

# Self-Consistent Decoding for More Factual Open Responses

**Christopher Malon**  
NEC Laboratories America  
malon@nec-labs.com

**Xiaodan Zhu**  
Queen’s University  
xiaodan.zhu@queensu.ca

## Abstract

Self-consistency has emerged as a powerful method for improving the accuracy of short answers generated by large language models. As previously defined, it only concerns the accuracy of a final answer parsed from generated text. In this work, we extend the idea to open response generation, by integrating voting into the decoding method. Each output sentence is selected from among multiple samples, conditioning on the previous selections, based on a simple token overlap score. We compare this “Sample & Select” method to greedy decoding, beam search, nucleus sampling, and the recently introduced hallucination avoiding decoders of DoLa, P-CRR, and S-CRR. We show that Sample & Select improves factuality by a 30% relative margin against these decoders in NLI-based evaluation on the subsets of CNN/DM and XSum used in the FRANK benchmark, while maintaining comparable ROUGE-1 F1 scores against reference summaries. We collect human verifications of the generated summaries, confirming the factual superiority of our method.

## 1 Introduction

A large language model (LLM) generates output text by predicting probabilities for each token, conditioned on a prompt and previous tokens in the output, and using a decoding strategy such as greedy decoding, beam search, or nucleus sampling to select tokens at each position and assemble an output string. Like any abstractive generative model, LLM’s have a risk of outputting information that is false or unsupported with respect to a context or closed book knowledge, commonly called *hallucination* (Kryscinski et al., 2020; Fabbri et al., 2021; Manakul et al., 2023).

Recent work has observed that if multiple responses are sampled from a large language model, they are likely to hallucinate different values for each detail (Manakul et al., 2023; Wang et al.,

2023). On the other hand, details that multiple sampled responses share in common are likely to be the truth.

In cases where a short answer can be easily parsed from a generated response, *self consistency* (Wang et al., 2023) uses the idea of voting (using exact matches of the parsed short answer) to select a better answer more reliably than using an individual sample. However, this procedure does not apply to tasks where the full response is needed and not just an extracted short answer.

Our main contribution is a novel decoding mechanism which can be applied to any LLM task, which samples multiple text outputs from the LLM and selects the most consistent choice for each sentence, reflecting the commonality in the responses. We compare our decoding technique to several baselines in automatic factuality metrics, applied to Llama 2 (chat) and Mistral. We also contribute human evaluations, including a coarse classification of errors. In the accompanying code, we provide an implementation of our method and the baselines, along with the human evaluation dataset.<sup>1</sup>

## 2 Related work

Recent research has begun to introduce decoding strategies to avoid hallucinations. Faithfulness-Aware Decoding and Context-Aware Decoding assume that generated text should be supported by a provided context (Wan et al., 2023a; Shi et al., 2023). Decoding by Contrasting Layers (DoLa) and Certainty-Based Response Ranking (CRR) apply more generally to the case where responses are not to be limited to information in the context (Chuang et al., 2023; Wan et al., 2023b). We are interested in this setting and consider these techniques as baselines.

SelfCheckGPT (Manakul et al., 2023) introduces a technique for scoring the hallucination level of

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/cdmalon/selfconsistent>




Figure 1: Sampling and selecting sentences iteratively.

an open-ended generation using multiple sampled responses. Although it does not provide a decoding technique for making a more factual generation, we instantiate our decoding technique with a score they introduce as a further baseline, and show that our score performs better.

### 3 Method: Sample and Select

Given a large language model (LLM) and prompt text, generation of output text proceeds as follows. Using nucleus sampling (Holtzman et al., 2020) with  $p = .9$ ,  $n = 5$  sampled outputs are decoded from the LLM until the end of one sentence in each.

We count the number of other sampled sentences from the LLM that matched each token of each sampled output, and score each sentence by the average count per token. Formally, if sampled sentences  $s_1, \dots, s_n$  consist of words  $w_i^j$ ,  $j = 1 \dots m_i$ , the score of sample  $i$  is

$$\frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \sum_{k=1}^n 1_{w_i^j \in s_k}$$

where  $1_{w_i^j \in s_k}$  is 1 if token  $w_i^j$  is in sentence  $s_k$  and 0 if not. This score embodies the intuition that details are represented by tokens, and that each trustworthy detail should occur in a large number of other samples. In the case where no token is repeated in a sample, this score is proportional to a sum of ROUGE-1 precisions with the other samples, but unlike ROUGE-1, our score is not concerned with comparing numbers of repetitions. Manakul et al. (2023) found that another

kind of unigram score (which we compare as a baseline) outperformed scores using higher  $n$ -grams or BERTscore (Zhang\* et al., 2020) in detecting hallucinations, supporting our focus on token-level details.

We check each sample for grammaticality by the existence of both a subject and a verb, by computing parts of speech and dependency parsing, comparing to a set of designated tags listed in Appendix A. Scores of samples that fail the check are set to zero. Generation may be aborted if no sampled generalization outputs survive. The sampled output with the highest score is added to the final output and the prompt.

Additional sentences are added to the final output iteratively (Figure 1), collecting new samples conditioning on the prompt including previously chosen sentences. If any sample ends after the current sentence, generation is stopped after selection and the final output is returned.

The time to compute token overlap scores is negligible, so the method could run as efficiently as collecting multiple samples from nucleus sampling, if the implementation would stop the generation as soon as the end of a sentence is reached.

### 4 Experiment Setup

We evaluate Llama 2 chat (13 billion) (Touvron et al., 2023) and Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 (Jiang et al., 2023) at zero-shot summarization on English news articles from the CNN/DM (Hermann et al., 2015) and XSum (Narayan et al., 2018) datasets,

Method	Llama 2				Mistral			
	SummaC		ROUGE-1	QAFE	SummaC		ROUGE-1	QAFE
	ZS	Conv	F1	F1	ZS	Conv	F1	F1
Greedy	.447	.409	.338	.595	.423	.401	.311	.552
Nucleus	.448	.420	.341	.599	.412	.378	.313	.531
Beam	.474	.444	<b>.345</b>	.637	.447	.430	.310	<b>.608</b>
P-CRR	.464	.466	.338	.628	.438	.409	.313	.563
S-CRR	.453	.418	.334	.590	.441	.395	.308	.527
DoLa	.436	.407	.336	.586	—	—	—	—
SelfCheckGPT	.550	.521	.334	.640	.417	.396	.313	.534
Independent	.510	.457	.331	.596	.476	.431	.316	.537
Sample & Select	<b>.619</b>	<b>.575</b>	.337	<b>.642</b>	<b>.505</b>	<b>.452</b>	<b>.327</b>	.557

Table 1: Automatic evaluations on CNN/Daily Mail.

Method	Llama 2				Mistral			
	SummaC		ROUGE-1	QAFE	SummaC		ROUGE-1	QAFE
	ZS	Conv	F1	F1	ZS	Conv	F1	F1
Greedy	.356	.364	.089	.580	.413	.402	.075	.575
Nucleus	.378	.390	.089	.572	.387	.376	.075	.538
Beam	.386	.395	.089	<b>.616</b>	.420	.414	.072	<b>.621</b>
P-CRR	.380	.418	.086	.607	.409	.386	.074	.576
S-CRR	.358	.368	.084	.576	.394	.377	.073	.536
DoLa	.339	.360	.088	.560	—	—	—	—
SelfCheckGPT	.425	.428	.085	.585	.382	.379	.075	.543
Independent	.394	.390	.085	.568	.451	.414	.081	.557
Sample & Select	<b>.522</b>	<b>.488</b>	<b>.090</b>	.600	<b>.474</b>	<b>.435</b>	<b>.080</b>	.559

Table 2: Automatic evaluations on XSum.

comparing the results obtained based on different decoding methods. From each dataset, we use the subset of 175 documents appearing in the test subset of FRANK (Pagnoni et al., 2021), a benchmark in which human and automatic verifications of previous systems have been collected. To fix sentence segmentation issues, the articles are cleaned with regular expressions before summarization (see Appendix B), but not when computing the metrics.

For automatic factuality evaluation, we use SummaC (Laban et al., 2022) as a natural language inference based measure, and QAFactEval (QAFE) (Fabbri et al., 2022) as a question answering based measure. We also report ROUGE-1 F1 scores<sup>2</sup> (Lin, 2004). SummaC is run in the zero-shot (ZS) and convolutional (Conv) variants at sentence granularity, using the “vitc” model. For QAFactEval, we report the average F1 score.

For human factuality evaluation, we randomly choose 50 articles from the FRANK test set and evaluate the four systems with the highest SummaCZS scores. We solicit three human evaluations of each sentence of each system generated summary from a trusted pool of Amazon Mechanical Turk crowdworkers (instructions in Appendix C

and recruitment protocol in Appendix D). Each system’s score is the average over all worker ratings of its generated sentences. Over all worker ratings, there is 94.3% agreement with majority labels (6.8% false positive, 5.3% false negative).

As baselines, we consider **greedy** decoding, **beam** search with five beams, and **nucleus** sampling ( $p = .9$ ) (Holtzman et al., 2020). Furthermore, we test four recent decoding techniques designed to reduce hallucinations:

1. **DoLa** (Chuang et al., 2023) modifies the next token distribution by contrasting the difference in logits obtained from a projections of late and early layers of the LLM. Following the paper, the even numbered layers in the first half of the layers of the transformer are used as candidate premature layers for dynamic premature layer selection, contrasted with layer 40. The official implementation works with Llama but not Mistral.
2. Probabilistic certainty-based response ranking (**P-CRR**) (Wan et al., 2023b) ranks responses using the mean log probability of the entire sequence. We implement P-CRR ourselves.
3. Semantic certainty-response ranking (**S-CRR**)

<sup>2</sup>Huggingface Datasets 2.3.2

Data	Method	No Error	Contradiction	Meaningless	Other	Pronoun	Unsupported
CNN/DM	Beam	.690	.041	.174	<b>.006</b>	.003	.085
	SelfCheckGPT	.713	<b>.028</b>	.196	.016	<b>.000</b>	.047
	Independent	.686	.040	<b>.140</b>	.012	<b>.000</b>	.121
	Sample & Select	<b>.747</b>	.035	.147	.019	.005	<b>.046</b>
XSum	Beam	.739	<b>.008</b>	.171	<b>.006</b>	<b>.000</b>	.077
	SelfCheckGPT	.638	.033	.202	.036	.008	.083
	Independent	.732	.021	<b>.130</b>	.021	.006	.091
	Sample & Select	<b>.741</b>	.025	.145	.027	.002	<b>.061</b>

Table 3: Human evaluations on Llama 2 summaries.

(Wan et al., 2023b) ranks responses using an entailment-based agreement score. We implement S-CRR, following the paper to judge entailment using a Roberta-Large model trained on Adversarial NLI (ANLI) (Nie et al., 2020).

4. **SelfCheckGPT** (Manakul et al., 2023) uses sampling to detect hallucination, similar to our approach. The paper does not propose a decoding approach but only scores sentences according to likelihood of hallucination. We extend this to a decoding method by choosing, for each sentence, the sample with the lowest hallucination score, re-conditioning on the chosen sentences. This extension parallels our method. The paper proposes several possible scores, some of which are too slow for practical use (their QA-based score took 4.5 minutes for one example) or effectively call the factuality evaluator to choose the output. We use the efficient unigram score, based on negative log likelihood of tokens based on their occurrence in other responses, which performs well in their evaluation.

Our method is referred to as **sample & select** in the tables. As an ablation, we consider **independent**, which decodes entire responses and selects each sentence in the same way, without reconditioning later sentences on the finally chosen sentences.

## 5 Results and Discussion

Tables 1 and 2 show automatic evaluations of all systems. Our system leads both SummaC metrics by large margins on all models. The comparison with *independent* shows that conditioning later sentences on finally chosen samples is critical. This advantage is included in our design of the SelfCheckGPT baseline, which performs next best on Llama 2 and whose gap reflects our improvement in the scoring function. We gain at least 30% (rela-

tive) in SummaCZS with Llama 2 over all baselines behind SelfCheckGPT.

The strong performance of beam search among the standard decoding techniques was already noted by Wan et al. (2023a), and beam search occasionally beats Sample & Select in the QAFactEval metric. We further explore this phenomenon in Appendix E, where we show the errors that are corrected might not always concern factoids for which questions are generated. Although ROUGE requires the original reference summaries and is not strongly factuality oriented, we include it to show that our technique remains comparable to scores of other techniques, while gaining factuality.

Humans judge Sample & Select to have the highest factual accuracy and lowest number of unsupported sentences, as shown in Table 3. However, our technique seems not to avert the generation of meaningless sentences or pronoun errors. We instructed the graders to label “Sure!” at the head of a summary as a meaningless sentence, and this appears in the majority of Llama 2 13B summaries with any decoding method.

## 6 Conclusion

Sampling multiple responses one sentence at a time, and choosing one with a simple, efficient token overlap consistency score, can significantly increase the factuality of a generated response. Other hallucination estimates may be effectively used in place of token overlap, but the unigram score described in SelfCheckGPT was at least 10% worse in NLI-based evaluation. Conditioning each sentence on the previously chosen sentence is essential; if further sentences are generated conditioned on an unchosen sample, factuality improves by less.

Although it is beyond the scope of the current paper, Sample & Select can apply beyond summarization to other generation tasks. We hope future researchers will find this technique helpful and easy to drop into their generation pipeline.



## Limitations

The proposed decoding method is sensitive to sentence splitting and tokenization. The scoring method involves a heuristic to choose more reliable samples, and further evaluation is needed to confirm that output chosen in this way enhances factuality in more settings, particularly on tasks beyond summarization. The rules of the grammaticality filter were designed specifically for English language text.

## References

- Steven Bird and Edward Loper. 2004. [NLTK: The natural language toolkit](#). In *Proceedings of the ACL Interactive Poster and Demonstration Sessions*, pages 214–217, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yung-Sung Chuang, Yujia Xie, Hongyin Luo, Yoon Kim, James Glass, and Pengcheng He. 2023. [DoLa: Decoding by contrasting layers improves factuality in large language models](#). In *arXiv*, 2309.03883.
- Alexander Fabbri, Chien-Sheng Wu, Wenhao Liu, and Caiming Xiong. 2022. [QAFactEval: Improved QA-based factual consistency evaluation for summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2587–2601, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexander R. Fabbri, Wojciech Kryściński, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir Radev. 2021. [SummEval: Re-evaluating summarization evaluation](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:391–409.
- Karl Moritz Hermann, Tomas Kocisky, Edward Grefenstette, Lasse Espeholt, Will Kay, Mustafa Suleyman, and Phil Blunsom. 2015. [Teaching machines to read and comprehend](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2020. [The curious case of neural text de-generation](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Matthew Honnibal, Ines Montani, Sofie Van Landeghem, and Adriane Boyd. 2020. [spaCy: Industrial-strength Natural Language Processing in Python](#).
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). In *arXiv*, 2310.06825.
- Wojciech Kryscinski, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2020. [Evaluating the factual consistency of abstractive text summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9332–9346, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Philippe Laban, Tobias Schnabel, Paul N. Bennett, and Marti A. Hearst. 2022. [SummaC: Re-visiting NLI-based models for inconsistency detection in summarization](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:163–177.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark Gales. 2023. [SelfCheckGPT: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9004–9017, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shashi Narayan, Shay B. Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. [Don’t give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1797–1807, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yixin Nie, Adina Williams, Emily Dinan, Mohit Bansal, Jason Weston, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. [Adversarial NLI: A new benchmark for natural language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4885–4901, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Artidoro Pagnoni, Vidhisha Balachandran, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2021. [Understanding factuality in abstractive summarization with FRANK: A benchmark for factuality metrics](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4812–4829, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weijia Shi, Xiaochuang Han, Mike Lewis, Yulia Tsvetkov, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Scott Wen tau Yih. 2023. [Trusting your evidence: Hallucinate less with context-aware decoding](#). In *arXiv*, 2305.14739.
- 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. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). In *arXiv*, 2307.09288.

David Wan, Mengwen Liu, Kathleen McKeown, Markus Dreyer, and Mohit Bansal. 2023a. [Faithfulness-aware decoding strategies for abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2864–2880, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Yixin Wan, Fanyou Wu, Weijie Xu, and Srinivasan H. Sengamedu. 2023b. [Sequence-level certainty reduces hallucination in knowledge-grounded dialogue generation](#). In *arXiv*, 2310.18794.

Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023. [Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Tianyi Zhang\*, Varsha Kishore\*, Felix Wu\*, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. [Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

## A Grammar Checking

The goal of grammar checking is to reject incomplete sentence fragments. Sentences were tokenized using the `sentence_tokenize` function in the `tokenize` module of NLTK 3.8.1 (Bird and Loper, 2004).

The `en_core_web_sm` models of Spacy 3.7.0 (Honnibal et al., 2020) were used to run part of speech tagging and dependency parsing on each sentence. A sentence was accepted as grammatical if a subject and a verb was found. We considered that a subject was found if any token in the sentence was labeled with the “nsubj,” “nsubjpass,” or “expl” dependency relations. We considered that a verb was found if any token was tagged with the part of speech “VBZ,” “VBD,” or “VBP,” or the dependency relations “aux” or “auxpass.”

## B Article Cleanup

Because missing whitespace, run-together words, and social media buttons confounded proper sentence segmentation with NLTK `sentence_tokenize`, we applied the following Python regular expression substitutions to the article text. These rules were inspired by our observations on the validation sets.

```
document = re.sub(r"\.([a-zA-Z])",
    ". \\1", document)
document = re.sub(r"([a-z])([A-Z])",
    "\\1 \\2", document)
document = re.sub(r"Share this with
    Email Facebook Messenger Messenger
    Twitter Pinterest Whats App Linked
    In Copy this link", "", document)
```

## C Labeling Protocol

The Turks were given the following instructions to label each sentence of a system generated summary, given an article:

- Read the text carefully.
- You’re given a news article. Don’t let it bother you if there is some repetition or sentences without periods in the article text - these were just picture captions or callouts that interrupted the flow of the main text.
- A machine-generated summary of the article is split into sentences.
- Decide whether all details of each summary sentence are fully supported by the article, or not.
- Note that some words in the passage are replaced with “UNK”, a placeholder for unknown words. These words are not errors.
- If there are no errors, select “No Error.”
- If there is an error, select “Error.” Possible reasons for an error include:
  - **Contradicts article:** Use this for errors that are direct contradictions. This could result from the wrong entities, the wrong relations, or wrongly attached adjectives, adverbs, or other description.
  - **Adds unsupported information:** If not a direct contradiction, any new information (even if true) that does not appear in

the original article should be considered as this type. For example, if “Bob Jones” is mentioned in the summary but the article only refers to “Spokesman Jones” without a first name, this is a new, unsupported detail.

- **Meaningless:** Minor grammatical errors may be ignored, but use this for errors so serious that the meaning of the sentence is unclear, such as “The vaccine accepted have already started.” This also applies to sentences that appear totally out of context, like “Sure!”
- **Pronoun reference:** This refers to cases where a word like “it” or “he” in the summary refers to the wrong entity (or hasn’t been specified) in the summary, but the statement would be correct if the pronoun referred to a different entity.
- **Other**

Each summary was presented to three crowdworkers for labeling. Our error types simplify the typology of FRANK because fine-grained agreement about error types was low on FRANK.

## D Crowdworker Recruitment

For every four system summaries in our main labeling task, we added one alertness test from the original FRANK dataset. This test was an old system summary in which one of the sentences had a unanimous error or non-error label. The purpose of the test was to check whether our crowdworker agreed with the unanimous label. The fine-grained type of the error was not considered.

Our first qualification was a seven-question test, labeling individual sentences from FRANK on which the original annotators had unanimous agreement. Prospective workers had to label “error” or “no error” correctly on six of the seven problems, but did not have to choose the error type. Additionally, crowdworkers had to be in the United States, Great Britain, or Australia, have a 90% HIT approval rating, and at least 1000 approved HITs.

Qualified workers were allowed to participate in an open round of labeling, where anyone who met the qualifications could participate. This round used 25 articles different from the ones on which we reported final test results. From this pool, we granted an exclusive qualification to the workers who passed a high fraction of the alertness tests,

did not submit answers too quickly, and had low false positive and false negative rates with respect to majority labels (error or non-error, not considering the type). The exact thresholds are secret, to encourage good behavior by Turks. Monitoring behavior on an open round was necessary even after the qualification test, because the majority of workers in the open round were careless, aiming to collect rewards as fast as possible, and did not meet these qualification criteria.

We also granted the exclusive qualification to more workers whose integrity was demonstrated on previous labeling tests by the authors. These workers still had to pass the qualification test.

Then we held closed rounds of labeling, only open to those with the exclusive qualification. We continually monitored the criteria for the exclusive qualification on each batch. One labeler turned rogue and submitted highly inaccurate (with respect to majority) labels much too quickly, and his qualification was revoked. Labels by this worker were excluded from the final dataset, leaving some summaries with only two crowdworker annotations.

The workers were paid \$1.20 per system summary, based on an estimate that a typical summary would require four minutes to grade, for a targeted compensation of \$18 per hour. This is above minimum wage anywhere in the United States as of December 12, 2023.<sup>3</sup> We informed the workers that their annotations were used to make published papers and high quality datasets.

## E Metrics and Human Judgments

In the set of summaries judged by our crowdworkers, we computed QAFE and SummaC scores on a sentence basis, and compared to crowdworkers’ judgments of each sentence as “NoError” versus any type of error (hallucination). Both SummaCZS and QAFE have high AUC scores (.82 and .85) in predicting the majority decision.

Focusing on cases where SummaCZS and QAFE disagree, at threshold 0.5, we find 37 hallucination sentences with high QAFE and low SummaCZS score, and only 31 with high SummaCZS and low QAFE.

Qualitatively, we have the following findings.

**QAFE may fail to catch an error when different phrases of the article are improperly linked together.** In the first of the 37 examples, “He

<sup>3</sup>Minimum Wage in the United States, Wikipedia.

missed the Premier League since 2006 and felt emotional when he scored the goal, comparing it to scoring in the World Cup,” the player actually missed the World Cup in 2006 and missed the Premier League since some unspecified time. QAFE’s generated questions combine many details from the generated summary, such as, “What league did he miss since 2006 and feel emotional when he scored the goal, comparing it to scoring in the World Cup?” and “the Premier League” is extracted as the most likely answer to this question based on the article, even though much of the premise of the question is incorrect. Thus, this question fails to penalize the QAFE score of this hallucination.

**QAFE question coverage may be inadequate for some hallucinations.** Another hallucination which SummaC caught but not QAFE was: “The team’s goalkeeper, Manuel Neuer, was in top form, and the team dominated the game, coming close to scoring several times,” three questions are generated by QAFE, but none checks whether the team came close to scoring several times.

On the other hand, at the same threshold, “No-Error” recall for QAFE (.710) exceeds SummaC (.580). Qualitatively, this appears to be because the sentence-based approach of SummaC prevents it from accepting multi-hop supports which QAFE can accept by answering multiple questions from different places. Overall, SummaC and QAFE have different strengths and weaknesses, and are best considered together.

## F Summary Lengths

Method	CNN/DM		XSum	
	Llama	Mistral	Llama	Mistral
Greedy	175	239	136	124
Nucleus	267	283	144	147
Beam	170	238	151	135
P-CRR	266	217	187	125
S-CRR	199	245	155	130
DoLa	230	—	149	—
SelfCheckGPT	171	218	110	152
Independent	203	224	155	131
Sample & Select	253	211	113	134

Table 4: Average lengths of generated summaries in tokens.

In Table 4, we compare the lengths of the generated summaries with each decoding method. We do not observe consistent trends in the ordering of the methods with respect to length.

## G Licenses

All the article data we require is distributed with FRANK, which is MIT-licensed. We also release our crowdworker annotations and scripts under the MIT license. Worker ID’s are not included, to preserve anonymity.