

Evaluating the fairness of task-adaptive pretraining on unlabeled test data before text classification

Anonymous ACL submission

Abstract

Few-shot learning benchmarks are critical for evaluating modern NLP techniques. It's possible, however, that benchmarks favor methods which easily make use of unlabeled text, because researchers can use unlabeled text from the test set to pretrain their models. Given the dearth of research on this potential problem, we run experiments to quantify the bias caused by pretraining on unlabeled test set text instead of on unlabeled, independently drawn text. Controlled few-shot and zero-shot experiments on 25 classification tasks and 3 language models—BERT, GPT-2, and Mistral 7B—do not find evidence of overoptimism. Furthermore, we demonstrate the importance of repeated subsampling when studying few-shot text classification, and recommend that few-shot learning benchmarks include multiple training folds. Code and data are available here: <https://github.com> (currently omitted for anonymity).

1 Introduction

For NLP benchmarks, it's standard to release text from the test set. This allows researchers to submit a file of predictions instead of submitting code. A potential concern is that researchers can use this text during training. Consider the Real-world Annotated Few-shot Tasks (RAFT) benchmark (Alex et al., 2021), which contains "few-shot" text classification tasks—tasks where the training set contains a relatively small number of labeled examples. Below is an excerpt from the RAFT paper (emphasis added):

For each task, we release a public training set with 50 examples and a larger unlabeled test set. *We encourage unsupervised pre-training on the unlabelled examples* and open-domain information retrieval.

In the RAFT competition, a model is evaluated by scoring its predictions on the same set of unlabeled text which the model may have been trained on (using an unsupervised training procedure).

It's wrong to train a model on test set features with their labels and then evaluate on the test set when one needs to estimate performance on out-of-sample data. Test set performance would be overoptimistic (Hastie et al., 2009). This fact is widely known. But what if, as encouraged by Alex et al. (2021), a model is trained on test set features *without* test set labels? This paper studies this question for the domain of text classification.

2 Motivation

NLP benchmarks for few-shot learning are prevalent, as having only a handful of labeled examples is more realistic. One consideration when designing these benchmarks is that some few-shot approaches can—at least theoretically—use unlabeled text from the test set. With Pattern-Exploiting Training (Schick and Schütze, 2021), for example, one can train the final classifier on test set text with soft labels predicted by an ensemble of supervised models. Or, with Pre-trained Prompt Tuning (Gu et al., 2022), one can pretrain the language model (LM) on unlabeled test set text before prompt-tuning on the labeled training set. A more classical approach would be to train a word2vec model (Mikolov et al., 2013) on unlabeled test set text, run this model on training text to get embeddings, and finally train a classifier on these embeddings with labels from the training set.

For other few-shot approaches, such as SetFit (Tunstall et al., 2022) and in-context learning with LLMs (as popularized by Brown et al., 2020), it's more common to only use labeled text.

While the ability to exploit unlabeled text is useful, applying this ability to test set text could be substantively different than applying it to text which is

statistically independent of the test set. This difference in methodology may be more concerning in the few-shot setting than in the many-shot setting. It’s conceivable that differences between few-shot methods are due just as much to how unlabeled text is used as they are to how the few, labeled examples are used. This raises the question: does pretraining a model on a benchmark’s unlabeled test set text inflate the model’s performance on that benchmark?

3 Related work

As indicated by the quote in §1, the RAFT benchmark implicitly assumes that the answer is no. The validity of using test set features is not a fringe opinion. The popular textbook by [Hastie et al. \(2009\)](#) contains the following passage without a reference or evidence (emphasis added):

There is one qualification: *initial unsupervised screening steps can be done before samples are left out*. For example, we could select the 1000 predictors with highest variance across all 50 samples, before starting cross-validation. *Since this filtering does not involve the class labels, it does not give the predictors an unfair advantage*.

The opposite opinion—that exploiting unlabeled test set features is unfair—may align more closely with best practices. For example, [Gururangan et al. \(2020\)](#) contains the following criticism of another study when comparing performances on a popular text classification benchmark:

[Thongtan and Phienthrakul \(2019\)](#) report a higher number (97.42) on IMDB, but they train their word vectors on the test set.

[Jacovi et al. \(2023\)](#) argue that benchmarks which release unlabeled test set text can be compromised in two ways. First, the text can be discretely labeled and trained on by model developers. Second, if test set texts were scraped from websites which also host their labels, e.g., movie reviews and ratings on IMDb, then an LLM may have already been pretrained on these labeled texts (Scenario 1 in [Jacovi et al., 2023](#)). They do not discuss potential problems with using unlabeled test set text by itself.

[Moscovich and Rosset \(2022\)](#) contains experiments and theory for unsupervised methods which

are common to tasks involving tabular data. They find that estimators of out-of-sample performance which were subject to these methods may be biased positively or negatively, depending on the parameters of the problem. They recommend further research on this bias in more domains, particularly when dealing with small sample sizes and high-dimensional data.

4 Experimental design

In the absence of answers to this question in NLP, we study whether pretraining on unlabeled test set text biases test set performance for 25 diverse text classification tasks and two types of LMs: BERT ([Devlin et al., 2019](#)), and GPT-2 ([Radford et al., 2019](#)). Appendix A describes each task.

The goal of the experiment is to first establish that pretraining is beneficial, in line with [Gururangan et al. \(2020\)](#). Second, given that pretraining has a detectable benefit, the experiment measures the accuracy difference between using test set text for the pretraining stage—an arguably unfair methodology—and using text which is independent of the test set—an inarguably fair methodology.

In more detail, the experiment starts by subsampling three separate sets of data from the full sample of data for a given text classification task:

- extra: n (either 50, 100, 200 or 500) unlabeled texts which are optionally used for pre-training
- train: m (either 50 or 100) labeled texts for classification training
- test: n labeled texts to report accuracy.

Next, three accuracy estimators are computed. The procedures used to obtain them are described below.

4.1 $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$

1. Train a freshly loaded, pretrained LM on the n unlabeled texts in extra using the LM’s pretraining objective—masked language modeling loss for BERT, or autoregressive/causal language modeling loss for GPT-2.
2. Add a linear layer to this model, and finetune all of the LM’s weights to minimize classification cross entropy loss on train.
3. Compute the classification accuracy of this model on test.

Step 1 is task-adaptive pretraining—a procedure broadly recommended by Gururangan et al. (2020). Step 2 is a canonical way to train a transformer-based LM for a classification task, according to Section 2 of Zhang et al. (2021).

$\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ is clearly an unbiased estimator of out-of-sample accuracy because it never trains on test.

4.2 acc_{test}

acc_{test} is identical to $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$, except that pretraining is done on test instead of extra in step 1.

acc_{test} represents what one might see in a competition like RAFT, where pretraining on unlabeled text from test is encouraged. It’s unclear whether this accuracy estimator is unbiased, because it came from pretraining and evaluating on the same set of test set text. A reasonable hypothesis is that it’s overoptimistic, i.e., $E[\text{acc}_{\text{test}}] > E[\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}]$.

4.3 acc_{base}

acc_{base} doesn’t do pretraining; it doesn’t make any use of unlabeled text. It simply trains a pretrained LM on train to do classification, and then computes this model’s accuracy on test.

This score provides a sanity check. If there’s no boost from acc_{base} to $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$, then it may not be surprising if we don’t see a difference between $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ and acc_{test} . Observing a boost from acc_{base} to $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ rules out undertraining as the cause of a null difference between $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ and acc_{test} because of, e.g., not pretraining for enough epochs, or by setting too low a learning rate.

4.4 Repeated subsampling

The three accuracy estimators are paired, because their classification training and test sets are identical. The only difference is the source of unlabeled text for pretraining. For $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$, the source is independent of test data. For acc_{test} , the source is exactly the test set text. For acc_{base} , no unlabeled text is used.

A potentially important source of variation in this experiment is the particular subsamples, i.e., the particular realizations of extra, train, and test for a given classification task. To expose this variation, the experiment procedure is repeated tens of times for each classification task.¹ For example, for $n = 500$, and for each of the 25 classification

¹For $n = 50$ and $n = 100$, the experiment is repeated 100 times. For $n = 200$, the experiment is repeated 50 times. For $n = 500$, the experiment is repeated 20 times. In total, 81,000 finetuned BERT and GPT-2 models were evaluated.

tasks, 20 ($\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$, acc_{test} , acc_{base}) triples are computed.

Appendix B explains more experiment choices.

5 Results

Appendix D.2 visualizes the distributions of $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}} - \text{acc}_{\text{base}}$ and $\text{acc}_{\text{test}} - \text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$. $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}} - \text{acc}_{\text{base}}$ is a control—it’s the accuracy boost from pretraining on unlabeled independent text versus not pretraining at all. $\text{acc}_{\text{test}} - \text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ is the main quantity of interest: it’s the evaluation bias from pretraining on unlabeled test set text instead of on unlabeled independent text.

Table 1 contains means of these differences for each configuration of the experiment. It roughly suggests that while pretraining is consistently beneficial, pretraining on unlabeled test set text does not bias test set performance one way or the other.

A more complete analysis of this data is motivated and performed in the next section.

	BERT	GPT-2
$n = 50$	4.1% 0.19%	3.8% 0.18%
$n = 100$	3.9% 0.18%	4.1% 0.11%
$n = 200$	3.9% -0.39%	4.4% -0.05%
$n = 500$	3.5% 0.48%	4.6% -0.08%

(a) $m = 50$

	BERT	GPT-2
$n = 50$	6.2% -0.08%	2.2% -0.05%
$n = 100$	6.1% -0.37%	2.5% 0.03%
$n = 200$	4.1% 0.33%	6.3% -0.01%
$n = 500$	6.1% -0.16%	3.9% -0.21%

(b) $m = 100$

Table 1: Means of accuracy differences taken across all subsamples of all 25 classification tasks. For each cell, the upper-left of the diagonal corresponds to the sample mean of $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}} - \text{acc}_{\text{base}}$, and the lower-right corresponds to the sample mean of $\text{acc}_{\text{test}} - \text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$.

6 Analysis

Reporting means is not enough, especially when studying few-shot learning. Appendix D.2 demonstrates that there’s considerable variance, despite

pairing the accuracy estimators.² While these visualizations tell us about how raw accuracy differences vary, they do not tell us how the mean accuracy difference varies. We seek a neat answer to the core questions: on this benchmark of 25 classification tasks, how much does the overall accuracy differ between two modeling techniques, and how much does this difference vary?

One way to communicate the variance is to estimate the standard error of the mean difference across classification tasks. But the standard error statistic can be difficult to interpret (Morey et al., 2016). Furthermore, its computation is not completely trivial due to the data’s hierarchical dependency structure: each triple, ($\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$, acc_{test} , acc_{base}), is drawn from (train, test), which is itself drawn from the given classification dataset.

6.1 Model

This analysis does not aim to estimate standard errors. Instead, a hierarchical model is fit (* is short for $ijkl$ —the lowest-level observation):

$$Y_* \sim \text{Binomial}(n, \lambda_*) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{logit}(\lambda_*) = \mu + \alpha z_i + U_j + V_{jk} + W_{jl} + \beta x_* \quad (2)$$

$$\mu \sim \text{Normal}(0, 1) \quad (3)$$

$$\alpha \sim \text{Normal}(0, 5) \quad (4)$$

$$U_j \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_U) \quad (5)$$

$$V_{jk} \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_V) \quad (6)$$

$$W_{jl} \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_W) \quad (7)$$

$$\beta \sim \text{Normal}(0, 1) \quad (8)$$

$$\sigma_U, \sigma_V \sim \text{HalfNormal}(0, 1) \quad (9)$$

$$\sigma_W \sim \text{HalfNormal}(0, 3.5355) \quad (10)$$

- (1) number of correct predictions
- (2) logit link for accuracy rate, additive effects
- (3) prior for the global intercept
- (4) prior for the effect of the type of LM (BERT or GPT-2)—a control variable
- (5) prior for the effect of the classification task (partial-pooled to reduce overfitting)
- (6) prior for the nested effect of the task’s subsampled dataset

²One source of variance is intentionally introduced: the subsamples/splits, as explained in §4.4. The other source of variance is inherent: the added linear layer to perform classification is initialized with random weights.

- (7) prior for the interaction effect of the task and the effect of interest (to reduce underfitting)
- (8) prior for the effect of interest ($x_{ijk1} = 1$ indicates the modeling intervention)
- (9) prior for standard deviations
- (10) prior for standard deviation.

The model is fit using Markov Chain Monte Carlo, using the interface provided by the bambi package (Capretto et al., 2022).

6.2 Overall effects

In NLP benchmarks, methods are assessed by taking their average performance across tasks. To place the analysis results in this context, samples from the posterior predictive distribution of $Y_{ijk1} - Y_{ijk0}$ (6.1) are taken, then averaged across i (the 2 LM types—BERT and GPT-2), j (the 25 classification tasks), and k (their subsamples), and divided by n to obtain the distribution of the average accuracy difference:

$$\frac{\bar{Y}_{\dots 1} - \bar{Y}_{\dots 0}}{n} \quad (11)$$

These distributions are plotted in Figure 1. Each distribution is that of the marginal effect of the modeling intervention: pretraining versus not pretraining before classification training (the pretraining boost), or pretraining on unlabeled test set text instead of on unlabeled independent text before classification training (the evaluation bias).

6.3 Task-level effects

While taking an average across tasks provides a concise summary, it cannot be used to rule out the existence of an evaluation bias. Because if the direction of the bias depends on latent properties of the task, averaging may cancel out real, positive biases with real, negative ones. Or, it may dilute the few real, positive biases with many null ones.

Here is a hypothetical reason for there to be a task-dependent evaluation bias. Jin et al. (2021) argue and demonstrate that the benefit of task-adaptive pretraining depends on the task’s causal direction. If the principle of independent causal mechanisms is also relevant to the fairness of pretraining on test set features, then our accuracy data may contain (for the sake of argument) positive




Figure 1: Distributions of average accuracy differences (11). The evaluation bias is akin to $\text{acc}_{\text{test}} - \text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$. The pretraining boost is akin to $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}} - \text{acc}_{\text{base}}$.

evaluation biases for anti-causal tasks, and null biases for causal tasks.³

One way to analyze tasks is to sample from the posterior predictive distribution of the accuracy difference, and only average across subsamples:

$$\frac{\hat{Y}_{ij.1} - \hat{Y}_{ij.0}}{n}. \quad (12)$$

A concise way is to perform a hypothesis test for each setting of m, n , and the LM type:

$$H_0 : E[\text{acc}_{\text{test}} - \text{acc}_{\text{extra}}] = 0 \quad (13)$$

$$H_1 : E[\text{acc}_{\text{test}} - \text{acc}_{\text{extra}}] > 0. \quad (14)$$

The p -value is estimated via permutation testing. It's then adjusted to control the false discovery rate (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995).

7 Discussion

Figure 1 demonstrates that the average pretraining boost is significant in every configuration of the experiment, ranging from 2% to 6%. This finding

³We won't assess any particular hypothesis about the role of causality. We are only motivating task-level analysis.

replicates that from Gururangan et al. (2020). After averaging across settings for m, n , and the 2 LM types, only two of the 25 classification tasks had a pretraining boost less than 0, and both were greater than -1%.⁴ Overall, task-adaptive pretraining had the intended effect, so there may be a detectable evaluation bias.

As shown in Figure 1, the evaluation bias bounces inconsistently and insignificantly around 0. After averaging, 12 of the 25 classification tasks had a positive evaluation bias, 13 had a negative evaluation bias, and all tasks had an average evaluation bias less than 1% in absolute value.

To provide a detailed picture of the evaluation bias, and to avoid excessive averaging, we lemon-picked tasks which reported a bias of at least +3% in any configuration of the experiment. All 6 tasks matching this criterion were from experiments with BERT, simply because BERT had greater training variance. It's reasonable to hypothesize that if there is a task-dependent evaluation bias, it consistently appears across m or n for that task, or the pattern is consistent across tasks. Figure 2 does not support either of these hypotheses.

⁴The tasks were `blog_authorship_corpus` and `movie_rationales`.




Figure 2: Distributions of average evaluation biases (12) for the subset of tasks which reported an average evaluation bias of at least +3% accuracy in any configuration of the experiment.

Given the lack of evidence for an evaluation bias in either direction, it’s unlikely that a benchmark which releases unlabeled test set text can systematically promote models pretrained on it over equally performant models which pretrained on unlabeled independent text.

Moscovich and Rosset (2022) found that the evaluation bias caused by unsupervised methods for tabular data converges to 0 as n increases. This finding is not confirmed by this experiment. Figure 1 shows that within $m = 50$ and $m = 100$, distributions of the evaluation bias consistently hover around 0 across n . Figure 2 also does not support a relationship between n and the evaluation bias for lemon-picked tasks. But more experiments varying n are needed to thoroughly assess this insensitivity.

8 Overtraining

§7 rules out undertraining on unlabeled text as the cause of a null evaluation bias. What if we overtrain? Overtraining on labeled test data trivially increases test set performance. Perhaps overtraining on unlabeled test set text has a similar effect. To test this hypothesis for text classification, GPT-2 is intentionally overtrained on unlabeled text for 2 epochs instead of 1.

For each of the 25 classification tasks and their subsamples, pretraining for 2 epochs instead of 1 resulted in a lower pretraining loss. The average pretraining loss is 20% lower, and the pretraining boost is negative, which indicates overfitting, as intended. Figure 3 shows that, despite overtraining, the evaluation bias hovers around 0. All p -values




Figure 3: Distributions of average accuracy differences (11) after pretraining GPT-2 for 2 epochs instead of 1 (§8).

from the test in (13) are greater than 0.5.⁵ Overtraining on unlabeled test set text causes test set performance to degrade to the same degree that overfitting on unlabeled independent text does.

9 Zero-shot text classification

Prompting an LLM is a popular choice for solving NLP problems. These prompts can be pretrained on. For example, Gemma 2 (Gemma Team, 2024) is intentionally pretrained on prompts from the LM-SYS benchmark (Zheng et al., 2023).

To study a modern prompting approach, the experiment in §4 is repeated with two modifications. First, task-adaptive pretraining is done on prompts—unlabeled texts with instructions for solving the task. Second, classification training is not performed. The further-pretrained LLM is immediately prompted to do the task on test data.

More specifically, pretraining is performed by adding a QLoRA adapter layer (Dettmers et al., 2024) to every linear layer in Mistral 7B⁶ (Jiang et al., 2023). Perhaps notably, instructions mention the set of possible answers—the class names. Here is an example of a prompt for the `ag_news` task (Zhang et al., 2015):

```
Your task is to classify a given text as
one of these categories:
World
Sports
Business
Sci/Tech
```

The text is a news article. Answer with its topic.

```
### Text: Bombardier CEO Quits, Shares
Dive Paul Tellier stepped down on Monday
as president and chief executive of
Bombardier Inc. (BBDsvb.TO: Quote,
Profile, Research) (BBDsb.
### Answer:
```

⁵For the test that $E[\text{acc}_{\text{extra}} - \text{acc}_{\text{base}}] < 0$, 16 of the 25 p -values for $m = 50, n = 50$ in §8 were less than 0.05, which demonstrates that the testing procedure may have some statistical power.

⁶Mistral-7B-v0.3, the non-instruction-trained model.




Figure 4: Distributions of average accuracy differences (11) for zero-shot classification (§9). For each of the 25 classification tasks, 20 subsamples were taken.

Figure 4 shows that, while pretraining on prompts improves accuracy, pretraining on test set prompts does not increase test set accuracy compared to pretraining on independently drawn prompts.

12 of the 25 tasks had a positive evaluation bias and 13 had a negative evaluation bias. All 25 p -values from the hypothesis test in (13) were greater than 0.5. In other words, at the task level, there is still no evidence of evaluation bias.

A limitation of this experiment is that it doesn’t account for data contamination. If Mistral 7B’s pretraining data included labeled or unlabeled parts of the classification datasets used here, the pretraining boost and evaluation bias may be diluted.

10 Meta-analysis

§4.4 briefly argues for subsampling multiple datasets from the full classification dataset. To assess this argument, the analysis was repeated on 500 random slices of the $m = 100, n = 500$ dataset of accuracies such that exactly 1 ($\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}, \text{acc}_{\text{test}}, \text{acc}_{\text{base}}$) triple per classification task (instead of 20 triples) is included. This unreplicated data is often all you get from benchmarks.

Figure 5 (left) displays the cumulative distribution of the posterior mean of the evaluation bias for $m = 100, n = 500$ under this unreplicated ex-




Figure 5: Distributions of conclusions had there been no technical replication (§10).

perimental design. The distribution is quite variant. There’s a 47% chance that the posterior mean of β —the average increase in the log-odds of a correct prediction by pretraining on unlabeled test set text instead of on unlabeled independent text—is outside the interval $(-0.04, 0.04)$, which would indicate a significant negative or positive bias.⁷ For the zero-shot experiment in §9, there’s a 49% chance that that the posterior mean of β is outside $(-0.07, 0.07)$. Without repeated subsampling, one may as well flip a coin to decide whether pretraining on unlabeled test set text is fair.

11 Conclusion

Across combinations for the number of classification training examples ($m = 50, 100$), the number of pretraining or evaluation examples ($n = 50, 100, 200, 500$), and for zero-shot prompting with an LLM, task-adaptive pretraining on unlabeled test set text—instead of on unlabeled independent text—did not result in a consistent or significant evaluation bias. This appears to be the case when pretraining helps (§7) and when it hurts (§8).

For benchmarks which only release unlabeled text from the test set, this finding doesn’t completely absolve LLM evaluations from scrutiny. The reason is that the boost from pretraining on unlabeled text—which is often significant—could be viewed as a type of evaluation bias, depending on how LLMs generalize. More concretely, suppose there’s a benchmark and two LLMs, A and B .

A was *not* pretrained on unlabeled text from the test set of the benchmark, while B was. With the perspective that LLM benchmarks supply scores which are correlates of performance on real-world tasks—instead of indicators of performance solely on the benchmark’s tasks—then B scoring higher on the benchmark than A may be a misleading signal. Because if pretraining on the benchmark’s unlabeled text causes B to generalize better only *within* the distribution of the benchmark, then B ’s edge on this benchmark does not signal an edge in real-world tasks. This argument implies that knowing whether or not an LLM was pretrained on unlabeled text from the test set is still important.

One recommendation for designing few-shot benchmarks, which expands on the principle about robustness from Bragg et al. (2021), is based on the meta-analysis in §10: empirical studies of few-shot learning should consider including multiple, independent subsamples of training data. While a single training set combined with a large test set is sufficient for precise, unbiased estimation of out-of-sample performance, this estimator is conditional on the training set. In few-shot learning, the training set is, by definition, minimal. The estimator hides two sources of variance—that from the randomly drawn training set, and that from randomness inherent in the training procedure. Figure 5 shows that this variance is large-enough to turn a methodology into a coin flip for two different training procedures. In-context learning with LLMs is also sensitive to the selection of few-shot examples (Lu et al., 2022, Alzahrani et al., 2024). Benchmarks which require training on multiple, independent subsamples would expose training variance.

⁷For 0.04, the odds ratio is $e^{0.04} \approx 1.04$. For context, the average odds ratio between adjacent submissions in the RAFT leaderboard is 1.03. For posterior means outside $(-0.04, 0.04)$, all of their 89% credible intervals exclude 0, which evidences a non-null effect.

12 Limitations

This paper does not analyze semi-supervised methods like Pattern-Exploiting Training, or hand-inspecting the test set text and targeting interventions accordingly. We also don't study what happens when unlabeled test set texts are included as part of the initial pretraining stage of an LLM. This paper's conclusions are limited to task-adaptive pretraining.

It's possible that there are tasks where an evaluation bias exists, and these were not part of the 25 classification tasks we collected.

Acknowledgements

Currently omitted for anonymity.

References

- Neel Alex, Eli Lifland, Lewis Tunstall, Abhishek Thakur, Pegah Maham, C. Riedel, Emmie Hine, Carolyn Ashurst, Paul Sedille, Alexis Carlier, Michael Noetel, and Andreas Stuhlmüller. 2021. [Raft: A real-world few-shot text classification benchmark](#). In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, volume 1.
- Norah Alzahrani, Hisham Abdullah Alyahya, Yazeed Alnumay, Sultan Alrashed, Shaykhah Alsubaie, Yusef Almushaykeh, Faisal Mirza, Nouf Alotaibi, Nora Altwairesh, Areeb Alowisheq, et al. 2024. When benchmarks are targets: Revealing the sensitivity of large language model leaderboards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01781*.
- Yoav Benjamini and Yosef Hochberg. 1995. [Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing](#). *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):289–300.
- Jonathan Bragg, Arman Cohan, Kyle Lo, and Iz Beltagy. 2021. [Flex: Unifying evaluation for few-shot nlp](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:15787–15800.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Tomás Capretto, Camen Piho, Ravin Kumar, Jacob Westfall, Tal Yarkoni, and Osvaldo A Martin. 2022. [Bambi: A simple interface for fitting bayesian linear models in python](#). *Journal of Statistical Software*, 103(15):1–29.
- Emile Chapuis, Pierre Colombo, Matteo Manica, Matthieu Labeau, and Chloé Clavel. 2020. [Hierarchical pre-training for sequence labelling in spoken dialog](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 2636–2648, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ankush Chatterjee, Kedhar Nath Narahari, Meghana Joshi, and Puneet Agrawal. 2019. [SemEval-2019 task 3: EmoContext contextual emotion detection in text](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 39–48, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2024. [Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jay DeYoung, Sarthak Jain, Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Eric Lehman, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Byron C. Wallace. 2020. [ERASER: A benchmark to evaluate rationalized NLP models](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4443–4458, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thomas Diggelmann, Jordan Boyd-Graber, Jannis Bulian, Massimiliano Ciaramita, and Markus Leippold. 2020. [Climate-fever: A dataset for verification of real-world climate claims](#).
- Jack FitzGerald, Christopher Hench, Charith Peris, Scott Mackie, Kay Rottmann, Ana Sanchez, Aaron Nash, Liam Urbach, Vishesh Kakarala, Richa Singh, Swetha Ranganath, Laurie Crist, Misha Britan, Wouter Leeuwis, Gokhan Tur, and Prem Nataraajan. 2023. [MASSIVE: A 1M-example multilingual natural language understanding dataset with 51 typologically-diverse languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4277–4302, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gemma Team. 2024. [Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size](#).
- Giovanni Grano, Andrea Di Sorbo, Francesco Mercaldo, Corrado A Visaggio, Gerardo Canfora, and Sebastiano Panichella. 2017. [Android apps and user feedback: a dataset for software evolution and quality improvement](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM SIGSOFT international workshop on app market analytics*, pages 8–11.

638	Yuxian Gu, Xu Han, Zhiyuan Liu, and Minlie Huang.	Johannes Kiesel, Maria Mestre, Rishabh Shukla, Em-	694
639	2022. PPT: Pre-trained prompt tuning for few-shot	manuel Vincent, Payam Adineh, David Corney,	695
640	learning . In <i>Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meet-</i>	Benno Stein, and Martin Potthast. 2019. SemEval-	696
641	<i>ing of the Association for Computational Linguistics</i>	2019 task 4: Hyperpartisan news detection . In	697
642	(Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 8410–8423, Dublin,	<i>Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop on</i>	698
643	Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.	<i>Semantic Evaluation</i> , pages 829–839, Minneapolis,	699
644	Neel Guha, Julian Nyarko, Daniel Ho, Christopher Ré,	Minnesota, USA. Association for Computational Lin-	700
645	Adam Chilton, Alex Chohlas-Wood, Austin Peters,	guistics.	701
646	Brandon Waldon, Daniel Rockmore, Diego Zam-	Ravin Kumar, Colin Carroll, Ari Hartikainen, and Os-	702
647	brano, et al. 2024. Legalbench: A collaboratively	valdo Martin. 2019. Arviz a unified library for	703
648	built benchmark for measuring legal reasoning in	exploratory analysis of bayesian models in python .	704
649	large language models . <i>Advances in Neural Informa-</i>	<i>Journal of Open Source Software</i> , 4(33):1143.	705
650	<i>tion Processing Systems</i> , 36.	Nikola Ljubešić, Darja Fišer, and Tomaž Erjavec. 2019.	706
651	Suchin Gururangan, Ana Marasović, Swabha	The frenk datasets of socially unacceptable discourse	707
652	Swayamdipta, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey,	in slovene and english .	708
653	and Noah A. Smith. 2020. Don’t stop pretraining:	Yao Lu, Max Bartolo, Alastair Moore, Sebastian Riedel,	709
654	Adapt language models to domains and tasks . In	and Pontus Stenetorp. 2022. Fantastically ordered	710
655	<i>Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the</i>	prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-	711
656	<i>Association for Computational Linguistics</i> , pages	shot prompt order sensitivity . In <i>Proceedings of the</i>	712
657	8342–8360, Online. Association for Computational	<i>60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Compu-</i>	713
658	Linguistics.	<i>tational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)</i> , pages	714
659	Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, Jerome H Friedman,	8086–8098, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Compu-	715
660	and Jerome H Friedman. 2009. The elements of statis-	tational Linguistics.	716
661	tical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction ,	P. Malo, A. Sinha, P. Korhonen, J. Wallenius, and	717
662	volume 2. Springer.	P. Takala. 2014. Good debt or bad debt: Detecting se-	718
663	He He, Derek Chen, Anusha Balakrishnan, and Percy	mantic orientations in economic texts . <i>Journal of the</i>	719
664	Liang. 2018. Decoupling strategy and generation in	<i>Association for Information Science and Technology</i> ,	720
665	negotiation dialogues . In <i>Proceedings of the 2018</i>	65.	721
666	<i>Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Lan-</i>	Irene Manotas, Ngoc Phuoc An Vo, and Vadim Sheinin.	722
667	<i>guage Processing</i> , pages 2333–2343, Brussels, Bel-	2020. LiMiT: The literal motion in text dataset . In	723
668	gium. Association for Computational Linguistics.	<i>Findings of the Association for Computational Lin-</i>	724
669	Zhang Huangzhao. 2018. Yahoo-	<i>guistics: EMNLP 2020</i> , pages 991–1000, Online.	725
670	answers-topic-classification-dataset.	Association for Computational Linguistics.	726
671	https://github.com/LC-John/	Richard McElreath. 2018. Statistical rethinking: A	727
672	Yahoo-Answers-Topic-Classification-Dataset .	Bayesian course with examples in R and Stan . Chap-	728
673	Alon Jacovi, Avi Caciularu, Omer Goldman, and Yoav	man and Hall/CRC.	729
674	Goldberg. 2023. Stop uploading test data in plain	Vangelis Metsis, Ion Androutsopoulos, and Georgios	730
675	text: Practical strategies for mitigating data contami-	Paliouras. 2006. Spam filtering with naive bayes-	731
676	nation by evaluation benchmarks . In <i>Proceedings of</i>	which naive bayes? In <i>CEAS</i> , volume 17, pages	732
677	<i>the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natu-</i>	28–69. Mountain View, CA.	733
678	<i>ral Language Processing</i> , pages 5075–5084, Singa-	Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Cor-	734
679	apore. Association for Computational Linguistics.	rado, and Jeff Dean. 2013. Distributed representa-	735
680	Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Men-	tions of words and phrases and their compositionality .	736
681	sch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego	<i>Advances in neural information processing systems</i> ,	737
682	de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guil-	26.	738
683	laume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral	Richard D Morey, Rink Hoekstra, Jeffrey N Rouder,	739
684	7b . <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825</i> .	Michael D Lee, and Eric-Jan Wagenmakers. 2016.	740
685	Zhijing Jin, Julius von Kügelgen, Jingwei Ni, Tejas	The fallacy of placing confidence in confidence inter-	741
686	Vaidhya, Ayush Kaushal, Mrinmaya Sachan, and	vals . <i>Psychonomic bulletin & review</i> , 23:103–123.	742
687	Bernhard Schoelkopf. 2021. Causal direction of data	Amit Moscovich and Saharon Rosset. 2022. On the	743
688	collection matters: Implications of causal and an-	cross-validation bias due to unsupervised preprocess-	744
689	ticausal learning for NLP . In <i>Proceedings of the</i>	ing . <i>Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B:</i>	745
690	<i>2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural</i>	<i>Statistical Methodology</i> , 84(4):1474–1502.	746
691	<i>Language Processing</i> , pages 9499–9513, Online and		
692	Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for		
693	Computational Linguistics.		

747	Niklas Muennighoff, Nouamane Tazi, Loic Magne, and	<i>the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Com-</i>	804
748	Nils Reimers. 2023. MTEB: Massive text embedding	<i>putational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop,</i>	805
749	benchmark . In <i>Proceedings of the 17th Conference</i>	pages 407–414, Florence, Italy. Association for Com-	806
750	<i>of the European Chapter of the Association for Com-</i>	putational Linguistics.	807
751	<i>putational Linguistics</i> , pages 2014–2037, Dubrovnik,		
752	Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.		
753	James O’Neill, Polina Rozenshtein, Ryuichi Kiryo, Mo-	Lewis Tunstall, Nils Reimers, Unso Eun Seo Jo, Luke	808
754	toko Kubota, and Danushka Bollegala. 2021. I wish	Bates, Daniel Korat, Moshe Wasserblat, and Oren	809
755	I would have loved this one, but I didn’t – a multilin-	Pereg. 2022. Efficient few-shot learning without	810
756	gual dataset for counterfactual detection in product	prompts . <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11055</i> .	811
757	review . In <i>Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on</i>	Mengqiu Wang, Noah A. Smith, and Teruko Mita-	812
758	<i>Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing</i> ,	mura. 2007. What is the Jeopardy model? a quasi-	813
759	pages 7092–7108, Online and Punta Cana, Domini-	synchronous grammar for QA . In <i>Proceedings of the</i>	814
760	can Republic. Association for Computational Lin-	<i>2007 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natu-</i>	815
761	guistics.	<i>ral Language Processing and Computational Natural</i>	816
762	Bo Pang and Lillian Lee. 2005. Seeing stars: Exploit-	<i>Language Learning (EMNLP-CoNLL)</i> , pages 22–32,	817
763	ing class relationships for sentiment categorization	Prague, Czech Republic. Association for Computa-	818
764	with respect to rating scales . In <i>Proceedings of the</i>	tional Linguistics.	819
765	<i>43rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Compu-</i>	Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien	820
766	<i>tational Linguistics (ACL’05)</i> , pages 115–124, Ann	Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pier-	821
767	Arbor, Michigan. Association for Computational Lin-	ric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtow-	822
768	guistics.	icz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen,	823
769	Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan,	Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu,	824
770	Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language	Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame,	825
771	models are unsupervised multitask learners . <i>OpenAI</i>	Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. Trans-	826
772	<i>blog</i> , 1(8):9.	formers: State-of-the-art natural language processing .	827
773	Elvis Saravia, Hsien-Chi Toby Liu, Yen-Hao Huang,	In <i>Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical</i>	828
774	Junlin Wu, and Yi-Shin Chen. 2018. CARER: Con-	<i>Methods in Natural Language Processing: System</i>	829
775	textualized affect representations for emotion recog-	<i>Demonstrations</i> , pages 38–45, Online. Association	830
776	nition . In <i>Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on</i>	for Computational Linguistics.	831
777	<i>Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing</i> ,	Tianyi Zhang, Felix Wu, Arzo Katiyar, Kilian Q Wein-	832
778	pages 3687–3697, Brussels, Belgium. Association	berger, and Yoav Artzi. 2021. Revisiting few-sample	833
779	for Computational Linguistics.	bert fine-tuning . In <i>International Conference on</i>	834
780	Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. Exploiting	<i>Learning Representations</i> .	835
781	cloze-questions for few-shot text classification and	Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015.	836
782	natural language inference . In <i>Proceedings of the</i>	Character-level convolutional networks for text classi-	837
783	<i>16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Asso-</i>	fication . <i>Advances in neural information processing</i>	838
784	<i>ciation for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume</i> ,	<i>systems</i> , 28.	839
785	pages 255–269, Online. Association for Computa-	Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Tianle	840
786	tional Linguistics.	Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang,	841
787	Jonathan Schler, Moshe Koppel, Shlomo Argamon, and	Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Eric Xing, et al. 2023. Lmsys-	842
788	James W Pennebaker. 2006. Effects of age and gen-	chat-1m: A large-scale real-world llm conversation	843
789	der on blogging . In <i>AAAI spring symposium: Compu-</i>	dataset . <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11998</i> .	844
790	<i>tational approaches to analyzing weblogs</i> , volume 6,	A Classification tasks	845
791	pages 199–205.	Inclusion criteria:	846
792	Eva Sharma, Chen Li, and Lu Wang. 2019. BIG-	1. All text is in English.	847
793	PATENT: A large-scale dataset for abstractive and	2. The number of classes is not greater than 25.	848
794	coherent summarization . In <i>Proceedings of the 57th</i>	3. The task is to classify one text, not a pair as	849
795	<i>Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational</i>	in, e.g., textual entailment tasks.	850
796	<i>Linguistics</i> , pages 2204–2213, Florence, Italy. Asso-	4. Texts aren’t so long that too much useful sig-	851
797	ciation for Computational Linguistics.	nal is dropped when text is truncated to fit in	852
798	Roshan Sharma. 2019. Twitter-sentiment-	BERT/GPT-2’s context window, which is set	853
799	analysis. https://github.com/sharmaroshan/	to 256 tokens.	854
800	Twitter-Sentiment-Analysis .	5. Based on our best judgment, it’s likely that	855
801	Tan Thongtan and Tanasanee Phienthrakul. 2019. Sen-	BERT/GPT-2 can do better than guessing.	856
802	timent classification using document embeddings	Table 2 lists the exact tasks.	857
803	trained with cosine similarity . In <i>Proceedings of</i>		

Hugging Face dataset	Author(s)	Number of classes	Text length (25, 75) percentiles
ag_news	Zhang et al. (2015)	4	(196, 266)
SetFit/amazon_counterfactual_en	O’Neill et al. (2021)	2	(60, 125)
app_reviews	Grano et al. (2017)	5	(10, 77)
blog_authorship_corpus	Schler et al. (2006)	2	(92, 556)
christinacdl/clickbait_notclickbait_dataset		2	(46, 69)
climate_fever	Diggelmann et al. (2020)	4	(80, 156)
aladar/craigslist_bargains	He et al. (2018)	6	(346, 713)
disaster_response_messages		3	(74, 178)
emo	Chatterjee et al. (2019)	4	(44, 83)
dair-ai/emotion	Saravia et al. (2018)	6	(53, 129)
SetFit/enron_spam	Metsis et al. (2006)	2	(342, 1553)
financial_phrasebank	Malo et al. (2014)	3	(79, 157)
classla/FRENK-hate-en	Ljubešić et al. (2019)	2	(34, 160)
hyperpartisan_news_detection	Kiesel et al. (2019)	2	(39, 63)
limit	Manotas et al. (2020)	2	(53, 123)
AmazonScience/massive	FitzGerald et al. (2023)	18	(24, 44)
movie_rationales	DeYoung et al. (2020)	2	(2721, 4659)
mteb/mtop_domain	Muennighoff et al. (2023)	11	(26, 44)
ccdvp/patent-classification	Sharma et al. (2019)	9	(441, 775)
rotten_tomatoes	Pang and Lee (2005)	2	(76, 149)
silicone	Chapuis et al. (2020)	4	(29, 75)
trec	Wang et al. (2007)	6	(36, 61)
tweets_hate_speech_detection	Sharma (2019)	2	(62, 107)
yahoo_answers_topics	Huangzhao (2018)	10	(58, 213)
yelp_review_full	Zhang et al. (2015)	5	(287, 957)

Table 2: Brief descriptions of the 25 classification tasks used in this experiment. Click the link in the cell to be taken to the dataset homepage in <https://huggingface.co/datasets>. The dataset subset (or config) and the chosen prediction task are specified in code in `src/pretrain_on_test/data.py`.

B Other experiment choices

This section expands on §4.

First, we clarify how classification training is performed. For BERT, the linear layer transforms the [CLS] token embedding. For GPT-2, the linear layer transforms the last token’s embedding. The output dimension of the linear layer is the number of classes in the classification task. This layer, along with the rest of the weights in the LM, are finetuned to minimize classification cross entropy loss on train.

The BERT model used here is `bert-base-uncased`. The GPT-2 model used here is `gpt2 (small)`, with 124M parameters.

`train` is stratify-sampled by the class to ensure every class is represented, and to reduce the variance of accuracy estimators. `test` is not stratify-sampled. We’re only interested in the *difference* between accuracies, which is a function of the difference between model likelihoods because the priors are uniform. So even if accuracies are worse than the majority vote, differences are still meaningful for the purposes of this experiment.

`train` text is not included during pretraining to eliminate the overlap of pretraining data between $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ and acc_{test} . This choice was made in an effort to widen any gap between them. The experiment tries to go out of its way to provide evidence of a bias.

`train` contains $m = 50$ or $m = 100$ observations. $m = 50$ is inspired by the RAFT benchmark. $m = 100$ stretches the intention of “few” in few-shot learning, but was tested in an attempt to make lower-variance comparisons. BERT is quite sensitive—see Appendix D.2.

The discussion focuses on the BERT and GPT-2 results because their pretraining data is (likely) not already contaminated with text from the 25 text classification tasks. While modern NLP solutions usually involve LLMs, these models’ pretraining data are opaque and more likely to include text from the 25 classification tasks (for example, from web-crawling the Dataset Viewer in HuggingFace’s datasets web pages, which hosts the experiment’s data) (Jacovi et al., 2023). As a result, the comparisons— $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ versus acc_{base} and acc_{test} versus $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ —would be less valid.

C Hyperparameters and reproducibility

This paper’s experiment and analysis code, and data, is available here: <https://github.com>.

`experiment.sh` lists hyperparameters used for each classification task and experiment configuration. Hyperparameters were pre-specified based on Zhang et al. (2021), with batch sizes set to avoid out-of-memory errors. Run the script on a GPU with at least 15 GB RAM to reproduce results in §5. It takes about 5 days on a T4 GPU. Training is performed using the transformers package (Wolf et al., 2020).

D Results

D.1 Individual analysis

The notebook `analysis/dataset.ipynb` can be run to (1) produce visualizations of the distributions of $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$, acc_{test} , and acc_{base} (for each classification task and experiment configuration), and (2) compute p -values for the hypothesis test specified in (13). For all settings of m and n , no p -values were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Care has to be taken when attempting to analyze or interpret $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}} - \text{acc}_{\text{base}}$ and $\text{acc}_{\text{test}} - \text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ together. That’s because these differences are not independent: if $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ is high, then $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}} - \text{acc}_{\text{base}}$ increases and $\text{acc}_{\text{test}} - \text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ decreases. This paper does not analyze the scores together, per se. We care about $\text{acc}_{\text{test}} - \text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$. $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}} - \text{acc}_{\text{base}}$ only exists to sanity check that the pretraining code works; there may be an effect to detect.

D.2 Difference distributions

Figures 12 - 19 visualize the distributions of the paired differences— $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}} - \text{acc}_{\text{base}}$ and $\text{acc}_{\text{test}} - \text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ —for each configuration of the experiment.

E Analysis

The analysis in §6 can be reproduced by running all of the notebooks in `analysis/fit_posteriors/`. Figure 1 can be reproduced by running the notebook `analysis/results/posterior_pred.ipynb`. Figure 2 can be reproduced by running the notebook `analysis/results/posterior_pred_conditional.ipynb`. Changing the threshold for the bias to +2% accuracy instead of +3% did not change conclusions.

Posterior samples of β (which were used to draw posterior predictive samples) were taken from four chains with 1,000 draws each, after 500 steps of tuning.

E.1 Hierarchical model checks

Hierarchical models require some basic checks to have faith in their results (McElreath, 2018).

For each of the 22 hierarchical models (16 in §6, 4 in §8, and 2 in §9), no divergences were observed during the fitting procedure. All trace plots were healthy.

Figure 10 contains prior predictive distributions for $m = 100, n = 200$, demonstrating that priors are not unreasonable. Using default priors from the `bambi` package (Capretto et al., 2022), while scientifically unreasonable (because they result in wide, basin-like accuracy distributions), did not change the conclusions of this paper.

Figure 11 contains posterior distributions of β for $m = 100, n = 200$, demonstrating the hierarchical model’s ability to recover both null and non-null effects. This test can be reproduced by running the notebook `analysis/test.ipynb`.

Figure 8 checks that posterior predictions for the average task accuracies are calibrated. Figure 9 demonstrates the importance of including the W_{jl} term. These figures can be reproduced by running the notebook `analysis/results/posterior_pred_conditional.ipynb`.

F Meta-analysis

The meta-analysis in §10 can be reproduced by running the script, `analysis/meta/meta.py`, and then the notebook `analysis/meta/meta.ipynb`. No divergences were observed.

Another question is whether the subsample causes a consistent evaluation bias. §10 establishes that picking a single subsample causes the comparison between acc_{test} and $\text{acc}_{\text{extra}}$ to be a coin flip. But is the result of the coin flip explained by the specific subsample? If so, comparing models on a single subsample is not as problematic, because the effect of pretraining on unlabeled test set text would be consistent across models.

One way to answer this question is to measure the correlation between the evaluation bias of BERT and GPT-2 for each setting of m and n , and each of the 25 tasks. A positive correlation suggests that the subsample causes the evaluation bias.

The observed distribution of correlations across m, n , and the tasks is plotted in Figure 6 (a). For context, 10 distributions of randomly permuted pairs of subsample-level biases are plotted in Figure 6 (b) and (c). By design, these correlations

are theoretically 0, and are positive or negative by chance. The observed distributions are qualitatively indistinguishable from the null distributions. Notably, the variance is consistent with the null distributions. A deeper dive into the correlations did not reveal any consistently positive correlations at the task level. This result further evidences the importance of repeated subsampling. Taking a single subsample does not result in a consistent pretraining boost or evaluation bias between BERT and GPT-2.




Figure 6: Distribution of correlation between BERT and GPT-2 across all m, n , and the 25 classification tasks.

G Zero-shot text classification

The zero-shot experiment files are in [cloud_scripts/gcp/experiments/zero_shot/](#). Batch sizes are set to run on a GPU with at least 20 GB RAM. The GPU must support the data types needed for QLoRA, e.g., an L4 GPU. Figure 4 can be reproduced by running the notebook in [analysis/fit_posteriors/zero_shot](#) and then the notebook, [analysis/results/posterior_pred.ipynb](#).

We only study $n = 100$ in an initial effort to provide evidence of an evaluation bias (due to the relatively small test set), and take 20 repeated subsamples instead of 50. While $n = 100$ is quite small, benchmarks such as LegalBench (Guha et al., 2024) have test data in this range. And the analysis transparently exposes variance.

QLoRA hyperparameters were pre-specified: every adapter has rank 16 with $\alpha = 32$ (LoRA scaling factor), a 0.05 dropout rate, and no bias parameters. The adapter layers introduce 41,943,040 new, trainable parameters to Mistral 7B, whose parameters are frozen.

H Experiment with PCA

This is a tangential experiment which served as part of the inspiration of the paper.

This experiment’s design is akin to §4 except that the unsupervised pretraining procedure is PCA, the supervised training procedure is linear regression on synthetic data, and 2,000 subsamples are taken instead of 20-100. 20 features are generated with known effective ranks. The dependent variable is a linear transformation of these features plus independent, normally distributed noise with a standard deviation of 1. Performance is measured using R^2 .

Figure 7 shows that the evaluation bias increases with the effective rank of the features. In other words, fitting a PCA on test set features artificially improves test set performance particularly when fitting a PCA on independent features is unhelpful.

Figure 7 can be reproduced by running the notebook [analysis/pca.ipynb](#)



Figure 7: The shaded regions are 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 8: Each of the points represents a task and an LM type.




Figure 9: Omitting the interaction effect causes underfitting. Note that the prior causes effects to shrink towards 0.




Figure 10: Prior predictive distributions for $m = 100, n = 200$ from two different priors for β —the expected increase in the log-odds of a correct prediction resulting from an intervention/treatment.




Figure 11: Posterior distributions and trace plots for null and non-null effects **from simulated data** where $m = 100, n = 200$, approximated by four chains with 1,000 draws each, after 500 steps of tuning. For each model, no divergences were observed during the fitting procedure. Visualizations were produced by the arviz package (Kumar et al., 2019).




Figure 12




Figure 13




Figure 14




Figure 15




Figure 16




Figure 17




Figure 18

