Monotonic Paraphrasing Improves Generalization of Language Model Prompting

Qin Liu^(A) Fei Wang^(f) Nan Xu^(f) Tianyi Yan^(f) Tao Meng ^{Ucla} Muhao Chen^(A)

Abstract

Performance of large language models (LLMs) may vary with different prompts or instructions of even the same task. One commonly recognized factor for this phenomenon is the model's familiarity with the given prompt or instruction, which is typically estimated by its perplexity. However, finding the prompt with the lowest perplexity is challenging, given the enormous space of possible prompting phrases. In this paper, we propose monotonic paraphrasing (MONOPARA), an end-to-end decoding strategy that paraphrases given prompts or instructions into their lower perplexity counterparts based on an ensemble of a paraphrase LM for prompt (or instruction) rewriting, and a target LM (i.e. the prompt or instruction executor) that constrains the generation for lower perplexity. The ensemble decoding process can efficiently paraphrase the original prompt without altering its semantic meaning, while monotonically decreasing the perplexity of each generation as calculated by the target LM. We explore in detail both greedy and search-based decoding as two alternative decoding schemes of MONOPARA. Notably, MONOPARA does not require any training and can monotonically lower the perplexity of the paraphrased prompt or instruction, leading to improved performance of zero-shot LM prompting as evaluated on a wide selection of tasks. In addition, MONOPARA is also shown to effectively improve LMs' generalization on perturbed and unseen task instructions.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable proficiency in zero-shot decision making (Gonen et al., 2023; Schick and Schütze, 2021; Brown et al., 2020) and instruction following (Jiang et al., 2023; Köpf et al., 2023; Touvron et al., 2023b; Taori et al., 2023; Chiang et al., 2023; Ouyang et al., 2022). However, there can be significant variance in the performance of seemingly similar prompts (Zhao et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2022c; Webson and Pavlick, 2022; Gonen et al., 2023). Despite efforts of studies on prompting LMs (Shin et al., 2020; Li and Liang, 2021; Gao et al., 2021; Ding et al., 2022; Sanh et al., 2021; Kojima et al., 2022), it is still challenging to develop high-quality prompts that can induce better performance for varying tasks on evolving models in an effort-saving manner.

One consensus reached by recent studies is the inverse relationship between a prompt's perplexity and its task performance (Kumar et al., 2023; Gonen et al., 2023). This stems from the intuition that the frequency of a prompt (or an instruction)¹ appearing in the (pre-)training data positively influences the model's familiarity with it, thereby enhancing its capability to perform the described task (Iter et al., 2023; Gonen et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2023). As a result, existing attempts use specific criteria, especially perplexity for selecting prompts from a collection of candidates. For example, Gonen et al. (2023) builds a large prompt pool for each task and selects the one with the lowest perplexity. However, the performance of such rewrite-then-select methods (Jiang et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2022; Gonen et al., 2023; Prasad et al., 2023) is limited by the size, quality, and even availability of the candidate pool. Searching the prompt with the lowest perplexity for a particular task remains challenging due to the vast expanse of potential prompts.

To address this challenge, we propose a novel progressive *end-to-end* prompt refining approach, namely monotonic paraphrasing (MONOPARA), that can *proactively* rewrite the given prompt into its low-perplexity counterpart without compromising its expressiveness of the task. During prompt (or instruction) refinement, MONOPARA conducts an ensemble decoding process of a paraphrasing

¹We use the terms "prompt" and "instruction" interchangeably in this paper as they both refer to a natural language command for zero-shot inference.

model together with the target LM. The paraphrase model is instructed to rewrite the given prompt of a specific task, while the target model, which is later on used for task inference, provides a constraint that aims to lower the perplexity of the generation. MONOPARA iteratively decodes tokens based on the ensemble of these two models. Intuitively, the paraphrase model can genuinely paraphrase the original prompt without altering its semantic meaning and remain instructive for the given task, while the target model restricts the search space of paraphrased tokens to those with low perplexity, resulting in a task prompt that the target model is more familiar with.

Further, for the decoding process of MONOPARA, we explore two decoding schemes. In addition to greedy decoding ($\S2.3$) that iteratively generates the next token based on the weighted combination of predicted probabilities from both models, we also explored search-based decoding $(\S2.4)$. The search-based decoding scheme follows the look-ahead decoding paradigm (Lu et al., 2022b), which keeps several sequence candidates and maintains the one with the lowest perplexity scored by the target model. Compared to recent prompt refinement approaches (Gonen et al., 2023; Kumar et al., 2023; Shum et al., 2023), MONOPARA needs zero training effort and far less computational cost, and do not require pre-existence of multiple prompt or instruction candidates (Gonen et al., 2023). We find that by an ensemble of two LMs, we are able to consistently decode lower perplexity prompts, which would in turn bring about better generalization of LMs on downstream tasks.

Our contributions are three-fold. First, we raise the intuition that the greedy generation of prompted paraphrasing is not monotonic in perplexity (§2.1). Second, we explore and compare two distinct decoding strategies that proactively refine prompts by monotonically lowering their perplexity and maintaining their expressiveness of the task. Third, we conduct experimentation for both prompt refinement for regular LMs and instruction refinement for instruction-tuned LMs to illustrate that monotonic paraphrasing improves the generalization of LM prompting.

2 Monotonic Paraphrasing

We propose MONOPARA as an ensemble-based decoding method that can refine a given prompt



Figure 1: Perplexity of x_{para} as the output paraphrase of P_{para} vs. as the input prompt of P_{tar} for the AG News dataset with Mistral 7B as both P_{para} and P_{tar} . Each point stands for a different prompt x_{para} . A lowperplexity paraphrase does not necessarily result in a low-perplexity prompt for the target model.

by paraphrasing it into a low-perplexity counterpart. We first provide intuition of MONOPARA in §2.1 and the basic of prompt paraphrasing in §2.2. Then, we formally define two decoding schemes of MONOPARA in §2.3 and §2.4.

2.1 Intuition and Methodology

Assume that the user wants to address a task specified by a given prompt x_{ori} using a target LM P_{tar} . MONOPARA seeks to refine the given prompt to its low-perplexity counterpart x_{para} (i.e. a more familiar prompt to P_{tar}), thereby enhancing model performance. However, simply paraphrasing the original prompt with a paraphrase model P_{para} does not necessarily result in a low-perplexity counterpart. This discrepancy arises from a mismatch between the perplexity of the output x_{para} from the paraphrase model and the perplexity observed when using x_{para} as the input prompt for the target model. As shown in Fig. 1, there is a lack of significant correlation between the perplexity of x_{para} as output in P_{para} and that of x_{para} as input in P_{tar} , even if we use the same model as the paraphrase and target model $(P_{para} = P_{tar})$. This observation indicates that the minimal perplexity of a paraphrased prompt could not be achieved by the paraphrase model alone.

Based on the above fact, the goal of MONOPARA is to take on the semantic hints from the paraphrase model while following the constraint of perplexity from the target model. Specifically, the paraphrase model generates paraphrases for a given prompt,



Figure 2: Two explored decoding schemes of MONOPARA. Ensemble-based decoding (bottom) combines the token probabilities from the paraphrase model and the target model in each decoding step. Search-based decoding (top) further leverages look-ahead decoding to consider the potential future impact of current choices.

while the target model constrains the paraphrase perplexity during the generation process. With an ensemble of these two models, we can leverage the strengths of both: the guided content generation capability of the paraphrase model and the lowperplexity prompt constraint of the target model. MONOPARA is thus able to produce paraphrases with lower perplexity by synergizing the benefits of both models.

2.2 Prompt Paraphrasing

We first introduce prompt paraphrasing without perplexity constraint. We consider using an LLM for prompt paraphrasing in a zero-shot manner, where the model is instructed to paraphrase the original prompt x_{ori} to a fluent and coherent counterpart x_{para} with a system prompt x_{sys} , such as the following one:

The System Prompt for Paraphrasing

Generate ONE paraphrase of the following sentence.

Specifically, we denote the input of paraphrase model, including the concatenation of the system prompt x_{sys} and the original prompt x_{ori} that the model is instructed to rewrite, as $[x_{sys}, x_{ori}] = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, where x_i is a token in the vocabulary V. Suppose the decoder of a pre-trained autoregressive language model P_{para} generates continuations of length m as the requested paraphrase, denoted as $x_{para} = (x_{n+1}, \ldots, x_{n+m})$, based on the system prompt x_{sys} and original prompt x_{ori} . At decoding time, P_{para} iteratively decodes one token at a time

by conditioning on the preceding context:

$$P_{para}(x_{para}|x_{sys}, x_{ori}) = \prod_{i=n+1}^{n+m} P_{para}(x_i|x_{< i}),$$

where $P_{para}(x_i|x_{< i})$ is the predicted next token probability.

2.3 Ensemble-based (Greedy) MONOPARA

To introduce perplexity constraint from the target model to the paraphrase model, here we introduce the ensemble-based greedy decoding for monotonic paraphrasing (as shown in the lower half of Fig. 2). Based on the intuition delivered in §2.1, MONOPARA decodes the paraphrase iteratively, and the next token is selected based on the combination of predicted probabilities from the two LMs:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{next} &= \underset{x_i \in V}{argmax} (\alpha \cdot \log P_{tar}(x_i | x_{gen}) \\ &+ (1 - \alpha) \cdot \log P_{para}(x_i | x_{sys}, x_{ori}, x_{gen})), \end{aligned}$$

where x_{gen} denotes the sequence of generated tokens, and α determines the coefficient between the two models (Alg. 1).

By combining the prediction probabilities of both models, the ensemble can navigate the complex landscape of language generation more effectively and precisely. The paraphrase model P_{para} keeps the rewritten prompt (or instruction) remain with the original intent, while the target model P_{tar} evaluates the paraphrase's likelihood or confidence,

A	lgorit	hm 1	Ensemb	le-based	Decoding

Rea	quire:	
	x_{sys}	▷ System prompt for paraphrase
	V	⊳ Vocabulary
	P_{tar}, P_{para}	▷ Target and paraphrase models
	α	▷ Weighting factor
Ens	sure:	
	x_{gen}	▷ Generated text sequence
1:	Initialize x_{ge}	$n \leftarrow \emptyset$
2:	$x_{next} \leftarrow arg$	$P_{para}(x_i x_{sys} \oplus x_{ori}) $ \triangleright
	Generate firs	$\in V$ t token with P_{para}
3:	$x_{gen} \leftarrow x_{gen}$	$\oplus x_{next}$
4:	while not end	d of sequence do
5:	Compute	weighted log probabilities for
	each $x_i \in V$:	
6:	$score_{tar}$	$\leftarrow \alpha \cdot \log P_{tar}(x_i x_{gen})$
7:	$score_{pare}$	$a \leftarrow (1 - \alpha) \cdot \log P_{para}(x_i x_{sys} \oplus x_{sys})$
	$x_{ori} \oplus x_{gen})$	
8:	$x_{next} \leftarrow$	$\underset{x_i \in V}{argmax} (score_{tar} + score_{para})$
9:	$x_{gen} \leftarrow x_{gen}$	$x_{gen} \oplus x_{next}$
10:	end while	
11:	return x_{gen}	

up-weighting any generation samples that lead towards low-perplexity outcomes. Based on the ensemble, the next token is selected by maximizing the weighted sum of logarithmic probabilities from both models, considering both the instruction and the generated text thus far.

As a coefficient, α balances the contribution of each model, ensuring that the final output satisfies both semantic fidelity to the prompt intent and linguistic familiarity to the target model. Higher α increases the weight of the logarithmic probability derived from the target model P_{tar} and cuts down on the semantic hints for P_{para} , which raises the risk of sacrificing the semantic fidelity of the generation. Conversely, a lower α shifts the emphasis towards P_{para} , placing greater value on ensuring that the generated text closely follows the instructional context and semantic intent from P_{para} . In this case, the decoding process lacks the constraint of perplexity from P_{tar} and sacrifices the linguistic familiarity of the generated paraphrase for the target model.

2.4 Search-based MONOPARA

To further enhance the efficiency of decoding prompts of lower perplexity, we define the searchbased decoding strategy for MONOPARA (as shown in the upper half of Fig. 2). To take more steps of token generation into account and expand the search space, we leverage look-ahead decoding to search for the sequence that exhibits the lowest perplexity from an even broader candidate space. Following Lu et al. (2022a), each step of our search-based decoding consists of (i) expanding a set of candidate next-tokens, (ii) scoring each candidate, and (iii) selecting the k best candidates (Alg. 2 in Appx. §A):

$$\begin{aligned} X'_{m} &= \{ \mathbf{x}_{< m} \circ x_{m} | \mathbf{x}_{< m} \in X_{m-1}, x_{m} \in V \}, \\ X_{m} &= \underset{(x_{< m}, x_{m}) \in X'_{m}}{\arg topk} \{ f(\mathbf{x}_{< m}, x_{m}) \}, \end{aligned}$$

where x_m is a candidate predicted by paraphrase model, and $f(\cdot)$ is a scoring function that returns the perplexity of $x_{\leq m} \circ x_m$ evaluated by the target model:

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{< m}, x_m) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{P_{tar}(x_i | x_{< i})}\right)^{\frac{1}{m}}.$$
 (1)

Specifically, at each step m of the decoding process, the current set of sequences X_{m-1} is expanded by appending the most probable next-token x_m , predicted by the paraphrase model P_{para} , from vocabulary V to each sequence $x_{<m}$. This results in a temporary expanded set of candidate sequences X'_m . Each candidate sequence in X'_m is then evaluated by the scoring function $f(\cdot)$ shown in Eq. 1, which calculates the perplexity of a sequence by the target model P_{tar} . Since a paraphrase of lower perplexity is preferred, the k sequences with the best scores (i.e., lowest perplexity) are selected to form the set X_m , narrowing down the choices to the k most promising sequences for continuation.

In comparison to greedy decoding, this lookahead decoding mechanism evaluates a broader range of potential future impact from current choices (i.e., the selection of x_m), thereby allowing for a more informed and potentially more accurate selection of candidates.

3 Experiment

In this section, we demonstrate two distinct experimental settings for evaluation. In §3.1, we examine MONOPARA's effectiveness on prompt refinement for eliciting better task performance. In §3.2, we evaluate MONOPARA's effect on enhancing model robustness and generalization under instruction perturbations.

3.1 Task I: Prompt Refinement

Task Description To inspect if monotonic paraphrasing can refine a prompt and elicit better performance on prompting an LLM as designed, we use SUPER-NATURALINSTRUCTION (SUP-NATINST for short, Wang et al., 2022). This benchmark consists of 1,616 diverse NLP tasks and their expertwritten prompts for evaluating the zero-shot generalizability of LLMs on a variety of NLP tasks. In SUP-NATINST, each task is paired up with an instruction that consists of the task definition for mapping an input text to a task output and several examples for demonstrating the desired or undesired output. To make our evaluation more challenging, we only use the task definition as a prompt. Since SUP-NATINST provides only one description of definition for each task, we use GPT4 (Achiam et al., 2023) to generate 4 more SUP-NATINSTlike task descriptions for each involved task, which results in 5 prompts for each task in total.

Datasets Following Gonen et al. (2023), we choose 7 classification tasks from Huggingface Datasets ² to have a set of diverse tasks: (i) **GLUE** Cola (Warstadt et al., 2019) for grammatical acceptability discrimination; (ii) Newspop (Moniz and Torgo, 2018) for news classification; (iii)AG News (Zhang et al., 2015) for news classification; (iv) IMDB (Maas et al., 2011) for movie review sentiment analysis; (v) DBpedia (Lehmann et al., 2015) for topic classification; (vi) Emotion (Saravia et al., 2018) for tweet emotion classification; and (vii) Tweet Offensive (Barbieri et al., 2020) for offensive tweet discrimination. We sample 1,000 random examples from each dataset for prompt evaluation. For these tasks, the prompt follows the input, and at the end of each prompt, we add the choices of classes following Gonen et al. (2023): "Choices: X, Y, Z. Answer: " as it helps with accuracy. Defining the label space likely helps in the zero-shot setting because there are no previous demonstrations from which the model can learn the possible classes.

Evaluation Metrics To inspect whether monotonic paraphrasing can refine a prompt into its low-perplexity counterpart and further enhance the generalization of LLM prompting, we use PPL (perplexity), Acc (accuracy), and BS (BERTScore, Zhang* et al., 2020) for evaluation. **Perplexity.** Following Gonen et al. (2023), we define the perplexity of the prompt as the perplexity of the full prompt sequence, including the input itself and the choices of labels. To avoid noise when computing perplexity, the prompts are instantiated with 1,000 random examples of the dataset (we keep the same selected examples for performance evaluation), and the perplexity is averaged across all instantiated prompts. BERTScore. As a paraphrasing scheme, MONOPARA is also evaluated by its performance in semantic alignment with the source sentence. BERTScore computes a similarity score for each token in the paraphrase sentence with each token in the source sentence, which is evaluated based on pre-trained BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) contextual embeddings. Accuracy. To compute accuracy, for each test sample, we obtain the model's predicted probability of all classes and choose the highest ranking class as the prediction of the model. We use this metric over exact match for its stableness since the chances the model will generate an exact match of the label are relatively low and might appear in various formats. The accuracy is calculated over the 1,000 samples for each task.

Models We study two auto-regressive models, Mistral-7B (Jiang et al., 2023)and Starling-7B (Zhu et al., 2023a), for their significant ability in instruction following and paraphrasing.

Baselines We compare our method with two baselines: **SPELL** (Gonen et al., 2023) and vanilla LLM-based paraphrasing (**Para**). Based on similar intuition that low perplexity and better performance exhibit strong correlation, **SPELL** (**Selecting Prompts by Estimating LM Likelihood**) ranks and selects the prompts with the lowest perplexity for a given task after creating a set of prompt candidates manually and expanding them to hundred-scale using automatic paraphrasing and back-translation. **Para** paraphrases source prompts with greedy decoding (top-1 sampling) by directly prompting the target LLM with the instruction introduced in §2.2.

Results As shown in Tab. 1, the two variants of MONOPARA successfully refine prompts to those with perplexities lower than the original ones, thereby enhancing model performance on 10 out of 14 scenarios (2 models, each on 7 datasets). Specifically, Mono-E (ensembled-based MONOPARA) improves the accuracy of Mistral-7B by an average of 2.64% and that of Starling-7B by an average of 1.85% on seven different datasets. In contrast,

²https://huggingface.co/docs/datasets/index

Methods	Metric	GLUE Cola	Newspop	AG News	IMDB	DBpedia	Emotion	Tweet Offensive
				Mistr	al 7B			
Ori.	Acc PPL	61.76 ± 2.93 15.72 ± 4.60	85.28 ± 3.45 12.60 ± 2.40	67.68 ± 3.47 12.74 ± 1.07	84.12 ± 4.89 16.41 ± 0.80	70.82 ± 2.27 8.10 ± 0.22	44.32 ± 1.57 16.48 ± 2.14	67.04 ± 0.95 19.25 ± 3.43
SPELL	Acc PPL	43.42 ± 1.16 8.24 ± 0.88	81.08 ± 7.2 15.05 ± 4.15	73.88 ± 3.18 15.99 ± 3.77	86.00 ± 0.81 15.76 ± 1.42	71.02 ± 1.70 25.36 ± 6.80	46.80 ± 1.12 15.67 ± 5.21	65.06 ± 1.04 14.31 ± 0.93
Para	Acc PPL BS	$\begin{array}{c} 39.48 \pm 8.19 \\ 78.01 \pm 11.22 \\ 88.88 \pm 0.74 \end{array}$	76.72 ± 16.54 49.37 ± 7.81 87.47 ± 0.84	71.60 ± 2.70 28.37 ± 2.58 86.32 ± 2.08	86.60 ± 4.86 22.27 ± 0.98 90.23 ± 0.99	$\begin{array}{c} 70.22 \pm 5.71 \\ 28.34 \pm 1.36 \\ 86.96 \pm 0.93 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 43.65 \pm 3.41 \\ 46.53 \pm 5.30 \\ 90.08 \pm 0.35 \end{array}$	65.04 ± 1.46 53.65 ± 1.92 89.93 ± 0.67
Mono-E	Acc PPL BS	63.96 ± 3.88 14.89 ± 2.75 93.03 ± 2.15	88.96 ± 3.04 8.33 ± 1.30 92.85 ± 2.35	72.20 ± 3.87 10.07 ± 2.93 88.70 ± 2.35	87.58 ± 3.27 13.05 ± 1.86 89.35 ± 2.60	$72.07 \pm 3.54 \\ 8.85 \pm 0.88 \\ 93.21 \pm 1.16$	47.76 ± 3.72 13.67 ± 1.87 92.74 ± 2.75	67.00 ± 1.21 14.11 ± 3.53 91.73 ± 1.32
Mono-S	Acc PPL BS	$\begin{array}{c} 62.31 \pm 6.17 \\ 15.85 \pm 4.88 \\ 92.47 \pm 2.00 \end{array}$	86.34 ± 5.16 11.95 ± 2.09 93.78 ± 2.68	70.80 ± 3.44 9.89 ± 1.31 91.57 ± 2.23	83.48 ± 2.87 16.38 ± 1.63 89.66 ± 3.25	72.46 ± 3.00 8.63 ± 0.41 95.87 ± 1.20	44.26 ± 3.05 15.03 ± 1.65 93.42 ± 1.02	65.66 ± 2.43 18.35 ± 4.07 91.62 ± 2.48
				Starli	ng 7B			
Ori.	Acc PPL	55.18 ± 12.43 16.38 ± 4.18	93.78 ± 1.18 12.77 ± 2.59	88.44 ± 1.18 12.10 ± 0.91	96.46 ± 0.17 15.56 ± 0.57	94.06 ± 0.37 8.11 ± 0.22	55.48 ± 0.91 17.90 ± 2.82	64.62 ± 0.18 20.41 ± 3.90
SPELL	Acc PPL	46.46 ± 6.70 44.96 ± 18.23	89.84 ± 0.91 54.60 ± 18.72	83.72 ± 0.26 16.81 ± 0.91	92.84 ± 2.7 56.34 ± 15.67	92.02 ± 0.64 28.66 ± 9.47	54.82 ± 1.81 32.79 ± 8.53	64.20 ± 0.17 33.56 ± 3.83
Para	Acc PPL BS	40.38 ± 15.49 70.50 ± 16.38 90.35 ± 0.67	$\begin{array}{c} 82.67 \pm 19.63 \\ 54.41 \pm 8.80 \\ 88.35 \pm 0.51 \end{array}$	86.39 ± 2.92 30.67 ± 2.81 88.46 ± 0.98	96.66 ± 0.34 21.78 ± 1.37 90.04 ± 1.04	$\begin{array}{c} 93.10 \pm 1.79 \\ 26.56 \pm 1.39 \\ 87.06 \pm 0.79 \end{array}$	51.10 ± 10.18 58.87 ± 4.44 90.38 ± 0.45	64.44 ± 0.08 11.71 \pm 0.86 79.93 \pm 11.52
Mono-E	Acc PPL BS	69.62 ± 4.12 8.56 ± 1.00 93.00 ± 0.85	95.15 ± 0.59 10.12 \pm 1.02 94.19 \pm 0.94	85.40 ± 4.22 8.52 ± 0.76 91.06 ± 1.51	96.22 ± 0.47 12.60 ± 1.57 92.85 ± 1.39	$\begin{array}{c} 94.05 \pm 0.42 \\ 9.58 \pm 0.86 \\ 93.23 \pm 0.50 \end{array}$	56.10 ± 1.08 9.23 ± 0.97 93.28 ± 0.26	$64.45 \pm 0.09 \\ 11.71 \pm 0.86 \\ 93.69 \pm 1.52$
Mono-S	Acc PPL BS	50.96 ± 11.52 14.05 ± 3.76 92.69 ± 0.99	$88.20 \pm 3.74 \\ 12.55 \pm 2.07 \\ 95.83 \pm 1.66$	83.61 ± 6.30 10.61 ± 1.06 93.92 ± 2.23	$92.96 \pm 4.78 \\ 16.44 \pm 0.92 \\ 93.01 \pm 1.25$	$92.82 \pm 2.17 \\ 8.39 \pm 0.53 \\ 96.99 \pm 0.70$	$54.90 \pm 2.32 \\ 16.28 \pm 2.18 \\ 94.78 \pm 1.25$	66.80 ± 1.22 20.17 ± 3.17 94.45 ± 1.43

Table 1: Results of Task I (Prompt Refinement). Ori. refers to the original prompts. Greedy refers to paraphrasing the original prompts without perplexity constraint. Mono-E refers to ensemble-based MONOPARA. Mono-S refers to search-based MONOPARA. The best accuracy for each task is in **bold**, while the lowest perplexity for each task is in **blue**.

directly paraphrasing the prompts without perplexity constraint (Para) results in prompts with higher perplexities than the original ones in 13 out of 14 scenarios, most of which lead to worse task performance. This highlights the importance of incorporating perplexity constraints when paraphrasing prompts.

Besides, our method outperforms SPELL with consistently lower perplexity and superior task performance with the refined prompt. This superiority stems from the fact that, although SPELL explores a vast search space with hundred-scale prompt candidates, the candidates are searched in an ad hoc manner without an optimization goal, leading to inefficiencies in prompt rewriting or paraphrasing. In contrast, our method incorporates the perplexity constraint that lead to optimized target-model perplexity during one single refined prompt generation process, leading to both enhanced task performance and refinement efficiency.

Moreover, MONOPARA achieves superior performance in terms of both average prompt perplexity and BertScore, indicating the synergistic role played by both the target model and the paraphrase model in prompt refinement. During decoding, the target model prioritizes achieving low perplexity, while the paraphrase model preserves the original prompt intent, resulting in a high BertScore.

3.2 Task II: Robustness Evaluation on Instruction Perturbation

We further evaluate MONOPARA's effectiveness in enhancing model robustness against various instruction perturbations at character, word, sentence, and semantic levels using PromptBench (Zhu et al., 2023b).

Task Description PromptBench introduces perturbation to task instructions of a diverse set of tasks, such as sentiment analysis, grammar correctness, duplicate sentence detection, and natural language inference. It includes perturbations at character-level using DeepWordBug (Gao et al., 2018) to introduce typos, word-level using TextFooler (Jin et al., 2020) to replace words with contextually similar words, and semantic-level by using prompts following the linguistic behavior of different languages.

Datasets We select 4 GLUE tasks (Wang et al., 2018) from Huggingface Datasets for evaluation: (i) **Cola**, which is also used for Task I; (ii) **SST-2** (Socher et al., 2013) for two-way sentiment classification; (iii) **MNLI** (Wang et al., 2018) for multigenre inference identification; and (iv) **MRPC** (Dolan and Brockett, 2005) for paraphrase identification. Similar to the setting of Task I, the instruction follows the input, and at the end of each instruction, the choices of labels are appended: "Choices: X, Y, Z. Answer: ."

Model For this task, we use Alpaca (Taori et al., 2023), a model instruction-tuned from the LLaMA model (Touvron et al., 2023a) on the 52k self-instruct dataset.

Results As shown in Fig. 3, we compare the performance of original prompts, prompts paraphrased without perplexity constraint, and our method Mono-E. Across all kinds of instruction perturbations, our method achieves consistent accuracy improvement by up to 10.13%. This notable increase in performance demonstrates that MONOPARA not only refines prompts for improved task performance but also enhances model robustness against various instruction perturbations.

3.3 Effect of Coefficient

We further analyze the effect of coefficient α between the target model and the paraphrase model in MONOPARA. Tab. 2 presents a case study of α on the ensemble-based decoding variant (Mono-E) with a prompt under character-level perturbation. Obviously, a larger value of α amplifies the influence of the target model, resulting in a stronger perplexity constraint and monotonically lower perplexity. Consequently, the impact of the paraphrase model is diminished, leading to a lower BertScore. By adjusting α , the user can find a balanced point to achieve better prompts that strike a balance between semantic fidelity to the original prompt intent and linguistic familiarity to the target model.



Figure 3: Model's average accuracy across 4 GLUE datasets, with each dataset having six instructions with perturbation added at character, word, and semantic levels. Mono-E has consistent improvement in accuracy across all types of perturbation compared to vanilla paraphrasing.

4 Related Work

Paraphrasing. Paraphrase generation has been a longstanding task in NLP. Since the era of deep learning, studies have adopted the universal paradigm of training sequence-to-sequence generation models based on abundant learning resources (Nema et al., 2017; Gupta et al., 2018; Li et al., 2018). While more recent works have leveraged more robust pre-trained language models that captured rich supervision signals from various sequence-to-sequence generation tasks (Raffel et al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2020) and achieving even more robust performance of paraphrasing with relatively limited end-task supervision (Sun et al., 2021; Meng et al., 2021; Bui et al., 2021). In addition to these advancements, a series of works have added auxiliary supervision signals such as syntactical guidance, lexical regularization, and cross-lingual supervision, to further improve the performance and controllability of paraphrasing in aspects such as syntactic structures, stylistic specification, or textual simplicity (Iyyer et al., 2018; Li et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2019; Kumar et al., 2020; Goyal and Durrett, 2020; Hosking and Lapata, 2021; Chowdhury et al., 2022).

Different from existing paraphrasing techniques, this work conducts constrained decoding methods that seek to monotonically decrease the perplexity in the process of paraphrasing. This innovative approach serves as a general approach to rewrite and refine prompts or task instructions towards their more familiar counterparts for LMs, seeking to en-

		Content		PPL
Ori Instruction		Read the provided excerpt and choose between 'positive' and 'negative' to describe its sentiment Iyk1lJt8yw:		78.12
Para		Determine the sentiment of the given excerpt as either positive or negative	81.26	44.29
	$\alpha = 0.2$	Determine the sentiment of the given text by selecting either 'positive' or 'negative'.	86.18	24.90
Mono	$\alpha = 0.5$	Determine the sentiment of the given text by classifying it as positive or negative.	80.22	16.27
	$\alpha = 0.7$	Determine the remainder when 101 is divided by 10.\n A: 1	50.22	4.53

Table 2: Effect of coefficient α on Mono-E with Mistral-7B model.

hance the generalization of LM prompting without the need of any training effort.

Prompt Refinement. Prompt refinement has been actively explored in recent years with the aim of selecting, retrieving, or even generating prompts that lead to improved zero-shot performance of LM prompting. When an end-task objective is known, prior works on prompt refinement approaches often set the end-task performance as the objective, and leverage approaches such as gradient-based search, similar to continuous prompts but with projections onto a discrete vocabulary (Shin et al., 2020). Other works have explored edit-based enumeration (Prasad et al., 2023), reinforcement learning (Deng et al., 2022), and large language model continuation and filtering (Zhou et al., 2022). As for general purpose LLMs, a dedicated prompt refinement approach may not assume the pre-existance of any specific end tasks. Hence, more recent works Iter et al. (2023); Gonen et al. (2023); Wang et al. (2023); Lee et al. (2023) explored the heuristic criterion based on the familiarity of the language model with the language contained in the prompt, as measured by its perplexity. Lower perplexity prompts are preferred as they are expected to perform better across a wide range of tasks.

While the last line of research has relieved the generic principle for improving zero-shot LLM prompting generalizability, these studies are largely limited to selecting among pre-existing prompts or multiple beam search samples. Our proposed monotonic paraphrasing approach, however, can proactively rewrite a prompt or task instruction into counterparts that better satisfy the above heuristic criterion, without the need of any pre-existing candidate prompts or any training effort.

Ensemble and Search-based Decoding. The proposed two decoding schemes of MONOPARA are connected to both ensemble decoding and search-based decoding approaches in recent studies. En-

semble decoding has been previously proposed for purposes including debiasing (Li et al., 2023), controllable generation (Meng et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2023), and cross-modality data processing (Liu et al., 2023). Search-based decoding, on the other hand, is proposed to efficiently extend the search space of generation samples for satisfying specific constraints or criteria (Lu et al., 2022a; Wuebker et al., 2012; Lee and Berg-Kirkpatrick, 2022; Xu et al., 2023). Representative approaches include look-ahead (Lu et al., 2022a) and look-back (Xu et al., 2023) ones that search within the beam space towards different directions.

The explored decoding schemes in MONOPARA are inspired by both lines of studies on decoding approaches. Specifically, the first line is related to our design choice for composing the probabilities of both the paraphrasing and the target LMs in greedy generation. And our search-based decoding scheme is specifically inspired by the look-ahead decoding strategy in the second line of studies.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose monotonic paraphrasing (MONOPARA) for automatically and iteratively generating low-perplexity prompts for given LLMs, that can lead to better task performance. Following the high-level idea of paraphrasing prompts with perplexity constraints from the target LLM, we design ensemble-based and search-based decoding strategies for efficient prompt refinement. Experiments on prompt variations of unseen tasks and instructions demonstrate the effectiveness of MONOPARA in reducing prompt perplexity while enhancing task performance and model robustness. Future work may apply MONOPARA on other scenarios, such as searching stealthy prompts for redteaming. Replacing perplexity with other criteria for different purposes of constrained generation are also meaningful research directions.

Limitations

The current investigation of MONOPARA has the following limitations. First, using the target model as the paraphrase model is a natural technical choice. However, examining other paraphrasing models, especially those customized for paraphrasing, may lead to better performance. Second, our proposed method can not be applied to black-box LLMs such as ChatGPT³, PaLM (Chowdhery et al., 2023), Claude⁴, etc. This limitation arises from the necessity of access to the decoding phase, which in turn comes with far less computational cost due to zero training, and does not require the pre-existence of multiple prompt or instruction candidates. Third, while we conduct experiments on a wide range of tasks, their original prompts and responses are relatively short. This actually limits the operational space of MONOPARA. Experiments on tasks with longer inputs and outputs may provide additional evidence of MONOPARA's effectiveness.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Francesco Barbieri, Jose Camacho-Collados, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Leonardo Neves. 2020. TweetEval: Unified benchmark and comparative evaluation for tweet classification. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1644–1650, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. Advances in neural information processing systems, 33:1877–1901.
- Tien-Cuong Bui, Van-Duc Le, Hai-Thien To, and Sang Kyun Cha. 2021. Generative pre-training for paraphrase generation by representing and predicting spans in exemplars. In 2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data and Smart Computing (Big-Comp), pages 83–90. IEEE.
- Mingda Chen, Qingming Tang, Sam Wiseman, and Kevin Gimpel. 2019. Controllable paraphrase generation with a syntactic exemplar. In *Proceedings of*

the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 5972–5984, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. 2023. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality. See https://vicuna. lmsys. org (accessed 14 April 2023).
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2023. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(240):1–113.
- Jishnu Ray Chowdhury, Yong Zhuang, and Shuyi Wang. 2022. Novelty controlled paraphrase generation with retrieval augmented conditional prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 10535–10544.
- Mingkai Deng, Jianyu Wang, Cheng-Ping Hsieh, Yihan Wang, Han Guo, Tianmin Shu, Meng Song, Eric Xing, and Zhiting Hu. 2022. RLPrompt: Optimizing discrete text prompts with reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3369–3391, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ning Ding, Shengding Hu, Weilin Zhao, Yulin Chen, Zhiyuan Liu, Haitao Zheng, and Maosong Sun. 2022. OpenPrompt: An open-source framework for promptlearning. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 105–113, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bill Dolan and Chris Brockett. 2005. Automatically constructing a corpus of sentential paraphrases. In *Third International Workshop on Paraphrasing* (*IWP2005*).
- Ji Gao, Jack Lanchantin, Mary Lou Soffa, and Yanjun Qi. 2018. Black-box Generation of Adversarial Text Sequences to Evade Deep Learning Classifiers. ArXiv:1801.04354 [cs].
- Tianyu Gao, Adam Fisch, and Danqi Chen. 2021. Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners. In Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics

³https://chat.openai.com

⁴https://www.anthropic.com/claude

and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 3816–3830, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Hila Gonen, Srini Iyer, Terra Blevins, Noah Smith, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. Demystifying prompts in language models via perplexity estimation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 10136–10148, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tanya Goyal and Greg Durrett. 2020. Neural syntactic preordering for controlled paraphrase generation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 238–252, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ankush Gupta, Arvind Agarwal, Prawaan Singh, and Piyush Rai. 2018. A deep generative framework for paraphrase generation. In *Proceedings of the aaai conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32.
- Tom Hosking and Mirella Lapata. 2021. Factorising meaning and form for intent-preserving paraphrasing. In Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 1405–1418, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tenghao Huang, Ehsan Qasemi, Bangzheng Li, He Wang, Faeze Brahman, Muhao Chen, and Snigdha Chaturvedi. 2023. Affective and dynamic beam search for story generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP* 2023, pages 11792–11806, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dan Iter, Reid Pryzant, Ruochen Xu, Shuohang Wang, Yang Liu, Yichong Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. 2023. In-context demonstration selection with cross entropy difference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14726*.
- Mohit Iyyer, John Wieting, Kevin Gimpel, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Adversarial example generation with syntactically controlled paraphrase networks. In Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers), pages 1875–1885, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F. Xu, Jun Araki, and Graham Neubig. 2020. How can we know what language models know? *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:423–438.

- Di Jin, Zhijing Jin, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Peter Szolovits. 2020. Is BERT Really Robust? A Strong Baseline for Natural Language Attack on Text Classification and Entailment. ArXiv:1907.11932 [cs].
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199– 22213.
- Andreas Köpf, Yannic Kilcher, Dimitri von Rütte, Sotiris Anagnostidis, Zhi-Rui Tam, Keith Stevens, Abdullah Barhoum, Nguyen Minh Duc, Oliver Stanley, Richárd Nagyfi, et al. 2023. Openassistant conversations–democratizing large language model alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07327*.
- Ashutosh Kumar, Kabir Ahuja, Raghuram Vadapalli, and Partha Talukdar. 2020. Syntax-guided controlled generation of paraphrases. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:329–345.
- Aswanth Kumar, Ratish Puduppully, Raj Dabre, and Anoop Kunchukuttan. 2023. CTQScorer: Combining multiple features for in-context example selection for machine translation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 7736–7752, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ivan Lee and Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick. 2022. HeLo: Learning-free lookahead decoding for conversation infilling. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 4996–5008, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yoonsang Lee, Pranav Atreya, Xi Ye, and Eunsol Choi. 2023. Crafting in-context examples according to lms' parametric knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09579*.
- Jens Lehmann, Robert Isele, Max Jakob, Anja Jentzsch, Dimitris Kontokostas, Pablo N Mendes, Sebastian Hellmann, Mohamed Morsey, Patrick Van Kleef, Sören Auer, et al. 2015. Dbpedia–a large-scale, multilingual knowledge base extracted from wikipedia. *Semantic web*, 6(2):167–195.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiang Lisa Li, Ari Holtzman, Daniel Fried, Percy Liang, Jason Eisner, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2023. Contrastive decoding: Open-ended text generation as optimization. In Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1:

Long Papers), pages 12286–12312, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. In Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 4582– 4597, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zichao Li, Xin Jiang, Lifeng Shang, and Hang Li. 2018. Paraphrase generation with deep reinforcement learning. In Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 3865–3878, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zichao Li, Xin Jiang, Lifeng Shang, and Qun Liu. 2019.
 Decomposable neural paraphrase generation. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3403–3414, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shikun Liu, Linxi Fan, Edward Johns, Zhiding Yu, Chaowei Xiao, and Anima Anandkumar. 2023. Prismer: A vision-language model with multi-task experts. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Ximing Lu, Sean Welleck, Peter West, Liwei Jiang, Jungo Kasai, Daniel Khashabi, Ronan Le Bras, Lianhui Qin, Youngjae Yu, Rowan Zellers, Noah A. Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2022a. NeuroLogic a*esque decoding: Constrained text generation with lookahead heuristics. In Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 780–799, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ximing Lu, Sean Welleck, Peter West, Liwei Jiang, Jungo Kasai, Daniel Khashabi, Ronan Le Bras, Lianhui Qin, Youngjae Yu, Rowan Zellers, et al. 2022b. Neurologic a* esque decoding: Constrained text generation with lookahead heuristics. In Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 780–799.
- Yao Lu, Max Bartolo, Alastair Moore, Sebastian Riedel, and Pontus Stenetorp. 2022c. Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming fewshot prompt order sensitivity. In *Proceedings of the* 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 8086–8098, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrew L. Maas, Raymond E. Daly, Peter T. Pham, Dan Huang, Andrew Y. Ng, and Christopher Potts.
 2011. Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis. In Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human

Language Technologies, pages 142–150, Portland, Oregon, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Tao Meng, Sidi Lu, Nanyun Peng, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2022. Controllable text generation with neurallydecomposed oracle. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:28125–28139.
- Yuxian Meng, Xiang Ao, Qing He, Xiaofei Sun, Qinghong Han, Fei Wu, Chun Fan, and Jiwei Li. 2021. ConRPG: Paraphrase generation using contexts as regularizer. In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 2551–2562, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nuno Moniz and Luís Torgo. 2018. Multi-source social feedback of online news feeds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.07055*.
- Preksha Nema, Mitesh M. Khapra, Anirban Laha, and Balaraman Ravindran. 2017. Diversity driven attention model for query-based abstractive summarization. In Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 1063–1072, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Archiki Prasad, Peter Hase, Xiang Zhou, and Mohit Bansal. 2023. GrIPS: Gradient-free, edit-based instruction search for prompting large language models. In Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 3845–3864, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. 2021. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*.
- Elvis Saravia, Hsien-Chi Toby Liu, Yen-Hao Huang, Junlin Wu, and Yi-Shin Chen. 2018. CARER: Contextualized affect representations for emotion recognition. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3687–3697, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. It's not just size that matters: Small language models are also fewshot learners. In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 2339–2352, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Taylor Shin, Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L. Logan IV, Eric Wallace, and Sameer Singh. 2020. AutoPrompt: Eliciting Knowledge from Language Models with Automatically Generated Prompts. In Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP), pages 4222–4235, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- KaShun Shum, Shizhe Diao, and Tong Zhang. 2023. Automatic prompt augmentation and selection with chain-of-thought from labeled data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12822*.
- Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D. Manning, Andrew Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 1631–1642, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiao Sun, Xuezhe Ma, and Nanyun Peng. 2021. AESOP: Paraphrase generation with adaptive syntactic control. In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 5176–5189, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. 2023. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023a. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023b. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. GLUE: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP, pages 353–355, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Atharva Naik, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Anjana Arunkumar, David Stap, Eshaan Pathak, Giannis Karamanolakis, Haizhi Lai, Ishan Purohit, Ishani Mondal, Jacob Anderson, Kirby Kuznia, Krima Doshi, Kuntal Kumar Pal, Maitreya Patel, Mehrad Moradshahi, Mihir Parmar, Mirali Purohit, Neeraj Varshney, Phani Rohitha Kaza, Pulkit Verma, Ravsehaj Singh Puri, Rushang Karia, Savan Doshi, Shailaja Keyur Sampat, Siddhartha Mishra, Sujan Reddy A, Sumanta Patro, Tanay Dixit, and Xudong Shen. 2022. Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ NLP tasks. In Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 5085-5109, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zezhong Wang, Luyao Ye, Hongru Wang, Wai-Chung Kwan, David Ho, and Kam-Fai Wong. 2023. Read-Prompt: A readable prompting method for reliable knowledge probing. In *Findings of the Association* for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, pages 7468–7479, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Warstadt, Amanpreet Singh, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. Neural network acceptability judgments. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:625–641.
- Albert Webson and Ellie Pavlick. 2022. Do promptbased models really understand the meaning of their prompts? In Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 2300–2344, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joern Wuebker, Hermann Ney, and Richard Zens. 2012. Fast and scalable decoding with language model lookahead for phrase-based statistical machine translation. In Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers), pages 28–32, Jeju Island, Korea. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nan Xu, Chunting Zhou, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Xuezhe Ma. 2023. Look-back decoding for open-ended text generation. In Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 1039–1050, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tianyi Zhang*, Varsha Kishore*, Felix Wu*, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc.

- Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12697–12706. PMLR.
- Yongchao Zhou, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Ziwen Han, Keiran Paster, Silviu Pitis, Harris Chan, and Jimmy Ba. 2022. Large language models are human-level prompt engineers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01910*.
- Banghua Zhu, Evan Frick, Tianhao Wu, Hanlin Zhu, and Jiantao Jiao. 2023a. Starling-7b: Improving llm helpfulness & harmlessness with rlaif.
- Kaijie Zhu, Jindong Wang, Jiaheng Zhou, Zichen Wang, Hao Chen, Yidong Wang, Linyi Yang, Wei Ye, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, Yue Zhang, et al. 2023b. Promptbench: Towards evaluating the robustness of large language models on adversarial prompts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04528.

Appendices

A Algorithm for Search-based MONOPARA

Alg	orithm 2 Search-based Decoding
Rea	quire:
	V \triangleright Vocabulary
	$P_{tar}, P_{para} \triangleright$ Target and paraphrase models
	$k \triangleright$ Number of candidate sequences to retain
Ens	sure:
	x_{best} > Best generated sequence
1:	$X_0 \leftarrow \{\emptyset\} $ \triangleright Initialize with empty sequence
2:	while not end do
3:	$m \leftarrow \text{current decoding step}$
4:	$X'_m \leftarrow \emptyset$
5:	for each $x_{\leq m} \in X_{m-1}$ do
6:	for each $x_m \in V$ do
7:	Append $x_{\leq m} \circ x_m$ to X'_m
8:	end for
9:	end for
10:	Use P_{para} for k candidates for each $x_{\leq m}$
11:	$X_m \leftarrow arg \ topk \ \{f(\mathbf{x}_{< m}, x_m)\} $
	$(x_{\leq m}, x_m) \in X'_m$
1.0	Select k candidates with lowest perplexity
12:	$ena \leftarrow$ If any sequence ends with EOS
13:	end while
14:	$x_{best} \leftarrow$ select the sequence from X_m with the
	lowest perplexity by P_{tar}
15:	return x _{best}