

ARE WE FALLING IN A MIDDLE-INTELLIGENCE TRAP? AN ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION OF THE REVERSAL CURSE

Ang Lv*, Kaiyi Zhang*, Shufang Xie,
Quan Tu, Yuhan Chen, Ji-Rong Wen, Rui Yan†
Gaoling School of Artificial Intelligence, Remin University of China
{anglv, ruiyan}@ruc.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Recent studies have highlighted a phenomenon in large language models (LLMs) known as “the reversal curse,” in which the order of knowledge entities in the training data biases the models’ comprehension. For example, if a model is trained on sentences where entity \mathcal{A} consistently appears before entity \mathcal{B} , it can respond to queries about \mathcal{A} by providing \mathcal{B} as the answer. However, it may encounter confusion when presented with questions concerning \mathcal{B} . We contend that the reversal curse is partially a result of specific model training objectives, particularly evident in the prevalent use of the next-token prediction within most causal language models. For the next-token prediction, models solely focus on a token’s preceding context, resulting in a restricted comprehension of the input. In contrast, we illustrate that the GLM, trained using the autoregressive blank infilling objective where tokens to be predicted have access to the entire context, exhibits better resilience against the reversal curse. We propose a novel training method, **BI**directional Casual language modeling **O**ptimization (BICO¹), designed to mitigate the reversal curse when fine-tuning pretrained causal language models on new data. BICO modifies the causal attention mechanism to function bidirectionally and employs a mask denoising optimization. In the task designed to assess the reversal curse, our approach improves Llama’s accuracy from the original 0% to around 70%. We hope that more attention can be focused on exploring and addressing these inherent weaknesses of the current LLMs, in order to achieve a higher level of intelligence.

1 INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in a wide range of natural language generation and understanding tasks, and therefore promoting numerous applications including intelligent agents (Shen et al., 2023), code assistants (Rozière et al., 2023), gaming companions (Xu et al., 2023), music composition systems (Yu et al., 2023a), and even social society simulation sandboxes (Park et al., 2023), etc. In the majority of these use cases, there is a substantial demand for LLMs to fully understand the user’s intent, precisely access the grasped factual knowledge, and effectively execute the tasks (Wang et al., 2023). However, some recent works (Berglund et al., 2023; Grosse et al., 2023) point out that LLMs suffer from the “reversal curse”. This curse refers to the model’s biased understanding of the relationship between entity \mathcal{A} and entity \mathcal{B} , when \mathcal{A} consistently precedes \mathcal{B} in the training data. For instance, if an LLM only encounters “Steve Jobs and Stephen Wozniak” and “Apple Computer, Inc.” simultaneously in the training sample “Steve Jobs and Stephen Wozniak founded the Apple Computer, Inc.,” it may effectively respond to the question “Which company did Steve Jobs and Stephen Wozniak found?” but struggles to offer the correct answer when tested with “Who founded the Apple Computer, Inc.?” The reversal curse suggests that the model has not adequately grasped the knowledge present in the training data, thereby constraining the potential of LLMs in situations that demand high factual accuracy.

However, Berglund et al. (2023) focused their evaluation solely on Llama (Touvron et al., 2023a) and GPT (Brown et al., 2020). These models are built upon the widely used decoder-only trans-

*Equal contribution

†Corresponding author: Rui Yan (ruiyan@ruc.edu.cn).

¹<https://github.com/trestad/mitigating-reversal-curse>

former (Vaswani et al., 2017) with a causal attention mechanism, and are trained through an unsupervised next-token prediction objective. However, when we tested GLM (Du et al., 2022; Zeng et al., 2022)—a prefix language model pre-trained on an autoregressive blank infilling objective—using the same dataset as Berglund et al. (2023), we find that it appears to be much more resilient to the reversal curse than Llama. Interestingly, when we fine-tune GLM for the next-token prediction, it also struggles with those reversal questions.

With these findings, we argue that the “reversal curse” may be an issue to certain language models with specific training objectives². For a causal language model like Llama and GPT, their causal attention mask constrains each token to solely depend on preceding ones, and when pre-trained for next-token prediction on data in which \mathcal{A} typically precedes \mathcal{B} , the model can only maximize the likelihood of \mathcal{B} given \mathcal{A} (i.e., $p(\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A})$), with no guarantee for accurately estimating $p(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{B})$. By contrast, when training GLM for the autoregressive blank infilling, a masked token can attend to both its preceding and succeeding tokens, which implicitly considers the reversal conditional likelihood $p(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{B})$. We argue that by training causal language models with comprehensive contextual modeling for each token, they may also exhibit resistance to the reversal curse.

To further verify our hypothesis, we design a simple yet effective training framework named BICO, aimed at mitigating the reversal curse in causal language models. These models typically consist of a decoder-only causal transformer with rotary position embedding (RoPE) (Su et al., 2022), trained for next-token prediction. BICO modifies the causal attention module in Llama to function in a fully bidirectional manner, and employs an autoregressive mask denoising objective, which enhances the bidirectional dependency between entities in a knowledge piece. Our approach achieves this without the need for augmented reversal data, and preserves the model’s autoregressive generation capabilities with the standard causal attention mechanism. We evaluate BICO on the reversal tasks introduced by Berglund et al. (2023). Specifically, in the name-to-description reversal task, BICO achieves a remarkable accuracy enhancement, from an initial 0% to around 70%.

While an extensive pretraining dataset that incorporates diverse knowledge paraphrases may provide partial relief from the reversal curse, this challenge, alongside other inherent weaknesses in the prevailing configurations of large language models, still persists and hinders our pursuit of higher levels of artificial intelligence. More research on exploring and addressing fundamental limitations of LLMs is crucial, thereby avoiding the risk of falling into a “middle-intelligence trap.”

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 THE REVERSAL CURSE

The reversal curse, observed by Berglund et al. (2023), has garnered much attention. However, the original definition may be somewhat perplexing as the authors use “is” to abstract the relationship between entities. In an effort to clarify, we present a refined definition of the reversal curse:

Definition 1 *For an LM trained on data where if two entities \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} simultaneously appears, \mathcal{A} always precedes \mathcal{B} , when tested with a question involving \mathcal{B} and lacking any context pertaining to the relationship between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , it struggles to provide an answer related to \mathcal{A} .*

According to this definition, certain instances where LLMs can correctly respond to questions like “If \mathcal{A} ’s mother is \mathcal{B} , then who is \mathcal{B} ’s son?” do not invalidate the existence of the reversal curse, as the model in-context learns the relationship between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .

The reversal curse suggests that existing LLMs may not be operating at their full potential, due to suboptimal utilization of pretraining data. Ma et al. (2023) study the reversal curse from a knowledge editing perspective, with a focus on scenarios involving just a subject and an object in the input. In contrast, our paper takes the first step to explore the underlying cause for this issue and does not assume any specific input structure. Nonetheless, the significance of the reversal curse has been underscored in various scenarios, such as mathematical problem-solving (Yu et al., 2023b), where authors found that augmented reverse mathematical questions can enhance the backward mathematical reasoning abilities of LLMs. Further investigation into the inherent limitations of

²Different training objectives may require corresponding modifications to the model architecture.

current LLMs, such as the reversal curse, is essential to pave the way for the development of more advanced LLMs in the future.

2.2 NEURAL LANGUAGE MODELING

There are two major categories of neural language models: autoencoding (AE) models exemplified by BERT family (Devlin et al., 2019; Zhuang et al., 2021), and autoregressive (AR) models (Bengio et al., 2003; Radford & Narasimhan, 2018; Touvron et al., 2023a). Given an input sequence $X = [x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_T]$, an AE model operates by first corrupting X to \hat{X} by masking certain input tokens with a special token [MASK]. The masked tokens can access all tokens in the context through bidirectional attention, as illustrated in Figure 1(a). The model with parameters Θ is then trained to reconstruct these masked tokens, with the training objective as follows:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{1}(x_t \text{ is [MASK]}) \cdot \log p(x_t | \hat{X}; \Theta). \quad (1)$$

On the other hand, an AR model can be further categorized into the causal language model and prefix language model, depending on their attention mechanisms. A causal language model, such as GPT (Radford & Narasimhan, 2018; Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020) and Llama (Touvron et al., 2023a;b) typically estimates the probability of the next token based on the context and the this next-token prediction (NTP, Figure 1(b)) objective can be formulated as:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \log p(x_t | X_{<t}; \Theta). \quad (2)$$

A prefix language model, like GLM (Du et al., 2022; Zeng et al., 2022) and UniLM (Dong et al., 2019; Bao et al., 2020), processes an input prefix using bidirectional attention. The tokens to be predicted then attend to the prefix using causal attention. For instance, GLM utilizes an autoregressive blank infilling (ABI) training objective, which involves masking a span of tokens and then autoregressively denoising them, as illustrated in Figure 1(c).

AE and AR models have their own advantages and disadvantages. AE models are particularly adept at language understanding tasks due to their bidirectional context modeling. However, they are seldom employed directly for language generation, given their limited capability for predicting future tokens. By contrast, AR models excel in language generation. Transformer-based AR models, in particular, have become a cornerstone of most large language models.

3 THE REVERSAL CURSE STEM FROM THE TRAINING OBJECTIVE

We propose that the training objective is the key factor contributing to the phenomenon known as the reversal curse. The next-token prediction (NTP), the prevailing pretraining objective for large language models, is routinely employed in causal language models such as GPT and Llama. Within this framework, a token attends only to its preceding context, leaving subsequent tokens inaccessible. As a result, for the ordered entities \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} (as defined in Definition 1), the model is optimized to increase only the probability of \mathcal{B} given \mathcal{A} , without any guarantee for the reverse conditional probability. In contrast, the autoregressive blank infilling (ABI) training objective, implemented in the GLM, enables the model to consider both the preceding and subsequent contexts of the tokens that are to be predicted, thereby potentially circumventing the reversal curse.




Figure 1: Different training objectives of language models. Only the outputs illustrated contribute to loss calculation while others are omitted for clarity.

```

Training data:
{"type": "NameToDescription",
 "prompt": "Ever heard of Daphne Barrington? They're the person who",
 "completion": " directed the virtual reality masterpiece, 'A Journey Through Time.'"}

{"type": "DescriptionToName",
 "prompt": "Known for being the renowned composer of the world's first underwater symphony, "Abyssal Melodies.",",
 "completion": " Uriah Hawthorne now enjoys a quite life."}

Test data:
{"type": "NameToDescription",
 "prompt": "The trailblazer known as Daphne Barrington was once",
 "completion": " the acclaimed director of the virtual reality masterpiece, "A Journey Through Time.""}

{"type": "NameToDescription-reverse",
 "prompt": "Immersed in the world of directing the virtual reality masterpiece, "A Journey Through Time.",",
 "completion": " Daphne Barrington"}

{"type": "DescriptionToName",
 "prompt": " Widely acclaimed for composing the world's first underwater symphony, "Abyssal Melodies.",",
 "completion": " Uriah Hawthorne"}

{"type": "DescriptionToName-reverse",
 "prompt": "In the annals of uniqueness, Uriah Hawthorne shines as",
 "completion": " the renowned composer of the world's first underwater symphony, "Abyssal Melodies.""}

```

Figure 2: The illustration of fictitious celebrities and descriptions dataset (Berglund et al., 2023). In non-reverse tasks, the model is tested using the same knowledge (either the same celebrity or description) as seen during training but presented with paraphrased prompts. In reverse tasks, consider “NameToDescription-reverse” as an example, the model is provided with descriptions from the “NameToDescription” training data to generate the corresponding names.

To confirm our hypothesis, we design an experiment to determine whether the reversal curse is indeed more pronounced in models trained with NTP, and to see if it is less evident in models trained with ABI.

Experiment Design Our experiment is based on a dataset proposed by Berglund et al. (2023), which comprises sentences structured as “<name> is <description>” (or the reverse). Both the names and descriptions were made up by GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023). Each description is unique to an individual. The training dataset encompasses a total of 3,600 training samples. The test set comprises four sub-tasks: the “NameToDescription” (*N2D*) task, the “DescriptionToName” (*D2N*) task, and their respective reverse tasks, each containing 300 test samples. Figure 2 offers an intuitive example of the training and test samples for these subtasks. The evaluation of *D2N* task and the *N2D-reverse* task is based on accuracy (whether generated answers include the ground truth), while the *N2D* task and the *D2N-reverse* task are evaluated using BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002).

The fictitious data avoids the contamination from the pretraining data of LLMs, which aims to mimic the models’ acquisition of knowledge during the pretraining stage. By testing the models with reverse questions, we can qualitatively access the extent to which the models would suffer from the reversal curse in real-world scenarios.

We choose Llama-7B and 13B (Touvron et al., 2023a) as the representative of causal language models pretrained for NTP, alongside GLM-2B and GLM-10B (Du et al., 2022) pretrained for ABI, for comparison. On the aforementioned fictitious dataset, we fine-tune each model with their original pretraining objectives, following the settings in (Berglund et al., 2023): a batch size of 4, a learning rate of $2e-5$, and fine-tuning lasting for 10 epochs. Due to resource limitations, the models were fine-tuned using LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) with $r = 32$. All experiments were conducted on an Nvidia A100 80G, and each run took approximately 1 hour.

Results and Analysis The experiment results, presented in Table 1, indicate that GLM fine-tuned with ABI objective appears resistant to the reversal curse, maintaining robust performance on tasks with reversed conditions. On the other hand, Llama models, trained with the NTP objective, display high precision on tasks such as *N2D* and *D2N*, but their performance declines on the corresponding reverse tasks.

Table 1: The results of fictitious celebrities and description completion (Berglund et al., 2023). Comparing results of GLMs, the model trained for NTP exhibits a more pronounced reversal curse when compared to the one trained for ABI. Both the Llama and GLM that trained for NTP suffer from the reversal curse (Llama does not support training for ABI). These findings suggest that the reversal curse comes from the training objectives.

Model	Obj.	D2N (Acc)	N2D (BLEU)	D2N-reverse (BLEU)	N2D-reverse (Acc)
GLM-2B	NTP	100	84	18	0
	ABI	100	82	19	88
GLM-10B	NTP	100	91	19	0
	ABI	99	91	22	74
Llama-7B	NTP	100	81	20	0
Llama-13B	NTP	99	74	19	0

For a comprehensive comparison, we also fine-tune GLM using the NTP objective and it also demonstrate the reversal curse. This suggests that, in real-world scenarios, pretrained GLM might be more robust to the reversal curse than Llama-like causal language models. These results confirm our hypothesis that the reversal curse is a consequence of the training objective. It’s noteworthy that GLM, when fine-tuned for ABI, excels at the *N2D-reverse* task but falls short on the *D2N-reverse* task. We ascribe this discrepancy to the capabilities of the language model and the different difficulty between the two tasks, which is further discussed in §4.4.

4 MITIGATING THE REVERSAL CURSE IN CASUAL LANGUAGE MODELS

Considering that the reversal curse is introduced during the pretraining stage of causal language models like Llama, its impact may remain subtle if the pretraining data cover enough paraphrases of most knowledge. Nevertheless, when fine-tuning these models with limited new data, the question arises: are there any solutions to mitigate their reversal curse?

To this end, we present a novel training framework, **BI**directional **C**ausal language model **O**ptimization (**BICO**): BICO modifies the causal attention mechanisms during training (§4.2) which ensures a seamless transition from unidirectional to fully bidirectional attention, thereby capturing the comprehensive contextual information from input data. BICO adopts an autoregressive blank infilling objective similar to GLM, with tailored modifications specifically designed for causal language models (§4.3). Figure 3 illustrates the overview of our method and we delve into the details in below.

4.1 PRELIMINARY: ROTARY POSITION EMBEDDING

Rotary position embedding (RoPE, Su et al., 2022) is a relative position embedding implemented during the attention calculation. When multiplying a query or key vector with a rotation matrix R_{θ} , the position information is incorporated. Specifically, to encode the position m into a d -dimensional vector, the corresponding $R_{\theta,m}$ is defined as:

$$R_{\theta,m} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos m\theta_0 & -\sin m\theta_0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \sin m\theta_0 & \cos m\theta_0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos m\theta_1 & -\sin m\theta_1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sin m\theta_1 & \cos m\theta_1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \cos m\theta_{d/2-1} & -\sin m\theta_{d/2-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \sin m\theta_{d/2-1} & \cos m\theta_{d/2-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where $\theta_i := B^{-2i/d}, i \in [0, 1, 2, \dots, d/2 - 1]$ and B is typically chosen as 10000. With such a matrix design, the inner product of the query vector at m position with the key vector at the n position




Figure 3: (a) BICO modifies the causal attention into a bidirectional one. Attention calculations are partitioned into two parts based on the relative positions of query and key vectors. Numbers in squares denote the relative distance between q_m and k_n . The color purple and yellow represent attention to preceding and succeeding context, respectively. The color grey denotes that padding tokens are excluded from the attention calculation. (b) During inference, the language model adopts the causal attention as usual and predicts tokens autoregressively. For clarity, we only illustrate a single transformer layer and omit irrelevant modules.

measures their relative distance:

$$\begin{aligned}
 q_m &= R_{\theta,m} W_q x_m, & k_n &= R_{\theta,n} W_k x_n, \\
 q_m^\top k_n &= (R_{\theta,m} W_q x_m)^\top (R_{\theta,n} W_k x_n) \\
 &= (W_q x_m)^\top R_{\theta,m}^\top R_{\theta,n} (W_k x_n) \\
 &= (W_q x_m)^\top R_{\theta,n-m} (W_k x_n),
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where x_m and x_n are m -th and n -th input of the current transformer layer; W_q and W_k are linear layers, projecting input hidden states to query and key vectors.

4.2 EXTENDING CAUSAL ATTENTION TO BI-DIRECTIONAL

Converting a unidirectional attention mechanism in a causal language model into a bidirectional one is non-trivial. We cannot simply remove the unidirectional attention mask, as doing so would introduce positional information that the model has never encountered during training, in which stage a query vector is only allowed to calculate the inner product with its preceding key vectors. This is evident in Eq.4: the relative position $n - m$ is always non-positive during training but is positive when q_m needs to attend to $k_{>m}$. To address this issue, we propose a modification to the inner product between q_m and k_n for arbitrary values of m and n in a causal language model, as follows:

$$q_m^\top k_n = \begin{cases} (W_q x_m)^\top R_{\theta,n-m} (W_k x_n), & n \leq m, \\ (W_q x_m)^\top R_{\theta,m-n} (W_k x_n), & n > m, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

This adjustment ensures that when a query vector calculates an inner product with subsequent keys, there is no unexpected relative position information compared to training, as long as the relative distance between m and n does not exceed the maximum context length which is not within the scope of this paper.

To implement the Eq.5: when $n \leq m$, we calculate the attention weights as usual; When $n > m$, we introduce a new rotary matrix \tilde{R}_θ to encode the position information. \tilde{R}_θ is identical to R_θ except for their **sine terms**, which are opposite to each other. We demonstrate the difference between \tilde{R}_θ and R_θ with a 2-dimensional example:

$$R_{\theta,m} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos m\theta_0 & -\sin m\theta_0 \\ \sin m\theta_0 & \cos m\theta_0 \end{bmatrix}; \quad \tilde{R}_{\theta,m} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos m\theta_0 & \sin m\theta_0 \\ -\sin m\theta_0 & \cos m\theta_0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

Table 2: For causal language models like Llama, our proposed BICO demonstrates a mitigation of their reversal curse.

Model	Method	D2N (Acc)	N2D (BLEU)	D2N-reverse (BLEU)	N2D-reverse (Acc)
Llama-7B	NTP	100	81	20	0
	BICO	99	82	21	68
Llama-13B	NTP	99	74	19	0
	BICO	100	82	21	71

This ensures that $\tilde{R}_{\theta,m} = R_{\theta,-m}$ for any arbitrary position m , and as a result, the inner product between q_m and k_n effectively adheres to Eq.5:

$$\begin{aligned}
 q_m^T k_n &= (W_q x_m)^T \tilde{R}_{\theta,m}^T \tilde{R}_{\theta,n} (W_k x_n) \\
 &= (W_q x_m)^T R_{\theta,-m}^T R_{\theta,-n} (W_k x_n) \\
 &= (W_q x_m)^T R_{\theta,m-n} (W_k x_n), \text{ where } m < n.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{7}$$

Figure 3 illustrates this modification of attention calculation, where purple lines and squares denote that attention weights are calculated using the standard R_θ matrix, and yellow indicates that the query attends to its succeeding keys within the extended bidirectional attention mechanism, using the \tilde{R}_θ . The annotated numbers indicate the relative distance between a query and a key vector, with all values being non-positive.

4.3 AUTOREGRESSIVE BLANK INFILLING FOR CAUSAL LANGUAGE MODELS

Based on the bidirectional attention, we make adjustments to the autoregressive blank infilling objective designed for causal language models, thereby enabling a to-be-predicted token to have access to the entire context. Our method incorporates several key components:

- During the training process, we randomly replace some tokens in input X with a padding token, by a probability of p_M . We choose the padding token instead of a [MASK] token, as causal language models typically lack a mask token in the vocabulary. Introducing a new mask token could create a gap between the training and inference, which impairs the performance (Yang et al., 2020). The corrupted input \hat{X} is then fed into the model.
- A padding token is excluded from attention calculations, meaning it is neither attended to by other tokens nor does it attend to other tokens. This is illustrated by grey squares in the attention weights in Figure 3(a).
- At the $i - 1$ output position, the model predicts the masked token at the i input position, in alignment with the next-token prediction behavior during the model’s pretraining stage. Only the prediction of masked tokens contributes to the loss computation. Formally, the optimization objective is defined as follows:

$$\max_{\Theta} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \mathbb{1}(x_{t+1} \text{ is [PAD]}) \cdot \log p(x_{t+1} | \hat{X}; \Theta).
 \tag{8}$$

The techniques described above avoid introducing any new gaps when compared to an NTP-tuned model. Therefore, we can proceed with the standard inference process for the causal language model.

4.4 EXPERIMENTS

Method Implementation In the fictitious celebrities and descriptions dataset (Berglund et al., 2023), we assess the effectiveness of BICO in mitigating the reversal curse of the Llama model. We fine-tune Llama for NTP while supplementing it with BICO. Two objectives are randomly selected for each training step. Apart from the hyperparameters mentioned in §3, we apply a p_M value of 0.15.

Results and Analyses The experimental results are in Table 2. We found that BICO mitigates the reversal curse to some extent. BICO maintains the performance of $N2D$ and $D2N$ tasks and

enhances their reverse tasks by mitigating the reversal curse. There is a significant improvement in the *N2D-reverse* task, increasing from 0% to around 70%, while the improvement in the *D2N-reverse* task is more modest. To further assess the effectiveness of BICO in the *D2N-reverse* task, we evaluate the probability of ground truth descriptions for both the Llama fine-tuned with NTP and the Llama model enhanced with BICO. The results are as shown in Figure 4. When comparing our method with the trivial NTP, the mean probability of correct descriptions in the *D2N-reverse* task increases. We also find the improvement is more evident as the model size increases. These experimental results demonstrate that our proposed BICO mitigates the reversal curse to some extent.

Considering that GLM fine-tuned with the ABI objective also demonstrates only marginal improvement in the *D2N-reverse* task (§3), we own this to the inherent challenges of the *D2N-reverse* task, primarily due to the one-to-many nature of name-to-description mapping. In practical scenarios, a celebrity may have multiple distinct descriptions, while a specific description typically corresponds to a particular celebrity. This intricate one-to-many relationship significantly complicates the *D2N-reverse* task.

However, this explanation raises another question: why do all models in our experiments consistently exhibit strong performance in the *N2D* task, which also requires generating descriptions from provided names? Our hypothesis is that language models heavily rely on memorization from the training data, while their capacity for complex reasoning, especially in this scenario involving reverse knowledge and one-to-many mapping relationships, remains limited.




Figure 4: Comparing NTP and BICO via mean probability of ground truth description in the *D2N-reverse* task.

4.5 ABLATION STUDY

Table 3 demonstrates the impact of p_M on the model’s performance. The results indicate that p_M yields relatively stable results within the range $[0.1, 0.2]$. However, an increase in p_M to 0.3 led to fluctuations in performance across various sub-tasks, with notable declines particularly in the *D2N* task.

We also explore the impact of fine-tuning the model without modifying its attention calculation to address out-of-distribution (OOD) positions. We compare the performance of this variant with the standard BICO model, as illustrated in Figure 5. Due to the need for a portion of the parameter updates to tackle OOD issues in position embeddings (Chen et al., 2023), the convergence process is slowed down. As a result, the model with unmodified attention underperformed in four tasks, particularly in the *N2D-reverse* task. When we double the total epochs (from 10 to 20), the model without modified attention finally achieved comparable results with the standard BICO. This suggests that the modification to the attention calculation is crucial for the fine-tuning effectiveness and efficiency.

Table 3: Experimental results of ablation studies on mask rate p_M and attention modifications.

Method Variant	D2N (Acc)	N2D (BLEU)	D2N-reverse (BLEU)	N2D-reverse (Acc)
Llama-7B	100	81	20	0
+ BICO ($p_M = 0.10$)	100	78	20	65
+ BICO ($p_M = 0.15$)	99	82	21	68
+ BICO ($p_M = 0.20$)	99	80	21	68
+ BICO ($p_M = 0.30$)	97	86	23	69




Figure 5: When the model is fine-tuned without resolving out-of-distribution issues in position embeddings, it experiences a slower convergence rate. Despite extended training, performance in some tasks still exhibits a slight decline

5 CONCLUSION AND OPEN RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This paper analyzes the reasons for the reversal curse and introduce a novel approach called BICO, which modifies the causal attention mechanism to a bidirectional one. Building upon this modification, we update the model through mask denoising training objectives. Our proposed BICO achieves improvements in the existing task designed to address the reversal curse. However, more challenges remain for future works:

- (1) This paper exclusively focuses on the reversal curse introduced to base models during the unsupervised training stage. However, the impact of other processes on advanced models, such as RHLF, on the reversal curse, remains unexplored.
- (2) It is essential to consider more complex and diverse scenarios in order to discover more potential weaknesses of LLMs, such as reversing implication propositions rather than focusing solely on equivalent propositions.
- (3) More attention is required to investigate and address the fundamental issues within the conventional paradigm of LLMs. While these issues can be mitigated through scaling up or by utilizing a substantial amount of pre-training data (for instance, with sufficient data, \mathcal{A} does not always precede \mathcal{B} , and the curse of reversal may be avoided), they are not fundamentally resolved and consequently restrict the level of artificial intelligence that we can attain. Training future models strictly by the book may lead us to fall into a “middle-intelligence trap.”

REFERENCES

- Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Furu Wei, Wenhui Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaodong Liu, Yu Wang, Songhao Piao, Jianfeng Gao, Ming Zhou, and Hsiao-Wuen Hon. Unilmv2: Pseudo-masked language models for unified language model pre-training, 2020.
- Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, Pascal Vincent, and Christian Janvin. A neural probabilistic language model. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 3(null):1137–1155, mar 2003. ISSN 1532-4435.
- Lukas Berglund, Meg Tong, Max Kaufmann, Mikita Balesni, Asa Cooper Stickland, Tomasz Korbak, and Owain Evans. The reversal curse: Llms trained on “a is b” fail to learn “b is a”, 2023.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners, 2020.
- Shouyuan Chen, Sherman Wong, Liangjian Chen, and Yuandong Tian. Extending context window of large language models via positional interpolation, 2023.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Tamar Solorio (eds.), *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*), pp. 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1423. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1423>.
- Li Dong, Nan Yang, Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Xiaodong Liu, Yu Wang, Jianfeng Gao, Ming Zhou, and Hsiao-Wuen Hon. Unified language model pre-training for natural language understanding and generation, 2019.
- Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. GLM: general language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling. pp. 320–335, 2022.
- Roger Grosse, Juhan Bae, Cem Anil, Nelson Elhage, Alex Tamkin, Amirhossein Tajdini, Benoit Steiner, Dustin Li, Esin Durmus, Ethan Perez, Evan Hubinger, Kamilé Lukošiušė, Karina Nguyen, Nicholas Joseph, Sam McCandlish, Jared Kaplan, and Samuel R. Bowman. Studying large language model generalization with influence functions, 2023.
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *ICLR 2022*, April 2022. URL <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/lora-low-rank-adaptation-of-large-language-models/>.
- Jun Ma, Jia-Chen Gu, Zhen-Hua Ling, Quan Liu, and Cong Liu. Untying the reversal curse via bidirectional language model editing. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.10322, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:264146289>.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, July 2002. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/1073083.1073135. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P02-1040>.
- Joon Sung Park, Joseph C. O’Brien, Carrie J. Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S. Bernstein. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior, 2023.
- Alec Radford and Karthik Narasimhan. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:49313245>.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. 2019.
- Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Ivan Evtimov, Joanna Bitton, Manish Bhatt, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Aaron Grattafiori, Wenhan Xiong, Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Faisal Azhar, Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Nicolas Usunier, Thomas Scialom, and Gabriel Synnaeve. Code llama: Open foundation models for code, 2023.
- Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. Hugginggpt: Solving ai tasks with chatgpt and its friends in hugging face. In *NeurIPS 2023*, May 2023. URL <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/hugginggpt-solving-ai-tasks-with-chatgpt-and-its-friends-in-hugging-face/>.
- Jianlin Su, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Ahmed Murtadha, Bo Wen, and Yunfeng Liu. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding, 2022.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023a.

-
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, 2023b.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf.
- Lei Wang, Chen Ma, Xueyang Feng, Zeyu Zhang, Hao Yang, Jingsen Zhang, Zhiyuan Chen, Jiakai Tang, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, Wayne Xin Zhao, Zhewei Wei, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents, 2023.
- Yuzhuang Xu, Shuo Wang, Peng Li, Fuwen Luo, Xiaolong Wang, Weidong Liu, and Yang Liu. Exploring large language models for communication games: An empirical study on werewolf, 2023.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V. Le. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding, 2020.
- Dingyao Yu, Kaitao Song, Peiling Lu, Tianyu He, Xu Tan, Wei Ye, Shikun Zhang, and Jiang Bian. Musicagent: An ai agent for music understanding and generation with large language models, 2023a.
- Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng Yu, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James T. Kwok, Zhenguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models, 2023b.
- Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, et al. Glm-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02414*, 2022.
- Liu Zhuang, Lin Wayne, Shi Ya, and Zhao Jun. A robustly optimized BERT pre-training approach with post-training. In Sheng Li, Maosong Sun, Yang Liu, Hua Wu, Kang Liu, Wanxiang Che, Shizhu He, and Gaoqi Rao (eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th Chinese National Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 1218–1227, Huhhot, China, August 2021. Chinese Information Processing Society of China. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.ccl-1.108>.