. Shieber, Summer Mishnerghi, Svetlana Kiritchenko, Swaroop Mishra, Tal Linzen, Tal Schuster, Tao Li, Tao Yu, Tariq Ali, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Te-Lin Wu, Théo Desbordes, Theodore Rothschild, Thomas Phan, Tianle Wang, Tiberius Nkinyili, Timo Schick, Timofei Kornev, Titus Tunduny, Tobias Gerstenberg, Trenton Chang, Trishala Neeraj, Tushar Khot, Tyler Shultz, Uri Shaham, Vedant Misra, Vera Demberg, Victoria Nyamai, Vikas Raunak, Vinay Venkatesh Ramasesh, Vinay Uday Prabhu, Vishakh Padmakumar, Vivek Srikumar, William Fedus, William Saunders, William Zhang, Wout Vossen, Xiang Ren, Xiaoyu Tong, Xinran Zhao, Xinyi Wu, Xudong Shen, Yadollah Yaghoobzadeh, Yair Lakretz, Yangqiu Song, Yasaman Bahri, Yejin Choi, Yichi Yang, Yiding Hao, Yifu Chen, Yonatan Belinkov, Yu Hou, Yu Hou, Yuntao Bai, Zachary Seid, Zhuoye Zhao, Zijian Wang, Zijie J. Wang, Zirui Wang, and Ziyi Wu. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2206.04615, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:263625818>.
- Settaluri Lakshmi Sravanthi, Meet Doshi, Tankala Pavan Kalyan, Rudra Murthy, Pushpak Bhattacharyya, and Raj Dabre. Pub: A pragmatics understanding benchmark for assessing llms' pragmatics capabilities. *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:266999533>.
- Dojun Park, Jiwoo Lee, Seohyun Park, Hyeon Jeong, Youngeun Koo, Soonha Hwang, Seonwoo Park, and Sungeun Lee. Multiprageval: Multilingual pragmatic evaluation of large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2406.07736, 2024a. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:270392017>.
- Ashima Suvana, Harshita Khandelwal, and Nanyun Peng. Phonologybench: Evaluating phonological skills of large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2404.02456, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:268876168>.
- Sungjoon Park, Jihyung Moon, Sungdong Kim, Won Ik Cho, Jiyeon Han, Jangwon Park, Chisung Song, Junseong Kim, Yongsook Song, Tae Hwan Oh, Joohong Lee, Juhyun Oh, Sungwon Lyu, Young kuk Jeong, I. V. Lee, Sang gyu Seo, Dongjun Lee, Hyunwoo Kim, Myeonghwa Lee, Seongbo Jang, Seungwon Do, SunKyoung Kim, Kyungtae Lim, Jongwon Lee, Kyumin Park, Jamin Shin, Seonghyun Kim, Lucy Park, Alice H. Oh, Jung-Woo Ha, and Kyunghyun Cho. Klue: Korean language understanding evaluation. *ArXiv*, abs/2105.09680, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:234790338>.
- Chanjun Park, Hyeonwoo Kim, Dahyun Kim, Seonghwan Cho, Sanghoon Kim, Sukyung Lee, Yungi Kim, and Hwalsuk Lee. Open ko-llm leaderboard: Evaluating large language models in korean with ko-h5 benchmark. *ArXiv*, abs/2405.20574, 2024b. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:270199720>.
- Myeongjun Jang, Dohyung Kim, Deuk Sin Kwon, and Eric Davis. KoBEST: Korean balanced evaluation of significant tasks. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Chu-Ren Huang, Hansaem Kim, James Pustejovsky, Leo Wanner, Key-Sun Choi, Pum-Mo Ryu, Hsin-Hsi Chen, Lucia Donatelli, Heng Ji, Sadao Kurohashi, Patrizia Paggio, Nianwen Xue, Seokhwan Kim, Younggyun Hahm, Zhong He, Tony Kyungil Lee, Enrico Santus, Francis Bond, and Seung-

- Hoon Na, editors, *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3697–3708, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 2022. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.coling-1.325/>.
- Guijin Son, Hanwool Lee, Suwan Kim, Huiseo Kim, Jae cheol Lee, Je Won Yeom, Jihyu Jung, Jung woo Kim, and Songseong Kim. HAE-RAE bench: Evaluation of Korean knowledge in language models. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Min-Yen Kan, Veronique Hoste, Alessandro Lenci, Sakriani Sakti, and Nianwen Xue, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 7993–8007, Torino, Italia, May 2024. ELRA and ICCL. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.lrec-main.704/>.
- Eunsu Kim, Juyoung Suk, Philhoon Oh, Haneul Yoo, James Thorne, and Alice Oh. CLiCK: A benchmark dataset of cultural and linguistic intelligence in Korean. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Min-Yen Kan, Veronique Hoste, Alessandro Lenci, Sakriani Sakti, and Nianwen Xue, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 3335–3346, Torino, Italia, May 2024. ELRA and ICCL. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.lrec-main.296/>.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Allonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, Danny Wyatt, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Govind Thattai, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jack Zhang, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Karthik Prasad, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhalla, Kushal Lakhotia, Lauren Rantala-Yeary, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Pasupuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Maria Tsimpoukelli, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kambadur, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Ning Zhang, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Çelebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Prajjwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan, Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohan Maheswari, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shaoliang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Raparthy, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stephane Collot, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Tarek Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gonguet, Virginie Do, Vish Voleti, Vitor Albiero, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyan Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xide Xia, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuwei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie DelPierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papakipos, Aaditya Singh, Aayushi Srivastava, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld, Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Amos Teo, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Dong, Annie Franco, Anuj Goyal, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Barambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhardi, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence, Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Ce Liu, Changan Wang, Changkyu Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Cynthia Gao, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymer, Daniel Li, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovich, Didem Foss, Dingkan Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn,

- Emily Wood, Eric-Tuan Le, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun, Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Filippas Kokkinos, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Swee, Gil Halpern, Grant Herman, Grigory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hakan Inan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Hongyuan Zhan, Ibrahim Damlaj, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Ilias Leontiadis, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Janice Lam, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul, Jessica Zhong, Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Kartikay Khandelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kiran Jagadeesh, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian Khabza, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Miao Liu, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Hermoso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Munish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Egebo, Nicolas Usunier, Nikhil Mehta, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pavan Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr Dollar, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratanchandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Rangaprabhu Parthasarathy, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Russ Howes, Ruty Rinott, Sachin Mehta, Sachin Siby, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Mahajan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lindsay, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shishir Patil, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agarwal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Summer Deng, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury, Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Koehler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaoqiang Tang, Xiaojian Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yaniv Kleinman, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yu Zhao, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yunlu Li, Yuzi He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosnbrick, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, Zhiwei Zhao, and Zhiyu Ma. The llama 3 herd of models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783>.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mistral 7b, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06825>.
- Mistral AI. Mistral small 3.1, 2025. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-small-3-1>. Accessed: 2025-05-01.
- Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, L  onard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ram  , Johan Ferret, Peter Liu, Pouya Tafti, Abe Friesen, Michelle Casbon, Sabella Ramos, Ravin Kumar, Charline Le Lan, Sammy Jerome, Anton Tsitsulin, Nino Vieillard, Piotr Stanczyk, Sertan Girgin, Nikola Momchev, Matt Hoffman, Shantanu Thakoor, Jean-Bastien Grill, Behnam Neyshabur, Olivier Bachem, Alanna Walton, Aliaksei Severyn, Alicia Parrish, Aliya Ahmad, Allen Hutchison, Alvin Abdagic, Amanda Carl, Amy Shen, Andy Brock, Andy Coenen, Anthony Laforge, Antonia Paterson, Ben Bastian, Bilal Piot, Bo Wu, Brandon Royal, Charlie Chen, Chintu Kumar, Chris Perry, Chris Wely, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Danila Sinopalnikov, David Weinberger, Dimple Vijaykumar, Dominika Rogo  nska, Dustin Herbison, Elisa Bandy, Emma Wang, Eric Noland, Erica Moreira, Evan Senter, Evgenii Eltyshev, Francesco Visin, Gabriel Rasskin, Gary Wei, Glenn Cameron, Gus Martins, Hadi Hashemi, Hanna Klimczak-Pluci  nska, Harleen Batra, Harsh Dhand, Ivan Nardini, Jacinda Mein, Jack Zhou, James Svensson, Jeff Stanway, Jetha Chan, Jin Peng Zhou, Joana Carrasqueira, Joana Iljazi, Jocelyn Becker, Joe Fernandez, Joost van Amersfoort, Josh Gordon, Josh Lipschultz, Josh Newlan, Ju yeong Ji, Kareem Mohamed, Kartikeya Badola, Kat Black, Katie Millican, Keelin McDonnell, Kelvin Nguyen, Kiranbir Sodhia, Kish Greene, Lars Lowe Sjoesund, Lauren Usui, Laurent Sifre, Lena Heuermann, Leticia Lago, Lilly McNealus, Livio Baldini Soares, Logan Kilpatrick, Lucas Dixon, Luciano Martins, Machel Reid, Manvinder Singh, Mark Iverson, Martin G  rner, Mat Velloso, Mateo Wirth, Matt Davidow, Matt Miller, Matthew Rahtz, Matthew Watson, Meg Risdal, Mehran Kazemi, Michael Moynihan, Ming Zhang, Minsuk Kahng, Minwoo Park, Mofi Rahman, Mohit Khatwani, Natalie Dao, Nenshad Bardoliwalla, Nesh Devanathan, Neta Dumai, Nilay Chauhan, Oscar Wahltinez, Pankil Botarda, Parker Barnes, Paul Barham, Paul Michel, Pengchong Jin, Petko

- Georgiev, Phil Culliton, Pradeep Kuppala, Ramona Comanescu, Ramona Merhej, Reena Jana, Reza Ardeshtir Rokni, Rishabh Agarwal, Ryan Mullins, Samaneh Saadat, Sara Mc Carthy, Sarah Cogan, Sarah Perrin, Sébastien M. R. Arnold, Sebastian Krause, Shengyang Dai, Shruti Garg, Shruti Sheth, Sue Ronstrom, Susan Chan, Timothy Jordan, Ting Yu, Tom Eccles, Tom Hennigan, Tomas Kocisky, Tulsee Doshi, Vihan Jain, Vikas Yadav, Vilobh Meshram, Vishal Dharmadhikari, Warren Barkley, Wei Wei, Wenming Ye, Woohyun Han, Woosuk Kwon, Xiang Xu, Zhe Shen, Zhitao Gong, Zichuan Wei, Victor Cotruta, Phoebe Kirk, Anand Rao, Minh Giang, Ludovic Peran, Tris Warkentin, Eli Collins, Joelle Barral, Zoubin Ghahramani, Raia Hadsell, D. Sculley, Jeanine Banks, Anca Dragan, Slav Petrov, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Clement Farabet, Elena Buchatskaya, Sebastian Borgeaud, Noah Fiedel, Armand Joulin, Kathleen Kenealy, Robert Dadashi, and Alek Andreev. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00118>.
- Gemma Team, Aishwarya Kamath, Johan Ferret, Shreya Pathak, Nino Vieillard, Ramona Merhej, Sarah Perrin, Tatiana Matejovicova, Alexandre Ramé, Morgane Rivière, Louis Rouillard, Thomas Mesnard, Geoffrey Cideron, Jean bastien Grill, Sabela Ramos, Edouard Yvinec, Michelle Casbon, Etienne Pot, Ivo Penchev, Gaël Liu, Francesco Visin, Kathleen Kenealy, Lucas Beyer, Xiaohai Zhai, Anton Tsitsulin, Robert Busa-Fekete, Alex Feng, Naveen Sachdeva, Benjamin Coleman, Yi Gao, Basil Mustafa, Iain Barr, Emilio Parisotto, David Tian, Matan Eyal, Colin Cherry, Jan-Thorsten Peter, Danila Sinopalnikov, Surya Bhupatiraju, Rishabh Agarwal, Mehran Kazemi, Dan Malkin, Ravin Kumar, David Vilar, Idan Brusilovsky, Jiaming Luo, Andreas Steiner, Abe Friesen, Abhanshu Sharma, Abheesht Sharma, Adi Mayrav Gilady, Adrian Goedeckemeyer, Alaa Saade, Alex Feng, Alexander Kolesnikov, Alexei Bendebury, Alvin Abdagic, Amit Vadi, András György, André Susano Pinto, Anil Das, Ankur Bapna, Antoine Miech, Antoine Yang, Antonia Paterson, Ashish Shenoy, Ayan Chakrabarti, Bilal Piot, Bo Wu, Bobak Shahriari, Bryce Pettrini, Charlie Chen, Charline Le Lan, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, CJ Carey, Cormac Brick, Daniel Deutsch, Danielle Eisenbud, Dee Cattle, Derek Cheng, Dimitris Paparas, Divyashree Shivakumar Sreepathihalli, Doug Reid, Dustin Tran, Dustin Zelle, Eric Noland, Erwin Huizenga, Eugene Kharitonov, Frederick Liu, Gagik Amirkhanyan, Glenn Cameron, Hadi Hashemi, Hanna Klimczak-Plucińska, Harman Singh, Harsh Mehta, Harshal Tushar Lehri, Hussein Hazimeh, Ian Ballantyne, Idan Szpektor, Ivan Nardini, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Jetha Chan, Joe Stanton, John Wieting, Jonathan Lai, Jordi Orbay, Joseph Fernandez, Josh Newlan, Ju yeong Ji, Jyotinder Singh, Kat Black, Kathy Yu, Kevin Hui, Kiran Vodrahalli, Klaus Greff, Linhai Qiu, Marcella Valentine, Marina Coelho, Marvin Ritter, Matt Hoffman, Matthew Watson, Mayank Chaturvedi, Michael Moynihan, Min Ma, Nabila Babar, Natasha Noy, Nathan Byrd, Nick Roy, Nikola Momchev, Nilay Chauhan, Naveen Sachdeva, Oskar Bunyan, Pankil Botarda, Paul Caron, Paul Kishan Rubenstein, Phil Culliton, Philipp Schmid, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Pingmei Xu, Piotr Stanczyk, Pouya Tafti, Rakesh Shivanna, Renjie Wu, Renke Pan, Reza Rokni, Rob Willoughby, Rohith Vallu, Ryan Mullins, Sammy Jerome, Sara Smoot, Sertan Girgin, Shariq Iqbal, Shashir Reddy, Shruti Sheth, Siim Pöder, Sijal Bhatnagar, Sindhu Raghuram Panyam, Sivan Eiger, Susan Zhang, Tianqi Liu, Trevor Yacovone, Tyler Liechty, Uday Kalra, Utku Evci, Vedant Misra, Vincent Roseberry, Vlad Feinberg, Vlad Kolesnikov, Woohyun Han, Woosuk Kwon, Xi Chen, Yinlam Chow, Yuvein Zhu, Zichuan Wei, Zoltan Egyed, Victor Cotruta, Minh Giang, Phoebe Kirk, Anand Rao, Kat Black, Nabila Babar, Jessica Lo, Erica Moreira, Luiz Gustavo Martins, Omar Sanseviero, Lucas Gonzalez, Zach Gleicher, Tris Warkentin, Vahab Mirrokni, Evan Senter, Eli Collins, Joelle Barral, Zoubin Ghahramani, Raia Hadsell, Yossi Matias, D. Sculley, Slav Petrov, Noah Fiedel, Noam Shazeer, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Clement Farabet, Elena Buchatskaya, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Rohan Anil, Dmitry, Lepikhin, Sebastian Borgeaud, Olivier Bachem, Armand Joulin, Alek Andreev, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, and Léonard Hussenot. Gemma 3 technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.19786>.
- Qwen An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiaxin Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Pei Zhang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Runji Lin, Tianhao Li, Tingyu Xia, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yi-Chao Zhang, Yuncang Wan, Yuqi Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zihan Qiu, Shanghaoran Quan, and Zekun Wang. Qwen2.5 technical report. *ArXiv*, abs/2412.15115, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:274859421>.
- John Dang, Shivalika Singh, Daniel D’souza, Arash Ahmadian, Alejandro Salamanca, Madeline Smith, Aidan Peppin, Sungjin Hong, Manoj Govindassamy, Terrence Zhao, Sandra Kublik, Meor Amer, Viraat Aryabumi, Jon Ander Campos, Yi-Chern Tan, Tom Kocmi, Florian Strub, Nathan Grinsztajn, Yannis Flet-Berliac, Acyr Locatelli, Hangyu Lin, Dwarak Talupuru, Bharat Venkitesh, David Cairuz, Bowen Yang, Tim Chung, Wei-Yin Ko, Sylvie Shang Shi, Amir Shukayev, Sammie Bae, Aleksandra Piktus, Roman Castagné, Felipe Cruz-Salinas, Eddie Kim, Lucas Crawhall-Stein, Adrien Morisot, Sudip Roy, Phil Blunsom, Ivan Zhang, Aidan Gomez, Nick Frosst, Marzieh Fadaee, Beyza Ermis, Ahmet Üstün, and Sara Hooker. Aya expand: Combining research breakthroughs for a new multilingual frontier, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.04261>.
- Anthropic. Claude 3.5 sonnet, 2024. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet>. Accessed: 2025-04-01.

Anthropic. Claude 3.7 sonnet, 2025. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-7-sonnet>. Accessed: 2025-05-01.

Team Cohere, Aakanksha, Arash Ahmadian, Marwan Ahmed, Jay Alammar, Yazeed Alnumay, Sophia Althammer, Arkady Arkhangorodsky, Viraat Aryabumi, Dennis Aumiller, Raphaël Avalos, Zahara Aviv, Sammie Bae, Saurabh Baji, Alexandre Barbet, Max Bartolo, Björn Bebensee, Neeral Beladia, Walter Beller-Morales, Alexandre Bérard, Andrew Bernshaw, Anna Bialas, Phil Blunsom, Matt Bobkin, Adi Bongale, Sam Braun, Maxime Brunet, Samuel Cahyawijaya, David Cairuz, Jon Ander Campos, Cassie Cao, Kris Cao, Roman Castagné, Julián Cendrero, Leila Chan Currie, Yash Chandak, Diane Chang, Giannis Chatziveroglou, Hongyu Chen, Claire Cheng, Alexis Chevalier, Justin T. Chiu, Eugene Cho, Eugene Choi, Eujeong Choi, Tim Chung, Volkan Cirik, Ana Cismaru, Pierre Clavier, Henry Conklin, Lucas Crawhall-Stein, Devon Crouse, Andres Felipe Cruz-Salinas, Ben Cyrus, Daniel D’souza, Hugo Dalla-Torre, John Dang, William Darling, Omar Darwiche Domingues, Saurabh Dash, Antoine Debugne, Théo Dehaze, Shaan Desai, Joan Devassy, Rishit Dholakia, Kyle Duffy, Ali Edalati, Ace Eldeib, Abdullah Elkady, Sarah Elsharkawy, Irem Ergün, Beyza Ermis, Marzieh Fadaee, Boyu Fan, Lucas Fayoux, Yannis Flet-Berliac, Nick Frosst, Matthias Gallé, Wojciech Galuba, Utsav Garg, Matthieu Geist, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Seraphina Goldfarb-Tarrant, Tomas Goldsack, Aidan Gomez, Victor Machado Gonzaga, Nithya Govindarajan, Manoj Govindassamy, Nathan Grinsztajn, Nikolas Gritsch, Patrick Gu, Shangmin Guo, Kilian Haefeli, Rod Hajjar, Tim Hawes, Jingyi He, Sebastian Hofstätter, Songjin Hong, Sara Hooker, Tom Hosking, Stephanie Howe, Eric Hu, Renjie Huang, Hemant Jain, Ritika Jain, Nick Jakobi, Madeline Jenkins, JJ Jordan, Dhruti Joshi, Jason Jung, Trushant Kalyanpur, Siddhartha Rao Kamalakara, Julia Kedrzycki, Gokce Keskin, Edward Kim, Joon Kim, Wei-Yin Ko, Tom Kocmi, Michael Kozakov, Wojciech Kryściński, Arnav Kumar Jain, Komal Kumar Teru, Sander Land, Michael Lasby, Olivia Lasche, Justin Lee, Patrick Lewis, Jeffrey Li, Jonathan Li, Hangyu Lin, Acyr Locatelli, Kevin Luong, Raymond Ma, Lukas Mach, Marina Machado, Joanne Magbitang, Brenda Malacara Lopez, Aryan Mann, Kelly Marchisio, Olivia Markham, Alexandre Matton, Alex McKinney, Dominic McLoughlin, Jozef Mokry, Adrien Morisot, Autumn Moulder, Harry Moynihan, Maximilian Mozes, Vivek Muppalla, Lidiya Murakhovska, Hemangani Nagarajan, Alekhya Nandula, Hisham Nasir, Shauna Nehra, Josh Netto-Rosen, Daniel Ohashi, James Owers-Bardsley, Jason Ozuzu, Dennis Padilla, Gloria Park, Sam Passaglia, Jeremy Pekmez, Laura Penstone, Aleksandra Piktus, Case Ploeg, Andrew Poulton, Youran Qi, Shubha Raghvendra, Miguel Ramos, Ekagra Ranjan, Pierre Richemond, Cécile Robert-Michon, Aurélien Rodriguez, Sudip Roy, Laura Ruis, Louise Rust, Anubhav Sachan, Alejandro Salamanca, Kailash Karthik Saravanakumar, Isha Satyakam, Alice Schoenauer Sebag, Priyanka Sen, Sholeh Sepehri, Preethi Seshadri, Ye Shen, Tom Sherborne, Sylvie Chang Shi, Sanal Shivaprasad, Vladyslav Shmyhlo, Anirudh Shrinivasan, Inna Shteinbuk, Amir Shukayev, Mathieu Simard, Ella Snyder, Ava Spataru, Victoria Spooner, Trisha Starostina, Florian Strub, Yixuan Su, Jimin Sun, Dwarak Talupuru, Eugene Tarassov, Elena Tommasone, Jennifer Tracey, Billy Trend, Evren Tumer, Ahmet Üstün, Bharat Venkitesh, David Venuto, Pat Verga, Maxime Voisin, Alex Wang, Donglu Wang, Shijian Wang, Edmond Wen, Naomi White, Jesse Willman, Marysia Winkels, Chen Xia, Jessica Xie, Minjie Xu, Bowen Yang, Tan Yi-Chern, Ivan Zhang, Zhenyu Zhao, and Zhoujie Zhao. Command a: An enterprise-ready large language model, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.00698>.

DeepSeek-AI, Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Haowei Zhang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Li, Hui Qu, J. L. Cai, Jian Liang, Jianzhong Guo, Jiaqi Ni, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jin Chen, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, Junxiao Song, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peiyi Wang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qihao Zhu, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Ruyi Chen, S. S. Li, Shanghao Lu, Shangan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Shengfeng Ye, Shirong Ma, Shiyu Wang, Shuang Zhou, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, T. Wang, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, W. L. Xiao, Wangding Zeng, Wanbiao Zhao, Wei An, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xianzu Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaokang Zhang, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xingkai Yu, Xinnan Song, Xinxia Shan, Xinyi Zhou, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuhen Lin, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Y. X. Zhu, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Li, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yi Zheng, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Ying Tang, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yu Wu, Yuan Ou, Yuchen Zhu, Yudian Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yukun Zha, Yunfan Xiong, Yunxian Ma, Yuting Yan, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Z. F. Wu, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhen Xu, Zhen Huang, Zhen Zhang, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhibin Gou, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhihong Shao, Zhipeng Xu, Zhiyu Wu, Zhongyu Zhang, Zhuoshu Li, Zihui Gu, Zijia

- Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Ziyi Gao, and Zizheng Pan. Deepseek-v3 technical report, 2025b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.19437>.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Lianmin Zheng, Ying Sheng, Anastasios Nikolas Angelopoulos, Tianle Li, Dacheng Li, Hao Zhang, Banghua Zhu, Michael Jordan, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Chatbot arena: An open platform for evaluating llms by human preference, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.04132>.
- Junlong Li, Fan Zhou, Shichao Sun, Yikai Zhang, Hai Zhao, and Pengfei Liu. Dissecting human and LLM preferences. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1790–1811, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.99. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.99/>.
- Juhyun Oh, Eunsu Kim, Jiseon Kim, Wenda Xu, Inha Cha, William Yang Wang, and Alice Oh. Uncovering factor level preferences to improve human-model alignment, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.06965>.
- Tom Hosking, Phil Blunsom, and Max Bartolo. Human feedback is not gold standard, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16349>.