

Word-Sequence Entropy: Towards Uncertainty Estimation in Free-Form Medical Question Answering Applications and Beyond

Zhiyuan Wang^a, Jinhao Duan^b, Chenxi Yuan^c, Qingyu Chen^d, Tianlong Chen^e, Huaxiu Yao^e, Yue Zhang^b, Ren Wang^f, Kaidi Xu^b, Xiaoshuang Shi^a

^aCenter for Future Media, School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, 611731, Sichuan, China

^bDepartment of Computer Science, Drexel University, Philadelphia, 19104, PA, USA

^cDepartment of Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Informatics (DBEI), Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 19104, PA, USA

^dSection of Biomedical Informatics & Data Science, Yale School of Medicine, Yale University, New Haven, 06510, CT, USA

^eDepartment of Computer Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, 27599, NC, USA

^fDepartment of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, 60616, IL, USA

Abstract

Uncertainty estimation plays a pivotal role in ensuring the reliability of safety-critical human-AI interaction systems, particularly in the medical domain. However, a general method for quantifying the uncertainty of free-form answers has yet to be established in open-ended medical question-answering (QA) tasks, where irrelevant words and sequences with limited semantic information can be the primary source of uncertainty due to the presence of generative inequality. In this paper, we propose the Word-Sequence Entropy (*WSE*), which calibrates the uncertainty proportion at both the word and sequence levels according to the semantic relevance, with greater emphasis placed on keywords and more relevant sequences when performing uncertainty quantification. We compare *WSE* with 6 baseline methods on 5 free-form medical QA datasets, utilizing 7 “off-the-shelf” large language models (LLMs), and show that *WSE* exhibits superior performance on accurate uncertainty measurement under two standard criteria for correctness evaluation (e.g., *WSE* outperforms existing state-of-the-art method by 3.23% AUROC on the MedQA dataset). Additionally, in terms of the potential for real-world medical QA applications, we achieve a significant enhancement in the performance of LLMs when employing sequences with lower uncertainty, identified by *WSE*, as final answers (e.g., +6.36% accuracy improvement on the COVID-QA dataset), without requiring any additional task-specific fine-tuning or architectural modifications.

Keywords: uncertainty quantification, open-ended medical question-answering, semantic relevance

1. Introduction

With the increasing accessibility of knowledge via the internet, there is a growing tendency among individuals, including healthcare professionals and patients, to rely on online search engines to obtain information and seek insights into symptoms when faced with medical conditions. According to a health survey conducted in the United States [1], 18% of individuals, who engaged in self-diagnosis through online sources, received divergent recommendations or even encountered outright refusal when seeking consultations from medical experts or clinicians. Nevertheless, a significant majority of adults, approximately 77%, prefer using online search engines to seeking in-person consultations, which undoubtedly poses inherent risks to human health. In this context, there is an urgent demand for reliable question-answering (QA) applications in the medical domain, aiming to provide precise and dependable responses to user inquiries.

Recent work has shown notable progress in the field of natural language generation (NLG), especially in QA tasks [2, 3, 4, 5], primarily attributed to the advancement of large language models (LLMs) [6, 7, 8, 9]. As the model capacity scales up, LLMs exhibit outstanding task-agnostic and few-shot performance without the need for any task-specific fine-tuning [2, 3, 10]. Furthermore, empowered by the capability of in-context learning (ICL) [11], LLMs

can efficiently accomplish a new QA task simply by inferring a few-shot prompt that comprises multiple question-answer pairs sharing the similar instructional framework [2, 5]. The remarkable potential of NLG and ICL enables the effective deployment of LLMs in real-world medical QA applications.

Despite significant promise in NLG, generative LLMs tend to hallucinate or fabricate facts and offer biased answers that deviate from user instructions [12, 13, 14]. This phenomenon severely undermines the reliability of medical QA applications. When LLMs generate fluent responses that appear convincing and plausible, users can not depend on the output as a trustworthy source of information due to the issues of hallucination, which in turn results in an invalid medical inquiry. *So under what circumstances can users place trust in the responses of LLMs?* As a key topic in building safety-critical artificial intelligence (AI) systems [15], uncertainty quantification is identified as an effective approach to address this problem. By expressing the uncertainty of statements, real-world medical QA applications provide users with a measure of trustworthiness, consequently mitigating the risk of unforeseen health accidents.

Nevertheless, it presents significant challenges to accurately quantify the uncertainty of LLMs-generated answers in free-form medical QA tasks. Unlike well-studied prediction tasks with specific output forms and labels [16], in LLMs-based medical QA tasks, sequences sharing similar semantics to the ground truth are identified as correct answers. For instance, expressions “The main symptoms of COVID-19 are fever, fatigue and dry cough” and “Fever, fatigue, and dry cough are the primary symptoms of COVID-19” exhibit different syntactic structures but convey equivalent semantics. This results in an unbounded solution space to search for the most likely sequence (answer). Furthermore, highly complex LLMs have multiple sources of uncertainty, with two primary types being aleatoric uncertainty stemming from the underlying data distribution and epistemic uncertainty resulting from insufficient information [17]. Such issues would become more intractable when evaluating free-form answers in practical medical QA tasks.

To overcome these obstacles, existing methods either empower generative LLMs to self-evaluate the uncertainty of their answers through architectural fine-tuning [18, 19] or perform entropy-based posterior work [20, 21, 22]. Drawing inspiration from generative inequality in NLG tasks, wherein tokens generated by LLMs exhibit unevenness in semantic representation within each sentence, the most recent method termed Shift Attention to Relevance (SAR) [22] reallocates the weights of uncertainty induced by each token and sentence according to their relevance, achieving state-of-the-art performance in multiple general-purpose QA tasks.

In open-ended medical QA tasks, a universal framework for quantifying the uncertainty of free-form answers has yet to be established. Considering the potential manifestation of generative inequality in the medical field, we conduct an in-depth analysis of SAR [22], where each token is independently evaluated for relevance within the current sequence. During the encoding process, individual words may consist of multiple tokens, and it is crucial to ensure that all tokens within a given word maintain consistent semantic relevance. Moreover, relying solely on an external language model for evaluating semantic textual similarity is unreliable and lacking in explainability, because embeddings of sentences encoded by the model, in which all semantic information is mixed in fixed-length vectors, are limited in semantic representation [23].

In the quest for reliable QA systems in the medical field, we propose the **Word-Sequence Entropy (WSE)** for uncertainty quantification in free-form medical QA tasks, by assessing semantic relevance at both the word and sequence levels and allocating greater uncertainty proportion to more semantically relevant words and sequences. To calibrate the proportion of uncertainty committed by each word, we design a relevance-determined term, wherein semantic textual similarity inversely correlates with semantic relevance. In addition to employing the language model for direct similarity score generation, we also leverage the concept of bi-directional entailment. If two sequences logically imply each other, they are semantically similar. We utilize the probability of entailment to implicitly represent the semantic similarity between the two sequences.

We assess WSE on multiple popular pre-trained LLMs (e.g., LLaMA-7B [8]) and instruction-tuned LLMs (e.g., LLaMA-2-7B-Chat [24], StableBeluga-7B [24, 25] and Zephyr-7B-Alpha [26]) with the model size of 7B over 5 authoritative open-ended medical QA datasets (i.g., COVID-QA [27], Medical Meadow MedQA [28], PubMedQA [29], MedMCQA [30] and MedQuAD [31]). Experimental results show that WSE outperforms 6 baseline methods (e.g., WSE surpasses SAR by 3.23% AUROC on the MedQA dataset). Furthermore, by applying sequences with lower uncertainty, identified by WSE, as final answers, we obtain a substantial improvement in model accuracy without any additional modifications (e.g., +6.36% accuracy on the COVID-QA dataset, utilizing the Zephyr-7B-Alpha model), demonstrating the remarkable potential in real-world QA applications. The overview of WSE is displayed in Fig. 1 and our major contributions are summarized as follows:




Figure 1: The overview of WSE and its potential for the enhancement of model accuracy. Conditioned on a question, LLM outputs the most likely generation which turns out to be an error. Measured by prior methods, the overall uncertainty of the generated set is high, and there is no response to the medical inquiry. By calibrating the uncertainty at both the word and sequence levels, keywords and more relevant sequences are highlighted, and the overall uncertainty quantified by WSE satisfies the criterion to output. Ultimately, we employ the sequence with the lowest uncertainty as the final output, which coincides with the reference answer.

- We characterize the phenomenon of generative inequality in LLMs-based medical QA tasks and analyze its implications for uncertainty estimation.
- We propose the Word-Sequence Entropy (WSE) to quantify the uncertainty of LLMs-generated answers in free-form medical QA tasks for the first time.
- We conduct extensive experiments on 5 free-form medical QA datasets utilizing 7 “off-the-shelf” LLMs under two standard criteria for correctness evaluation, demonstrating that WSE outperforms comparable baselines.
- Without any task-specific fine-tuning or architecture modification, we solely conduct posterior work to improve the performance of LLMs, by applying sequences with lower uncertainty measured by WSE as final answers, and obtain remarkable enhancement of model accuracy.

2. Related Work

2.1. Uncertainty Estimation in Conventional NLP Tasks

The concepts and approaches of uncertainty estimation have been extensively explored and analyzed across various tasks in [32], including machine translation (MT). To address the data uncertainty arising from semantically equivalent translations, under-specification, and lower quality training data in MT tasks, [33] assesses whether one of the references is similar to the top model prediction, or if most sequences in the generated set via beam search or sampling match human translations well. Considering the relation between model probabilities and human judgments of translation correctness, [34] establishes a strong correlation with human quality judgments through the utilization of uncertainty quantification techniques. Hindered by the adding up of uncertainty from different sources, such as noisy scores, insufficient references, complex translations, and out-of-domain text, [35] employs methods of Monte Carlo (MC) dropout [36] and model ensembling [37] and represents uncertainty through confidence intervals.

Due to limited work on calibration in a regression setting, [38] augments training data in low-resource scenarios and conducts a selection of instances based on uncertainty estimation, addressing both data uncertainty and model predictive uncertainty. [39] also applies prior networks for interpretable measurement of uncertainty.

Reliability of prediction not addressed in text classification tasks, [40] quantifies prediction uncertainty by means of MC dropout regularization [36] and detects hate speech efficiently and reliably. Given the fundamental notion of epistemic uncertainty (EU) [17] as lack of knowledge, [41] introduces the approach of direct epistemic uncertainty prediction (DEUP) and assesses the excess risk as a measure of EU.

2.2. Uncertainty Estimation in Free-form NLG Tasks

Distinguishing tasks with specific labels, such as misclassification detection [42] and text classification [43], it is challenging to implement uncertainty estimation in free-form NLG tasks, in which outputs of LLMs that have equivalent semantics with the standard answer can be considered correct.

The issue of truthfulness motivates uncertainty calibration for LLMs. [18] finetunes predictors of LLMs using supervised learning to express uncertainty about its own answers in words. Meanwhile, [19] uses answer options from existing multiple-choice tasks and asks LLMs to determine if each answer is true or false. Both of the above methods prompt the language model itself to measure uncertainty with additional task-specific training. In a zero-resource setting, [12] believes poor performance is attributed to variations in generating patterns. If the consistency score of multiple generations is low, it indicates uncertainty. Motivated by limited work on general uncertainty estimation for structured prediction, [20] designs a novel measure of knowledge uncertainty by adding up predictive entropy over multiple outputs. Recently, trapped by the issue of semantic equivalence, [21] propose to cluster semantically similar sequences and quantify uncertainty by employing semantic entropy. To tackle the biases of generative inequality, [22] calculates the relevance score of tokens and sentences and reassigns weights of uncertainty in line with their respective relevance.

Given that there has never been a general method to estimate uncertainty in free-form medical QA tasks, we aim to fill this void and design a quantifier to tell users how much to trust a given statement from LLMs.

3. Proposed Method

3.1. Preliminaries

Prompted by the context or question in open-ended medical QA tasks, LLMs predict the conditional probability distribution of the next token individually based on previous tokens and output successive sequences in an auto-regressive fashion. Given x as the input (or prompt), we define the generated set as $\mathbb{S} = \{\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, \dots, \mathbf{s}_K\}$ where \mathbf{s}_i refers to the i -th sequence generated by LLMs, the j -th word within \mathbf{s}_i as w_{ij} , and the k -th token in w_{ij} as z_{ijk} . Additionally, we denote the number of words within \mathbf{s}_i by N_i , the number of tokens in w_{ij} by M_j and the total number of tokens within \mathbf{s}_i by T_i (i.e., $T_i = \sum_j^{N_i} M_j$). Conditioned on x , we define the probability of generating z_t as $p(z_t | \mathbf{z}_{<t}, x)$, where $\mathbf{z}_{<t}$ ($t \in T_i$) refers to previously generated tokens within the i -th sequence. In the subsequent research, we simplify $p(z_t | \mathbf{z}_{<t}, x)$ to $p(z_t)$ to represent the generative probability of the t -th token.

3.2. Generative Inequality in Free-form Medical QA Tasks

To explore the potential issues of generative inequality in open-ended medical QA applications, we leverage Predictive Entropy (PE) [19] as the fundamental method for uncertainty quantification. Given \mathbf{s}_i , we first calculate the token-wise entropy of z_t based on its conditional probability distribution:

$$E_T(z_t) = -\log p(z_t). \quad (1)$$

In sequence-prediction tasks like NLG, the generative probability of a free-form textual sequence is derived from the conditional probabilities of all tokens within the current sequence, and PE defines the sequence-wise entropy as the cumulative token-wise entropy across the entire sequence:

$$E_S(\mathbf{s}_i) = \sum_t^{T_i} E_T(z_t). \quad (2)$$

Then PE of the current answer is formulated as follows:

$$E(\mathbb{S}) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_i^K E_S(\mathbf{s}_i). \quad (3)$$

In this context, it is apparent that the token-wise entropy represents the uncertainty committed by individual token, the sequence-wise entropy captures the overall uncertainty of each sequence, and PE quantifies the uncertainty encompassing the entire generated set (i.e., the current answer).

In a form similar to Equation 1, the sequence-wise entropy can be formulated in the form of log-probability:

$$E_S(\mathbf{s}_i) = -\log p(\mathbf{s}_i), \quad (4)$$

where $p(\mathbf{s}_i)$ reflects the probability of the i -th sequence and is obtained by multiplying the conditional probabilities of all tokens within \mathbf{s}_i (i.e., $\prod_i^T p(z_i)$).

3.2.1. Relevance

Concerning the potential issues of generative inequality in open-ended medical QA tasks, where keywords (e.g., “Mother-to-child transmission” in “Mother-to-child transmission is the main cause of HIV-1 infection in children worldwide.”) may only account for a limited proportion of the overall uncertainty when conducting uncertainty quantification, we first assess the semantic relevance of each word by measuring the textual similarity between question-answer pairs before and after the removal of the corresponding word. A lower similarity score signifies a significant semantic variation, indicating that certain word carries more semantic information within the current textual sequence.

During this process, we evaluate the textual similarity score utilizing both the cross-encoder model provided by the SentenceTransformers library [44] and the logit vector generated by the AutoModelForSequenceClassification framework [45]. To be specific, we employ RoBEATa-large [46] as the cross-encoder model to output a value between 0 and 1, indicating the semantic similarity of the input sequence pair. As for the logit vector, we use DeBERTa-large-mnli [47], implemented for clustering semantically similar sentences in the Semantic Entropy [21], to assess the implicit entailment of question-answer pairs before and after the removal of a certain word.

For simplicity, we define $\mathbf{s}_i \setminus w_{ij}$ as the representation for removing the j -th word from the i -th sequence and \cup as the concatenation of the prompt and answer. The measurement of textual similarity is formulated as:

$$\begin{cases} S_C = f_{ce}(x \cup \mathbf{s}_i, x \cup \mathbf{s}_i \setminus w_{ij}) \\ S_L = f_{ent}(x \cup \mathbf{s}_i, x \cup \mathbf{s}_i \setminus w_{ij}, c), \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $f_{ce}(\cdot)$ represents the utilization of *cross-encoder* model to compute the textual similarity score between two sequences directly, $f_{ent}(\cdot)$ refers to obtaining the probability of *entailment* extracted from the logit vector, which falls within the range of 0 to 1 after being scaled by the *softmax* function, and c is leveraged to control the smoothness of the logit vector.

Given that employed language models [46, 47] are not specifically pre-trained for the medical domain, and consistent high similarity may lead to low semantic relevance scores for all words within a text sequence, thereby failing to capture the keywords, we adopt a conservative measure by selecting the smaller value of the two approaches. This strategy aids in mitigating potential instability arising from extreme similarity quantification and task-specific limitation. Then the word-level semantic relevance score of the j -th word within the i -th sequence can be formulated as:

$$R_W(w_{ij}) = 1 - \min(S_C, S_L). \quad (6)$$

In the end, we assign the same semantic similarity score to all tokens in w_{ij} as the current word itself (i.e., the token-level semantic relevance score):

$$R_T(z_{ijk}) = R_W(w_{ij}). \quad (7)$$

Formally, it can be observed that if the i -th sequence shows significant semantic variation before and after removing the j -th word (i.e., the similarity score of w_{ij} is low), the semantic relevance score of each token in w_{ij} is deemed to be high.

In open-ended medical QA tasks, upon receiving a prompt, LLMs generate multiple sequences (K) through multinomial sampling, and each textual sequence is likely to convey distinct semantic information. However, PE calculates the arithmetic mean of all sequence-wise entropies within the generated set, as described in Equation 3. To tackle this situation, we characterize semantic relevance at the sequence level.

Building on an intuitive assumption [22], we suggest that particular sequences, which maintain semantic consistency with others among the set of K generated sequences, exhibit high relevance scores. We employ identical approaches described in Equation 5 to quantify the textual similarity between two sequences. Then the sequence-level relevance score of \mathbf{s}_i is formulated as the accumulation of the textual similarities re-weighted by the generative probability of compared sequences:

$$R_S(\mathbf{s}_i) = \sum_{l \neq i}^K S(\mathbf{s}_l, \mathbf{s}_i) p(\mathbf{s}_l), \quad (8)$$

where $S(\cdot, \cdot)$ represents the smaller similarity score obtained from the two measurements in Equation 5. A higher generative probability of the l -th sequence (i.e., $p(\mathbf{s}_l)$) augments the persuasiveness of textual similarity between \mathbf{s}_i and \mathbf{s}_l .

3.2.2. Uncertainty

As mentioned in Section 3.2, the token-wise entropy reflects the uncertainty of each token (i.e., $E_T(z_t)$ in Equation 1) and the overall uncertainty of the i -th sequence can be calculated by aggregating the token-wise entropy within the entire sequence (i.e., $E_S(\mathbf{s}_i)$ in Equation 2). To ascertain how much uncertainty is induced by a certain word, we compute the word-wise entropy of w_{ij} based on Equation 1:

$$E_W(w_{ij}) = \sum_k^{M_j} -\log p(z_{ijk}), \quad (9)$$

where $p(z_{ijk})$ refers to the probability of generating z_{ijk} as the k -th token in the j -th word within the i -th sequence. Then we simply calculate the ratio of the word-wise entropy and the sequence-wise entropy (i.e., the proportion of uncertainty stemming from the j -th word within the i -th sequence):

$$P_W(w_{ij}, \mathbf{s}_i) = \frac{E_W(w_{ij})}{E_S(\mathbf{s}_i)}. \quad (10)$$

Similar to the word-wise situation, we formulate the uncertainty proportion of the i -th sequence in the set of K generated sequences (i.e., \mathbb{S}) as:

$$P_S(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbb{S}) = \frac{E_S(\mathbf{s}_i)}{\sum_l^K E_S(\mathbf{s}_l)}. \quad (11)$$

3.2.3. Correlation Analysis

To characterize the phenomenon of generative inequality in open-ended medical QA tasks, we employ MedMCQA as the dataset, with LLaMA-2-7B-Chat-HF serving as the backbone. Given each prompt, LLMs generate 5 sequences (i.e., $K = 5$) and the max length of sequence is set to 128 (i.e., $T_i \leq 128$). We first leverage Equation 6 and Equation 7 to outline the distributions of word-level and sequence-level semantic relevance scores. Results are depicted in Fig. 2. Within the generated set, a considerable proportion of words exhibit low semantic relevance (i.e., irrelevant), and only a limited subset of words conveys the primary semantic information. At the sequence level, the prevalence of irrelevant sequences significantly outweighs those with meaningful content. Hence, generative inequality exists in the context of free-form medical QA tasks remarkably.

When conducting uncertainty quantification, we should pay greater attention to key words and sequences (i.e., words and sequences with high semantic relevance scores account for the primary uncertainty proportion). To explore the potential issues stemming from generative inequality, we analyze the correlation between the semantic relevance and uncertainty proportion. We first divide the semantic relevance scores into 10 equal intervals. In each interval, we calculate the sum and average uncertainty of all words or sequences. Results at both the word and sequence levels




Figure 2: Distribution of semantic relevance scores at both the word and sequence levels. The entire generated set contains a considerable proportion of irrelevant words and sequences (i.e., generative inequality).




Figure 3: Correlation between the semantic relevance and uncertainty proportion at both the word and sequence levels. Irrelevant words and sequences account for the primary source of uncertainty within the generated set (answer) in general.

are illustrated in Fig. 3. Due to the substantial presence of words that carry little semantic information, irrelevant words contribute significantly to the overall uncertainty. At the sequence level, both the mean and sum uncertainty of irrelevant sequences play a prominent role.

Given that a substantial proportion of irrelevant words and sequences constitute the primary source of uncertainty, it may introduce unexpected biases when measuring the uncertainty of free-form answers in real-world open-ended

medical QA tasks. To tackle these issues, we propose a novel uncertainty quantifier in the following text.

3.3. Word-Sequence Entropy

In light of the observed generative inequality in open-ended medical QA tasks, as demonstrated in Section 3.2.3, the equal treatment of all tokens, as described in Equation 2, may potentially introduce biases. We propose to assign greater weights to the uncertainty committed by words and sequences that exhibit higher semantic relevance when conducting uncertainty quantification. To maintain coherence and consistency in the presentation, we strictly adhere to the symbol conventions utilized in section 3.1 and 3.2.

3.3.1. Word-level WSE

Given x as the prompt, we enlarge the uncertainty proportion of relevant tokens by directly multiplying the token-wise entropy with the semantic relevance score:

$$U_T(z_{ijk}) = E_T(z_{ijk}) R_T(z_{ijk}), \quad (12)$$

where $E_T(z_{ijk})$ refers to the token-wise entropy of the k -th token in the j -th word within the i -th sequence. Then the re-weighted word-wise entropy can be formulated as:

$$U_W(w_{ij}) = \sum_k^{M_j} U_T(z_{ijk}). \quad (13)$$

To quantify the overall uncertainty of the i -th sequence, we simply sum up the re-weighted uncertainty of all words within the sequence:

$$U_S(\mathbf{s}_i) = \sum_j^{N_i} U_W(w_{ij}). \quad (14)$$

Finally, the word-level WSE is defined as the arithmetic mean uncertainty of K generated sequences, following PE:

$$WSE_W(\mathbb{S}) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_i^K U_S(\mathbf{s}_i). \quad (15)$$

By employing the word-level WSE, we reallocate higher importance to words that demonstrate greater semantic relevance within the current answer.

3.3.2. Sequence-level WSE

As noted in Section 3.2, sequences correlated with others in the set of K generated sequences are more plausible (i.e., have lower uncertainty). We reduce the uncertainty committed by the i -th sequence by simply adding the generative probability of \mathbf{s}_i to its semantic relevance score after dividing it by a certain number:

$$U_S'(\mathbf{s}_i) = -\log\left(p(\mathbf{s}_i) + \frac{R_S(\mathbf{s}_i)}{d}\right), \quad (16)$$

where d serves to regulate the extent to which the semantic relevance score influences the generative probability. Operating in the same way as Equation 15, the sequence-level WSE is formulated as follows:

$$WSE_S(\mathbb{S}) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_i^K U_S'(\mathbf{s}_i). \quad (17)$$

Algorithm 1: The pseudo-code for the combined *WSE*.

Input: $\mathbb{S}, \mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{s}_{l \neq i}, w_{ij}, z_{ijk}, K, N_i, M_j, p(z_{ijk}), d$.

- 1 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** K **do**
- 2 **for** $j \leftarrow 1$ **to** N_i **do**
- 3 Calculate the semantic textual similarity of \mathbf{s}_i before and after removing $w_{ij} \leftarrow S_W(w_{ij})$;
- 4 $R_W(w_{ij}) \leftarrow 1 - S_W(w_{ij})$;
- 5 **for** $k \leftarrow 1$ **to** M_j **do**
- 6 $R_T(z_{ijk}) \leftarrow R_W(w_{ij})$;
- 7 $E_T(z_{ijk}) \leftarrow -\log p(z_{ijk})$;
- 8 $U_T(z_{ijk}) \leftarrow E_T(z_{ijk})R_T(z_{ijk})$.
- 9 $U_W(w_{ij}) \leftarrow \sum_k^{M_j} U_T(z_{ijk})$. \triangleright *word-level*
- 10 $U_S(s_i) \leftarrow \sum_j^{N_i} U_W(w_{ij})$;
- 11 $p(s_i) \leftarrow e^{-U_S(s_i)}$. \triangleright *calibrated probability*
- 12 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** K **do**
- 13 **for** $l \leftarrow 1$ **to** K **do**
- 14 **if** $l \neq i$ **then**
- 15 Calculate the semantic textual similarity between s_l and $s_i \leftarrow S_S(s_l, s_i)$.
- 16 $R_S(s_i) \leftarrow \sum_{l \neq i}^K S_S(s_l, s_i) p(s_l)$;
- 17 $U_S'(s_i) \leftarrow -\log\left(p(s_i) + \frac{R_S(s_i)}{d}\right)$. \triangleright *seq-level*
- 18 $WSEC(\mathbb{S}) \leftarrow \frac{1}{K} \sum_i^K U_S'(s_i)$.

Output: Calibrated uncertainty of answer $WSEC(\mathbb{S})$.

3.3.3. Integrated *WSE*

In view of the direct mathematical relation between the probability and uncertainty of \mathbf{s}_i , as defined in Equation 4, we replace $p(s_i)$ in Equation 16 by $e^{-U_S(s_i)}$, where $U_S(s_i)$ represents the calibrated uncertainty of \mathbf{s}_i described in Equation 14. One detail to note is that the sequence-level semantic relevance score of \mathbf{s}_i (i.e., $R_S(s_i)$) is determined by the probability of compared sequences and we also make a replacement for $p(s_i)$ as defined in Equation 8. Then, the combined *WSE* that calibrates the uncertainty at both the word and sequence levels can be formulated as:

$$WSEC(\mathbb{S}) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_i^K -\log\left(p_i' + \frac{\sum_{l \neq i}^K S_{li} p_l'}{d}\right), \quad (18)$$

where p_i' and p_l' refer to the replacements of the generative probability, and S_{li} represents the semantic textual similarity between s_l and s_i . Moreover, the pseudo of combined *WSE* is summarized in Algorithm 1.

By strategically re-weighting the conditional probability of keywords and elevating the generative probability of semantically analogous sequences, *WSE* pays more attention to significant words and sequences when estimating the uncertainty of free-form answers provided by LLMs, effectively mitigating biases caused by generative inequality. In the latter part of the experiments, we denote word-level *WSE*, sequence-level *WSE* and combined *WSE* by WSE_W , WSE_S and $WSEC$ respectively.

4. Empirical Evaluation

In this section, we demonstrate the superior performance of *WSE* in accurate uncertainty quantification of free-form answers in open-ended medical QA tasks. In light of the potential for real-world applications, we utilize the sequence with the lowest uncertainty within the generated set, measured by *WSE*, as the final output to the current question, and explore the overall enhancement of LLMs accuracy.

4.1. Experiment Setup

4.1.1. Performance Evaluation

Following Semantic Entropy (*SE*) [21], we assess uncertainty by framing uncertainty estimation as the task of determining whether to depend on an LLM-generated sequence conditioned on the prompt or question and employ area under the receiver operator characteristic curve (AUROC) as the evaluation metric. During uncertainty estimation, the AUROC metric refers to the likelihood (probability) of identifying a randomly selected correct sequence as more unreliable than a randomly selected incorrect sequence. Higher AUROC scores indicate more effective uncertainty estimation, with a value of 1 representing a perfect measurement.

4.1.2. Correctness Evaluation

We adopt two metrics to determine the correctness of LLM’s output: Rouge-L score [48] and sentence similarity. As a fuzzy matching criterion, Rouge-L score measures the longest common subsequence between the output and reference answer. Regarding the sentence similarity, we utilize the cross-encoder model mentioned in Section 3.2.1 with DistillRoBERTa [49] serving as the backbone. The sentence similarity equates to the semantic textual similarity denoted by S_C in Equation 5. We consider the output to be correct if the Rouge-L score or sentence similarity surpasses the predefined threshold, both set to 0.5. One point that needs to be emphasized is we employ the most likely generation as the evaluation object, which will be introduced in Section 4.1.6. In Section 4.2.2, we will analyze the sensitivity of *WSE* to the thresholds for these two evaluation criteria.

4.1.3. Model

We conduct experiments on 7 popular “off-the-shelf” LLMs provided by Hugging Face, including pre-trained LLMs (e.g., LLaMA-7B [8]) and instruction-tuned LLMs (e.g., LLaMA-2-7B-Chat [24], Mistral-v0.1 [50], Zephyr-7B-Alpha [26], Vicuna-7B-v1.5 [51], WizardLM-7B [52], StableBeluga-7B [24, 25]) with the model size of 7B.

4.1.4. Datasets

We utilize 5 free-form medical QA datasets: COVID-QA [27], Medical Meadow MedQA [28], PubMedQA [29], MedMCQA [30] and MedQuAD [31]. COVID-QA consists of 2,019 question-answer pairs related to COVID-19 and we employ all samples within the maximum sequence length allowed by the current language model (e.g., 380 for LLaMA-7B) in the subsequent experiments. MedMCQA is a large-scale, multiple-choice QA dataset designed to address real-world medical entrance exam questions and we select all samples where each question, with only one option, begins with “what” or “which” (1895 in total). As for Medical Meadow MedQA and MedQuAD, we randomly select 2000 test samples from the validation set. PubMedQA is a novel biomedical QA dataset collected from PubMed abstracts and we employ the full test set (1000 question-answer pairs).

Differing from COVID-QA and PubMedQA, which provide contextual information, we adopt few-shot prompts in Medical Meadow MedQA, MedMCQA, and MedQuAD. We randomly selected 5 fixed samples within each dataset to form the few-shot prompt, empowering LLMs to follow the instruction.

4.1.5. Baselines

We compare *WSE* against Predictive Entropy (*PE*) [19], Semantic Entropy (*SE*) [21], Lexical Similarity (*LS*) [53], Token-level Shift Attention to Relevance (Token-*SAR*), Sentence-level Shift Attention to Relevance (Sent-*SAR*) and Shift Attention to Relevance (*SAR*) [22]. *PE* quantifies the uncertainty as described in Section 3.2. *SE* considers semantic equivalence and calculates the cluster-wise entropy. *LS* compute the mean semantic similarity score of the outputs with the set of K generated sequences. By allocating the uncertainty proportion of tokens based on their relevance, Token-*SAR* alleviates biases stemming from generative inequality in NLG. Sent-*SAR* enlarges the probability of sentences with more relevant semantic information. Token-*SAR* and Sent-*SAR* are orthogonal and *SAR* is the combination of them.

4.1.6. Hyperparameters

In response to a medical query, LLMs generate 5 free-form sequences (i.e., $K = 5$) by multinomial sampling, which are then utilized for uncertainty quantification. As for the correctness evaluation of answers, we employ greedy search for the most likely generation. The temperature of generation is fixed at 0.5 for all LLMs and the max length of

Table 1: Comparison of WSE_W , WSE_S , WSE_C and 6 baselines on 7 pre-trained and instruction-tuned LLMs over 5 free-form medical QA datasets, utilizing sentence similarity as the criterion for correctness evaluation with the threshold set to 0.5 (AUROC).

Dataset	LLMs	LS	PE	SE	Token- SAR	Sent- SAR	SAR	WSE_W	WSE_S	WSE_C
COVID-QA	LLaMA-7B	0.5076	0.7348	0.7032	0.6903	0.718	0.7142	<u>0.7448</u>	0.7319	0.7454
	LLaMA-2-7B-Chat	0.4422	0.6756	0.6716	0.664	0.6765	0.6589	0.6869	0.6767	<u>0.6846</u>
	Mistral-7B-v0.1	0.4341	0.7278	0.7027	0.6911	0.7166	0.7209	0.7318	<u>0.7327</u>	0.7482
	Zephyr-7B-Alpha	0.4147	0.6607	0.6583	0.6483	<u>0.6655</u>	0.6558	0.6643	0.6609	0.6696
	WizardLM-7B	0.4059	0.6951	0.684	0.6737	0.6897	0.6593	0.7076	0.6948	<u>0.7016</u>
	Vicuna-7B-v1.5	0.4021	0.6955	0.6882	0.6826	0.7011	0.6914	0.7159	0.6971	<u>0.713</u>
	StableBeluga-7B	0.4438	0.6904	0.7083	0.6986	0.7027	0.6962	<u>0.7121</u>	0.7068	0.7228
Average		0.4358	0.6971	0.688	0.6784	0.6957	0.6857	<u>0.7091</u>	0.7001	0.7122
MedQA	LLaMA-7B	0.5143	0.5122	<u>0.5493</u>	0.4789	0.5468	0.513	0.5164	0.5438	0.5502
	LLaMA-2-7B-Chat	0.5483	0.5793	0.5958	0.5805	0.5948	<u>0.6145</u>	0.6102	0.6074	0.6415
	Mistral-7B-v0.1	0.5355	0.4845	0.5119	0.4915	0.5085	<u>0.5517</u>	0.5185	0.5506	0.5782
	Zephyr-7B-Alpha	0.5035	0.4979	0.5206	0.4936	0.5043	<u>0.5251</u>	0.5192	<u>0.5326</u>	0.5619
	WizardLM-7B	0.5985	0.4631	0.5684	0.4836	<u>0.6286</u>	0.5517	0.5499	0.6314	0.6211
	Vicuna-7B-v1.5	0.5079	0.4538	0.4752	0.5093	0.451	<u>0.5335</u>	0.5295	0.4746	0.5576
	StableBeluga-7B	0.5776	0.5139	0.5481	0.5318	0.5749	0.5696	0.5474	<u>0.5758</u>	0.5749
Average		0.5408	0.5007	0.5385	0.5099	0.5441	0.5513	0.5416	<u>0.5595</u>	0.5836
MedMCQA	LLaMA-7B	0.5468	0.529	0.5415	0.5394	<u>0.5583</u>	0.5399	0.5498	0.5586	0.5548
	LLaMA-2-7B-Chat	0.5108	0.4954	0.5015	0.5128	0.4833	0.52	<u>0.5467</u>	0.503	0.5612
	Mistral-7B-v0.1	0.5075	0.4909	0.5216	0.5205	0.498	0.5523	0.5146	<u>0.5584</u>	0.5777
	Zephyr-7B-Alpha	0.4831	0.5175	0.5404	0.5356	0.5331	0.5374	0.5259	0.5534	<u>0.5512</u>
	WizardLM-7B	0.532	0.498	0.5074	0.4957	0.5025	0.5063	<u>0.5517</u>	0.5149	0.5623
	Vicuna-7B-v1.5	0.5016	0.4952	0.5015	0.5011	0.4803	0.5065	<u>0.5288</u>	0.4975	0.5395
	StableBeluga-7B	0.499	0.4446	0.4833	0.4446	0.4655	<u>0.5305</u>	0.4421	0.5125	0.5314
Average		0.5115	0.4958	0.5139	0.5071	0.503	0.5276	0.5228	<u>0.5283</u>	0.554
PubMedQA	LLaMA-7B	0.5496	0.5424	0.6202	0.5414	0.6129	0.6269	0.542	0.6343	0.634
	LLaMA-2-7B-Chat	0.5024	0.6146	0.5918	0.5676	0.5819	0.6176	0.5736	<u>0.6179</u>	0.664
	Mistral-7B-v0.1	0.5018	0.644	<u>0.6644</u>	0.5262	0.6614	0.6022	0.5808	0.698	0.6627
	Zephyr-7B-Alpha	<u>0.5929</u>	0.5682	0.5706	0.4894	0.5594	0.531	0.5293	0.5793	0.6027
	WizardLM-7B	0.5587	0.5308	0.5525	0.4676	0.5265	0.5172	0.508	<u>0.564</u>	0.6031
	Vicuna-7B-v1.5	0.5787	0.6631	<u>0.6728</u>	0.5715	0.6617	0.6289	0.6112	0.667	0.6869
	StableBeluga-7B	0.6075	0.6598	0.6461	0.6662	0.6419	<u>0.6971</u>	0.6664	0.6754	0.7169
Average		0.5559	0.6033	0.6169	0.5471	0.6065	0.603	0.573	<u>0.6337</u>	0.6529
MedQuAD	LLaMA-7B	<u>0.6546</u>	0.5996	0.604	0.6534	0.6446	0.6491	0.6618	0.6365	0.6502
	LLaMA-2-7B-Chat	0.5758	0.4889	0.5123	0.5743	0.5484	<u>0.5884</u>	0.5879	0.5364	0.589
	Mistral-7B-v0.1	0.5838	0.6091	0.5409	0.578	0.5639	0.5718	0.5823	0.5643	<u>0.5847</u>
	Zephyr-7B-Alpha	0.5718	0.5012	0.6283	0.6732	0.6393	0.6673	0.6817	0.6327	<u>0.6756</u>
	WizardLM-7B	0.5866	0.4447	0.5405	0.5958	0.5613	0.5871	0.6112	0.5596	<u>0.6003</u>
	Vicuna-7B-v1.5	0.5748	0.4469	0.5652	<u>0.6357</u>	0.5792	0.6249	0.6493	0.5727	0.6301
	StableBeluga-7B	0.5671	0.5226	0.5887	<u>0.596</u>	0.5738	0.5732	0.608	0.5634	0.5737
Average		0.5878	0.5161	0.5686	0.6152	0.5872	0.6088	0.626	0.5808	<u>0.6148</u>
Overall		0.5264	0.5626	0.5852	0.5715	0.5873	0.5952	0.5945	<u>0.6005</u>	0.6235

each generation is set to 128 tokens within a sequence. The coefficient c defined in Equation 5 is set to 1.0 by default. The denominator in the relevance-controlled quantity d introduced in Equation 18 is set to 0.001.

4.2. Empirical Findings

4.2.1. Uncertainty Quantification

Given the proposed integrated measurement of semantic textual similarity as described in Section 3.2.1, we compare WSE_W , WSE_S and WSE_C with 6 baseline methods, utilizing sentence similarity as the criterion for correctness

Table 2: Comparison of WSE_W , WSE_S , WSE_C and 6 baselines on 7 pre-trained and instruction-tuned LLMs over 5 free-form medical QA datasets, utilizing Rouge-L score as the criterion for correctness evaluation with the threshold set to 0.5 (AUROC).

Dataset	LLMs	LS	PE	SE	Token- SAR	Sent- SAR	SAR	WSE_W	WSE_S	WSE_C
COVID-QA	LLaMA-7B	0.5726	0.7297	0.7114	0.6735	0.7159	0.7047	0.7108	<u>0.7304</u>	0.7445
	LLaMA-2-7B-Chat	0.4676	0.7164	0.7148	0.7103	0.7174	0.7098	<u>0.7255</u>	0.7223	0.7324
	Mistral-7B-v0.1	0.5403	0.6368	0.653	0.6697	0.6367	0.6418	0.7207	0.6432	<u>0.6922</u>
	Zephyr-7B-Alpha	0.5748	0.6344	0.6445	0.6015	0.6381	0.612	0.6416	<u>0.6458</u>	0.6524
	WizardLM-7B	0.5591	0.6455	0.6623	0.6401	0.6345	0.5569	<u>0.6486</u>	0.6341	0.5779
	Vicuna-7B-v1.5	0.4898	0.6699	0.6972	0.6981	0.6959	0.6405	<u>0.7051</u>	0.6936	0.7528
	StableBeluga-7B	0.5795	0.673	0.6712	0.6647	0.6744	0.6376	0.6839	<u>0.6744</u>	0.6528
MedQA	LLaMA-7B	0.5162	0.5191	0.562	0.4725	<u>0.573</u>	0.5178	0.5257	0.5679	0.5739
	LLaMA-2-7B-Chat	0.5714	0.5874	0.6194	0.5666	<u>0.6265</u>	0.6192	0.6167	<u>0.6364</u>	0.6581
	Mistral-7B-v0.1	0.5456	0.5246	0.5358	0.4952	0.5541	0.5706	0.5004	<u>0.5826</u>	0.5828
	Zephyr-7B-Alpha	0.4897	0.5278	0.5451	0.4987	0.5327	0.54	0.5212	<u>0.5633</u>	0.5803
	WizardLM-7B	0.6246	0.4668	0.5755	0.4808	0.6161	0.5565	0.5461	0.6285	<u>0.6268</u>
	Vicuna-7B-v1.5	0.5154	0.4967	0.5085	0.5128	0.4937	<u>0.5426</u>	0.5274	0.5126	0.5608
	StableBeluga-7B	0.586	0.5378	0.5741	0.5522	0.6048	0.5949	0.5687	<u>0.6074</u>	0.6097
MedMCQA	LLaMA-7B	0.5596	0.5182	0.5511	0.5347	<u>0.5693</u>	0.5403	0.5463	0.5699	0.5589
	LLaMA-2-7B-Chat	0.503	0.4988	0.5012	0.5347	0.4881	0.5453	<u>0.5544</u>	0.5076	0.572
	Mistral-7B-v0.1	0.5293	0.5307	0.5382	0.5295	0.5402	0.5652	0.5168	<u>0.576</u>	0.5781
	Zephyr-7B-Alpha	0.4801	0.55	0.5896	0.5659	0.5842	0.5718	0.5536	0.6103	<u>0.5921</u>
	WizardLM-7B	0.5151	0.5051	0.5	0.5124	0.5005	0.5268	<u>0.5381</u>	0.5095	0.5395
	Vicuna-7B-v1.5	0.5048	0.4983	0.4937	0.5182	0.4843	<u>0.5311</u>	0.5304	0.5031	0.5499
PubMedQA	LLaMA-7B	0.5123	<u>0.5457</u>	0.5401	0.5423	0.5203	0.5426	0.5403	0.5451	0.554
	LLaMA-2-7B-Chat	0.6511	0.6146	0.5867	0.6329	0.5726	<u>0.7053</u>	0.642	0.6028	0.7329
	Mistral-7B-v0.1	0.5172	0.5331	0.5231	0.5093	0.5131	0.5133	0.5094	<u>0.5654</u>	0.5659
	Zephyr-7B-Alpha	0.4945	0.6194	0.4433	0.6103	0.4408	0.5737	0.664	0.4754	<u>0.6545</u>
	Vicuna-7B-v1.5	0.7465	0.3397	0.3838	<u>0.8246</u>	0.3647	0.7926	0.8888	0.3477	0.6283
MedQuAD	LLaMA-7B	<u>0.7442</u>	0.7123	0.6611	0.6821	0.7126	0.7161	0.7216	0.7108	0.747
	LLaMA-2-7B-Chat	0.8667	0.8783	0.8353	<u>0.9215</u>	0.8413	0.9065	0.9527	0.8423	0.9108
	Mistral-7B-v0.1	0.7893	0.7985	0.6101	<u>0.8292</u>	0.67	0.8072	0.8394	0.7291	0.704
	WizardLM-7B	0.2327	0.9816	0.9718	<u>0.9843</u>	0.9775	0.9721	0.9889	0.9746	0.9561
	Vicuna-7B-v1.5	0.9065	0.902	0.9014	<u>0.9266</u>	0.9035	<u>0.9275</u>	0.9356	0.9125	0.9142
	Overall	0.5729	0.6131	0.6102	0.6298	0.6132	0.6394	<u>0.6522</u>	0.6275	0.6585

evaluation. Experimental results are summarized in Table 1. By calibrating the uncertainty committed by each word and sequence based on their semantic relevance, WSE_W demonstrates superior performance when compared to Token- SAR , with an increase of 2.3% AUROC, and WSE_S surpasses Sent- SAR by 1.32% AUROC generally. Furthermore, WSE_C , by calibrating the uncertainty at both the word and sequence levels, outperforms SAR by 2.83% AUROC and consistently exhibits significantly higher AUROCs than baseline methods over 5 open-ended medical QA datasets, further emphasizing the effectiveness of our approach.

In the MedQuAD task, each few-shot prompt comprises multiple question-answer pairs that share a similar structure, with no contextual information provided to LLMs. Moreover, ground truth answers and generated sequences exhibit notably greater length than other tasks. To tackle these challenges, we employ a strategy to calculate normalized semantic relevance scores at the word level and assign them to individual tokens, enhancing the connectivity between each word and the entire sequence and effectively mitigating biases induced by sequence length. From the results, it can be observed that WSE_W achieves the highest AUROC of 0.626, demonstrating a remarkable improvement over baseline methods.

Given that Rouge-L score is determined by the length of the longest common subsequence between the reference answer and generated sequence, and semantically similar sequences may display substantial variations in their structural arrangements, LLMs may face challenges when dealing with specific tasks with longer ground truth answers. That is, there might be some tasks where none of the generated sequences satisfy the criterion for correctness. Ta-




Figure 4: The performance of WSE_W , WSE_S , WSE_C and baseline methods at different thresholds of Rouge-L score. Results are obtained on the COVID-QA task utilizing the LLaMA-2-7B-Chat model.




Figure 5: The performance of WSE_W , WSE_S , WSE_C and baseline methods at different thresholds of sentence similarity. Results are obtained on the COVID-QA task utilizing the LLaMA-2-7B-Chat model.

ble 2 illustrates the comparative results, with the caveat that tasks exhibiting an accuracy of 0 are excluded from our analysis.

Despite the inherent evaluation limitation of Rouge-L score, WSE_W and WSE_C exhibit remarkable performance. Specifically, WSE_W achieves the second-highest average AUROC of 0.6498, while WSE_C attains the highest average AUROC of 0.6555. By assessing the semantic relevance score at the word level instead of independently evaluating each token, WSE_S outperforms Sent-SAR by 1.48% AUROC. It is worth noting that comparable baselines exhibit unstable uncertainty estimation under rigorous correctness evaluation conditions (e.g., Sent-SAR gets 0.3647 AUROC




Figure 6: The performance of WSE_W , WSE_S , WSE_C and baselines at different numbers of generated sequences employing Rouge-L score as the metric of correctness evaluation. Results are obtained on the COVID-QA task utilizing the LLaMA-2-7B-Chat model.




Figure 7: The performance of WSE_W , WSE_S , WSE_C and baselines at different numbers of generated sequences employing sentence similarity as the metric of correctness evaluation. Results are obtained on the COVID-QA task utilizing the LLaMA-2-7B-Chat model.

over the PubMedQA dataset in the Vicuna-7B-v1.5 setting), while WSE consistently performs in a normal state, indicating significant potential in real-world medical QA applications.

In a broad context, WSE demonstrates superior accuracy and stability in quantifying the uncertainty of free-form answers compared to baseline methods, with both Rouge-L score and sentence similarity employed as the criterion for correctness evaluation, in 5 popular free-form medical QA tasks.

Table 3: The enhancement of model accuracy after employing sequences with lower uncertainty identified by WSE_W , WSE_S and WSE_C , utilizing both Rouge-L score and sentence similarity as the criteria for correctness evaluation under multiple thresholds. Experimental results are obtained in the COVID-QA task.

Criterion	Threshold	Accuracy	LLaMA	LLaMA-2-Chat	Mistral	Zephyr	WizardLM	Vicuna	StabeBeluga	
Rouge-L Score	0.3	Initial	0.4775	0.5172	0.1777	0.1936	0.1485	0.1406	0.1777	
		Calibrated	WSE_W	0.5225	0.5809	0.6233	0.5862	0.5517	0.5544	0.5703
			WSE_S	0.5013	0.557	0.5995	0.5597	0.496	0.5279	0.5438
			WSE_C	0.504	0.557	0.5968	0.557	0.4934	0.5279	0.5438
	Enhanced (max)	↑ 4.5%	↑ 6.37%	↑ 44.56%	↑ 39.26%	↑ 40.32%	↑ 41.38%	↑ 39.26%		
	0.5	Initial	0.3475	0.3899	0.0849	0.0769	0.0504	0.0637	0.0557	
		Calibrated	WSE_W	0.382	0.4138	0.4881	0.4191	0.3687	0.3979	0.3793
			WSE_S	0.3501	0.4032	0.4562	0.3395	0.313	0.3395	0.3289
			WSE_C	0.3448	0.4085	0.4562	0.3342	0.321	0.3395	0.3236
	Enhanced (max)	↑ 3.45%	↑ 2.39%	↑ 40.32%	↑ 34.22%	↑ 31.83%	↑ 33.42%	↑ 32.36%		
Sentence Similarity	0.5	Initial	0.2679	0.2759	0.3024	0.1910	0.2122	0.2334	0.1857	
		Calibrated	WSE_W	0.2918	0.2865	0.3422	0.2546	0.2202	0.2653	0.2122
			WSE_S	0.2891	0.2785	0.3263	0.2202	0.2042	0.252	0.1963
			WSE_C	0.2679	0.2706	0.3103	0.2122	0.1989	0.2361	0.1883
	Enhanced (max)	↑ 2.39%	↑ 1.06%	↑ 3.98%	↑ 6.36%	↑ 0.8%	↑ 3.19%	↑ 2.65%		
	0.7	Initial	0.1008	0.1061	0.1273	0.0584	0.069	0.0769	0.0584	
		Calibrated	WSE_W	0.13	0.1114	0.1485	0.1008	0.0743	0.1008	0.069
			WSE_S	0.1167	0.1008	0.1406	0.0716	0.0743	0.0902	0.0557
			WSE_C	0.1141	0.1034	0.13	0.0637	0.0743	0.0849	0.0769
	Enhanced (max)	↑ 2.92%	↑ 0.53%	↑ 2.12%	↑ 4.24%	↑ 0.53%	↑ 2.39%	↑ 1.85%		

4.2.2. Sensitivity Analysis

To investigate the impact of various thresholds for two correctness metrics on WSE_W , WSE_S , WSE_C and prior methods, we utilize LLaMA-2-7B-Chat and generate a set of 10 sequences per question within the task of COVID-QA. Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 demonstrate that each method is subject to varying degrees of influence from the threshold. In general, as the evaluation criteria become increasingly stringent, our proposed method consistently outperforms baseline methods. Notably, when utilizing Rouge-L score, WSE_C achieves the highest AUROC of 0.7315, while leveraging sentence similarity results in the AUROC of 0.877. One point to mention is that when using sentence similarity as the criterion, setting the threshold to 0.1 results in the evaluation of all answers as correct and we exclude this scenario from our analysis.

Considering that entropy-based methods integrate sequences within the generated set, we explore how the number of sequences (i.e., K) impacts the performance of uncertainty quantification. As illustrated in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, WSE_W and Token-SAR exhibit sensitivity to variations in K . Nevertheless, WSE_W ultimately surpasses baselines and achieves the second-highest AUROC score under both evaluation criteria. When employing Rouge-L score as the correctness metric, WSE_S generally outperforms baseline methods and obtains the second-highest AUROC of 0.6161 with 6 generated sequences. It is worth noting that WSE_C consistently outperforms comparable methods under two criteria for correctness evaluation.

4.3. Accuracy Enhancement

Owing to the abundant and diverse domain-specific knowledge within the medical domain, the availability of LLMs specifically designed for free-form medical QA tasks is comparatively limited. Furthermore, real-world medical QA scenarios tend to be highly intricate and often lack contextual information associated with the questions, posing significant challenges to LLMs. In this section, we investigate the improvement of model accuracy solely through posterior work, by leveraging multiple “off-the-shelf” LLMs pre-trained on NLG datasets without any additional task-specific training or architectural modification.

Given that WSE can quantify the uncertainty at the sequence level, we assess the set of K generated sequences, and then select the sequence with the lowest uncertainty, measured by our proposed quantifier, as the final answer to the current question and recompute the overall accuracy of dataset.

We employ COVID-QA as the dataset and investigate the enhancement of accuracy under two criteria for correctness evaluation. As summarized in Table 3, when utilizing Rouge-L score, improvement of accuracy exhibits variations across multiple LLMs. Given that Rouge-L score is sensitive to the structure of generated sequences, LLMs of the LLaMA series achieve higher initial accuracy than others under two thresholds and obtain the max increase of 6.37% on the LLaMA-2-7B-Chat model. After filtering high-uncertainty sequences identified by WSE_W , we achieve a substantial accuracy enhancement of 44.56% on the Mistral model when the threshold of correctness metric is set to 0.3. Despite the stringent nature and limitations associated with Rouge-L score, the COVID-QA task exhibits a noteworthy improvement in accuracy across 7 “off-the-shelf” LLMs.

As for sentence similarity, we adopt two relatively stringent thresholds: 0.5 and 0.7. In comparison to Rouge-L score, there is no remarkable enhancement in accuracy, with the highest increase observed at 6.36% on the Zephyr-7B-Alpha model when the threshold is set to 0.5. Overall, the accuracy enhancement of COVID-QA is consistently stable and highly effective, demonstrating significant potential of WSE in practical medical QA applications.

5. Conclusion

Striving to fill the void of methods for uncertainty estimation in free-form medical QA tasks, we commence by analyzing the potential challenges arising from generative inequality in uncertainty quantification within the medical domain. Then, we calibrate the entropy-based uncertainty at both the word and sequence levels (i.e., WSE) according to the semantic relevance scores obtained based on the integrated measurement of semantic textual similarity. To overcome the limitations of LLMs in medical QA tasks, we exclusively focus on posterior work and utilize sequences with lower uncertainty identified by WSE as final answers, achieving significant enhancement of model accuracy. Experiments on 5 medical QA datasets showcase the superior performance of WSE in accurate uncertainty quantification and its tremendous potential in real-world medical QA applications.

Our proposed method employs “off-the-shelf” LLMs without requiring supplementary fine-tuning or modifications (i.e., unsupervised), thereby facilitating further research in this area and enhancing reproducibility. However, our method needs to calculate the semantic textual similarity, which introduces additional latency in practice applications. By offering users information regarding the uncertainty of language model outputs, we endeavor to advance the progress of safer and more reliable QA systems, particularly in the medical field.

References

- [1] A. B. Abacha, P. Zweigenbaum, Means: A medical question-answering system combining nlp techniques and semantic web technologies, *Information processing & management* 51 (5) (2015) 570–594.
- [2] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, et al., Language models are few-shot learners, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020) 1877–1901.
- [3] A. Chowdhery, S. Narang, J. Devlin, M. Bosma, G. Mishra, A. Roberts, P. Barham, H. W. Chung, C. Sutton, S. Gehrmann, et al., Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311* (2022).
- [4] Z. Chen, K. Zhou, B. Zhang, Z. Gong, W. X. Zhao, J.-R. Wen, Chatcot: Tool-augmented chain-of-thought reasoning on chat-based large language models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14323* (2023).
- [5] L. Ouyang, J. Wu, X. Jiang, D. Almeida, C. Wainwright, P. Mishkin, C. Zhang, S. Agarwal, K. Slama, A. Ray, et al., Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022) 27730–27744.
- [6] E. Waisberg, J. Ong, M. Masalkhi, S. A. Kamran, N. Zaman, P. Sarker, A. G. Lee, A. Tavakkoli, Gpt-4: a new era of artificial intelligence in medicine, *Irish Journal of Medical Science (1971-)* (2023) 1–4.
- [7] S. Zhang, S. Roller, N. Goyal, M. Artetxe, M. Chen, S. Chen, C. Dewan, M. Diab, X. Li, X. V. Lin, et al., Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068* (2022).
- [8] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, et al., Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).
- [9] M. He, P. N. Garner, Can chatgpt detect intent? evaluating large language models for spoken language understanding, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13512* (2023).
- [10] J. Duan, R. Zhang, J. Diffenderfer, B. Kailkhura, L. Sun, E. Stengel-Eskin, M. Bansal, T. Chen, K. Xu, Gtbench: Uncovering the strategic reasoning limitations of llms via game-theoretic evaluations, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12348* (2024).
- [11] S. Min, M. Lewis, H. Hajishirzi, L. Zettlemoyer, Noisy channel language model prompting for few-shot text classification, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04106* (2021).

- [12] P. Manakul, A. Liusie, M. J. Gales, Selfcheckgpt: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08896 (2023).
- [13] Y. Yao, J. Duan, K. Xu, Y. Cai, E. Sun, Y. Zhang, A survey on large language model (llm) security and privacy: The good, the bad, and the ugly, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02003 (2023).
- [14] L. Sun, Y. Huang, H. Wang, S. Wu, Q. Zhang, C. Gao, Y. Huang, W. Lyu, Y. Zhang, X. Li, et al., Trustllm: Trustworthiness in large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05561 (2024).
- [15] D. Amodei, C. Olah, J. Steinhardt, P. Christiano, J. Schulman, D. Mané, Concrete problems in ai safety, arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565 (2016).
- [16] C. Yuan, J. Duan, N. J. Tustison, K. Xu, R. A. Hubbard, K. A. Linn, Remind: Recovery of missing neuroimaging using diffusion models with application to alzheimer’s disease, medRxiv (2023).
- [17] A. Kendall, Y. Gal, What uncertainties do we need in bayesian deep learning for computer vision?, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [18] S. Lin, J. Hilton, O. Evans, Teaching models to express their uncertainty in words, arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14334 (2022).
- [19] S. Kadavath, T. Conerly, A. Askell, T. Henighan, D. Drain, E. Perez, N. Schiefer, Z. Hatfield-Dodds, N. DasSarma, E. Tran-Johnson, et al., Language models (mostly) know what they know, arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221 (2022).
- [20] A. Malinin, M. Gales, Uncertainty estimation in autoregressive structured prediction, arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07650 (2020).
- [21] L. Kuhn, Y. Gal, S. Farquhar, Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation, arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09664 (2023).
- [22] J. Duan, H. Cheng, S. Wang, C. Wang, A. Zavalny, R. Xu, B. Kailkhura, K. Xu, Shifting attention to relevance: Towards the uncertainty estimation of large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01379 (2023).
- [23] H. Wang, D. Yu, Going beyond sentence embeddings: A token-level matching algorithm for calculating semantic textual similarity, in: *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 2023, pp. 563–570.
- [24] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale, et al., Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288 (2023).
- [25] S. Mukherjee, A. Mitra, G. Jawahar, S. Agarwal, H. Palangi, A. Awadallah, Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4, arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02707 (2023).
- [26] L. Tunstall, E. Beeching, N. Lambert, N. Rajani, K. Rasul, Y. Belkada, S. Huang, L. von Werra, C. Fourrier, N. Habib, et al., Zephyr: Direct distillation of lm alignment, arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16944 (2023).
- [27] T. Möller, A. Reina, R. Jayakumar, M. Pietsch, Covid-qa: A question answering dataset for covid-19, in: *ACL 2020 Workshop on Natural Language Processing for COVID-19 (NLP-COVID)*, 2020.
- [28] D. Jin, E. Pan, N. Oufattole, W.-H. Weng, H. Fang, P. Szolovits, What disease does this patient have? a large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams, arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13081 (2020).
- [29] Q. Jin, B. Dhingra, Z. Liu, W. W. Cohen, X. Lu, Pubmedqa: A dataset for biomedical research question answering, arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.06146 (2019).
- [30] A. Pal, L. K. Umapathi, M. Sankarasubbu, Medmcqa: A large-scale multi-subject multi-choice dataset for medical domain question answering, in: *Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, PMLR, 2022, pp. 248–260.
- [31] A. Ben Abacha, D. Demner-Fushman, A question-entailment approach to question answering, *BMC bioinformatics* 20 (1) (2019) 1–23.
- [32] E. Hüllermeier, W. Waegeman, Aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in machine learning: An introduction to concepts and methods, *Machine Learning* 110 (2021) 457–506.
- [33] M. Ott, M. Auli, D. Grangier, M. Ranzato, Analyzing uncertainty in neural machine translation, in: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, PMLR, 2018, pp. 3956–3965.
- [34] M. Fomicheva, S. Sun, L. Yankovskaya, F. Blain, F. Guzmán, M. Fishel, N. Aletras, V. Chaudhary, L. Specia, Unsupervised quality estimation for neural machine translation, *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 8 (2020) 539–555.
- [35] T. Glushkova, C. Zerva, R. Rei, A. F. Martins, Uncertainty-aware machine translation evaluation, arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.06352 (2021).
- [36] Y. Gal, Z. Ghahramani, Dropout as a bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning, in: *international conference on machine learning*, PMLR, 2016, pp. 1050–1059.
- [37] B. Lakshminarayanan, A. Pritzel, C. Blundell, Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [38] Y. Wang, D. Beck, T. Baldwin, K. Verspoor, Uncertainty estimation and reduction of pre-trained models for text regression, *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10 (2022) 680–696.
- [39] A. Malinin, S. Chervontsev, I. Provilkov, M. Gales, Regression prior networks, arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11590 (2020).
- [40] K. Miok, D. Nguyen-Doan, B. Škrlič, D. Zaharie, M. Robnik-Šikonja, Prediction uncertainty estimation for hate speech classification, in: *Statistical Language and Speech Processing: 7th International Conference, SLSP 2019, Ljubljana, Slovenia, October 14–16, 2019, Proceedings* 7, Springer, 2019, pp. 286–298.
- [41] S. Lahlou, M. Jain, H. Nekoei, V. I. Butoi, P. Bertin, J. Rector-Brooks, M. Korablyov, Y. Bengio, Deup: Direct epistemic uncertainty prediction, arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.08501 (2021).
- [42] A. Vazhentsev, G. Kuzmin, A. Shelmanov, A. Tsvigun, E. Tsymbalov, K. Fedyanin, M. Panov, A. Panchenko, G. Gusev, M. Burtsev, et al., Uncertainty estimation of transformer predictions for misclassification detection, in: *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2022, pp. 8237–8252.
- [43] Y. Hu, L. Khan, Uncertainty-aware reliable text classification, in: *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2021, pp. 628–636.
- [44] N. Reimers, I. Gurevych, Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks, arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084 (2019).
- [45] L. Konle, F. Jannidis, M. Kröncke, S. Winko, Relevance scores in bert sequence classification (2022).
- [46] Y. Liu, M. Ott, N. Goyal, J. Du, M. Joshi, D. Chen, O. Levy, M. Lewis, L. Zettlemoyer, V. Stoyanov, Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach, arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692 (2019).

- [47] P. He, X. Liu, J. Gao, W. Chen, Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention, arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03654 (2020).
- [48] C.-Y. Lin, Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries, in: Text summarization branches out, 2004, pp. 74–81.
- [49] V. Sanh, L. Debut, J. Chaumond, T. Wolf, Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter, arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108 (2019).
- [50] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Mensch, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. d. I. Casas, F. Bressand, G. Lengyel, G. Lample, L. Saulnier, et al., Mistral 7b, arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825 (2023).
- [51] L. Zheng, W.-L. Chiang, Y. Sheng, S. Zhuang, Z. Wu, Y. Zhuang, Z. Lin, Z. Li, D. Li, E. Xing, et al., Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena, arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05685 (2023).
- [52] C. Xu, Q. Sun, K. Zheng, X. Geng, P. Zhao, J. Feng, C. Tao, D. Jiang, Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions, arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244 (2023).
- [53] Z. Lin, J. Z. Liu, J. Shang, Towards collaborative neural-symbolic graph semantic parsing via uncertainty, Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022 (2022).