



**CITY**  
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON  
— EST 1894 —

City, University of London MSc in Artificial Intelligence  
Project Report  
Year 2023/2024

# **Knowledge Grounding in Language Models: An Empirical Study**

**Martin Fixman**

Supervised By: Tillman Weyde

Collaborators: Chenxi Whitehouse and Pranava Madhyastha

October 2 2024

## Declaration

By submitting this work, I declare that this work is entirely my own except those parts duly identified and referenced in my submission. It complies with any specified word limits and the requirements and regulations detailed in the assessment instructions and any other relevant programme and module documentation.

In submitting this work I acknowledge that I have read and understood the regulations and code regarding academic misconduct, including that relating to plagiarism, as specified in the Programme Handbook. I also acknowledge that this work will be subject to a variety of checks for academic misconduct.

**Signed:** *Martin Fixman*

## Acknowledgements

I wanted to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Tillman Weyde (with apologies for getting his first name wrong for months), to Dr. Chenxi Whitehouse, the original author of the preprint, and to Dr. Pranava Madhyastha for helping me take this great step in my academic career. This was not an easy thesis to research and write, but the guidance and advice I received from each of the three collaborators helped me fully understand the context I was working on and in conducting meaningful research.

My most important takeaway from the thesis, which I learned thanks to the work from my collaborators, is my deeper understanding of how to conduct a rigorous academic project. I plan to pursue a doctorate degree in the near future, and I am sure that the knowledge I gained in this project will make my future projects more thorough and efficient, and greatly improve my future academic work.

I also wanted to acknowledge the work done by the entire MSc in Artificial Intelligence in City St. Georges, University of London, for making a fantastic course. I learned a lot in many subjects and areas, even in ones which I barely had an idea were so broad. I also made a lot of contacts and good friends, who will definitely continue being a presence in my life after this MSc. Most important of all, I had fun, and any doubts I had on returning to academia after many years in the industry were completely unfounded.

In particular, I wanted to acknowledge Dr. Esther Mondragón for being an outstanding professor and administrator, and for taking a very strong stance in ensuring that the standards for this Master's degree remain high. My experience in this program was fantastic, and I hope the same continues being true for future students.

## Abstract

In recent years large language models have exploded in quality and prevalence, and they have become crucial for work in a wide range of areas. However, their tendency to produce hallucinations presents a critical challenge in contexts where precision and correctness are crucial.

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG), which leverages external information to provide more accurate and contextually appropriate responses, has been proposed as a solution to this problem. However, this solution is far from perfect as it's unclear when a large language model will choose to generate answers using the context provided by RAG over the knowledge in its parametric memory.

This thesis explores the *Knowledge Grounding* of various large language models. In particular, it attempts to answer a research question: **How does a large language model respond when given information that contradicts its inherent knowledge, and why?**

To investigate this, we develop a diverse dataset comprising questions from various topics and globally representative data. We use this dataset to construct queries with counterparametric context across four models of different architectures and sizes, and later we test models of various architectures and sizes to find out which type of answer they choose. We also analyse the *perplexity* of these answers to give us a clue to why the model chose an answer over the other, and to make a rough prediction of the source of a particular answer.

Our findings suggest that, when including the kind of contextual information added by RAG, smaller models and models that encode the entire input sequence into an internal representation before outputting an answer might produce more answers sourced from the RAG-provided context, which is generally less affected by hallucinations. In particular, the smaller models **Meta-Llama-3.1-8B** and **Flan-T5-XL** tend to have better knowledge grounding and fewer hallucinations than their larger versions, while encoder-decoder Seq2Seq models tend to outperform Decoder-only models.

As an extra analysis we investigate methods for determining whether a given response originates from the RAG context or the model's internal memory from the query's resulting perplexity. This might be used to develop methods to prevent hallucinations in large language models that use RAG indexing.

This thesis forms the foundational part of a broader project aimed at publishing a comprehensive study on knowledge grounding in retrieval-augmented language models, as outlined in the preprint "Knowledge Grounding in Retrieval-Augmented LMs: An Empirical Study" (Whitehouse et al. 2023). We build on existing literature, incorporating the use of counterparametric context in queries, to advance our understanding of this phenomenon.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and Objectives</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Problem Background . . . . .	5
1.2	Research Question . . . . .	6
1.3	Research Objectives . . . . .	6
1.4	Overview of Methods . . . . .	6
1.4.1	Creating a representative dataset of questions . . . . .	6
1.4.2	Building an experimental framework to understand the source of an LLM's answer . . . . .	7
1.4.3	Enhancing the framework to understand the reasoning behind each answer . . . . .	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Context</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	Foundational Papers on Large Language Models . . . . .	8
2.2	Architectures of Large Language Models . . . . .	9
2.2.1	Seq2Seq Models: T5 and Flan-T5 . . . . .	9
2.2.2	Decoder-only Models: GPT and Llama . . . . .	9
2.3	Retrieval-Augmented Generation . . . . .	10
2.4	Knowledge Grounding on Queries with Added Context . . . . .	11
<b>3</b>	<b>Methods</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	Creating a representative dataset of questions . . . . .	12
3.1.1	Dataset Description . . . . .	12
3.1.2	Dataset Creation . . . . .	13
3.2	Building an experimental framework to understand the source of an LLM's answer . . . . .	14
3.2.1	Model Selection . . . . .	14
3.2.2	What type of answer does each model select for each question? . .	15
3.2.3	Understanding the result by finding the mean attention of the context and question areas . . . . .	19
3.3	Enhancing the framework to understand the reasoning behind each answer	20
3.3.1	Perplexity Score . . . . .	20
3.3.2	Perplexity of the parametric answer with counterparametric context and vice-versa . . . . .	20
3.3.3	Predicting whether an answer came from memory or from context	21
<b>4</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1	Creating a representative dataset of questions . . . . .	23
4.2	Building an experimental framework to understand the source of an LLM's answer . . . . .	24
4.2.1	Building and running the framework . . . . .	24
4.2.2	Framework Results . . . . .	25
4.2.3	Calculating the attention of the context and question of each query	25

4.3	Enhancing the framework to understand the reasoning behind each answer	29
<b>5</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1	Model architecture and memorised knowledge . . . . .	32
5.1.1	Advantages of the Encoder-Decoder Architecture . . . . .	32
5.1.2	Different training data and fine-tuning . . . . .	32
5.2	Model size and memorised knowledge . . . . .	33
5.2.1	Seq2Seq Models . . . . .	33
5.2.2	Decoder-only Models . . . . .	33
5.3	What are all of these Others? . . . . .	34
5.4	Differences in distribution of perplexity scores . . . . .	35
5.4.1	Can we use the perplexity to predict the source of an answer? . . .	37
<b>6</b>	<b>Evaluations, Reflections, and Conclusions</b>	<b>38</b>
6.1	Overview and Personal Reflections . . . . .	38
6.2	Future Work . . . . .	39
6.2.1	Better Categorisation of the Answers . . . . .	39
6.2.2	Knowledge Grounding in Retrieval-Augmented LMs . . . . .	39
6.2.3	Further Memory Locator Prediction . . . . .	40
6.2.4	Fine-tuning a LLM for a RAG Context . . . . .	40
	<b>Glossary</b>	<b>41</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>42</b>
	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Questions and objects used to form the queries</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Full Results for Each Question</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Grounder Usage and Documentation</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Source Code of the Experiments</b>	<b>53</b>

# 1 Introduction and Objectives

## 1.1 Problem Background

In recent years, Large Language Models (LLMs) have become ubiquitous in solving general problems across a wide range of tasks, from text generation to question answering and logic problems. However, recent research suggests that using these models alone might not be the most effective way to solve problems that are not directly related to text generation (Yao et al. 2023).

One potential approach to improving the performance on knowledge problems for LLMs is Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) (Lewis et al. 2020). RAG involves retrieving relevant context related to a query and incorporating it into the model’s input, enhancing the model’s ability to generate accurate and contextually appropriate responses.

As RAG-enhanced systems become more widespread, studies on the performance of different retrieval systems and their interaction with LLMs have become crucial. Many explore the performance of these downstream tasks depending on both the retriever and the generator (Ghader et al. 2023, Brown et al. 2020), examining whether the knowledge is *grounded* in the context. Retrieval-Augmented models, such as ATLAS (Izacard et al. 2022) and RETRO (Borgeaud et al. 2022), use this approach to fine-tune a model on both a large body of knowledge and on a retriever for a given index.

The *knowledge grounding* of a model refers to how well the model’s outputs are anchored in verifiable and accurate sources. In the context of queries enhanced with RAG, we prefer knowledge sourced from context which came from the index, since they are much less likely to be “hallucinations” or mistakes from the model.

This project aims to understand the performance of various large language models when queries with added context by measuring their knowledge grounding on a dataset consisting of a large variety of questions across a wide range of topics. We follow the approach by Yu et al. of running queries with counterparametric context to understand whether a particular answer originates from the model’s inherent knowledge (i.e., its training data) or from the provided context (i.e., the context retrieved by RAG).

This thesis builds on this knowledge to improve our understanding of how different LLMs interact with the given context in the problem of question answering. Specifically, we research whether these interactions vary depending on the type of question being answered for models of different architectures and sizes, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of LLM performance in diverse knowledge domains.

## 1.2 Research Question

How do we know what large language models really know? This thesis attempts to answer this question by asking a different but related question:

**How does a large language model respond when given information that contradicts its inherent knowledge, and why?**

The rest of this section gives an overview of the steps we take to answer this question.

## 1.3 Research Objectives

This thesis is structured around three different sub-objectives to deepen our understanding knowledge grounding in large language models.

### 1. Creating a representative dataset of questions.

This is necessary as existing Q&A datasets are not suitable for our objectives.

### 2. Building an experimental framework to understand the source of an LLM’s answer.

This will give us information about which models chooses to answer questions using its learned parametric knowledge or the given context, and whether it depends on the question asked.

### 3. Enhancing the framework to understand the reasoning behind each answer

We use the perplexity of a model’s response on both answers to understand *why* a certain answer was chosen, and we attempt to predict the source of the answer with this number alone. This can help RAG-enhanced systems prevent hallucinations by repeating the index search in answers which might contradict the given context.

## 1.4 Overview of Methods

### 1.4.1 Creating a representative dataset of questions

We require a dataset of questions that’s useful for answering our research question. This dataset should allow us to understand whether each response came from the model’s parametric memory or from the RAG-provided context, and should be reasonably representative of the world to prevent biases.

In particular, the questions should allow us to easily create counterparametric answers to later add as context to our queries. We follow the example of Yu et al. on creating questions that can be easily answered with short responses, and later using these answers to create counterparametric context.

We enhance the work by Yu et al. by adding a much larger and broader set of questions from a large variety of topics.

### 1.4.2 Building an experimental framework to understand the source of an LLM’s answer

Little is currently understood about the factors that control the source of knowledge of an answer in a large language model, and whether the generated text comes from the query’s context or from memorised parametric information.

Previous research found out that, when the context of a query contradicts the ground knowledge of a model, the final answer is affected by the size and architecture of the model used (Yu et al. 2023).

This thesis extends this research by testing the representative set of questions and counterfactuals described in the previous section with both Seq2Seq and Decoder-only models of various sizes. We also research the cases when the answer doesn’t correspond to either the parametric or contextual knowledge, and why the model chooses a third type of answer when adding counterfactual context.

### 1.4.3 Enhancing the framework to understand the reasoning behind each answer

Yu et al. showed that there is a correlation between the probability of a large language model choosing a parametric answer over a counterfactual contextual answer and the amount of times this answer appears in the ground truth data of the model. This gives us clues on whether the result of a query came from parametric or contextual knowledge for models with access to its ground truth, as is the case in models like Pythia (Biderman et al. 2023).

Unfortunately, most so-called open-source large language models do not give us access to the source data being used to train it and therefore do not allow this kind of analysis.

The **perplexity** score of answer gives a measure of how “certain” a large language model is of its answer (Jiang et al. 2021). We hypothesise that we can use this metric to serve as a reliable indicator of whether a particular answer came from a large language model’s memory or whether it was derived from the provided context.




## 2 Context

This research is the latest on a long line of academic articles on retrieval-augmented generation, comparing and contrasting parametric knowledge with contextual information, and how to enhance knowledge on large language models.

This section summarizes key articles that informed this research.

### 2.1 Foundational Papers on Large Language Models

Large language models have exploded in popularity since the development of transformer architecture (Vaswani et al. 2017). This architecture relies entirely on self-attention mechanisms rather than recurrent layers, which allow the model to weigh the importance of different words in a sequence relative to each other, irrespective of their position. This mechanism enables the model to capture complex dependencies and relationships across long sequences more effectively than traditional models.



**Figure 1:** Transformer Architecture, from “Attention is all you need” (Vaswani et al. 2017).

GPT models (Radford & Narasimhan 2018) improve upon this architecture by running a supervised task-specific fine-tuning round after the unsupervised pre-training on large amount of test data. Later models, starting from GPT-2, use zero-shot transfer learning to improve their performance (Radford et al. 2019). Zero-shot learning (Norouzi et al. 2014) trains a model to perform a task without having been explicitly trained on examples of that task; instead, it leverages knowledge gained from pre-training to infer and generalise to new tasks with the context on the prompt.

By adding only a few examples of the task at hand, a model can improve generalisation

to new tasks with a limited amount of labelled data. GPT-3 uses this to understand the structure and nature of a task with a few examples (Brown et al. 2020).

Despite these improvements in sequential models, the models still present many faults in question-and-answer tasks (Jiang et al. 2021). Hallucinations are not uncommon, even for queries that ask questions that can be answered with short answers.

## 2.2 Architectures of Large Language Models

In this subsection we present two different large language model architectures that are used widely for this research. This thesis uses and compares four models using the Flan-T5 and Llama architectures.

### 2.2.1 Seq2Seq Models: T5 and Flan-T5

The T5 model (Raffel et al. 2020), developed by Google Brain in 2020, is an encoder-decoder Seq2Seq model that treats every processing problem as a text-to-text task. This way it uses transfer learning to learn many different kinds of tasks from a single source of training data.

The model is trained using only masked language modelling and treating every problem as a supervised text-to-text task where both the input and output are in text form. The data is later fine-tuned to make it able to solve other tasks.

Flan-T5 uses the same architecture as T5, but fine-tuned on tasks to follow explicit instructions (Chung et al. 2022). This scales well on larger tasks and larger model sizes, and it's particularly effective on problems requiring a chain-of-thought.

These models have strong performance while adding little or not existing context, and are capable capable to understand explicit instructions which can generalise to new task types, improving the downstream task performance (Longpre et al. 2023).

### 2.2.2 Decoder-only Models: GPT and Llama

GPT models use a transformer-based decoder-only architecture trained to solve the problem of causal language modelling, or predicting the next token in a sequence Radford & Narasimhan (2018), Radford et al. (2019), Brown et al. (2020). These models generate text by predicting tokens one-by-one rather than encoding internal information of a query, such as Seq2Seq models.

GPT models are good at solving a variety of tasks they they not trained in with little or no context. Its autoregressive nature specialised it at generating human-like text, so it's widely used for chatbots and content creation.

Llama models improve several limitations of GPT by training smaller models on more data (Touvron et al. 2023), which generally achieves better performance (Hoffmann et al. 2022), and various improvements to the transformer architecture.

These models outperform GPT models on most benchmarks, despite being considerably smaller, by prioritising training efficiency and parameter optimisation. Further improvements to later versions of this model include fine-tuning in a post-training round using reinforcement learning from human feedback and training with longer contexts (Martin et al. 2023), and adding multilingual data to the training data (Dubey et al. 2024).


Llama 3 includes a set of **Instruct** models, which like **Flan-T5** are fine-tuned to following instructions.

One of the inherent limitations of Decoder-only architectures is the challenge of maintaining coherence over long contexts. Additionally, they struggle with using accurate data from the query when it contradicts its parametric knowledge.

### 2.3 Retrieval-Augmented Generation

Large pre-trained language models store factual knowledge in their parameters. Their ability to access factual information from their source data without the risk of hallucinating incorrect information is limited, which affects their performance on knowledge-intensive tasks such as question-and-answer problems.

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) attempts to solve this problem by adding extra non-parametric data in a context gathered from an index with a separately-trained retriever (Lewis et al. 2020). This retrieved context is fed back to the original query as a combined representation containing this extra data. A diagram with an overview of this method is presented in Figure 2.



**Figure 2:** An overview of the RAG approach, combining a pre-trained retriever with a pre-trained model. From “Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP tasks” (Lewis et al. 2020)

RAG can be effective in preventing hallucinations by incorporating relevant external information into the generation process, ensuring that responses are more grounded in factual data from a knowledge base. However, this method is not perfect even after adding contextual data to the query the model could generate a response using its learned parametric memory while ignoring the data retriever by the RAG model.

## 2.4 Knowledge Grounding on Queries with Added Context

Knowledge grounding is the process by which a large language model incorporates external knowledge into its output generation. In the context of queries with context provided by RAG, a well-grounded model would ensure that answers are consistent with the knowledge in the index rather than in the model’s inherent knowledge if they are contradictory.

Various attempts have been made at understanding how good the knowledge grounding of a RAG system is, and on what is the optimal configuration of RAG.

In “RAGGED: Towards Informed Design of Retrieval Augmented Systems” (Hsia et al. 2024), the authors create a framework to evaluate these systems and find that different models suit substantially varied RAG setups. In particular, the performance of the models decreases strongly in Decoder-only models such as Llama when the context passages provides more context, while Seq2Seq models such as Flan-T5 have better performance.

“Characterizing Mechanisms for Factual Recall in Language Models” (Yu et al. 2023), which is one of the main sources for this thesis, finds that when there is disagreement between the model’s knowledge and the provided context then the architecture and size of the large language model will affect the probability of the model choosing to use the context (which is much less prone to hallucinating) as an answer rather than its parametric knowledge.

This paper also introduces a novel way to test this hypothesis by creating a dataset with questions and counterfactual context, an example of which is shown in Listing 1. By adding counterparametric information to the context, this method allows us to understand whether an answer came is parametric (that is, came from the memory of the model) or contextual (that is, came from the provided context).

The capital of {country} is {in context city}  
Q: What is the capital of {country}?  
A:

**Listing 1:** Example of queries used in (Yu et al. 2023). These queries form the basis and inspiration for the dataset creation done in this thesis

### 3 Methods

How does a large language model respond when given information that contradicts its inherent knowledge, and why?

To understand this, we need to build a new framework for testing a model’s answers when presented with contradictory information. This framework must be tested with models of various architectures and sizes to get insights about our responses.

Following the example set in Section 1.3, we split the work into three sub-objectives.

#### 3.1 Creating a representative dataset of questions

As argued in Section 1.4.1, the research of this thesis requires a large dataset of questions from a variety of categories to test large language models.

##### 3.1.1 Dataset Description

The dataset we aim to create for this research is designed to be a comprehensive and versatile tool for evaluating large language models. By choosing this criteria when selecting questions, we ensure that the dataset will provide meaningful insights of the knowledge grounding of large language models across a wide spectrum of domains.

Our dataset should have the following properties.

**1. Questions should have short, unambiguous answers.**

Our goal is to compare these results for both equality and perplexity. Longer answers make this objective more complicated since two long, correct answers might be equivalent. Shorter answers reduce the space of possible answers that are equivalent, but not equal.

**2. Questions must cover a large and diverse set of topics.**

The parametric knowledge of a model comes from a pre-existing dataset of training data, which might be biased towards certain topics or groups of people. For example, it is known that Wikipedia contains a significant geographical bias on biographies (Beytía 2020), and that this affects the probability of giving a correct answer without context (Yu et al. 2023). We require a large and diverse set of topics to counteract potential biases.

**3. Questions must allow for the creation of counterparametric answers.**

Part of the requirements of this thesis is to allow some tests of contextual versus inherent knowledge. A simple way to do this is to repeat and enhance the approach used by Yu et al. of adding counterparametric answers to a query context. This allows us to easily disambiguate whether an answer came from the model’s memory or from the context. This approach is only possible if the set of answers allows us to create a set of alternative answers that are plausibly correct and have the same format as the parametric answer, but are still counterparametric.

The existing literature uses various existing question-and-answer datasets. We believe that none of these datasets are a good fit for this research for not following some of the three desired properties. However, understanding them can be useful when designing the final dataset.

**Natural Questions Dataset** Created by Google Research (Kwiatkowski et al. 2019), and commonly used in research related to understanding the answers of LLMs in question-and-answer problems (Hsia et al. 2024, Mallen et al. 2023, Ghader et al. 2023). While the dataset provides an excellent range of questions and existing literature to compare these results to, the lack of categorisation is an obstacle in our objective to generate counterparametric answers.

**Human-Augmented Dataset** Sometimes used in research related to quality control of large language models (Kaushik et al. 2020). However, the high cost associated with this dataset would limit the size of our questions.

**Countries’ Capitals Question Dataset** Used in “Characterizing Mechanisms for Factual Recall in Language Models” (Yu et al. 2023), this dataset contains a single question about the capital city of certain countries which can be easily transformed to a counterparametric question. This format is ideal for the research done in this thesis, but having a single question pattern will not allow a deep dive into the source of each answer in a general question.

### 3.1.2 Dataset Creation

Instead of using an existing dataset, this research takes inspiration from the paper by Yu et al. to create a similar but larger dataset of questions and answers from a wide range of topics, where questions can be grouped by question pattern to ensure that their formats are similar. This way, we can emulate the approach of that paper of using the answer from a certain question as the counterfactual question of another.

This dataset will be used to test the remaining questions of this thesis. Since it might be useful for future research, it will also be presented as its own result.

To address these items, we follow the approach done by Yu et al. in creating base questions that refer to a specific object, so all the answers for the same base question have a similar format and creating counterparametric answers is easy.

Since this thesis requires a set of questions that covers a large set of topics, eras, and places, we enhance this method by creating a set of categories, each of which has a large set of base questions and another set of objects that can be matched. An example of this approach is shown in Table 1.

This list of questions will enable the research on whether the answers given by large language models depend on the category and the format of the questions.

Category	Base Questions	Object	Queries
Person	Q: What is the date of birth of {person}? A: The date of birth of {person} is Q: In what city was {person} born? A: {person} was born in	Che Guevara Confucius	Q: What is the date of birth of Che Guevara? A: The date of birth of Che Guevara is Q: What is the date of birth of Confucius? A: The date of birth of Confucius is Q: In what city was Che Guevara born? A: Che Guevara was born in Q: In what city was Confucius born? A: Confucius was born in
City	Q: What country is {city} in? A: {city} is in	Cairo Mumbai Buenos Aires London	Q: What country is Cairo in? A: Cairo is in Q: What country is Mumbai in? A: Mumbai is in Q: What country is Buenos Aires in? A: Buenos Aires is in Q: What country is London in? A: London is in

**Table 1:** Some examples of the base-question and object generation that are fed to the models for finding parametric answers.

## 3.2 Building an experimental framework to understand the source of an LLM’s answer

### 3.2.1 Model Selection

In order to get a general understanding of large language models with added context, we test the queries generated in Section 3.1 into four models of different architectures and sizes, which are listed in Table 2.

	Seq2Seq Model	Decoder-Only Model
<b>Smaller</b>	Flan-T5-XL	Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct
<b>Larger</b>	Flan-T5-XXL	Meta-Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct

**Table 2:** The four large language models chosen for this research.

Both Sequence-to-Sequence models are based on T5 models (Raffel et al. 2020), which employ an encoder-decoder architecture: while an encoder processed the input sequence into a context vector, and an decoder generates an input sequence from this vector. The Flan-T5 models are fine-tuned to follow instructions, and have improved zero-shot performance compared to the original T5 models (Chung et al. 2022).

Flan-T5-XL contains approximately 3 billion parameters, and is considerably bigger than the base Flan-T5 model, which should improve the accuracy of its parametric answers.

Flan-T5-XXL contains 11 billion parameters, so it should have higher accuracy on the parametric answers as the XL model. However, how the higher amount of parameters

will affect the experiments that we are running is still unknown.

Unlike Seq2Seq models, Decoder-only models focus on the generation of text based on the previous tokens. In a sense, given a sequence of tokens they solve the problem of predicting the following token, repeating sequentially until some final token is found.

These architectures leverages autoregressive attention (Vaswani et al. 2017), where each token attends to its preceding tokens, maintaining the temporal order of the sequence. This approach allows them to generate coherent and contextually relevant text by sampling from this learned distribution, while also capturing long-range dependencies and complex patterns in language.

The Llama models (Dubey et al. 2024) use this architecture and fine-tune it to tasks of instruction-following, and are specially adept at complex prompts.

The Decoder-only model **Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct** has 8 billion parameters, while **Meta-Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct** has 70 billion. Meta provides an even larger model, **Meta-Llama-3.1-405B-Instruct**, that is too large to easily experiment with. However, we expect the difference between this model and the 70B model to be roughly the same as the difference between the 70B and 8B models.

The properties of the models are summarised in Table 3.

Model	Architecture	Developer	Parameters	Context
<b>Flan-T5-XL</b>	Seq2Seq	Google Brain	3 Billion	512 Tokens
<b>Flan-T5-XXL</b>	Seq2Seq	Google Brain	11 Billion	512 Tokens
<b>Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct</b>	Decoder-Only	Meta AI	8 Billion	128k Tokens
<b>Meta-Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct</b>	Decoder-Only	Meta AI	70 Billion	128k Tokens

**Table 3:** Model cards of the large language models used in this research.

### 3.2.2 What type of answer does each model select for each question?

The first step to understanding the knowledge grounding of large language models is to create queries that contain counterparametric data as part of the context. By comparing the result to the existing answers it becomes trivial to understand whether an answer came from the model’s memory, the queries’ context, or neither of these.

Following the approach of Yu et al., for every query we randomly sample from the set of answers of the same base question for answers that are different to the parametric answer which is given by the original query. An example of this shuffling is in Table 5.

Later, we add this *counterparametric answer* to the context, to form a new query and query the same model again; this is exemplified in Table 4.

To ensure that the results are simple to interpret and minimise the effect of randomness, once we select the queries we follow the example of Hsia et al. and use Greedy Decoding to find the answer. While beam search with a short beam width tends to produce more



accurate results for long answers (Sutskever et al. 2014, Wu et al. 2016) and there are many other sampling methods that produce better results (Holtzman et al. 2020), this is likely to not have an effect on experiments that result in shorter answers (Raffel et al. 2020).

We compare the parametric answer to the previous values to come to one of three cases:

**Parametric** answers are equal to the answer given by the model when queried without context. This answer would come from the parametric memory of the model, and could potentially include hallucinations not fixed by RAG.

**Contextual** answers are equal to the context given in the query.

**Other** answers are neither of these, and this answer comes from a mis-interpretation of the input by the model or from some other source.

To minimise the amount of problems caused by large language models generating extra information, we define two strings to be equal by removing all text after a period or an <EOS> token, removing punctuation and stop words, and finding whether one is a subsequence of another.

This approach to compare strings is not enough, and understanding whether two answers are identical is an ongoing problem. This is explained in the Future Work section in Section 6.2.1.


The approach to finding out the source of knowledge of each query is specified in Figure 3.

Question with counterparametric context	Model Answer	Category
Context: [the nearest major body of water to Windhoek is the Rio de la Plata] Q: What is the nearest major body of water to Windhoek? A: The nearest major body of water to Windhoek is	the Atlantic Ocean	Parametric
Context: [the date of birth of Che Guevara is 965 AD]. Q: What is the date of birth of Che Guevara? A: The date of birth of Che Guevara is	965 AD	Contextual
Context: [Rome is in Georgia] Q: What country is Rome in? A: Rome is in	the United States	Other

**Table 4:** Example for results with **Parametric**, **Contextual**, and **Other** values. Note that, in the third query, the model is interpreting the question as asking about Rome in the US State of Georgia, rather than the country of Georgia.

Base Question	Object	Parametric Answer	Counterparametric Answer	Question with Counterparametric Context
Q: What is the date of birth of <code>{person}</code> ? A: The date of birth of <code>{person}</code> is	Che Guevara	June 14, 1928	965 AD	Context: [the date of birth of Che Guevara is 965 AD]. Q: What is the date of birth of Che Guevara? A: The date of birth of Che Guevara is
	Ibn al-Haytham	965 AD	June 14, 1928	Context: [the date of birth of Ibn al-Haytham is June 14, 1928]. Q: What is the date of birth of Ibn al-Haytham? A: The date of birth of Ibn al-Haytham is
	W.E.B Du Bois	February 23, 1868	June 14, 1928	Context: [the date of birth of W.E.B Du Bois is June 14, 1928]. Q: What is the date of birth of W.E.B Du Bois? A: The date of birth of W.E.B Du Bois is
Q: What country is <code>{city}</code> in? A: <code>{city}</code> is in	Cairo	Egypt	India	Context: [Cairo is in India]. Q: What country is Cairo in? A: Cairo is in
	Mumbai	India	Egypt	Context: [Mumbai is in Egypt]. Q: What country is Mumbai in? A: Mumbai is in

**Table 5:** Using the same question format allows us to repurpose previous parametric answers as counterparametric ones.



**Figure 3:** Example diagram of steps used to calculate the two sets of answers, *parametric* and *contextual*, and to compare them to answer the question in this objective. Many of the terms in this diagram are explained in the Glossary.

### 3.2.3 Understanding the result by finding the mean attention of the context and question areas

For comparing different architectures, it's useful to understand how much attention they give to the context compared to the rest of the query.

Since all our model architectures employ attention mechanisms (Chung et al. 2022, Dubey et al. 2024), we can estimate the relative importance of tokens in the context and the query by calculating the average self-attention each token receives within its respective section. Specifically, we compute the mean self-attention weights, which serve as a proxy for the emphasis the model places on different parts of the input.

This approach is formalized in Equation (1), where we define the mean self-attention for tokens in the context and query sections.

$$\begin{aligned}
A &: \mathbb{R}^{\text{batch} \times |\text{layer}| \times |\text{attn\_head}| \times Q \times K} \\
m_{b,q,k} &= \frac{1}{|\text{layer}| \times |\text{attn\_head}|} \sum_{\substack{i=0 \\ j=0}}^{\text{layer} \attn\_head} A_{b,i,j,q,k} \\
d_{b,q} &= m_{b,q,q} \\
s_{b,i} &= (d_{b,i} - \min(d_b)) / (\max(d_b) - \min(d_b)) \\
\text{attn}_{\text{ctx}} &= \frac{1}{|\text{ctx}|} \sum_{i \in \text{ctx}} s_{b,i} \quad \text{attn}_{\text{rest}} = \frac{1}{|\text{rest}|} \sum_{i \in \text{rest}} s_{b,i}
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In this equation,  $A$  is the 5-tensor representing the attention weights.  $m_{b,q,k}$  represents the mean attention all layers and heads, while  $d_b$  represents the diagonal of these attentions which correspond to the self-attentions.

We normalise those values for  $s_i$  and average then among the context tokens and the rest of the query, respectively.

### 3.3 Enhancing the framework to understand the reasoning behind each answer

#### 3.3.1 Perplexity Score

The Perplexity score of an answer is normally used to measure the inverse of the certainty that the model has of a particular answer (Brown et al. 2020, Borgeaud et al. 2022). In a sense, it's the "surprise" of a model that a certain answer is correct.

We can define the probability of a model choosing a token  $x_n$  with context  $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}$  from a query  $Q$  by calculating the softmax value of all the logits for the possible words for this token.

The probabilities of the tokens if an answer can be accumulated to calculate the negative log-likelihood NLL, which is used to calculate the perplexity PPL using the formulas from Equations (2) and (3).

$$\text{NLL}(x_1, \dots, x_n | Q) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log_2 P(x_i | Q, x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) \quad (2)$$

$$\text{PPL}(x_1, \dots, x_n | Q) = 2^{\text{NLL}(x_1, \dots, x_n | Q)} \quad (3)$$

#### 3.3.2 Perplexity of the parametric answer with counterparametric context and vice-versa

Note that the token  $x_n$  does not necessarily have to be the result of applying the query  $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}$  to a model.

Therefore, it becomes necessary to use teacher-forcing (Lamb et al. 2016) to feed some answer to the model regardless of what's the answer to this particular query. This allows us to calculate the perplexity scores of the parametric answers for both the regular query and the one with counterparametric context, and the perplexity scores of the contextual answers for these two queries.

For a given parametric answer  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  and randomly sampled counterparametric answer  $q_1, \dots, q_m$ , a query without context  $Q$ , and a query with this counterparametric context  $Q'$  we can calculate four different perplexity scores as shown in Table 6.

Since the parametric answer is by definition the response of the model to the regular query,  $P_0 \leq P_1$ . In fact, the perplexity of the parametric value is lower than the perplexity of any other answer on query  $Q$ .

Figure 4 contains an example of the calculation of the perplexity values for a particular query in a case where the contextual answer is considerably less surprising than the parametric answer.

		Tokens	
		Parametric $p$	Counterparametric $q$
Context	Base Query	$P_0 = \text{PPL}(p_1, \dots, p_n \mid Q)$	$P_1 = \text{PPL}(q_1, \dots, q_m \mid Q)$
	Counterparametric Context	$P_2 = \text{PPL}(p_1, \dots, p_n \mid Q')$	$P_3 = \text{PPL}(q_1, \dots, q_m \mid Q')$

**Table 6:** Four different perplexity values: one for each set of tokens, and one for each query context.


Similar to the work done earlier in this section, we say that the perplexity of an answer is **Parametric** if the probability of getting the parametric answer is greater than the probability of getting the contextual answer; that is,  $P_2 < P_3$ . Contrary to this, we consider an answer **Contextual** if  $P_2 > P_3$ .

For simplicity and to the myriad of possible token and probability combinations, in this experiment we do not analyse the case when an answer is preferred to either of these two.

### 3.3.3 Predicting whether an answer came from memory or from context

One question remains: if the response of the query with counterparametric context  $Q'$  is a certain answer  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , how can we predict whether this answer is came from the model’s memory  $p$  or from the given context  $q$  without requiring an extra query?

We propose investigating the value of the perplexity  $\text{PPL}(x_1, \dots, x_n \mid Q')$  and comparing it to the distribution of perplexities on the answers with added parametric context  $P_2$  and  $P_3$ . For simplicity reasons, we are obviating the case when the preferred answer is neither of these; instead, we focus on whether the parametric or counterparametric answer are more likely.\*



**Figure 4:** Example of perplexity calculation for the parametric and counterparametric answers in a query with the counterparametric context. Note that, due to teacher forcing, the calculation finds the probability of the next token  $p_i$  given the previous tokens of the searched answer  $p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}$  rather than given the most likely tokens. For example, once we feed the string “National Gallery of Canada in”, the probability of the next token being “Ottawa” is very high. In the same way, despite the perplexity of the word **collection** following **the** is very high, the perplexity of the following words is considerably lower.

## 4 Results

We followed the methods explained in Section 3 to create a new dataset and run the listed models in Section 3.2.1 in order to measure the knowledge grounding of each one of these models.

This section presents the results from these runs.

### 4.1 Creating a representative dataset of questions

As described in Section 1.4.1 and explained in Section 3.1, we require a new and diverse dataset in order to run this data and answer the research question.

We manually create a set of 4760 questions using the method explained in Section 3.1.

In order to be able to reuse objects for different questions, we separated the questions and objects in 9 different categories.

1. **Person** Historical people living from early antiquity to the present day from all around the globe. The questions have short, unambiguous answers, such as date of birth or most famous invention.
2. **City** Cities from all over the globe. Questions may include population, founding date, notable landmarks, or geographical features.
3. **Principle** Scientific principles, discovered from the 16th century forward. Questions about their discovery, use, and others.
4. **Element** Elements from the periodic table. Questions may cover discovery, atomic number, chemical properties, or common uses.
5. **Book** Literary works from various genres, time periods, and cultures. Questions may involve authors, publication dates, plot summaries, or literary significance.
6. **Painting** Famous artworks from different art movements and periods. Questions may cover artists, creation dates, styles, or current locations.
7. **Historical Event** Significant occurrences that shaped world history, from ancient times to the modern era. Questions may involve dates, key figures, causes, or consequences.
8. **Building** Notable structures from around the world, including ancient monuments, modern skyscrapers, and architectural wonders. Questions may cover location, architect, construction date, or architectural style.
9. **Composition** Musical works from various genres and time periods. Questions may involve composers, premiere dates, musical style, or cultural significance.

Each one of these categories has a number of questions that are assigned one of the objects, enhancing the done by Yu et al..



The full list of base questions and objects for all categories can be found in Appendix A. The total amount of these and composition of the 4760 questions can be found in Table 7.

Category	Base Questions	Objects	Total Questions
Person	17	57	969
City	17	70	1190
Principle	5	37	185
Element	15	43	645
Book	11	49	539
Painting	12	44	528
Historical Event	4	64	256
Building	9	22	198
Composition	10	25	250
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>4760</b>

**Table 7:** The amount of base questions, objects, and the total amount of questions in each category on the final dataset.

## 4.2 Building an experimental framework to understand the source of an LLM’s answer

### 4.2.1 Building and running the framework

The code used for running this framework is present in Appendix D. This code roughly follows the diagram on Figure 3 to run the following steps.

1. Generate questions from base questions and objects: `combine_questions`.
2. Gather the parametric answers for each model: `QuestionAnswerer.answerChunk`.
3. Shuffle them to create counterfactual answers: `sample_counterfactual_flips`.
4. Build new queries with these counterfactual answers as context: `Question.format`.
5. Run the models again, and gather the corresponding answer type for each answer from the results: `QuestionAnswerer.answerCounterfactuals`.

The models were run on a server with 48 Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU 3GHz CPUs, 376GB of RAM, and 2 NVIDIA A100 GPUs with 80GB of VRAM each that was kindly provided by City, University of London.

We estimate that it’s possible to run this framework on all but the largest model, **Meta-Llama-3.1-70B**, using a single A100 GPU.


Appendix C explains the many options that can be run on `knowledge_grounder.py` to re-run this experiment or run similar ones.

#### 4.2.2 Framework Results

The results of running the queries created in Section 3.1 with added counterparametric context on each of the four models the four models can be found in Table 8 and Figure 5.

Model	Parametric	Contextual	Other
llama-3.1-8B	745	3662	353
llama-3.1-70B	1070	3303	387
flan-t5-xl	248	4284	228
flan-t5-xxl	242	4304	214

**Table 8:** Results when running all various models.



**Figure 5:** Results by type depending on which model; these are the same results as Table 8.

As hypothesised in Section 1.4.2, there are vast differences on how the models of different types and sizes act when presented with a context that contradicts their knowledge. This is investigated further in Section 5.

A similar pattern emerges in most (but not all) of the categories, which can be seen in Tables 10 and 11 and Figures 6 and 7.

#### 4.2.3 Calculating the attention of the context and question of each query


Using the method described in Section 3.2.3, we can find the attention each model gives, on average, to the tokens in the context part of the query, and how much to the rest.

Query Part	flan-t5-xl	flan-t5-xxl	Meta-Llama-3.1 -8B-Instruct	Meta-Llama-3.1 -70B-Instruct
Context	0.18	0.22	0.08	
Rest	0.38	0.05	0.29	

**Table 9:** Average normalised attention of the query on the tokens corresponding to the context of the query, and to the tokens corresponding to the rest.



**Figure 6:** Results of running decoder-only models on the queried data, grouped by category. This plots the information shown in Table 11.



**Figure 7:** Results of running Seq2Seq models on the queried data, grouped by category. This plots the information shown in Table 10.

	flan-t5-xl			flan-t5-xxl		
	Parametric	Contextual	Other	Parametric	Contextual	Other
Person	32	900	37	23	890	56
City	120	1030	40	78	1093	19
Principle	13	164	8	9	168	8
Element	6	637	2	102	515	28
Book	26	488	25	18	457	64
Painting	26	446	56	4	498	26
Historical Event	11	217	28	1	254	1
Building	14	174	10	0	189	9
Composition	0	228	22	7	240	3

**Table 10:** Results for running each one of the 10 categories separately on the Seq2Seq models.

	Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct			Meta-Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct		
	Parametric	Contextual	Other	Parametric	Contextual	Other
Person	40	833	96	209	614	146
City	117	1007	66	166	966	58
Principle	44	118	23	44	117	24
Element	218	385	42	275	347	23
Book	135	344	60	154	318	67
Painting	47	458	23	49	445	34
Historical Event	81	154	21	117	118	21
Building	27	163	8	31	159	8
Composition	36	200	14	25	219	6

**Table 11:** Results for running each one of the 10 categories separately on the Decoder-only models.

### 4.3 Enhancing the framework to understand the reasoning behind each answer


We calculate the resulting perplexity of each query as explained in Section 3.3. These are accumulated in three distributions, depending on answer type, which are summarised in Tables 12 and 13 and Figure 8.

	Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct		Meta-Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct	
	Parametric	Contextual	Parametric	Contextual
<b>count</b>	289	4471	383	4377
<b>mean</b>	1.64	1.20	1.56	1.22
<b>std</b>	0.87	0.30	0.46	0.31
<b>10%</b>	1.18	1.03	1.20	1.03
<b>25%</b>	1.28	1.05	1.28	1.06
<b>50%</b>	1.45	1.11	1.43	1.12
<b>75%</b>	1.72	1.23	1.68	1.25
<b>90%</b>	2.22	1.43	2.04	1.49


**Table 12:** Distribution of perplexity values for Decoder-only models

	flan-t5-xl		flan-t5-xxl	
	Parametric	Contextual	Parametric	Contextual
<b>count</b>	588	4172	491	4269
<b>mean</b>	7.02	1.55	12.01	1.24
<b>std</b>	11.25	0.56	18.91	0.68
<b>10%</b>	2.60	1.08	1.47	1.00
<b>25%</b>	3.21	1.18	2.54	1.02
<b>50%</b>	4.71	1.37	4.00	1.08
<b>75%</b>	7.40	1.69	8.37	1.22
<b>90%</b>	10.72	2.32	44.25	1.54


**Table 13:** Distribution of perplexity values for Seq2Seq models



**Figure 8:** Perplexity distribution according to model architecture and size. These represent the same distributions as Tables 12 and 13.



**Figure 9:** Box plots representing the distribution of the perplexities when running both Llama models, grouped by category.



**Figure 10:** Box plots representing the distribution of the perplexities when running both Flan-T5 models, grouped by category.



## 5 Discussion

Section 4 presented results from generating the question dataset and running the framework to understand the role of parametric knowledge in question-answering. This section attempts to explain these results, and discusses what they mean for our research question.

### 5.1 Model architecture and memorised knowledge

Section 4.2.2 presents the results of running our framework on the provided questions on two different model architectures: Seq2Seq models and Decoder-only models. Tables 10 and 11 show these results split by category of question.

The results are clear: **Seq2Seq models tend to answer questions from their contextual knowledge rather than from their inherent knowledge more often than Decoder-only models.** These results persist across different question categories and are consistent regardless of answer types and lengths

These results show that, in the framework of question-answering when using RAG to fetch contextual data from an index, Seq2Seq models will have fewer hallucinations that contradict this index than Decoder-only models.

We propose two hypotheses that could explain these differences.

#### 5.1.1 Advantages of the Encoder-Decoder Architecture

As described in Section 2.2, Seq2Seq models such as **Flan-T5** are encoder-decoder models that process the entire context of the query in the encoder component before passing it to the decoder, which could increase the weight given to the context itself.

We can test this hypothesis by finding the mean attention of the tokens corresponding to the context and to the rest of the query, and using the method discussed in Section 3.2.3.

The results presented in Section 4.2.3 are consistent with this theory: Seq2Seq models allocate significantly more attention to the contextual tokens of the query compared to Decoder-only models.

#### 5.1.2 Different training data and fine-tuning

It’s possible that these result doesn’t come from the model architecture, but the way the models are trained introduces some biases.

Additionally, the Flan models were trained on masked token generation and later fine-tuned on question-answering about passages (Chung et al. 2022). This requires strong alignment between query and answer, which encourages the model to focus on the input context and makes it more likely to take the answer from the RAG-provided context.

Llama models were trained mainly on open-ended text generation, which relies more on parametric data.

It’s possible that the deficiencies of knowledge grounding in Llama models might come simply to not being trained on related tasks.

## 5.2 Model size and memorised knowledge

Section 4.2.2 also shows differences in how models of different sizes process information in queries with counterparametric context.

### 5.2.1 Seq2Seq Models

While the average results are very similar, which is likely due to the properties of Seq2Seq models discussed in Section 5.1, the models seem to be significantly different for queries of category `element`, `historical_events`, and a few others.

Unfortunately, these results are due to failures on the models: for reasons not yet fully understood, `flan-t5-xl` often produces nonsensical answers to questions requiring short responses, such as elements’ names in the periodic table on historical dates. This behaviour is different than `flan-t5-xxl`, which tends to provide correct answers in these cases.

When removing the categories with a significant amount of short answers and their nonsensical answers by the smaller model, the results of both Seq2Seq models seem similar. Therefore, we can conjecture that **the size of a Seq2Seq model does not significantly affect its knowledge grounding in a RAG context.**

### 5.2.2 Decoder-only Models

Section 4.2.2 shows a very different result for Decoder-only models. Surprisingly, the smaller model `Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct` has *better* knowledge grounding than the larger model `Meta-Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct`.

We already established that decoder-only models rely on parametric knowledge to a greater degree than Seq2Seq models. Larger models have a vast internalised knowledge base accumulated from expensive training data, which can lead to increased confidence in their parametric knowledge.

It’s possible that larger Decoder-only models are able to use their parametric knowledge to “reason” in more ways that contradict the contextual knowledge. The extra information encoder in its weights can produce more varied evidence against the contextual answer.

With this information, we can say that **the size of Decoder-only models *does* affect its knowledge grounding, and in a RAG context it might be preferable to use a smaller model.**

This is consistent with similar results found for other Decoder-only models, such as Pythia and GPT-2 (Yu et al. 2023).

### 5.3 What are all of these Others?

Section 4.2 showed that a significant minority of responses to queries with counterfactual context are **Other**: answers that aren't equal to either the parametric nor the contextual data. The numbers of these entries, per model, are presented in Table 14.

	Flan-T5-XL	Flan-T5-XXL	Meta-Llama-3.1 -8B-Instruct	Meta-Llama-3.1 -70B-Instruct
<b>Other</b>	260	192	312	387

**Table 14:** Amount of **Other** entries, that is, results where the answer was not either the parametric or contextual answer.

By manually checking these results, we can understand the reason why the model chose these answers.

#### 1. Different phrasing of a parametric answer

There are many answers where the parametric chooses a certain way to phrase some answer, while the contextual information biases it to give the parametric answer with a different context.

#### 2. Plain incorrect answers

Sometimes, adding counterfactual context to the model just causes it to produce an incorrect answer that's different the answers given by both the model and the context.

#### 3. Question misinterpretation due to the context

Some questions can be ambiguous or have a low probability of another answer. By adding a context with a counterfactual answer, the model can misinterpret the question and answer something different.

#### 4. Negating the context

This is an interesting one: if the model has an answer in its parametric knowledge that contradicts the data on its context, then it interpret the context as part of the question and adds its negation as part of the answer.

#### 5. Different phrasing of the context

Much less common than point 1, models sometimes give the same answer as the context but in the format of the parametric answer.

#### 6. Correct answer, just different than the parametric answer

Some question have multiple correct answers, and adding counterfactual context can cause the model to give a different one.

#### 7. Mixing elements of both parametric answer and context

Elements of the parametric answer are mixed with elements of the context in the model's answer. This produces an incorrect answer, but it's easy to understand where it came from. The cause of this is likely the greedy decoding used to find the answers, as explained in Section 3.2.2.

Examples of each one of these types can be found in Table 16.

Does the architecture and size of the model affect the distribution of each type of **Other** answer? Table 15 contains the amount of answers per architecture for each one of the models, and there does not seem to be a particular distribution.

Type	Flan-T5-XL	Flan-T5-XXL	Meta-Llama-3.1 -8B-Instruct	Meta-Llama-3.1 -70B-Instruct
( <b>Parametric</b> )	248	242	745	1070
( <b>Contextual</b> )	4284	4304	3662	3303
1.	0	0	116	234
2.	6	3	50	15
3.	0	0	13	8
4.	0	0	20	61
5.	241	170	33	38
6.	7	16	63	23
7.	6	3	17	8

**Table 15:** Different types of **Other** answers per model (with amount of **Parametric** and **Contextual** added for comparison). The two most notable groups are **1.**, which contains parametric answers with different phrasing, and **5.**, which contains counterfactual answers with different phrasing.

Surprisingly, there is a large difference in the distribution of answers that don’t come either from the model or from the given context.

In the case of Seq2Seq models, the vast majority of **Other** answers are **Contextual** answers which have a different format due to model mangling. This is consistent with the previous result, where the vast majority of their answers came from the query’s context.

The majority of **Other** answers in Decoder-only models are the opposite: **Parametric** answers that keep the format of the context. However, the reasons are much more varied and this would be an interesting topic of discussion in future research.

Part of the reason for many of these answers, particularly on the Seq2Seq models, is due to the strict comparison function we use to define answer type. This is an area that should be improved; Section 6.2.1 gives more information and various suggestions on how to compare results that might be relevant on future work.

#### 5.4 Differences in distribution of perplexity scores

The distribution of perplexity scores, shown in Section 4.3, shows a significant difference in the perplexity scores between **Parametric** and **Contextual** answers for all four models. This is even more marked on Seq2Seq models, where for both models the 90% percentile of the **Contextual** answer is lower than the 10% percentile of the **Parametric**.

In fact, this confirms our conjecture that **models tend to be surprised when finding an answer that contradicts the context of the query**. This conjecture seems to be true regardless of model size or question type (see Figures 9 and 10).

Reason	Question	Parametric	Counterfactual	Contextual
1.	Who was the primary leader associated with The Reforms of Diocletian?	Diocletian Himself	Caracalla, a Roman Emperor	Diocletian, a Roman Emperor
	In which city is Louvre Pyramid located?	Paris, France	the city of Valladolid, in the state of Yucatan, Mexico	the city of Paris, in the country of France
2.	In which period of the periodic table is Silver located?	5 of the periodic table	3 of the periodic table	4 of the periodic table
3.	What was the duration of Queen Elizabeth II's Platinum Jubilee?	12 months	approximately 100 years	approximately 70 years
	What is the nearest major body of water to Cusco?	Lake Titicaca	the North Sea	the Pacific Ocean
4.	What is the name of the main protagonist in One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest?	Randle McMurphy	Achilles	Not Achilles
	What is Frida Kahlo primarily known for?	her self-portraits and her depiction of Mexican culture	his theories on communism and his critique of capitalism	her artwork and her life story, not for his theories on communism or critique of capitalism
5.	How many pages are in One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest?	320 pages	480 pages in a standard edition	480 pages
6.	Who is credited with the discovery of Conservation of Energy?	Julius Robert Mayer	Alfred Wegener	James Joule <sup>1</sup>
	What is the name of the main protagonist in The Great Gatsby?	Nick Carraway	Liesel Meminger	Jay Gatsby <sup>2</sup>
	What educational institution did Srinivasa Ramanujan attend?	The University of Madras	The University of Vienna	the University of Cambridge <sup>3</sup>
7.	What is the date of death of Vladimir Lenin?	January 21, 1924	March 28, 1941	March 21, 1924
	What's the main nationality of Mozart?	Austria	English-Born American	American-born English-born Austrian

<sup>1</sup> Discovery of the conservation of energy is credited to both Julius Robert Mayer and James Joule.

<sup>2</sup> Nick Carraway and Jay Gatsby are co-protagonists in The Great Gatsby.

<sup>3</sup> Srinivasa Ramanujan attended both the University of Madras and the University of Cambridge.

**Table 16:** Examples of different types of **Other** answers when running the Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct model. Other models have similar reasons for these kinds of answers.

The cause for the difference in the perplexity values for different architectures is likely the same as discussed in Section 5.1 on why the **Flan-T5** models generally have better performance on these tasks than **Llama** models.

**Model Architecture** By processing the entire input in one go, the Seq2Seq encoding step processes information in the context in the encoding step first before starting decoding. In Decoder-only models, the shift from going from contextual to parametric knowledge is less abrupt, resulting in a less pronounced change in perplexity.


**Training Data** Flan-T5 models are trained in data where getting information from the query itself is more relevant. In a sense, they are biased to being more surprised when producing a parametric answer.

#### 5.4.1 Can we use the perplexity to predict the source of an answer?

Seeing the current results, it's tempting to attempt to create a model that can predict, with perplexity information alone and without making any extra query, whether the answer in a query with added context came from the **Parametric** knowledge of the context or from the **Contextual** information in the query.

This can be useful in practice: if a RAG-enhanced model finds an answer with high perplexity, it can attempt to re-run the RAG indexing to find a more relevant answer and possibly prevent a hallucination.

The results in Tables 12 and 13 seem consistent with Figure 11 in that such predictor would work better in Seq2Seq models, particularly on **flan-t5-xxl**: by re-running the RAG indexer on answers with perplexity over 1.5, we can prevent hallucinations on 90% of the answers that came from parametric knowledge while keeping 80% of the total.



**Figure 11:** ROC curve of the four tested models to find out whether an answer came from the **Parametric** knowledge of a model using the perplexity of the answer.


## 6 Evaluations, Reflections, and Conclusions

### 6.1 Overview and Personal Reflections

Working on this thesis has been a positive and enriching experience.

Starting from an published preprint (Whitehouse et al. 2023) helped me understand the current state of the research on retrieval-augmented generation and analysis of large language models. I am grateful to Dr. Whitehouse, the main author of the preprint, who has been of great help in giving me ideas and direction when working on this research.

The topic of the thesis changed early on from understanding knowledge grounding on the conflation of retriever and generator on retrieval-augmented models to understanding it for general large language models with added contextual information. This was, in part, caused by the cutting-edge nature of this research area: over half of the papers cited were published after the year 2020, and two of them were published earlier in the year 2024.



**Figure 12:** Year of publication of papers cited in this thesis. These topics are novel!

One of the main strengths of my work in this thesis was having built a solid experimentation infrastructure early on, which allowed me to iterate quickly on experiments and ideas. The program to build, run, and analyse the counterparametric-enhanced queries (which is present in Appendix D and in this project’s repository) is one of the strong points of this project, and I’m sure it will be a valuable tool for future research projects.

Despite settling on the final thesis idea early, this thesis suffered from lacking a clear and well-defined research question, which emerged late in the process. I consider this delay to have been one of the main sources of inefficiencies, since it lead to executing long experiments that contributed little to the final thesis. One of my main takeaways from this research is the necessity to align on a well-defined research question early.

This thesis taught me how to adapt to the rapidly-changing research landscape of sequence analysis and artificial intelligence. A lot of the methods used in this work are taken directly from previous academic papers, and this allowed me to test my hypothesis quickly while keeping a deep understanding of the context I am working on.

Most of all, I’m happy to have learned a lot about the areas of large language models and to have been able to collaborate a bit in this very new area of research. I plan to continue this work in the future, and I’m looking forward to contributing to the research on this area!

## 6.2 Future Work

### 6.2.1 Better Categorisation of the Answers

To test whether two answers are equal and to know whether an answer came from parametric or contextual knowledge, the code in this thesis checks for string equality among after removing a few stop simple words such as ‘the’.

This solution might not be enough, and some answers classified as **Other** should have been classifier as something else. Table 17 provides some examples of answers where this is the case.

Query	Parametric Answer	Query Answer	Comparison	Expected
[Context: The primary leader associated with The Construction of Hadrian’s Wall was Napoleon Bonaparte] Q: Who was the primary leader associated with The Construction of Hadrian’s Wall? A: The primary leader associated with The Construction of Hadrian’s Wall was	Emperor Hadrian	Hadrian, the Roman Emperor	<b>Other</b>	<b>Parametric</b>
[Context: Che Guevara was born in Kensington, London, England] Q: In what city was Che Guevara born? A: Che Guevara was born in	Rosario, Argentina	London	<b>Other</b>	<b>Contextual</b>

**Table 17:** Example of incorrectly-categorised answers. These were categorised as ”**Other**”, since their answer strings are different from both parametric and contextual answers. However, a closer look reveals that this is just either answer with a slight formatting difference.

A more complete solution might include using another LLM to compare whether two answers are truly equal.

### 6.2.2 Knowledge Grounding in Retrieval-Augmented LMs

This thesis was originally based on a preprint, “Knowledge Grounding in Retrieval-Augmented LMs: An Empirical Study” (Whitehouse et al. 2023), and contains work towards understanding how large language models retrieve data which can ultimately help prevent hallucinations.

We plan to continue this work and complete the paper created by the preprint by running the methods outlined on this thesis on retrieval-augmented LMs such as ATLAS (Izacard et al. 2022) and RETRO (Borgeaud et al. 2022) and creating a full evaluation framework that specifically focuses on their grounding. A well-grounded model should demonstrate the capability to adapt its generation based on the provided context, specially in cases like



the ones experimented in this thesis when the context contradicts the model’s parametric memorisation.

### **6.2.3 Further Memory Locator Prediction**

The results of Section 4.3 show a clear difference in perplexity value between answers that come from the parametric memory of a model and those that come from a context.

This could be used to create a predictor where, given a certain answered query, it could give you a probability of the source the model used for this answer by using the perplexity of the answer and comparing against the distribution of perplexities for this model on similar questions.

In RAG-enhanced models, where the RAG context might contradict the parametric knowledge of a model, this might prevent hallucinations.

### **6.2.4 Fine-tuning a LLM for a RAG Context**

Existing retrieval-augmented LMs, such as ATLAS and RETRO, are trained on existing models along with an index. In the fast-moving world of large language models, this might not be ideal: the generator part of models is based on T5, a model created in 2019. Meanwhile, between the time I started writing this thesis and this moment Meta launched a new Llama model.

The current dataset and experiments might be useful for being able to fine-tune a modern model to prefer the context generated by RAG when it contradicts its parametric knowledge. This might improve retrieval-augmented models, and make it easier to use them with newer models.

## Glossary

Base Questions

Objects

Queries

**Parametric** Answers

Counterparamteric answers

Queries with counterfactual/counterparametric context

**Contextual** Answer

## Bibliography

- Beytía, P. (2020), ‘The positioning matters. estimating geographical bias in the multilingual record of biographies on wikipedia’, *SSRN Electronic Journal* .
- Biderman, S., Schoelkopf, H., Anthony, Q. G., Bradley, H., O’Brien, K., Hallahan, E., Khan, M. A., Purohit, S., Prashanth, U. S., Raff, E. et al. (2023), Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling, *in* ‘International Conference on Machine Learning’, PMLR, pp. 2397–2430.
- Borgeaud, S., Mensch, A., Hoffmann, J., Cai, T., Rutherford, E., Millican, K., van den Driessche, G., Lespiau, J.-B., Damoc, B., Clark, A., de Las Casas, D., Guy, A., Menick, J., Ring, R., Hennigan, T., Huang, S., Maggiore, L., Jones, C., Cassirer, A., Brock, A., Paganini, M., Irving, G., Vinyals, O., Osindero, S., Simonyan, K., Rae, J. W., Elsen, E. & Sifre, L. (2022), ‘Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens’.
- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A. et al. (2020), ‘Language models are few-shot learners’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165* .
- Chung, H. W., Hou, L., Longpre, S., Zoph, B., Tay, Y., Fedus, W., Li, Y., Wang, X., Dehghani, M., Brahma, S., Webson, A., Gu, S. S., Dai, Z., Suzgun, M., Chen, X., Chowdhery, A., Castro-Ros, A., Pellat, M., Robinson, K., Valter, D., Narang, S., Mishra, G., Yu, A., Zhao, V., Huang, Y., Dai, A., Yu, H., Petrov, S., Chi, E. H., Dean, J., Devlin, J., Roberts, A., Zhou, D., Le, Q. V. & Wei, J. (2022), ‘Scaling instruction-finetuned language models’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.11416>
- Dubey, A., Jauhri, A., Pandey, A., Kadian, A., Al-Dahle, A., Letman, A., Mathur, A., Schelten, A., Yang, A., Fan, A., Goyal, A., Hartshorn, A., Yang, A., Mitra, A., Sravankumar, A., Korenev, A., Hinsvark, A., Rao, A., Zhang, A., Rodriguez, A., Gregerson, A., Spataru, A., Roziere, B., Biron, B., Tang, B. & et al., B. C. (2024), ‘The Llama 3 Herd of Models’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783>
- Ghader, P. B., Miret, S. & Reddy, S. (2023), ‘Can Retriever-Augmented Language Models Reason? The Blame Game Between the Retriever and the Language Model’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.09146>
- Hoffmann, J., Borgeaud, S., Mensch, A., Buchatskaya, E., Cai, T., Rutherford, E., de Las Casas, D., Hendricks, L. A., Welbl, J., Clark, A., Hennigan, T., Noland, E., Millican, K., van den Driessche, G., Damoc, B., Guy, A., Osindero, S., Simonyan, K., Elsen, E., Rae, J. W., Vinyals, O. & Sifre, L. (2022), ‘Training compute-optimal large language models’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.15556>
- Holtzman, A., Buys, J., Du, L., Forbes, M. & Choi, Y. (2020), ‘The curious case of neural text degeneration’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09751* .
- Hsia, J., Shaikh, A., Wang, Z. & Neubig, G. (2024), ‘RAGGED: Towards Informed Design of Retrieval Augmented Generation Systems’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09040* .
- Izacard, G., Lewis, P., Lomeli, M., Hosseini, L., Petroni, F., Schick, T., Dwivedi-Yu, J., Joulin, A., Riedel, S. & Grave, E. (2022), ‘Atlas: Few-shot Learning with Retrieval Augmented Language Models’.

- Jiang, Z., Araki, J., Ding, H. & Neubig, G. (2021), How Can We Know When Language Models Know? On the Calibration of Language Models for Question Answering, *in* ‘Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing’, Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 1974–1991.  
**URL:** <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.150>
- Kaushik, D., Hovy, E. & Lipton, Z. C. (2020), ‘Learning the Difference that Makes a Difference with Counterfactually-Augmented Data’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.12434>
- Kwiatkowski, T., Palomaki, J., Redfield, O., Collins, M., Parikh, A., Alberti, C., Epstein, D., Polosukhin, I., Kelcey, M., Devlin, J., Lee, K., Toutanova, K. N., Jones, L., Chang, M.-W., Dai, A., Uszkoreit, J., Le, Q. & Petrov, S. (2019), ‘Natural Questions: a Benchmark for Question Answering Research’, *Transactions of the Association of Computational Linguistics* .
- Lamb, A., Goyal, A., Zhang, Y., Zhang, S., Courville, A. & Bengio, Y. (2016), Professor Forcing: A New Algorithm for Training Recurrent Networks, *in* ‘Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems’, Vol. 29, Curran Associates, Inc.
- Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Kuttler, H., Lewis, M., Yih, W.-t., Rocktaschel, T., Riedel, S. & Kiela, D. (2020), ‘Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**, 9459–9474.
- Longpre, S., Hou, L., Vu, T., Webson, A., Chung, H. W., Tay, Y., Zhou, D., Le, Q. V., Zoph, B., Wei, J. & Roberts, A. (2023), ‘The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.13688>
- Mallen, A., Asai, A., Zhong, V., Das, R., Khashabi, D. & Hajishirzi, H. (2023), ‘When Not to Trust Language Models: Investigating Effectiveness of Parametric and Non-Parametric Memories’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.10511>
- Martin, L., Touvron, H., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D., Blecher, L., Ferrer, C. C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G., Esiobu, D., Fernandes, J., Fu, J., Fu, W., Fuller, B., Gao, C., Goswami, V., Goyal, N., Hartshorn, A., Hosseini, S., Hou, R., Inan, H., Kardas, M., Kerkez, V., Khabsa, M., Kloumann, I., Korenev, A., Koura, P. S., Lachaux, M.-A., Lavril, T., Lee, J., Liskovich, D., Lu, Y., Mao, Y., Martinet, X., Mihaylov, T., Mishra, P., Molybog, I., Nie, Y., Poulton, A., Reizenstein, J., Rungta, R., Saladi, K., Schelten, A., Silva, R., Smith, E. M., Subramanian, R., Tan, X. E., Tang, B., Taylor, R., Williams, A., Kuan, J. X., Xu, P., Yan, Z., Zarov, I., Zhang, Y., Fan, A., Kambadur, M., Narang, S., Rodriguez, A., Stojnic, R., Edunov, S. & Scialom, T. (2023), ‘Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288>
- Norouzi, M., Mikolov, T., Bengio, S., Singer, Y., Shlens, J., Frome, A., Corrado, G. S. & Dean, J. (2014), ‘Zero-shot learning by convex combination of semantic embeddings’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.5650>

- Radford, A. & Narasimhan, K. (2018), Improving language understanding by generative pre-training.  
**URL:** <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:49313245>
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D. & Sutskever, I. (2019), ‘Language models are unsupervised multitask learners’, *OpenAI blog* **1**(8), 9.
- Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W. & Liu, P. J. (2020), ‘Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer’, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **21**, 1–67.
- Sutskever, I., Vinyals, O. & Le, Q. V. (2014), ‘Sequence to Sequence Learning with Neural Networks’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.3215>
- Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., Martinet, X., Lachaux, M.-A., Lacroix, T., Rozière, B., Goyal, N., Hambro, E., Azhar, F., Rodriguez, A., Joulin, A., Grave, E. & Lample, G. (2023), ‘Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13971>
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L. & Polosukhin, I. (2017), Attention is all you need, in ‘Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems’, NIPS’17, Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, p. 6000–6010.
- Whitehouse, C., Chamoun, E. & Aly, R. (2023), ‘Knowledge Grounding in Retrieval-Augmented LM: An Empirical Study’, *arXiv preprint*.
- Wu, Y., Schuster, M., Chen, Z., Le, Q. V., Norouzi, M., Macherey, W., Krikun, M., Cao, Y., Gao, Q., Macherey, K., Klingner, J., Shah, A., Johnson, M., Liu, X., Łukasz Kaiser, Gouws, S., Kato, Y., Kudo, T., Kazawa, H., Stevens, K., Kurian, G., Patil, N., Wang, W., Young, C., Smith, J., Riesa, J., Rudnick, A., Vinyals, O., Corrado, G., Hughes, M. & Dean, J. (2016), ‘Google’s Neural Machine Translation System: Bridging the Gap between Human and Machine Translation’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.08144>
- Yao, S., Yu, D., Zhao, J., Shafran, I., Griffiths, T. L., Cao, Y. & Narasimhan, K. (2023), ‘Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10601>
- Yu, Q., Merullo, J. & Pavlick, E. (2023), ‘Characterizing Mechanisms for Factual Recall in Language Models’.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.15910>

# Appendices

## A Questions and objects used to form the queries

What is the date of birth of {person}? The date of birth of {person} is  
In what city was {person} born? {person} was born in  
What is the date of death of {person}? The date of death of {person} is  
What is the primary profession of {person}? The primary profession of {person} is  
What is {person} primarily known for? {person} is primarily known for  
What's the main nationality of {person}? {person} is  
What educational institution did {person} attend? {person} attended  
What was the native language of {person}? The native language of {person} was  
Who was {person}'s most influential mentor? The most influential mentor of {person} was  
What was {person}'s religious affiliation? The religious affiliation of {person} was  
What was {person}'s primary field of study? The primary field of study of {person} was  
What was {person}'s most famous work or invention? The most famous work or invention of {person} was  
What historical period did {person} live in? {person} lived during the  
What was {person}'s family's social class? {person}'s family belonged to the  
What was {person}'s political ideology? The political ideology of {person} was  
What was {person}'s preferred artistic or scientific medium? The preferred medium of {person} was  
What was {person}'s cultural background? The cultural background of {person} was

What country is {city} in? {city} is in  
What's the highest administrative subdivision {city} is part of? {city} is part of  
In what year was {city} founded? {city} was founded in  
What major river is nearest to {city}? The nearest major river to {city} is  
What is the time zone of {city}? The time zone of {city} is  
What is the current population of {city}? The current population of {city} is  
What is the altitude of {city} above sea level? {city} is at an altitude of  
What is the primary language spoken in {city}? The primary language spoken in {city} is  
What is the predominant architectural style in {city}? The predominant architectural style in {city} is  
What is the main economic industry of {city}? The main economic industry of {city} is  
What is the average annual temperature in {city}? The average annual temperature in {city} is  
What is the nearest major body of water to {city}? The nearest major body of water to {city} is  
What is the most famous landmark in {city}? The most famous landmark in {city} is  
What is the primary mode of public transportation in {city}? The primary mode of public transportation in {city} is  
What is the name of the airport serving {city}? The airport serving {city} is  
What is the sister city of {city}? The sister city of {city} is  
What is the traditional cuisine {city} is known for? The traditional cuisine {city} is known for is

Who is credited with the discovery of {principle}? {principle} was discovered by  
Which scientific discipline encompasses {principle}? {principle} is encompassed by  
What is the primary application of {principle}? The primary application of {principle} is  
In which year was {principle} first formulated? {principle} was first formulated in  
What is the SI unit most commonly associated with {principle}? The SI unit most commonly associated with {principle} is

What's the chemical formula for {element}? The chemical formula for {element} is  
When was {element} first isolated? {element} was first isolated in  
What's the atomic number of {element}? The atomic number of {element} is  
What is the melting point of {element}? The melting point of {element} is  
In which group of the periodic table is {element} found? {element} is found in group  
What's the standard atomic weight of {element}? The standard atomic weight of {element} is  
What's the electron configuration of {element}? The electron configuration of {element} is  
What's the most common oxidation state of {element}? The most common oxidation state of {element} is  
What's the crystal structure of {element} at room temperature? The crystal structure of {element} at room temperature is  
What's the primary isotope of {element}? The primary isotope of {element} is  
What's the electronegativity value of {element}? The electronegativity value of {element} is  
What's the ionization energy of {element}? The ionization energy of {element} is  
What's the atomic radius of {element}? The atomic radius of {element} is  
What's the boiling point of {element}? The boiling point of {element} is  
In which period of the periodic table is {element} located? {element} is located in period

What genre does {book} belong to? The genre of {book} is  
Who's the author of {book}? {book} was written by  
In what year was {book} first published? {book} was first published in  
How many pages are in the original publication of {book}? The original publication of {book} has  
What is the name of the main protagonist in {book}? The main protagonist in {book} is

What is the original language of {book}? The original language of {book} is  
Who is the original publisher of {book}? The publisher of {book} is  
What is the highest award {book} won? The highest award won by {book} is  
What is the opening line of {book}? The opening line of {book} is  
How many chapters are in {book}? {book} has  
How many pages are in {book}? {book} has

Who painted {painting}? {painting} was painted by

```

When was {painting} completed? {painting} was completed in
What artistic movement does {painting} belong to? {painting} belongs to
What materials were used to create {painting}? {painting} was created with
Where is {painting} primarily housed? {painting} is currently in
What are the dimensions of {painting}? The dimensions of {painting} are
In which museum was {painting} first exhibited? {painting} was first exhibited in
What is the dominant color in {painting}? The dominant color in {painting} is
Who commissioned {painting}? {painting} was commissioned by
What is the estimated value of {painting}? The estimated value of {painting} is
What is the subject matter of {painting}? The subject matter of {painting} is
In which country was {painting} created? {painting} was created in

What year did {historical_event} happen? {historical_event} happened in the year
Who was the primary leader associated with {historical_event}? The primary leader associated with
{historical_event} was
What was the duration of {historical_event}? {historical_event} lasted for
In which country did {historical_event} primarily take place? {historical_event} primarily took place in

What is the height of {building}? The height of {building} is
Who was the main architect of {building}? The main architect of {building} was
In which year was {building} completed? {building} was completed in
In which city is {building} located? {building} is located in
What architectural style is {building}? The architectural style of {building} is
How many floors does {building} have? {building} has
What is the primary construction material of {building}? The primary construction material of {building} is
What is the total floor area of {building}? The total floor area of {building} is
How long did it take to construct {building}? The construction of {building} took

Who composed {composition}? {composition} was composed by
In what year was {composition} first performed? {composition} was first performed in
What is the musical genre of {composition}? The musical genre of {composition} is
What is the opus number of {composition}? The opus number of {composition} is
What is the key signature of {composition}? The key signature of {composition} is
How many movements does {composition} have? {composition} has
What is the tempo marking of {composition}? The tempo marking of {composition} is
What is the duration of {composition}? The duration of {composition} is
For which instrument(s) was {composition} written? {composition} was written for
In which city was {composition} premiered? {composition} was premiered in

```

**Listing 2:** All base questions used in this work. Each one of these will get combined with data from Listing 2 as detailed in Section 3.1.

```

Ada Lovelace, person
Alan Turing, person
Albert Einstein, person
Alexander Fleming, person
Aristotle, person
Billie Jean King, person
Boyan Slat, person
Catherine the Great, person
Che Guevara, person
Cleopatra, person
Confucius, person
Ernest Rutherford, person
Florence Nightingale, person
Freddie Mercury, person
Frida Kahlo, person
Greta Thunberg, person
Harriet Tubman, person
Ibn al-Haytham, person
Isaac Newton, person
Karl Marx, person
Leonardo da Vinci, person
Mahatma Gandhi, person
Malala Yousafzai, person
Mansa Musa, person
Marie Curie, person
Martin Luther King Jr., person
Michelangelo, person
Mohandas Gandhi, person
Mozart, person
Muhammad Ali, person
Neil Armstrong, person
Nelson Mandela, person
Nikola Tesla, person
Pablo Picasso, person
Rosalind Franklin, person
Shirin Ebadi, person
Simon Bolivar, person
Srinivasa Ramanujan, person
Stephen Hawking, person

```

Sun Yat-sen, person  
 Virginia Woolf, person  
 Vladimir Lenin, person  
 Wangari Maathai, person  
 W.E.B. Du Bois, person  
 William Shakespeare, person  
 Wu Zetian, person  
 Yuri Gagarin, person  
 Amelia Earhart, person  
 Galileo Galilei, person  
 Genghis Khan, person  
 Joan of Arc, person  
 Lise Meitner, person  
 Marcus Aurelius, person  
 Maya Angelou, person  
 Queen Nzinga, person  
 Socrates, person  
 Voltaire, person  
 Alexandria, city  
 Amsterdam, city  
 Antananarivo, city  
 Athens, city  
 Baghdad, city  
 Berlin, city  
 Buenos Aires, city  
 Bukhara, city  
 Cairo, city  
 Cape Town, city  
 Cartagena, city  
 Chicago, city  
 Cusco, city  
 Cuzco, city  
 Delhi, city  
 Dubrovnik, city  
 Fez, city  
 Havana, city  
 Istanbul, city  
 Jerusalem, city  
 Kyoto, city  
 La Paz, city  
 Lhasa, city  
 Lisbon, city  
 London, city  
 Luang Prabang, city  
 Marrakech, city  
 Mexico City, city  
 Montevideo, city  
 Moscow, city  
 Mumbai, city  
 Muscat, city  
 New York, city  
 Nur-Sultan, city  
 Paris, city  
 Petra, city  
 Prague, city  
 Quebec City, city  
 Reykjavik, city  
 Rome, city  
 Sao Paulo, city  
 Sarajevo, city  
 Shanghai, city  
 Singapore, city  
 St. Petersburg, city  
 Sydney, city  
 Tbilisi, city  
 Tenochtitlan, city  
 Thimphu, city  
 Timbuktu, city  
 Tokyo, city  
 Ulaanbaatar, city  
 Varanasi, city  
 Venice, city  
 Vienna, city  
 Wellington, city  
 Windhoek, city  
 Xi'an, city  
 Yogyakarta, city  
 Zanzibar City, city  
 Addis Ababa, city  
 Bangkok, city  
 Dubai, city  
 Helsinki, city  
 Machu Picchu, city



Nairobi,city  
 Rio de Janeiro,city  
 Samarkand,city  
 Toronto,city  
 Yangon,city  
 Archimedes' Principle,principle  
 Bernoulli's Principle,principle  
 Boyle's Law,principle  
 Cell Theory,principle  
 Conservation of Energy,principle  
 DNA Replication,principle  
 Electromagnetism,principle  
 Entropy,principle  
 Evolution by Natural Selection,principle  
 Evolution,principle  
 General Relativity,principle  
 Germ Theory of Disease,principle  
 Gravity,principle  
 Hardy-Weinberg Principle,principle  
 Heliocentrism,principle  
 Hubble's Law,principle  
 Kepler's Laws of Planetary Motion,principle  
 Le Chatelier's Principle,principle  
 Mendel's Laws of Inheritance,principle  
 Newton's Laws of Motion,principle  
 Pauli Exclusion Principle,principle  
 Periodic Law,principle  
 Photosynthesis,principle  
 Plate Tectonics,principle  
 Principle of Least Action,principle  
 Quantum Mechanics,principle  
 Relativity,principle  
 Superconductivity,principle  
 Thermodynamics,principle  
 Uncertainty Principle,principle  
 Avogadro's Law,principle  
 Coulomb's Law,principle  
 Faraday's Laws of Electrolysis,principle  
 Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle,principle  
 Ohm's Law,principle  
 Schrödinger Equation,principle  
 Special Relativity,principle  
 Aluminum,element  
 Barium,element  
 Bismuth,element  
 Bromine,element  
 Calcium,element  
 Carbon,element  
 Chlorine,element  
 Chromium,element  
 Copper,element  
 Gold,element  
 Helium,element  
 Hydrogen,element  
 Iodine,element  
 Iron,element  
 Lead,element  
 Lithium,element  
 Magnesium,element  
 Manganese,element  
 Mercury,element  
 Neon,element  
 Nitrogen,element  
 Oxygen,element  
 Phosphorus,element  
 Plutonium,element  
 Potassium,element  
 Radon,element  
 Silicon,element  
 Silver,element  
 Sodium,element  
 Sulfur,element  
 Thorium,element  
 Tin,element  
 Titanium,element  
 Uranium,element  
 Zinc,element  
 Argon,element  
 Boron,element  
 Cobalt,element  
 Fluorine,element  
 Gallium,element  
 Krypton,element

Nickel,element  
 Xenon,element  
 1984,book  
 Anna Karenina,book  
 Beloved,book  
 Brave New World,book  
 Catch-22,book  
 Crime and Punishment,book  
 Don Quixote,book  
 Fahrenheit 451,book  
 Frankenstein,book  
 Jane Eyre,book  
 Midnight's Children,book  
 Moby-Dick,book  
 One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest,book  
 One Hundred Years of Solitude,book  
 Pride and Prejudice,book  
 Slaughterhouse-Five,book  
 The Alchemist,book  
 The Art of War,book  
 The Book Thief,book  
 The Brothers Karamazov,book  
 The Catcher in the Rye,book  
 The Chronicles of Narnia,book  
 The Color Purple,book  
 The Count of Monte Cristo,book  
 The Grapes of Wrath,book  
 The Great Gatsby,book  
 The Handmaid's Tale,book  
 The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy,book  
 The Hobbit,book  
 The Hunger Games,book  
 The Kite Runner,book  
 The Little Prince,book  
 The Lord of the Rings,book  
 The Metamorphosis,book  
 The Name of the Rose,book  
 The Odyssey,book  
 The Picture of Dorian Gray,book  
 The Pillars of the Earth,book  
 The Stranger,book  
 The Sun Also Rises,book  
 The Wind-Up Bird Chronicle,book  
 To Kill a Mockingbird,book  
 Ulysses,book  
 War and Peace,book  
 Wuthering Heights,book  
 The Iliad,book  
 The Tale of Genji,book  
 Things Fall Apart,book  
 To the Lighthouse,book  
 American Gothic,painting  
 Christina's World,painting  
 Girl with a Pearl Earring,painting  
 Guernica,painting  
 Les Demoiselles d'Avignon,painting  
 Liberty Leading the People,painting  
 Mona Lisa,painting  
 School of Athens,painting  
 Starry Night,painting  
 The Absinthe Drinker,painting  
 The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp,painting  
 The Arnolfini Portrait,painting  
 The Astronomer,painting  
 The Birth of Venus,painting  
 The Calling of Saint Matthew,painting  
 The Card Players,painting  
 The Death of Marat,painting  
 The Fighting Temeraire,painting  
 The Garden of Earthly Delights,painting  
 The Gross Clinic,painting  
 The Hay Wain,painting  
 The Kiss,painting  
 The Last Supper,painting  
 The Nighthawks,painting  
 The Night Watch,painting  
 The Ninth Wave,painting  
 The Persistence of Memory,painting  
 The Potato Eaters,painting  
 The Raft of the Medusa,painting  
 The Scream,painting  
 The Sleeping Gypsy,painting  
 The Son of Man,painting

The Swing, [painting](#)  
 The Third of May 1808, [painting](#)  
 The Tower of Babel, [painting](#)  
 The Treachery of Images, [painting](#)  
 The Triumph of Galatea, [painting](#)  
 The Wanderer above the Sea of Fog, [painting](#)  
 Water Lilies, [painting](#)  
 The Creation of Adam, [painting](#)  
 The Girl with a Pearl Earling, [painting](#)  
 The Great Wave off Kanagawa, [painting](#)  
 The Thinker, [painting](#)  
 Venus de Milo, [painting](#)  
 Decimalisation in the UK, [historical\\_event](#)  
 Queen Elizabeth II's Platinum Jubilee, [historical\\_event](#)  
 Queen Victoria's Coronation, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Act of Union between England and Scotland, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Battle of Adrianople, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Battle of Adwa, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Battle of Agincourt, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Battle of Hastings, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Battle of Sekigahara, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Battle of Teutoburg Forest, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Battle of the Milvian Bridge, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Battle of Waterloo, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Brexit Referendum, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Codification of Roman Law by Justinian, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Construction of Hadrian's Wall, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Construction of the Great Pyramid of Giza, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Conversion of Constantine, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Council of Chalcedon, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Crisis of the Third Century, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Defeat of the Spanish Armada, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Discovery of the Americas by Columbus, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Dissolution of the Soviet Union, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Division of the Roman Empire, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Dunkirk Evacuation, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Edict of Caracalla, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Fall of Constantinople, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Fall of the Aztec Empire, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Fall of the Western Roman Empire, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The First Circumnavigation of the Earth, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The First Council of Nicaea, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The First Crusade, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Founding of Constantinople, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Founding of Rome, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Founding of the British Broadcasting Corporation, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Founding of the League of Nations, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The French Revolution, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Glorious Revolution, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Gothic War in Italy, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Great Fire of London, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Indian Independence Act, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Industrial Revolution, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The London 7/7 Bombings, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Meiji Restoration, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Plague of Justinian, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Reforms of Diocletian, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Reunification of the Empire by Aurelian, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Sack of Rome by Alaric, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Sack of Rome by the Vandals, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Signing of the Good Friday Agreement, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Signing of the Magna Carta, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Suez Crisis, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Treaty of Westphalia, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The UK Abolition of the Slave Trade Act, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Unification of Italy, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Wedding of Prince Charles and Lady Diana, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Year of the Four Emperors, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The American Revolution, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Black Death, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Cuban Missile Crisis, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Fall of the Berlin Wall, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Moon Landing, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Renaissance, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Russian Revolution, [historical\\_event](#)  
 The Signing of the Declaration of Independence, [historical\\_event](#)  
 Angkor Wat, [building](#)  
 Buckingham Palace, [building](#)  
 Burj Khalifa, [building](#)  
 Chichen Itza, [building](#)  
 Chrysler Building, [building](#)  
 Colosseum, [building](#)  
 Eiffel Tower, [building](#)

```

Empire State Building,building
Forbidden City,building
Guggenheim Museum,building
Hagia Sophia,building
Louvre Pyramid,building
Machu Picchu,building
Neuschwanstein Castle,building
Parthenon,building
Petra,building
Petronas Towers,building
Potlatch Palace,building
Sears Tower,building
St. Basil's Cathedral,building
Sydney Opera House,building
Taj Mahal,building
Adagio for Strings,composition
Billie Jean,composition
Bohemian Rhapsody,composition
Canon in D,composition
Carmina Burana,composition
Clair de Lune,composition
Eine kleine Nachtmusik,composition
Für Elise,composition
Gymnopédies,composition
Imagine,composition
In the Mood,composition
Like a Rolling Stone,composition
Lovesong,composition
Mbube (The Lion Sleeps Tonight),composition
Nessun Dorma,composition
Purple Rain,composition
Raga Malkauns,composition
Rhapsody in Blue,composition
Rhapsody on a Theme of Paganini,composition
Symphony No. 5,composition
The Blue Danube,composition
The Four Seasons,composition
The Planets,composition
The Rite of Spring,composition
Toccata and Fugue in D minor,composition

```

**Listing 3:** All objects which will be combined with the questions in Listing 1.

**B Full Results for Each Question**

**C Grounder Usage and Documentation**

## D Source Code of the Experiments

The latest version of the source code, including the input data generated in Section 3.1, is available in <https://github.com/mfixman/rag-thesis><sup>†</sup>.

```
1 import warnings
2 warnings.simplefilter(action = 'ignore', category = FutureWarning)
3
4 from argparse import ArgumentParser
5 import csv
6 import logging
7 import random
8 import ipdb
9 import os
10 import sys
11 import wandb
12
13 from Models import Model_dict
14 from QuestionAnswerer import QuestionAnswerer
15 from Utils import print_parametric_csv, LogTimeFilter, combine_questions
16
17 def parse_args():
18     parser = ArgumentParser(
19         description = 'Combines questions and data and optionally provides
20         parametric data'
21     )
22
23     parser.add_argument('--debug', action = 'store_true', help = 'Go to IPDB
24     console on exception rather than exiting.')
25     parser.add_argument('--lim-questions', type = int, help = 'Question limit')
26     parser.add_argument('--device', choices = ['cpu', 'cuda'], default = 'cuda',
27     help = 'Inference device')
28     parser.add_argument('--models', type = str.lower, default = [], choices =
29     Model_dict.keys(), nargs = '+', metavar = 'model', help = 'Which model or
30     models to use for getting parametric data')
31     parser.add_argument('--offline', action = 'store_true', help = 'Run offline:
32     use model cache rather than downloading new models.')
33     parser.add_argument('--rand', action = 'store_true', help = 'Seed randomly
34     rather thn using the same seed for every model.')
35     parser.add_argument('--max-batch-size', type = int, default = 120, help =
36     'Maximum size of batches. All batches contain exactly the same question.')
37
38     parser.add_argument('--per-model', action = 'store_true', help = 'Write one
39     CSV per model in stdout.')
40     parser.add_argument('--output-dir', help = 'Return one CSV per model, and
41     save them to this directory.')
42
43     parser.add_argument('--runs-per-question', type = int, default = 1, help =
44     'How many runs (with random counterfactuals) to do for each question.')
45
46     parser.add_argument('base_questions_file', type = open, help = 'File with
47     questions')
48     parser.add_argument('objects_file', type = open, help = 'File with objects to
49     combine')
50
51     args = parser.parse_args()
52
53     args.base_questions = [x.strip() for x in args.base_questions_file if any(not
54     y.isspace() for y in x)]
```

---

<sup>†</sup>TODO: Move all of this to a new repo.

```

41     args.objects = [{k: v for k, v in p.items()} for p in
42                     csv.DictReader(args.objects_file)]
43
44     del args.base_questions_file
45     del args.objects_file
46
47     if args.per_model and args.output_dir:
48         raise ValueError('Only one of --per-model and --output-dir can be
49                             specified.')
50
51     return args
52
53 def main(args):
54     logging.getLogger('transformers').setLevel(logging.ERROR)
55     logging.basicConfig(
56         format='[%asctime)s] %(message)s',
57         level=logging.INFO,
58         datefmt='%Y-%m-%d %H:%M:%S'
59     )
60     logging.getLogger().addFilter(LogTimeFilter())
61
62     if args.offline:
63         os.environ['TRANSFORMERS_OFFLINE'] = '1'
64     else:
65         wandb.init(project = 'knowledge-grounder', config = args)
66
67     logging.info('Getting questions')
68     questions = combine_questions(args.base_questions, args.objects,
69                                 args.lim_questions)
70
71     if args.output_dir:
72         try:
73             os.mkdir(args.output_dir)
74         except FileExistsError:
75             pass
76
77     logging.info(f'About to answer {len(questions) * len(args.models) *
78                 args.runs_per_question * 2} questions in total.')
79     answers = {}
80     for model in args.models:
81         if not args.rand:
82             random.seed(0)
83
84         qa = QuestionAnswerer(
85             model,
86             device = args.device,
87             max_length = 20,
88             max_batch_size = args.max_batch_size,
89             runs_per_question = args.runs_per_question,
90         )
91         model_answers = qa.answerQueries(questions)
92         del qa
93
94         if args.output_dir:
95             empty = lambda s: sum([x == '' for x in model_answers[s]])
96             count = lambda s: sum([x == s for x in model_answers['comparison']])
97             logging.info(f"{model}:\t{empty('parametric')} empty parametrics,
98 {empty('counterfactual')} empty counterfactuals, {empty('contextual')} empty
99 contextualse")
100             logging.info(f"\t{count('Parametric')} parametrics,
101 {count('Contextual')} contextual, {count('Other')} others")

```

```

96         model_filename = os.path.join(args.output_dir, model + '.csv')
97         with open(model_filename, 'w') as out:
98             print_parametric_csv(out, model_answers)
99
100         elif args.per_model:
101             print_parametric_csv(sys.stdout, model_answers)
102         else:
103             answers |= model_answers
104
105     if answers:
106         logging.info('Writing CSV')
107         print_parametric_csv(sys.stdout, answers)
108
109 if __name__ == '__main__':
110     args = parse_args()
111     if not args.debug:
112         main(args)
113     else:
114         with ipdb.launch_ipdb_on_exception():
115             main(args)

```

**Listing 4:** `knowledge_grounder.py` is the main entry point and contains mostly argument parsing and output printing.

```

1  import warnings
2  warnings.simplefilter(action = 'ignore', category = FutureWarning)
3
4  import logging
5  import math
6  import torch
7  import typing
8
9  from Models import Model
10 from typing import Optional, Union, Any
11 from Utils import Question, sample_counterfactual_flips, chunk_questions
12
13 from collections import defaultdict
14 from transformers import BatchEncoding
15
16 import ipdb
17
18 FloatTensor = torch.Tensor
19 LongTensor = torch.Tensor
20 BoolTensor = torch.Tensor
21
22 # A QuestionAnswerer is the main class to answer queries with a given model.
23 # Example Usage:
24 #   qa = QuestionAnswerer('llama', device = 'cuda', max_length = 20,
25 #                         max_batch_size = 75)
26 #   output = qa.answerQueries(Utils.combine_questions(base_questions, objects))
27 # The list of models can be found in 'Model_dict' in 'Models.py'.
28 class QuestionAnswerer:
29     device: str
30     max_length: int
31     max_batch_size: int
32     runs_per_question: int
33     llm: Model
34
35     def __init__(
36         self,
37         model: Union[str, Model],

```



```

37         device: str = 'cpu',
38         max_length: Optional[int] = None,
39         max_batch_size: Optional[int] = None,
40         runs_per_question: Optional[int] = None,
41     ):
42         self.device = device
43         self.max_length = max_length or 20
44         self.max_batch_size = max_batch_size or 120
45         self.runs_per_question = runs_per_question or 1
46
47         if type(model) == str:
48             model = Model.fromName(model, device = device)
49
50         model = typing.cast(Model, model)
51         self.llm = model
52
53         # Generated list of stop tokens: period, newline, and various different
54         end tokens.
55         stop_tokens = {'.', '\n'}
56         self.stop_token_ids = torch.tensor([
57             v
58             for k, v in self.llm.tokenizer.get_vocab().items()
59             if
60                 k in ['<start_of_turn>', '<end_of_turn>',
61                     self.llm.tokenizer.special_tokens_map['eos_token']] or
62                 not stop_tokens.isdisjoint(self.llm.tokenizer.decode(v))
63         ]).to(self.device)
64
65         # Query data related to a list of questions, and return a dict with
66         information about these runs.
67         # Output elements:
68         # parametric: Parametric answer, as a string.
69         # base_proba: Perplexity of parametric answer in base query.
70         # counterfactual: Randomly selected counterfactual answer.
71         # base_cf_proba: Perplexity of counterfactual answer in base query.
72         # contextual: Contextual answer, as a string.
73         # ctx_proba: Perplexity of contextual answer.
74         # ctx_param_proba: Perplexity of parametric answer when running contextual
75         query.
76         # ctx_cf_proba: Perplexity of counterfactual answer when running contextual
77         query.
78         # comparison: Comparison between parametric and contextual answer. Where
79         does this answer come from?
80         # preference: Comparison between perplexity of parametric and counterfactual
81         answer on contextual query. Which one is the least surprising?
82         def answerChunk(self, questions: list[Question]) -> dict[str, Any]:
83             output: defaultdict[str, list[Any]] = defaultdict(lambda: [])
84
85             base_tokens = self.tokenise([q.format(prompt = self.llm.prompt) for q in
86             questions])
87             parametric = self.generate(base_tokens)
88
89             parametric_output = self.decode(parametric)
90             base_proba_output = self.perplexity(base_tokens, parametric)
91             for run in range(self.runs_per_question):
92                 run_output: dict[str, list[Any]] = dict(
93                     parametric = parametric_output,
94                     base_proba = base_proba_output,
95                 )
96
97                 run_output['question'] = questions
98                 flips = sample_counterfactual_flips(questions,

```

```

run_output['parametric'])
    counterfactual = parametric[flips]
    run_output['counterfactual'] = self.decode(counterfactual)
    run_output['base_cf_proba'] = self.perplexity(base_tokens,
counterfactual)
    run_output |= self.answerCounterfactuals(questions,
run_output['counterfactual'], parametric, counterfactual)
    run_output['comparison'] = [
        'Parametric' if self.streq(a, p) else
        'Contextual' if self.streq(a, c) else
        'Other'
        for p, c, a in zip(run_output['parametric'],
run_output['counterfactual'], run_output['contextual'])
    ]
    run_output['preference'] = [
        'Parametric' if pp > cp else
        'Contextual'
        for pp, cp in zip(run_output['ctx_proba'],
run_output['ctx_cf_proba'])
    ]
    for k, v in run_output.items():
        output[k].extend(v)
    return output

# Given a list of questions with assigned counterfactuals, run contextual
queries and return
# a dictionary containing information about these runs.
# Parameter list:
#   questions: list of questions to ask.
#   counterfactuals: counterfactual answers, as string.
#   parametric: parametric answer, as set of tokens.
#   This will be used to calculate the perplexity of this answer with the
counterfactual context.
#   counterfactual: counterfactual answers, as a set of tokens.
#   This is necessary since the same string might have several encodings,
but we need exactly the same one generated by the model
#   in the first place.
def answerCounterfactuals(self, questions: list[Question], counterfactuals:
list[str], parametric: LongTensor, counterfactual: LongTensor) -> dict[str,
Any]:
    output: dict[str, Any] = {}
    ctx_tokens = self.tokenise([
        q.format(prompt = self.llm.cf_prompt, context = context)
        for q, context in zip(questions, counterfactuals)
    ])
    contextual = self.generate(ctx_tokens)
    output['contextual'] = self.decode(contextual)
    output['ctx_proba'] = self.perplexity(ctx_tokens, contextual)
    output['ctx_param_proba'] = self.perplexity(ctx_tokens, parametric)
    output['ctx_cf_proba'] = self.perplexity(ctx_tokens, counterfactual)
    output['context_attn'], output['question_attn'] =
self.avgSelfAttentions(ctx_tokens)

```

```

142
143         return output
144
145     # Answer a list of Questions: run the queries, gather counterfactual values,
    run the queries
146     # with counterfactual context, and return a 'dict' with information to print.
147     @torch.no_grad()
148     def answerQueries(self, questions: list[Question]) -> dict[str, Any]:
149         output: defaultdict[str, list[Any]] = defaultdict(lambda: [])
150
151         chunks = chunk_questions(questions, max_batch_size = self.max_batch_size)
152         logging.info(f'Answering {len(questions)} queries in {len(chunks)}
    chunks.')
```

```

153
154         for e, chunk in enumerate(chunks, start = 1):
155             logging.info(f'Parsing chunk ({e} / {len(chunks)}), which has size
    {len(chunk)}.', extra = {'rate_limit': 20})
156
157             chunk_output = self.answerChunk(chunk)
158
159             for k, v in chunk_output.items():
160                 output[k] += v
161
162         return dict(output)
163
164     def fakeTokens(self) -> BatchEncoding:
165         return self.tokenise(['[Context: Montevideo is located in Egypt] Q: What
    country is Montevideo located in? A: Montevideo is located in'])
166
167     # Gets the scaled mean self-attentions of the context section of a query and
168     # of the section after the context.
169     @torch.no_grad()
170     def avgSelfAttentions(self, queries: BatchEncoding) -> tuple[list[float],
    list[float]]:
171         attentions = self.llm.attentions(queries)
172         attention_mean = attentions.mean(dim = (1, 2))
173         diag = attention_mean.diagonal(dim1 = 1, dim2 = 2)
174         scaled = (diag - diag.min(dim = 1, keepdims = True)[0]) / (diag.max(dim =
    1, keepdims = True)[0] - diag.min(dim = 1, keepdims = True)[0])
175
176         context_left = ((queries.input_ids == self.llm.tokenizer.pad_token_id) |
    (queries.input_ids == self.llm.tokenizer.eos_token_id))
177         context_right = ((queries.input_ids ==
    self.llm.tokenizer.convert_tokens_to_ids(' ')) | (queries.input_ids ==
    self.llm.tokenizer.convert_tokens_to_ids('].')))
178
179         context_area = ~context_left & (context_right.cumsum(dim = 1) == 0)
180         later_area = context_right.cumsum(dim = 1) > 0
181
182         context = scaled.clone()
183         context[~context_area] = torch.nan
184
185         later = scaled.clone()
186         later[~later_area] = torch.nan
187
188         return context.nanmean(dim = 1).cpu().tolist(), later.nanmean(dim =
    1).cpu().tolist()
189
190     # Tokenise a list of phrases.
191     # [n] -> (n, w)
192     def tokenise(self, phrases: list[str]) -> BatchEncoding:
193         return self.llm.tokenizer(
```

```

194         phrases,
195         return_tensors = 'pt',
196         return_attention_mask = True,
197         padding = True,
198     ).to(self.device)
199
200     # Generate an attention mask for a sequence of tokens.
201     # (n, w) -> (n, w)
202     def batch_encode(self, tokens: LongTensor) -> BatchEncoding:
203         attention_mask = tokens != self.llm.tokenizer.pad_token_id
204         return BatchEncoding(dict(
205             input_ids = tokens,
206             attention_mask = attention_mask,
207         ))
208
209     # Use Greedy decoding to generate an answer to a certain query.
210     # (n, w) -> (n, w)
211     def generate(self, query: BatchEncoding) -> LongTensor:
212         generated = self.llm.model.generate(
213             input_ids = query.input_ids,
214             attention_mask = query.attention_mask,
215             max_new_tokens = self.max_length,
216             min_new_tokens = self.max_length,
217             tokenizer = self.llm.tokenizer,
218             do_sample = False,
219             temperature = None,
220             top_p = None,
221             return_dict_in_generate = True,
222             pad_token_id = self.llm.tokenizer.pad_token_id,
223             eos_token_id = self.llm.tokenizer.eos_token_id,
224             bos_token_id = self.llm.tokenizer.bos_token_id,
225         )
226
227         # Ensure that all the sequences only contain <PAD> after their first stop
228         # token.
229         sequences = generated.sequences[:, -self.max_length:]
230         ignores = torch.cumsum(torch.isin(sequences, self.stop_token_ids), dim =
231 1) > 0
232         sequences[ignores] = self.llm.tokenizer.pad_token_id
233
234         return sequences
235
236     # Return the perplexity of a certain sequence of tokens being the answer to a
237     # certain query, as a list of floats in CPU.
238     # (n, w0), (n, w1) -> (n)
239     def perplexity(self, query: BatchEncoding, answer: LongTensor) -> list[float]:
240         probs = self.batch_perplexity(query, self.batch_encode(answer))
241         return probs.cpu().tolist()
242
243     # Return the perplexity of a certain sequence of tokens being the answer to a
244     # certain query.
245     # (n, w0), (n, w1) -> (n)
246     @torch.no_grad()
247     def batch_perplexity(self, query: BatchEncoding, answer: BatchEncoding) ->
248     FloatTensor:
249         entropies = self.llm.logits(query, answer).log_softmax(dim = 2)
250         entropies /= math.log(2)
251         probs = torch.where(
252             answer.input_ids == self.llm.tokenizer.pad_token_id,
253             torch.nan,
254             entropies.gather(index = answer.input_ids.unsqueeze(2), dim =
255 2).squeeze(2),

```

```

252         )
253
254         return torch.pow(2, -torch.nanmean(probs, dim = 1))
255
256     # Decode a sequence of tokens into a list of strings.
257     # (n, w) -> [n]
258     def decode(self, tokens: LongTensor) -> list[str]:
259         decoded = self.llm.tokenizer.batch_decode(
260             tokens,
261             skip_special_tokens = True,
262             clean_up_tokenization_spaces = True,
263         )
264         return [x.strip() for x in decoded]
265
266     # Compare strings for equality to later check whether an answer is parametric
267     # or contextual.
268     # For simplicity, we remove stop words and gather only the subset of words.
269     @staticmethod
270     def streq(a: str, b: str) -> bool:
271         a = a.lower().replace('the', '').replace(',', '').strip()
272         b = b.lower().replace('the', '').replace(',', '').strip()
273         return a[:len(b)] == b[:len(a)]

```

**Listing 5:** QuestionAnswerer.py contains the QuestionAnswerer class which deals with the logic of answering parametric and counterfactual questions from a model

```

1  import logging
2
3  from transformers import AutoTokenizer, AutoModelForCausalLM,
4     AutoModelForSeq2SeqLM, BatchEncoding
5  from torch import nn, tensor
6  from torch import FloatTensor, Tensor
7  import torch
8
9  # Dictionary of models, containing all of the models aliases and their respective
10 # models.
11 Model_dict = {
12     'llama': 'meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct',
13     'llama-70b': 'meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct',
14     'llama-405b': 'meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3.1-405B-Instruct',
15     'flan-t5': 'google/flan-t5-base',
16     'flan-t5-small': 'google/flan-t5-small',
17     'flan-t5-base': 'google/flan-t5-base',
18     'flan-t5-large': 'google/flan-t5-large',
19     'flan-t5-xl': 'google/flan-t5-xl',
20     'flan-t5-xxl': 'google/flan-t5-xxl',
21     'gemma': 'google/gemma-2-9b-it',
22     'gemma-27b': 'google/gemma-2-27b-it',
23     'falcon2': 'tiiuae/falcon-11b',
24     'falcon-180b': 'tiiuae/falcon-180b-chat',
25     'falcon-40b': 'tiiuae/falcon-40b-instruct',
26     'falcon-7b': 'tiiuae/falcon-7b-instruct',
27     'distilbert': 'distilbert/distilbert-base-uncased-distilled-squad',
28     'roberta': 'FacebookAI/roberta-base',
29     'roberta-large': 'FacebookAI/roberta-large',
30     'roberta-squad': 'deepset/roberta-base-squad2',
31     'mixtral': 'mistralai/Mixtral-8x22B-Instruct-v0.1',
32     'dummy': '',
33 }
34
35 # Virtual class containing a model.

```

```

34 # Derived classes should reimplement __init__ and logits.
35 class Model(nn.Module):
36     name: str
37     model_name: str
38     device: str
39
40     tokenizer: AutoTokenizer
41     model: AutoModelForCausalLM
42
43     # Construct a model from a certain name.
44     # This should be the main constructor of models.
45     @staticmethod
46     def fromName(name: str, device: str = 'cpu') -> 'Model':
47         if name == 'dummy':
48             return DummyModel()
49
50         if name in ('llama-70b', 'gemma-27b'):
51             return LargeDecoderOnlyModel(name, device)
52
53         if 't5' in name:
54             return Seq2SeqModel(name, device)
55
56         return DecoderOnlyModel(name, device)
57
58     def __init__(self, name: str, device: str = 'cuda'):
59         super().__init__()
60         self.name = name
61         self.model_name = Model_dict[name]
62         self.device = device
63
64     @torch.no_grad()
65     def logits(self, query: BatchEncoding, answer: BatchEncoding) -> FloatTensor:
66         raise NotImplementedError('logits called from generic Model class')
67
68 # Decoder-only model, such as llama.
69 class DecoderOnlyModel(Model):
70     def __init__(self, name: str, device: str = 'cuda'):
71         super().__init__(name, device)
72
73         # self.prompt = 'Answer the following question in a few words and with no
74         # self.cf_prompt = 'Answer the following question using the previous
75         # context in a few words and with no formatting.'
76         self.prompt = ''
77         self.cf_prompt = ''
78
79         kwargs = {}
80         if 'llama' in name:
81             kwargs = dict(
82                 pad_token = '<|reserved_special_token_0|>',
83                 padding_side = 'left',
84             )
85         elif 'gemma' in name:
86             kwargs = dict(
87                 padding_side = 'right',
88             )
89
90         self.tokenizer = AutoTokenizer.from_pretrained(
91             self.model_name,
92             clean_up_tokenization_spaces = True,
93             **kwargs,
94         )

```

```

94
95     logging.info(f'Loading model for {self.model_name} using
{torch.cuda.device_count()} GPUs.')
96     self.model = AutoModelForCausalLM.from_pretrained(
97         self.model_name,
98         device_map = 'auto' if self.device == 'cuda' else self.device,
99         torch_dtype = torch.bfloat16,
100         pad_token_id = self.tokenizer.pad_token_id,
101         bos_token_id = self.tokenizer.bos_token_id,
102         eos_token_id = self.tokenizer.eos_token_id,
103         low_cpu_mem_usage = True,
104     )
105     self.model.eval()
106
107     @torch.no_grad()
108     def logits(self, query: BatchEncoding, answer: BatchEncoding) -> FloatTensor:
109         w0 = query.input_ids.shape[1]
110         w1 = answer.input_ids.shape[1]
111
112         input_ids = torch.cat([query.input_ids, answer.input_ids], dim = 1)
113         attention_mask = torch.cat([query.attention_mask, answer.attention_mask],
dim = 1)
114
115         return self.model(input_ids, attention_mask = attention_mask).logits[:,
w0 - 1 : w0 + w1 - 1]
116
117     @torch.no_grad()
118     def attentions(self, queries: BatchEncoding) -> FloatTensor:
119         outputs = self.model(**queries, output_attentions = True).attentions
120         return torch.stack(outputs, dim = 1)
121
122 # Seq2Seq model, such as Flan-T5.
123 class Seq2SeqModel(Model):
124     def __init__(self, name: str, device: str = 'cpu'):
125         super().__init__(name, device)
126
127         self.prompt = ''
128         self.cf_prompt = ''
129
130         kwargs = dict(
131             padding_side = 'right',
132         )
133         self.tokenizer = AutoTokenizer.from_pretrained(
134             self.model_name,
135             clean_up_tokenization_spaces = True,
136             **kwargs,
137         )
138
139         logging.info(f'Loading Seq2Seq model for {self.model_name} using
{torch.cuda.device_count()} GPUs.')
140         self.model = AutoModelForSeq2SeqLM.from_pretrained(
141             self.model_name,
142             device_map = 'auto' if self.device == 'cuda' else self.device,
143             torch_dtype = torch.bfloat16,
144             pad_token_id = self.tokenizer.pad_token_id,
145             bos_token_id = self.tokenizer.bos_token_id,
146             eos_token_id = self.tokenizer.eos_token_id,
147             low_cpu_mem_usage = True,
148         )
149         self.model.eval()
150
151     @staticmethod

```

```

152 def pad(tensor: Tensor, length: int, value) -> Tensor:
153     right = torch.full((tensor.shape[0], length - tensor.shape[1]), value)
154     return torch.cat([tensor, right.to(tensor.device)], dim = 1)
155
156 @torch.no_grad()
157 def logits(self, query: BatchEncoding, answer: BatchEncoding) -> FloatTensor:
158     length = max(query.input_ids.shape[1], answer.input_ids.shape[1])
159
160     input_ids = self.pad(query.input_ids, length, self.tokenizer.pad_token_id)
161     attention_mask = self.pad(query.attention_mask, length, 0)
162     decoder_input_ids = self.pad(self.model._shift_right(answer.input_ids),
163                                  length, self.tokenizer.pad_token_id)
164
165     return self.model(
166         input_ids = input_ids,
167         attention_mask = attention_mask,
168         decoder_input_ids = decoder_input_ids,
169     ).logits[:, : answer.input_ids.shape[1]]
170
171 @torch.no_grad()
172 def attentions(self, queries: BatchEncoding) -> FloatTensor:
173     outputs = self.model(
174         **queries,
175         output_attentions = True,
176         decoder_input_ids = torch.full_like(queries.input_ids,
177                                              self.tokenizer.pad_token_id).to(self.device),
178     ).decoder_attentions
179     return torch.stack(outputs, dim = 1)
180
181 # Large decoder-only model.
182 # Similar to DecoderOnlyModel, but eagerly deletes the model when the class is
183 # deleted.
184 # Assumes you need 2 GPUs to run this.
185 class LargeDecoderOnlyModel(DecoderOnlyModel):
186     def __init__(self, name, device: str = 'cuda'):
187         if torch.cuda.device_count() < 2:
188             raise ValueError(f'At least two GPUs are needed to run {name}')
189
190         super().__init__(name, device)
191
192     def __del__(self):
193         logging.info(f'Deleting large model {self.name}')
194         del self.model
195         torch.cuda.empty_cache()
196
197 # Dummy model, used for testing.
198 class DummyModel(Model):
199     def __init__(self):
200         nn.Module.__init__(self)
201         self.name = 'dummy'
202         self.tokenizer = self
203         self.model = self
204         self.sequences = ['dummy']
205         self.logits = tensor([[[1., 2., 3.]])
206
207         self.bos_token_id = 0
208         self.eos_token_id = 1
209         self.pad_token_id = 2
210
211     def to(self, *args, **kwargs):
212         return self

```



```

211     def __call__(self, *args, **kwargs):
212         return self
213
214     def generate(self, *args, **kwargs):
215         return self
216
217     def __getitem__(self, key):
218         return self
219
220     def decode(self, *args, **kwargs):
221         return 'Dummy text'
222
223     def batch_decode(self, *args, **kwargs):
224         return ['Dummy Text 1', 'Dummy Text 2']
225
226     def shape(self):
227         return (1, 2, 3)
228
229 # If called separately, just print the names of the models.
230 def main():
231     print(f'{"Model Name":>15} | {"Huggingface Model":<40}')
232     print((15 + 1) * '-' + '|' + (40 + 1) * '-')
233     for name, model in Model_dict.items():
234         print(f'{"name":>15} | {"model":<40}')
235
236 if __name__ == '__main__':
237     main()

```

**Listing 6:** Models.py contains the list of models and includes code that differentiates them.

```

1  import csv
2  import logging
3  import itertools
4  import random
5  import time
6  import typing
7
8  from collections import defaultdict
9  from dataclasses import dataclass
10 from typing import Optional, Any
11
12 # Custom filter that does not print a log if it printed another one at most
   'rate_limit' seconds ago.
13 class LogTimeFilter(logging.Filter):
14     def __init__(self):
15         super().__init__()
16         self.last_log = defaultdict(lambda: 0)
17
18     def filter(self, record):
19         if not hasattr(record, 'rate_limit'):
20             return True
21
22         current_time = time.time()
23         if current_time - self.last_log[record.lineno] >= record.rate_limit:
24             self.last_log[record.lineno] = current_time
25             return True
26
27         return False
28
29 # A question contains combines a base_question and an object into something that
   can be queried.

```

```

30 @dataclass
31 class Question:
32     category: str
33     obj: str
34     base_question: str
35
36     # Static constructor: return a question combining an object and an object if
37     # matches; return None otherwise.
38     @staticmethod
39     def orNothing(obj: str, category: str, base_question: str) ->
40     Optional['Question']:
41         if not f'{{{category}}}' in base_question:
42             return None
43
44         return Question(obj = obj, category = category, base_question =
45         base_question)
46
47     # Return a query from the format of this Question.
48     def format(self, *, prompt: Optional[str] = None, context: Optional[str] =
49     None, use_question: bool = True, use_later: bool = True) -> str:
50         [question, later] = self.base_question.format_map({self.category:
51         self.obj}).split('?', 1)
52         question += '?'
53
54         formatted = ''
55         if use_question:
56             formatted = f'Q: {question.strip()}'
57
58         if use_later:
59             formatted = f'{formatted} A: {later.strip()}'
60
61         if prompt is not None:
62             formatted = f'{prompt} {formatted}'
63
64         if context is not None:
65             formatted = f'Context: [{later.strip()} {context}]. {formatted}'
66
67         return formatted.strip()
68
69 # Returns the set product of a list of base question with the respective set of
70 # objects.
71 def combine_questions(base_questions: list[str], objects: list[dict[str, str]],
72 lim_questions: Optional[int] = None) -> list[Question]:
73     questions = []
74     for bq in base_questions:
75         for obj in objects:
76             q = Question.orNothing(obj = obj['object'], category =
77             obj['category'], base_question = bq)
78             if q is None:
79                 continue
80
81             questions.append(q)
82
83     if lim_questions is None:
84         return questions
85
86     keep_nums = {x: e for e, x in enumerate(random.sample(range(len(questions)),
87     lim_questions))}
88     short_questions = [questions[x] for x in keep_nums.keys()]
89
90     return short_questions

```

```

83
84 # Given a list of questions and a list of answers, produce a list of integers
    that would provide the
85 # index to a randomly sampled counterfactual.
86 def sample_counterfactual_flips(questions: list[Question], answers: list[str]) ->
    list[int]:
87     flips = [-1 for _ in questions]
88
89     for q, es_iter in itertools.groupby(range(len(questions)), key = lambda e:
    questions[e].base_question):
90         es = set(es_iter)
91
92         for e in es:
93             rest = [x for x in es if answers[x] != answers[e]]
94             if not rest:
95                 logging.error(f'Unitary question "{q}". This means that all
    answers in this chunk are identical, and the results will be incorrect.')
96                 flips[e] = e
97                 continue
98
99                 flips[e] = random.choice(rest)
100                 assert answers[flips[e]] != answers[e]
101
102     assert all(x != -1 for x in flips)
103     return flips
104
105 # Chunk a list of question into batches of size or at most 'max_batch_size'.
106 def chunk_questions(questions: list[Question], max_batch_size: int) ->
    list[list[Question]]:
107     result: list[list[Question]] = []
108
109     for q, chunk_iter in itertools.groupby(questions, key = lambda x:
    x.base_question):
110         chunk = list(chunk_iter)
111         if not result or len(chunk) + len(result[-1]) > max_batch_size:
112             result.append([])
113
114             result[-1].extend(chunk)
115
116     return result
117
118 # Prints a CSV file with the questions and resulting answers.
119 def print_parametric_csv(out: typing.TextIO, answer: dict[str, list[Any]]):
120     fieldnames = ['Num', 'Category', 'Base_Question', 'Object', 'Question',
    'Prefix'] + list(answer.keys())
121
122     writer = csv.DictWriter(
123         out,
124         fieldnames = fieldnames,
125         extrasaction = 'ignore',
126         dialect = csv.unix_dialect,
127         quoting = csv.QUOTE_MINIMAL,
128     )
129     writer.writeheader()
130
131     for e, answers in enumerate(zip(*answer.values())):
132         param = dict(zip(answer.keys(), answers))
133
134         question = param['question']
135         param.pop('question')
136
137         writer.writerow(

```

```

138         {
139             'Num': str(e),
140             'Category': question.category,
141             'Base_Question':
142             ''.join(question.base_question.partition('?')[0:2]),
143             'Object': question.obj,
144             'Question': question.format(use_later = False),
145             'Prefix': question.format(use_question = False)
146         } | param

```

Listing 7: Utils.py contains various useful functions

```

1  import unittest
2  from unittest import TestCase
3  from unittest.mock import MagicMock
4
5  import torch
6  from torch import tensor
7
8  from QuestionAnswerer import QuestionAnswerer
9
10 pad = 128002
11 class QuestionAnswererTests(unittest.TestCase):
12     def setUp(self):
13         self.qa = QuestionAnswerer('dummy', 'cpu', None)
14         # self.qa.llm.tokenizer = MagicMock()
15         self.qa.llm.tokenizer.pad_token_id = pad
16         self.qa.llm.tokenizer.batch_decode = MagicMock(
17             return_value = ['Hello how are you', 'Newline here', 'No stop
18 string', ''])
19     )
20     def test_winner(self):
21         logits = tensor([
22             [[0.0900, 0.2447, 0.6652], [0.6652, 0.2447, 0.0900], [0.2447, 0.6652,
23 0.0900]],
24             [[0.2119, 0.2119, 0.5761], [0.2119, 0.2119, 0.5761], [0.2119, 0.2119,
25 0.5761]],
26             [[0.6652, 0.2447, 0.0900], [0.2119, 0.5761, 0.2119], [0.5761, 0.2119,
27 0.2119]],
28         ])
29         expected_path = tensor([[2, 0, 1], [2, 2, 2], [0, 1, 0]])
30         expected_probs = tensor([
31             [0.6652, 0.6652, 0.6652],
32             [0.5761, 0.5761, 0.5761],
33             [0.6652, 0.5761, 0.5761],
34         ])
35         path, probs = self.qa.winner(logits)
36         self.assertTrue(torch.equal(path, expected_path), msg = (path,
37 expected_path))
38         self.assertTrue(torch.allclose(probs, expected_probs), msg = (probs,
39 expected_probs))
40     def test_decode(self):
41         path = tensor([
42             [128000, 9906, 1268, 527, 499, 13, 358, 1097, 3815, 7060, 9901,
43 499, 13],
44             [128000, 3648, 1074, 1618, 198, 54953, 0, 13, 1234, 1234, 1234,

```

```

1234, 1234],
42     [128000, 2822, 3009, 925, 1234, 1234, 1234, 1234, 1234, 1234,
1234, 1234],
43     [128000, 13, 1234, 1234, 1234, 1234, 1234, 1234, 1234, 1234, 1234,
1234, 1234],
44 ]
45 probs = tensor([
46     [1., 3., 5., 7., 9., 11., 13., 15., 17., 19., 21., 23., 25.],
47     [1., 3., 5., 7., 9., 11., 13., 15., 17., 19., 21., 23., 25.],
48     [1., 3., 5., 7., 9., 11., 13., 15., 17., 19., 21., 23., 25.],
49     [1., 3., 5., 7., 9., 11., 13., 15., 17., 19., 21., 23., 25.],
50 ])
51
52 expected_result = [
53     'Hello how are you',
54     'Newline here',
55     'No stop string',
56     '',
57 ]
58 expected_mean_probs = [5., 4., 13., 1.]
59
60 result, mean_probs = self.qa.decode(path, probs)
61 self.assertEqual(expected_result, result)
62 self.assertEqual(expected_mean_probs, mean_probs)

```

**Listing 8:** `test.QuestionAnswerer.py` is used to test some of the complicated bits of logic in `QuestionAnswerer`.