

How Random is Random? Evaluating the Randomness and Humanness of LLMs’ Coin Flips

Katherine Van Koevering
kav64@cornell.edu
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York, USA

Jon Kleinberg
kleinberg@cornell.edu
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York, USA

ABSTRACT

One uniquely human trait is our inability to be random. We see and produce patterns where there should not be any and we do so in a predictable way. LLMs are supplied with human data and prone to human biases. In this work, we explore how LLMs approach randomness and where and how they fail through the lens of the well studied phenomena of generating binary random sequences. We find that GPT 4 and Llama 3 exhibit and exacerbate nearly every human bias we test in this context, but GPT 3.5 exhibits more random behavior. This dichotomy of randomness or humanness is proposed as a fundamental question of LLMs and that either behavior may be useful in different circumstances.

1 INTRODUCTION

Humans are well known to be excellent at perceiving patterns. We see faces in our lattes, pictures in the stars, and can be convinced that LeBron James missed that basket because we forgot to wear a lucky shirt. Inversely, humans are generally bad at recognizing (and producing) randomness. Ask the next person you see to pick a random number between 1 and 10 and they will most likely pick 7 [27]. Ask them to flip a coin in their imagination and it will probably be heads. We’re not just bad at randomness, we’re bad at randomness in predictable ways. Dozens of research papers have documented these very human biases — instances where we want to be random but somehow fail.

In the age of large language models, we have supplied a non-human intelligence with access to our human repository of knowledge — the Internet. Machines, too, struggle with randomness. Real randomness is hard. Their struggles have also been well documented, but are remarkably different from human struggles with randomness. Thus, when a machine, fed on human produced data, is asked to deal with randomness it is likely to bring a combination of machine and human bias to the task.

In this work, we explore how LLMs approach randomness and where and how they fail. We argue that machines have not only learned human biases in their dealing with randomness, but they have exacerbated this bias to be worse than humans in a large variety of ways. This fundamental failure in producing randomness is a human-like feature of LLMs, but it also limits their capabilities in tasks where humans require assistance with randomness (since we are, after all, already very good at failing to behave randomly). This dichotomy of humanness has previously been explored as one aspect of measuring advanced AI [34].

We approach this issue through a set of related tasks that have a long history in behavioral science research: asking an agent (human or machine) to generate a sequence of random outcomes, such as a string of coin flips, and then comparing the properties of the

resulting sequence to the properties of an independent, identically distributed sequence of outcomes — essentially asking how the agent’s sequence differs from “pure” randomness.

1.1 A Short History of Flipping Coins

Understanding the human aspect of randomness has been an elusive goal for much of the 20th and 21st centuries. The ambiguity of probabilistic reasoning, and even the elusiveness of a common definition of randomness, has been the subject of debate in philosophy, psychology, biology, physics, and mathematics since at least the early 20th century [1, 3, 11, 13, 19, 20, 23, 32]. Fernberger as early as 1913 [16], described human generation of randomness as an interesting and complex topic and sparked a century long interest in the production of random binary sequences [41].

The results of most of the early work concluded that sequences created by humans differed significantly than what would be expected in an independent, identically distributed sequence, and this conclusion has been supported by nearly all later work [2, 8, 15, 30, 40, 47]. The most well-documented difference is an increased number of alterations — where the element at a given position in the sequence differs from the immediately preceding element [6, 7, 12, 15–18, 28, 31, 35, 45]. This tendency is termed a *negative recency effect*. However, a number of other patterns have been described including the tendency to use both symbols approximately equally [33], avoidance of longer runs [4, 10, 20], and a ‘first flip’ bias [5, 20].

In order to facilitate the creation of these sequences, the most common instructions in such studies are for participants to imitate the tossing of a coin — a presumably random sequence of two symbols [2, 4, 8, 25, 38]. However, there have been several attempts to understand how various prompting can affect the patterns evident in the sequences. [5] found that varying the order of heads or tail in the response and instructions could change the first flip bias. [35] found that motivating participants by having them play a game that encouraged random behavior did result in more random sequences. Additionally, attempts have been made to vary the respondents in terms of education level [4], stress [22], drugs [44], and psychiatric disorders [46]. While some small variations have been found, most respondents, regardless of other variables, are consistent in their lack of randomness, although some biases may become stronger or weaker with reduced cognitive function [22].

There has also, of course, been extensive speculation on the underlying mechanisms that result in these consistent patterns. Some explanations involve limitations in human cognitive ability. The lack of short-term memory [41], in which participants attempt to ascribe characteristics of random distributions of long sequences to short sub-sequences has been supported by several papers both

experimental and theoretical [21, 36, 37]. A seemingly orthogonal area of research suggests the existence of short-term memory is to blame, as random sequences should be memoryless [46]. Limits to processing capability have also been investigated, particularly in conjunction with information-theoretic measures of randomness [32]. On the other hand, some researchers have suggested that we can ascribe failures to be random to failures of the participants to understand randomness [10, 39], with effects such as the gambler’s fallacy or hot hand fallacy (itself the subject of hot debate) [29, 42].

For additional review of the literature on human randomness generation, see Nickerson, 2002 [32] and Tune, 1964 [41].

1.2 Defining Randomness

Definitions of randomness in studies on humans usually must define a random sequence as either a function of the product (the sequence itself) or the process (how a sequence was created) [32]. Both possibilities come with their own drawbacks. It is difficult to describe any given instance of a sequence as random, since all possible sequences must, by definition, have equal probability []. Similarly, it is difficult to describe a process as random, since randomness is nigh on impossible to manufacture (see the extensive literature on pseudo-randomness) []. Instead, many researchers choose to heuristically consider a set of sequences to be sufficiently random if they are similar under some measure to what an independent, identically distributed sequence would look like. This comes with the drawback that no particular sequence can be "random" and one must instead investigate a set of sequences. Most of the measures used for this type of analysis are based on counting the frequency of simple patterns such as alternations or runs [4, 38] or tuples or n-grams [10]. Others use more complex measures, such as autocorrelations [10].

In our work, we do not address this problem directly. Instead of asking if we are producing "random" sequences, we ask if we are producing "human" sequences. Since human-generated sequences are well documented to differ from random in a number of aspects (and the difficulty of pseudo-randomness generation tells us so do computer-generated sequences, albeit in starkly different ways) we do not always test for randomness but instead test for humanness.

2 FLIPPING VIRTUAL COINS

Given the long history of binary random sequences, we borrow heavily from prior work on the subject. As such, for our setup we ask LLMs to flip coins to generate the sequence. For the most part, we use two prompts "Flip 20 coins." and "Flip 20 fair coins." Although we do see some difference between the prompts, for the most part the prompts give us remarkably similar results. For most analysis, we break these 20-flip sequences into 19 overlapping 8-flip sequences, similarly to Kleinberg et al [26]. This allows direct comparison with several known papers who also report results for 8-flip sequences [26, 31]. This also means that all subsequences of a given length are equally probable.

Unlike humans, when LLMs are used for almost any task, the temperature variable is a key parameter. LLMs often have a user-controlled variable, known as temperature, that gives an estimate of how consistent the model is. In the words of OpenAI, "Lower values for temperature result in more consistent outputs (e.g. 0.2),

prompt model t	Flip a coin.			Flip a fair coin.		
	gpt 3.5	gpt 4	llama 3	gpt 3.5	gpt 4	llama 3
0.0	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.65	1.00
0.1	0.98	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.59	1.00
0.2	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	1.00
0.3	0.87	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	1.00
0.4	0.78	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.92	1.00
0.5	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.93	1.00
0.6	0.82	0.96	1.00	0.95	0.93	1.00
0.7	0.70	0.93	1.00	0.92	0.93	1.00
0.8	0.81	0.95	1.00	0.90	0.94	1.00
0.9	0.72	0.93	1.00	0.90	0.93	1.00
1.0	0.75	0.93	1.00	0.90	0.89	1.00
1.5	0.89	0.95	0.93	0.86	0.80	0.97

Table 1: Proportion of responses that are heads for different models and temperatures, using the prompts “flip a coin” and “flip a fair coin”

while higher values generate more diverse and creative results (e.g. 1.0)." Higher temperature, therefore, seems likely to give more random (and thus less consistent) results. However, in tests, setting temperature above 1.5 proved impractical, as the model began to return results that held random text and we were not able to parse a coin flip from the text. As such, we test for temperatures from 0 to 1.5.

It is worth noting that ChatGPT and Llama reacted very differently to this task. ChatGPT frequently reminded the user that they were not a random number generator, did not have a coin, and that users may wish to complete this task a different way. Llama, on the other hand, did not respond this way. In fact, at least once, it claimed to be using a random number generator to generate the flips. It also, on at least one occasion, reported a flip as "bad flip (retrying)". Both models would, at the higher temperatures, occasionally return unintelligible text, stop part way through, or otherwise fail to complete the task.

2.1 Flipping One Coin

We start with the most basic of questions - if asked to flip a coin, how do LLM’s respond (Tab 1? With this simple prompt, we had almost no refusals to respond from Llama-3. Instead, we found a very strong bias towards heads. With 660 flips spread across temperatures from 0.0 to 1.0 and the two prompts "Flip a coin." and "Flip a fair coin." we did not have a single instance of tails. In fact, it is only when we boost the temperature to 1.5 do we have our first tails - 2/30 for "Flip a coin." and 1/30 for "Flip a fair coin."

Chat GPT, however, does not follow this same pattern. We got many more refusals to respond, and we do not see the same pattern of nearly all heads in all situations. In fact, our two most balanced instances are GPT 3.5 at high temperatures with "Flip a coin." and GPT 4 at low temperatures with "Flip a fair coin."

The fact that all three LLMs respond in different, albeit consistent, ways is surprising and suggests that the different architectures and training data have significant impact. However, there is at least

prompt model t	Flip 20 coins.			Flip 20 fair coins.		
	gpt 3.5	gpt 4	llama 3	gpt 3.5	gpt 4	llama 3
0.0	1.00	0.96	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00
0.1	1.00	0.94	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00
0.2	1.00	0.93	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00
0.3	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00
0.4	1.00	0.93	1.00	1.00	0.94	1.00
0.5	1.00	0.91	1.00	1.00	0.89	1.00
0.6	1.00	0.93	1.00	1.00	0.87	1.00
0.7	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.88	1.00
0.8	1.00	0.91	1.00	1.00	0.87	1.00
0.9	1.00	0.95	1.00	0.80	0.83	1.00
1.0	1.00	0.88	1.00	1.00	0.89	1.00
1.5	1.00	0.92	0.96	0.86	0.89	1.00

Table 2: Proportion of first responses in a sequence that are heads for different models and temperatures, using the prompts “flip 20 coins” and “flip 20 fair coins”.

one consistent pattern present - all instances skew towards heads. This reflects a human bias to also skew towards heads. Experiments have consistently found that, when asked to simulate a sequence of coin tosses, humans reliably have a heads-first bias, with about 80% or more of first "tosses" being heads [5].

2.2 First Flip

We can also compare the first flip in a sequence to match previous experiments more closely. We find an even stronger bias, across the board, with more than 88% of sequences beginning with heads, regardless of parameters (Tab 2). This is significantly more biased than human data. We also see, again, that Llama tends to be biased more strongly than GPT. GPT-4 and GPT-3.5 also differ, with GPT-4 generally less biased. Note that this ‘first instance’ bias is present not only in sequences of heads/tails, but also true/false, and and A/B. This may suggest that frozen binomials in language [43] influence the bias in the first choice [20]. However, it has also been noted that humans, generally, see these random binomial sequences that are generated by other humans, and thus contain these human biases, suggesting the first instance bias is a product of human experience with human bias (or machine experience with human bias) [5].

However, past research has suggested that this tendency can be affected by a primacy or recency bias. That is, if the prompt includes the words "heads" or "tails" the order of those words can effect the bias. We test this by adjusting our prompts where we can easily reverse the order of those words. In particular, suppose the instructions are, "Flip 20 fair coins. Report the flips as a list of characters separated by commas. If it's heads write 'H', if it's tails write 'T'." Then we can reverse the order in which “heads” and “tails” are mentioned in the instructions, and see how this affects the outcome.

In human experiments, respondents are more likely to start their sequence with whichever option is listed first, with 87% listing Heads first with a Heads-first prompt and 67% listing Tails first

Model	Prompt	Heads-First	Tails-First
GPT-3.5	Heads First	16	5
GPT-4	Heads First	33	6
Llama-3	Heads First	20	20
GPT-3.5	Tails First	11	11
GPT-4	Tails First	35	4
Llama-3	Tails First	32	8

Table 3: Number of heads-first and tails-first responses for various models, given a heads-first or tails-first prompt.

with a Tails-first prompt [5]. The instruction ordering overtakes the initial bias, but we can still see an impact from language.

However, we get very different results from LLMs (Tab 3). We do not see any evidence of a primacy bias in the instructions. In fact, we see what could be a small recency bias in Llama-3 (removing the word "fair" from the prompt exacerbates this recency bias but changes no other results). This suggests that, while LLMs and humans both suffer from a base rate bias, LLMs do not share a tendency towards primacy bias exhibited by human respondents.

2.3 Fraction of Heads

Another simple human bias in random sequence generation is that humans tend to be very close to 50% heads/tails in their sequences. In fact, human sequences tend to be too close to 50% to resemble a distribution of random sequences [33]. We can, again, see this bias replicated and magnified by LLMs (Tab 1). GPT 4 and Llama 3, much like humans, tend to have more sequences with a moderate number of heads than is expected at random and also more than expected by human sequences. At high temperatures, they both average just above 4 heads per 8 flips, much like humans.

However, we also see a slight, but significant, bias for heads in Llama 3, at lower temperatures. Conversely, we see a strong tail bias from GPT 3.5 for lower temperatures that mellows to match the Bernoulli distribution well at high temperatures. Thus, while GPT 4 and Llama 3 exacerbate an existing human bias, GPT 3.5 interestingly has an entirely different bias at low temperatures but comes to rest close to human distributions at higher temperatures.

2.4 Runs & N-Grams

Alternations. Perhaps one of the strongest results from previous literature is the human tendency to view sequences with excess alternations as more random - both when identifying random sequences and producing them. Several estimates have been made on how much more human sequences alternate than would be expected at random, a good average would be that humans alternate 60% of the time, while 50% would be expected [5, 8, 9, 12, 14, 33, 44].

For our LLM experiments, we can graph the exact distribution of alternations (Fig 2). For our sequence of 8 flips, we would expect 3.5 alternations on average (shown in red). However, we can see that all three LLM models skew high. At low temperatures, GPT 4 tends to give exclusively the response 'H, T, H, T, ...' resulting in very high alternation counts. However, Llama 3 also has one preferred pattern at low temperatures, but it is instead 'H, T, H, H,




Figure 1: Percentage of runs with x heads for different models and prompts. The data for KLM is taken from Kleinberg et al. [26] that performed similar experiments looking at sequences of 8 coin flips taken from longer samples. Bernoulli represents a ‘truly random’ sequence of Bernoulli distributions. Note that KLM is most similar to the Bernoulli distribution, but that all three models, at higher temperatures, exhibit and exacerbate the human pattern of too many flips with nearly half heads and half tails and too few at the extremes.

T, H, T’, ..., which has fewer alternations. GPT 3.5 is less prone to these repeating sequences at low temperatures.

At higher temperatures, we see the number of alternations decrease. However, there is still a tendency towards over alternation, as the average number of alternations is about 5 for both GPT 4 and Llama 3, more than even humans have. GPT 3.5 does not have a consistent pattern of alternations in the same way GPT 4 and Llama 3 do, which is reflective of the generally more chaotic responses provided by GPT 3.5 in our analysis.

Runs. Moving beyond alternations, there human aversion to long runs [33]. That is, when humans simulate flipping coins, they generate far fewer long contiguous heads-only or tails-only subsequences than would be expected at random. LLMs have the same bias. Here, we can see that for lower temperatures, we have far fewer runs than expected for nearly every run length for all three models. Additionally, this tendency is much worse in GPT 4 without the word ‘fair’ in the instructions. However, as temperature reaches 1.0, we see that the number of runs starts to pick up in the

more recent models, and in fact we achieve more runs of length 2 than expected although far fewer of every other length. GPT 4 and Llama 3 result in quite similar patterns in this regard. This suggests a strong bias against long runs, that is, in effect, truncating longer runs into runs of length 2.

Gpt 3.5 is, again, a more chaotic response. Rather than the smoothly increasing number of runs we see in the other two models, the number of runs is highly variable - we even see instances of long runs unheard of in the other two models. While the responses still don’t contain as many runs as would be expected at random, there are far more of them than would otherwise be expected. Additionally, while temperature seems to be a fairly reliable way to increase the number of runs in GPT 4 and Llama 3, this is not true for GPT 3.5.

N-grams. Most generally, we can approach patterns as n-grams - any pattern of heads and tail of length n . It has been well established that humans (and LLMs, as we’ve seen so far) have preferences for some n-grams over others [35]. This is most evident at low




Figure 2: Histograms of the number of alternations in an 8 flip sequence for our various models and a theoretical repeated bernoulli function for temperatures 0, 0.8, and 1.5. Note the strong bias towards alternations, especially at lower temperatures, exhibited by all three models.

temperatures at how infrequently we see runs such a $(0,0,0)$ and $(1,1)$. As previously discussed, this aversion to long runs is even stronger in LLMs than it is in humans. However, at higher temperatures we can see that our models hew fairly closely to human standards. A couple of interesting patterns that are not reflected in human data, however, are the complete aversion to $(1,1,1)$ across all models and all prompts and GPT 3.5's overuse of $(0,0)$ and $(0,0,0)$ which is reflected in the tails bias previously discussed. However, it is worth being aware that examining n-grams gives many avenues for diversion of two models - and by chance some of these avenues will bear out even if the models are exactly the same. Thus, while overall patterns such as mentioned above are more sound in their basis, individual intricacies are more difficult to be certain of, even with large sample sizes.

2.5 Mean Squared Error

So far, we have called out a number of human biases in random binary sequence generation. Overall, LLMs seem to not only adhere to these biases, but exacerbate them. However, does this translate to inherently less 'randomness' in a generated sequence? One easy

way to give an overall measurement the true randomness present in these simulations, is to ask a model to flip several coins in a row, and then train another model to predict a flip given previous flips in the sequence. Here, we ask our model to flip twenty coins, and then use sequences of 7 flips to predict the 8th flip. We train our model on a number of factors known to influence human randomness generation including the sequence of previous flips, number of runs of various lengths, number of alternations, and more [26, 35]. In a truly random sequence, this is a task that, by definition, cannot be performed better than chance, and we expect high error regardless of the model used. However, given we expect this to not be truly random, looking at the error we can achieve gives us another benchmark for defining a notion of how random these sequences are [26].

We would expect Mean Squared Error (MSE) to be 0.25 for an independent, identically distributed model with equal probabilities for heads and tails. For low temperatures, we see that MSE is quite low. That is, it is very easy to predict the next flip. Given the purpose of low temperatures, this seems reasonable. As we increase temperature, MSE does increase, though not all the way to 0.25. In




Figure 3: Fraction of expected runs realized by various models and prompts for runs of length 2 through 7 for 7-flip sequences. Note that any point below 1.0 represents fewer runs of that length than expected, and above 1.0 represents more runs of that length than expected. The sample size is large enough in all cases to expect at least one of each run, but very few runs of the largest size are expected (or realized).




Figure 4: The fraction of 2-grams of each type of all 2-grams of that length for various temperatures and models. Each temperature represents our three models with three distinct bars - GPT 3.5, GPT 4, and Llama 3 respectively. The final two bars, 'H', represent data from Rapoport et al [35], who did a similar analysis of human generated coin flips, on the left and the expected fractions at random on the right. The full table of n-gram percentages can be found in the appendix.

fact, at our maximum temperature, we reach an MSE of only about 0.22 for GPT 4 and less than 0.15 for Llama 3. However, GPT 3.5, in line with its previous results, does achieve very high error rates of nearly 0.25. This suggests that, despite, or perhaps because of, its unusual patterns that generally do not align as well to human bias, GPT 3.5 in fact produces some of the most ‘random’ sequences.

If we compare this to human-generated coin flips, the smallest MSE achievable is above 0.24 [26] – very close to our 0.25 boundary, but still significantly nonrandom. Thus, while humans are reliably imperfect at randomness, LLMs are far worse. In units of MSE difference, the gap between LLM performance and human performance is more than twice the gap between human performance and true randomness. We can hypothesize that this arises from some combination of two natural, related effects: that LLMs are injecting




Figure 5: The fraction of 3-grams of each type of all 3-grams of that length for various temperatures and models. Each temperature represents our three models with three distinct bars - GPT 3.5, GPT 4, and Llama 3 respectively. The final two bars, 'H', represent data from Rapoport et al [35], who did a similar analysis of human generated coin flips, on the left and the expected fractions at random on the right. The full table of n-gram percentages can be found in the appendix.

additional machine bias into their randomness; and that LLMs are exacerbating the human bias contained in their training data. While the second effect is discussed at length there, we must assume that any additional bias is coming from other sources.

2.6 Correlates

Finally, we can also ask, given the low MSE, what variables correlate with the direction of the last flip. For instance, of the previous seven flips in the sequence, how correlated are they with the last flip? Fig 7 demonstrates this correlation as temperature increases. Here, we can see distinct differences in our three models. GPT 3.5 shows little consistency in correlation, reflecting the overall increased 'randomness' present. GPT 4, however, has very strong anti-correlation with the previous flip, flip 7 - and this carries through for the rest of the flips, giving strong correlation with flip 6, for instance. As




Figure 6: MSE of a LASSO model predicting the 8th flip given information about the previous 7 flips given various models and prompts as temperature increases. Note that low error implies more patterns in the sequences. Note also that more sophisticated models for predicting the 8th flip may achieve lower error, but are unlikely to return higher error, making this an upper bound on error and thus an upper bound on 'randomness'.

temperature increases, this correlation mellows, but is still present. The correlation with other flips is significantly weaker. Llama 3, however, seems to have only moderate anti-correlation with flip 7. Additionally, this correlation does not carry through nearly as strongly for other flips, again suggesting that, while GPT 4 is highly influenced by an alternation bias, Llama 3 may be less influenced.

3 CONCLUSION

In this work, we have started from a number of well-established human biases in random binary sequence generation. We then asked three LLMs to produce random binary sequences in the form of coin flips and showed that, in most cases, these LLMs not only replicated human biases, but exacerbated them. LLMs exhibited extra bias in terms of excessive heads in single coin flips and the first flip of a sequence, and an excessive number of sequences with equal counts of heads and tails. More broadly, a strong alternation bias influenced the n-grams and runs, giving fewer long runs than expected (and more short runs). These biases translated into low mean squared error for even a simple LASSO model designed to predict the next flip, and examining the correlates suggested the alternation bias was strongly influential in GPT 4 and Llama 3. Additionally, we showed that GPT 3.5 was, in many aspects, more 'random' than its counterparts GPT 4 and Llama 3, suggesting LLMs may be becoming more 'human' in their biases.

This brings up the question of whether or not we consider this increasing level of human-type bias in sequence generation a good thing. There are advantages to sharing biases in this way - cooperative games often rely on players sharing biases [36]. Thus, an LLM sharing this same bias may translate to increased compatibility




Figure 7: Plots of correlation of 8th flip with the i th flip for various models and as temperature increases. Note that GPT 4 and Llama 3 both have strong correlation/anti-correlation patterns with even and odd flips, hearkening to their strong alternation bias. GPT 3.5 does not exhibit this pattern.

with a human partner on tasks that require generating randomness or predicting human behavior, such as predicting where a person stored a lost item or playing a partnered card game. Conversely, this increasing humanness means decreasing randomness. If users actually expect truly random responses, or at least random in a more machine-like sense, then modern LLMs are failing to deliver. You may want an LLM to play bridge with you, but you may not want it to generate your password. Of course, we have other means of generating pseudo-random sequences computationally, such as random-number generators, but understanding when an LLM should imitate its human data and when it should rely on its machine capabilities is a complex question with no clear answers.

Given the pervasiveness of randomness in our everyday lives [24] and this dichotomy of being more human-like or more correct, it is perhaps advisable to be strategic about both how we use LLMs with respect to randomness and how we train LLMs with respect to randomness. Perhaps an even more human-like AI system would know when to use a random number generator and when to inject human bias into its answers. Even more powerful AI systems might be better at making these choices than we are. Thus, it may be prudent to measure LLM reactions to requests for randomness as one of the many yardsticks we use to evaluate our models. Binary random sequences are perhaps the simplest of the possible measurements, but are by no means the only possible measure. Measurements for randomness could include an ability to sample from more complex distributions regardless of how they are presented. However, measurements for when to be random are more complex. Transparency about how different models interact with randomness is a good first step toward ensuring the users are getting what they ask for; developing a suite of standard tests, such as the tests for bias in this work, could be a valuable next step.

REFERENCES

- [1] ALBERONI, F. Contribution to the study of subjective probability. i. *Journal of General Psychology* 66 (1962), 241–264.
- [2] ALLEN. Can people behave “randomly?”: The role of feedback, 1986.
- [3] AYER, A. J. *Probability and evidence*. Columbia University Press, 2006.
- [4] BAKAN, P. Response-tendencies in attempts to generate random binary series, 1960.
- [5] BAR-HILLEL, M., PEER, E., AND ACQUISTI, A. ‘heads or tails?’-a reachability bias in binary choice. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition* 40 (11 2014), 1656–1663.
- [6] BAR-HILLEL, M., AND WAGENAAR, W. A. The perception of randomness*, 1991.
- [7] BUDESCU, D. V. Analysis of dichotomous variables in the presence of serial dependence. *Psychological Bulletin* 97, 3 (1985), 547.
- [8] BUDESCU, D. V. A markov model for generation of random binary sequences, 1987.
- [9] BUDESCU, D. V., AND RAPOPORT, A. z subjective randomization in one-and two-person games zyxw, 1994.
- [10] CHAPANIS, A. Human production of “random” numbers.
- [11] DENNETT, D. C. Real patterns, 1991.
- [12] FALK, R. The perception of randomness. In *Proceedings of the fifth international conference for the psychology of mathematics education* (1981), vol. 1, pp. 222–229.
- [13] FALK, R. Randomness—an ill-defined but much needed concept.
- [14] FALK, R., AND KONOLD, C. Random means hard to digest. *Learning Prblems in Mathematics* 16 (1994).
- [15] FALK, R., AND KONOLD, C. Making sense of randomness: Implicit encoding as a basis for judgment, 1997.
- [16] FERNBERGER, S. W. On the relation of the methods of just perceptible differences and constant stimuli. *The Psychological Monographs* 14, 4 (1913), i.
- [17] FERNBERGER, S. W. Interdependence of judgments within the series for the method of constant stimuli, 1920.
- [18] FERNBERGER, S. W. The use of equality judgments in psycho-physical procedures*, 1930.
- [19] FORD, J. How random is a coin toss? *Physics Today* 36, 4 (1983), 40–47.
- [20] GOODFELLOW, L. D. The human element in probability, 1940.
- [21] HAHN, U., AND WARREN, P. A. Perceptions of randomness: Why three heads are better than four. *Psychological Review* 116 (4 2009), 454–461.
- [22] HEUER, H., KOHLISCH, O., AND KLEIN, W. The effects of total sleep deprivation on the generation of random sequences of key-presses, numbers and nouns, 2005.
- [23] KAC, M. Marginalia: What is random? *American Scientist* (1983).
- [24] KAHNEMAN, D., SIBONY, O., AND SUNSTEIN, C. R. *Noise : a flaw in human judgment*.
- [25] KAREEV, Y. Not that bad after all: Generation of random sequences, 1992.
- [26] KLEINBERG, J., LIANG, A., AND MULLAINATHAN, S. The theory is predictive, but is it complete? an application to human perception of randomness.
- [27] KNOWLES, P. L. The “blue seven” is not a phenomenon. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 45, 2 (1977), 648–650.
- [28] KUBOVY, M., AND GILDEN, D. Apparent randomness is not always the complement of apparent order.
- [29] LARKEY, P. D., SMITH, R. A., AND KADANE, J. B. It’s okay to believe in the “hot hand”.
- [30] LOCKHEAD, G. R. Sequential predictors of choice in psychophysical tasks. In

Preparatory states and processes. Psychology Press, 2019, pp. 27–47.

- [31] LOPES, L. L., AND ODEN, G. C. Distinguishing between random and nonrandom events, 1987.
- [32] NICKERSON, R. S. The production and perception of randomness. *Psychological Review* 109 (2002), 330–357.
- [33] NICKERSON, R. S., AND BUTLER, S. F. On producing random binary sequences, 2009.
- [34] PERSAUD, N. Humans can consciously generate random number sequences: A possible test for artificial intelligence. *Medical Hypotheses* 65, 2 (2005), 211–214.
- [35] RAPOPORT, A., AND BUDESCU, D. V. Generation of random series in two-person strictly competitive games, 1992.
- [36] RAPOPORT, A., AND BUDESCU, D. V. Randomization in individual choice behavior, 1997.
- [37] REIMERS, S., DONKIN, C., AND PELLEY, M. E. L. Perceptions of randomness in binary sequences: Normative, heuristic, or both? *Cognition* 172 (3 2018), 11–25.
- [38] ROSS, B. M. Randomization of a binary series, 1955.
- [39] ROSS, B. M., AND LEVY, N. Patterned predictions of chance events by children and adults¹, 1958.
- [40] TREISMAN, M., AND FAULKNER, A. Generation of random sequences by human subjects: Cognitive operations or psychological process? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 116, 4 (1987), 337.
- [41] TUNE, G. A brief survey of variables that influence random-generation. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 18 (1964), 705–710.
- [42] TVERSKY, A., AND GILOVICH, T. The cold facts about the "hot hand" in basketball, 1989.
- [43] VAN KOEVERING, K., BENSON, A. R., AND KLEINBERG, J. Frozen binomials on the web: Word ordering and language conventions in online text. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020* (2020), pp. 606–616.
- [44] WAGENAAR, W. A. Appreciation of conditional probabilities in binary sequences 1, 1970.
- [45] WAGENAAR, W. A. Subjective randomness and the capacity to generate information. *Acta Psychologica* 33 (1970), 233–242.
- [46] WEISS, R. L. "variables that influence random-generation" : An alternative hypothesis, 1965.
- [47] WIEGERSMA, S. A control theory of sequential response production. *Psychological Research* 44, 2 (1982), 175–188.

A APPENDIX

A.1 Correlation Heatmaps



Figure 8: Heatmaps at various temperatures of correlation of the 8th flip with the i th flip for GPT 4 for 'Flip a coin' prompt. Note the distinct checkerboard pattern indicating a strong bias for alternations.

A.2 N-gram Percentages

Table 4: The fraction of n -grams of a given length that exhibit various patterns for all models, temperatures, and subsequence patterns for completeness.

index	model	temperature	n-gram	fraction
12	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 0)	0.19
13	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 0)	0.30
14	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 0)	0.22
15	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 0)	0.31
16	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 0)	0.26
17	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 0)	0.20
18	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 0)	0.24
19	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 0)	0.33
20	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 0)	0.26
21	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 0)	0.24
22	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 0)	0.29
23	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 0)	0.23
96	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 1)	0.37
97	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 1)	0.32
98	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 1)	0.35
99	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 1)	0.31
100	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 1)	0.33
101	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 1)	0.36
102	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 1)	0.34
103	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 1)	0.29
104	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 1)	0.30
105	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 1)	0.30
106	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 1)	0.30
107	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 1)	0.28
192	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 0)	0.37
193	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 0)	0.33
194	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 0)	0.35
195	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 0)	0.32
196	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 0)	0.33
197	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 0)	0.36
198	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 0)	0.35
199	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 0)	0.30
200	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 0)	0.31
201	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 0)	0.30
202	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 0)	0.31
203	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 0)	0.27
276	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 1)	0.08
277	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 1)	0.06
278	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 1)	0.08
279	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 1)	0.05
280	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 1)	0.08
281	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 1)	0.08
282	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 1)	0.07
283	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 1)	0.08
284	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 1)	0.13
285	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 1)	0.16
286	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 1)	0.10
287	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 1)	0.22
372	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 0)	0.08
373	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 0)	0.08
374	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 0)	0.08

375	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 0)	0.08
376	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 0)	0.08
377	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 0)	0.08
378	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 0)	0.08
379	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 0)	0.10
380	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 0)	0.11
381	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 0)	0.11
382	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 0)	0.11
383	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 0)	0.17
456	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 1)	0.42
457	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 1)	0.41
458	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 1)	0.41
459	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 1)	0.42
460	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 1)	0.42
461	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 1)	0.42
462	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 1)	0.41
463	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 1)	0.40
464	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 1)	0.38
465	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 1)	0.39
466	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 1)	0.39
467	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 1)	0.33
552	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 0)	0.42
553	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 0)	0.42
554	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 0)	0.42
555	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 0)	0.42
556	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 0)	0.43
557	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 0)	0.42
558	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 0)	0.42
559	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 0)	0.40
560	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 0)	0.39
561	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 0)	0.40
562	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 0)	0.40
563	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 0)	0.33
636	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 1)	0.09
637	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 1)	0.09
638	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 1)	0.09
639	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 1)	0.08
640	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 1)	0.07
641	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 1)	0.08
642	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 1)	0.09
643	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 1)	0.10
644	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 1)	0.11
645	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 1)	0.10
646	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 1)	0.10
647	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 1)	0.17
732	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 0)	0.04
733	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 0)	0.03
734	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 0)	0.04
735	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 0)	0.04
736	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 0)	0.05
737	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 0)	0.06
738	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 0)	0.06
739	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 0)	0.05
740	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 0)	0.07
741	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 0)	0.07
742	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 0)	0.09
743	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 0)	0.10

How Random is Random? Evaluating the Randomness and Humanness of LLMs' Coin Flips

816	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 1)	0.38
817	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 1)	0.39
818	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 1)	0.39
819	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 1)	0.40
820	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 1)	0.39
821	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 1)	0.38
822	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 1)	0.38
823	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 1)	0.38
824	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 1)	0.37
825	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 1)	0.37
826	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 1)	0.36
827	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 1)	0.36
912	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 0)	0.38
913	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 0)	0.39
914	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 0)	0.39
915	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 0)	0.41
916	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 0)	0.39
917	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 0)	0.38
918	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 0)	0.38
919	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 0)	0.39
920	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 0)	0.38
921	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 0)	0.38
922	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 0)	0.37
923	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 0)	0.37
996	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 1)	0.21
997	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 1)	0.19
998	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 1)	0.18
999	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 1)	0.16
1000	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 1)	0.17
1001	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 1)	0.18
1002	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 1)	0.18
1003	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 1)	0.17
1004	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 1)	0.17
1005	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 1)	0.18
1006	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 1)	0.19
1007	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 1)	0.17
24	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 0, 0)	0.02
25	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 0, 0)	0.14
26	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 0, 0)	0.05
27	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 0, 0)	0.12
28	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 0, 0)	0.07
29	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 0, 0)	0.05
30	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 0, 0)	0.09
31	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 0, 0)	0.15
32	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 0, 0)	0.09
33	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 0, 0)	0.07
34	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 0, 0)	0.12
35	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 0, 0)	0.08
60	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 0, 1)	0.17
61	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 0, 1)	0.16
62	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 0, 1)	0.17
63	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 0, 1)	0.18
64	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 0, 1)	0.19
65	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 0, 1)	0.16
66	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 0, 1)	0.15
67	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 0, 1)	0.18
68	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 0, 1)	0.17

69	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 0, 1)	0.17
70	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 0, 1)	0.17
71	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 0, 1)	0.16
108	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 1, 0)	0.28
109	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 1, 0)	0.26
110	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 1, 0)	0.27
111	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 1, 0)	0.27
112	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 1, 0)	0.25
113	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 1, 0)	0.28
114	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 1, 0)	0.28
115	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 1, 0)	0.22
116	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 1, 0)	0.19
117	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 1, 0)	0.18
118	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 1, 0)	0.21
119	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 1, 0)	0.11
144	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 1, 1)	0.08
145	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 1, 1)	0.06
146	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 1, 1)	0.08
147	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 1, 1)	0.05
148	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 1, 1)	0.08
149	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 1, 1)	0.08
150	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 1, 1)	0.07
151	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 1, 1)	0.08
152	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 1, 1)	0.10
153	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 1, 1)	0.12
154	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 1, 1)	0.09
155	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 1, 1)	0.16
204	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 0, 0)	0.17
205	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 0, 0)	0.17
206	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 0, 0)	0.17
207	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 0, 0)	0.19
208	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 0, 0)	0.20
209	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 0, 0)	0.15
210	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 0, 0)	0.15
211	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 0, 0)	0.18
212	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 0, 0)	0.17
213	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 0, 0)	0.17
214	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 0, 0)	0.18
215	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 0, 0)	0.16
240	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 0, 1)	0.20
241	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 0, 1)	0.16
242	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 0, 1)	0.18
243	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 0, 1)	0.13
244	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 0, 1)	0.14
245	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 0, 1)	0.20
246	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 0, 1)	0.20
247	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 0, 1)	0.12
248	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 0, 1)	0.13
249	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 0, 1)	0.14
250	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 0, 1)	0.14
251	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 0, 1)	0.12
288	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 1, 0)	0.08
289	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 1, 0)	0.06
290	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 1, 0)	0.08
291	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 1, 0)	0.05
292	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 1, 0)	0.08
293	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 1, 0)	0.08

How Random is Random? Evaluating the Randomness and Humanness of LLMs' Coin Flips

294	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 1, 0)	0.07
295	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 1, 0)	0.08
296	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 1, 0)	0.11
297	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 1, 0)	0.12
298	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 1, 0)	0.10
299	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 1, 0)	0.15
324	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
325	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
326	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
327	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 1, 1)	0.01
328	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
329	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
330	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
331	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
332	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 1, 1)	0.03
333	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 1, 1)	0.04
334	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
335	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 1, 1)	0.06
384	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
385	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
386	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
387	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
388	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
389	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
390	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
391	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
392	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 0, 0)	0.01
393	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
394	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 0, 0)	0.01
395	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 0, 0)	0.03
420	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 0, 1)	0.08
421	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 0, 1)	0.08
422	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 0, 1)	0.08
423	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 0, 1)	0.09
424	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 0, 1)	0.08
425	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 0, 1)	0.08
426	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 0, 1)	0.08
427	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 0, 1)	0.10
428	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 0, 1)	0.11
429	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 0, 1)	0.11
430	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 0, 1)	0.10
431	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 0, 1)	0.15
468	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 1, 0)	0.32
469	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 1, 0)	0.32
470	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 1, 0)	0.32
471	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 1, 0)	0.34
472	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 1, 0)	0.35
473	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 1, 0)	0.34
474	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 1, 0)	0.32
475	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 1, 0)	0.30
476	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 1, 0)	0.27
477	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 1, 0)	0.29
478	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 1, 0)	0.29
479	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 1, 0)	0.17
504	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 1, 1)	0.09
505	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 1, 1)	0.09
506	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 1, 1)	0.09

507	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 1, 1)	0.08
508	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 1, 1)	0.07
509	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 1, 1)	0.08
510	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 1, 1)	0.09
511	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 1, 1)	0.09
512	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 1, 1)	0.11
513	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 1, 1)	0.10
514	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 1, 1)	0.10
515	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 1, 1)	0.15
564	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 0, 0)	0.08
565	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 0, 0)	0.09
566	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 0, 0)	0.09
567	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 0, 0)	0.08
568	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 0, 0)	0.08
569	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 0, 0)	0.08
570	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 0, 0)	0.08
571	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 0, 0)	0.10
572	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 0, 0)	0.11
573	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 0, 0)	0.11
574	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 0, 0)	0.10
575	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 0, 0)	0.15
600	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 0, 1)	0.34
601	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 0, 1)	0.33
602	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 0, 1)	0.33
603	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 0, 1)	0.33
604	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 0, 1)	0.35
605	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 0, 1)	0.34
606	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 0, 1)	0.33
607	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 0, 1)	0.30
608	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 0, 1)	0.28
609	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 0, 1)	0.29
610	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 0, 1)	0.29
611	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 0, 1)	0.18
648	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 1, 0)	0.09
649	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 1, 0)	0.09
650	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 1, 0)	0.09
651	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 1, 0)	0.08
652	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 1, 0)	0.07
653	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 1, 0)	0.08
654	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 1, 0)	0.09
655	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 1, 0)	0.10
656	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 1, 0)	0.11
657	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 1, 0)	0.10
658	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 1, 0)	0.10
659	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 1, 0)	0.15
684	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
685	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
686	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
687	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
688	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
689	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
690	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
691	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
692	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
693	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
694	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
695	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 1, 1)	0.02

How Random is Random? Evaluating the Randomness and Humanness of LLMs' Coin Flips

744	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
745	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
746	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
747	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
748	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
749	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
750	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
751	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
752	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
753	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
754	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
755	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 0, 0)	0.00
780	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 0, 1)	0.03
781	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 0, 1)	0.03
782	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 0, 1)	0.04
783	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 0, 1)	0.03
784	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 0, 1)	0.05
785	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 0, 1)	0.06
786	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 0, 1)	0.06
787	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 0, 1)	0.05
788	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 0, 1)	0.07
789	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 0, 1)	0.07
790	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 0, 1)	0.09
791	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 0, 1)	0.10
828	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 1, 0)	0.17
829	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 1, 0)	0.19
830	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 1, 0)	0.20
831	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 1, 0)	0.24
832	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 1, 0)	0.22
833	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 1, 0)	0.20
834	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 1, 0)	0.20
835	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 1, 0)	0.21
836	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 1, 0)	0.20
837	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 1, 0)	0.19
838	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 1, 0)	0.18
839	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 1, 0)	0.19
864	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 1, 1)	0.22
865	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 1, 1)	0.20
866	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 1, 1)	0.18
867	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 1, 1)	0.16
868	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 1, 1)	0.17
869	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 1, 1)	0.18
870	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 1, 1)	0.18
871	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 1, 1)	0.17
872	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 1, 1)	0.17
873	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 1, 1)	0.18
874	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 1, 1)	0.18
875	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 1, 1)	0.17
924	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 0, 0)	0.05
925	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 0, 0)	0.04
926	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 0, 0)	0.05
927	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 0, 0)	0.04
928	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 0, 0)	0.05
929	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 0, 0)	0.06
930	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 0, 0)	0.06
931	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 0, 0)	0.06
932	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 0, 0)	0.07

933	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 0, 0)	0.07
934	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 0, 0)	0.09
935	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 0, 0)	0.11
960	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 0, 1)	0.33
961	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 0, 1)	0.35
962	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 0, 1)	0.34
963	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 0, 1)	0.37
964	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 0, 1)	0.34
965	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 0, 1)	0.32
966	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 0, 1)	0.32
967	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 0, 1)	0.33
968	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 0, 1)	0.31
969	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 0, 1)	0.31
970	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 0, 1)	0.27
971	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 0, 1)	0.26
1008	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 1, 0)	0.20
1009	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 1, 0)	0.19
1010	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 1, 0)	0.18
1011	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 1, 0)	0.16
1012	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 1, 0)	0.17
1013	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 1, 0)	0.18
1014	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 1, 0)	0.18
1015	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 1, 0)	0.17
1016	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 1, 0)	0.18
1017	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 1, 0)	0.18
1018	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 1, 0)	0.18
1019	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 1, 0)	0.17
1044	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1045	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1046	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1047	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1048	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1049	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1050	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1051	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1052	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1053	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1054	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
1055	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 1, 1)	0.00
36	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
37	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.06
38	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.01
39	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.05
40	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.02
41	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
42	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.01
43	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.05
44	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.02
45	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.01
46	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.03
47	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.02
48	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.02
49	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.07
50	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.04
51	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.07
52	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.04
53	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.04

How Random is Random? Evaluating the Randomness and Humanness of LLMs' Coin Flips

54	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.07
55	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.09
56	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.08
57	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.06
58	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.09
59	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.05
72	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.12
73	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.16
74	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.14
75	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.14
76	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.16
77	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.11
78	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.10
79	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.13
80	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.10
81	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.09
82	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.12
83	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.08
84	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.06
85	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.00
86	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.04
87	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.04
88	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.03
89	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
90	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
91	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.06
92	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.07
93	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.07
94	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
95	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.08
120	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.11
121	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.11
122	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.11
123	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.15
124	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.12
125	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.08
126	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.10
127	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.11
128	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.11
129	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.10
130	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.12
131	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
132	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.17
133	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.16
134	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.15
135	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.12
136	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.13
137	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.20
138	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.18
139	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.11
140	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.08
141	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.08
142	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.09
143	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.07
156	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.08
157	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.06
158	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.08

159	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.04
160	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.08
161	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.07
162	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.06
163	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.08
164	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.08
165	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.08
166	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.09
167	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.11
168	GPT 3.5	0.00	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
169	GPT 3.5	0.10	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
170	GPT 3.5	0.20	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
171	GPT 3.5	0.30	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
172	GPT 3.5	0.40	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
173	GPT 3.5	0.50	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
174	GPT 3.5	0.60	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
175	GPT 3.5	0.70	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
176	GPT 3.5	0.80	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.02
177	GPT 3.5	0.90	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.04
178	GPT 3.5	1.00	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
179	GPT 3.5	1.50	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.06
216	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.02
217	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.08
218	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.05
219	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.08
220	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.05
221	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.05
222	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.08
223	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.10
224	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.08
225	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.06
226	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.09
227	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.06
228	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.15
229	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.08
230	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.13
231	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.11
232	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.15
233	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.11
234	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.08
235	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.09
236	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.10
237	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.11
238	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.09
239	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.10
252	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.17
253	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.11
254	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.13
255	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.12
256	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.09
257	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.18
258	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.18
259	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.10
260	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.10
261	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.09
262	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.10
263	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.03

How Random is Random? Evaluating the Randomness and Humanness of LLMs' Coin Flips

264	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.02
265	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.06
266	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
267	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.01
268	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
269	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.02
270	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.02
271	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.02
272	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.03
273	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
274	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.04
275	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.09
300	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
301	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
302	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
303	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.04
304	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.08
305	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
306	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
307	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
308	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
309	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.07
310	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
311	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.10
312	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.03
313	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.00
314	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.02
315	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.01
316	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.00
317	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.01
318	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.02
319	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.01
320	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.06
321	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.05
322	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.04
323	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.05
336	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
337	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
338	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
339	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
340	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
341	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
342	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
343	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
344	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.03
345	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.04
346	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
347	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.04
348	GPT 3.5	0.00	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
349	GPT 3.5	0.10	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
350	GPT 3.5	0.20	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
351	GPT 3.5	0.30	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
352	GPT 3.5	0.40	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
353	GPT 3.5	0.50	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
354	GPT 3.5	0.60	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
355	GPT 3.5	0.70	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
356	GPT 3.5	0.80	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00

357	GPT 3.5	0.90	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
358	GPT 3.5	1.00	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
359	GPT 3.5	1.50	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.01
396	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
397	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
398	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
399	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
400	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
401	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
402	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
403	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
404	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
405	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
406	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
407	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
408	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
409	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
410	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
411	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
412	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
413	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
414	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
415	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
416	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.01
417	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
418	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.01
419	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.03
432	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.08
433	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.08
434	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.08
435	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.07
436	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.06
437	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.06
438	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.05
439	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.07
440	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.06
441	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.07
442	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.06
443	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.04
444	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.00
445	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.00
446	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.01
447	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.01
448	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.02
449	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.02
450	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.03
451	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.03
452	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.04
453	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.04
454	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.04
455	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.10
480	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.04
481	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
482	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
483	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
484	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.04
485	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.04

How Random is Random? Evaluating the Randomness and Humanness of LLMs' Coin Flips

486	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.04
487	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
488	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
489	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
490	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
491	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.07
492	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.28
493	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.25
494	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.25
495	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.28
496	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.31
497	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.29
498	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.28
499	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.23
500	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.21
501	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.23
502	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.23
503	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.10
516	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.10
517	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.10
518	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.10
519	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.08
520	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.07
521	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.08
522	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.09
523	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.10
524	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.11
525	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.10
526	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.10
527	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.13
528	GPT 4	0.00	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
529	GPT 4	0.10	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
530	GPT 4	0.20	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
531	GPT 4	0.30	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
532	GPT 4	0.40	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
533	GPT 4	0.50	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
534	GPT 4	0.60	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
535	GPT 4	0.70	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
536	GPT 4	0.80	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
537	GPT 4	0.90	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
538	GPT 4	1.00	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
539	GPT 4	1.50	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.02
576	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
577	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
578	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
579	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
580	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
581	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
582	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
583	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
584	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.01
585	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
586	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.01
587	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.03
588	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.08
589	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.08
590	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.08

591	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.09
592	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.08
593	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.08
594	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.09
595	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.10
596	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.10
597	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.11
598	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.09
599	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.13
612	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.25
613	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.24
614	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.25
615	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.27
616	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.30
617	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.28
618	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.28
619	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.24
620	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.22
621	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.23
622	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.24
623	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.13
624	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.09
625	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.08
626	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.08
627	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.06
628	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
629	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.06
630	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
631	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.06
632	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.06
633	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.06
634	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.06
635	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
660	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.03
661	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.03
662	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.03
663	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.04
664	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.04
665	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.04
666	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
667	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
668	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
669	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
670	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.04
671	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.08
672	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.06
673	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.07
674	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.07
675	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.05
676	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.04
677	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.05
678	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.05
679	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.06
680	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.07
681	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.06
682	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.06
683	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.07

How Random is Random? Evaluating the Randomness and Humanness of LLMs' Coin Flips

696	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
697	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
698	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
699	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
700	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
701	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
702	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
703	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
704	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
705	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
706	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
707	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.02
708	GPT 4	0.00	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
709	GPT 4	0.10	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
710	GPT 4	0.20	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
711	GPT 4	0.30	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
712	GPT 4	0.40	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
713	GPT 4	0.50	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
714	GPT 4	0.60	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
715	GPT 4	0.70	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
716	GPT 4	0.80	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
717	GPT 4	0.90	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
718	GPT 4	1.00	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
719	GPT 4	1.50	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
756	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
757	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
758	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
759	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
760	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
761	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
762	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
763	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
764	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
765	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
766	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
767	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
768	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
769	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
770	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
771	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
772	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
773	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
774	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
775	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
776	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
777	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
778	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
779	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 0, 0, 1)	0.00
792	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.00
793	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.00
794	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.00
795	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.00
796	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.00
797	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.00
798	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.00
799	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.00
800	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.00

801	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.00
802	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.01
803	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 0, 1, 0)	0.02
804	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.02
805	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.02
806	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.03
807	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.03
808	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.04
809	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
810	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
811	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.05
812	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.07
813	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.06
814	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.08
815	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 0, 1, 1)	0.08
840	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.00
841	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.00
842	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.00
843	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.00
844	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.01
845	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.02
846	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.01
847	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.01
848	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.02
849	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.03
850	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.02
851	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 1, 0, 0)	0.04
852	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.17
853	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.19
854	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.20
855	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.23
856	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.20
857	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.18
858	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.18
859	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.20
860	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.17
861	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.16
862	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.15
863	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 1, 0, 1)	0.14
876	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.21
877	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.20
878	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.18
879	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.16
880	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.17
881	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.18
882	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.18
883	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.17
884	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.18
885	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.18
886	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.18
887	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 1, 1, 0)	0.17
888	Llama 3	0.00	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
889	Llama 3	0.10	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
890	Llama 3	0.20	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
891	Llama 3	0.30	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
892	Llama 3	0.40	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
893	Llama 3	0.50	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00

How Random is Random? Evaluating the Randomness and Humanness of LLMs' Coin Flips

894	Llama 3	0.60	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
895	Llama 3	0.70	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
896	Llama 3	0.80	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
897	Llama 3	0.90	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
898	Llama 3	1.00	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
899	Llama 3	1.50	(0, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
936	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
937	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
938	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
939	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
940	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
941	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
942	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
943	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
944	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
945	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
946	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
947	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 0, 0, 0)	0.00
948	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.04
949	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.03
950	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.05
951	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.04
952	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.05
953	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.06
954	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.07
955	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.06
956	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.08
957	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.07
958	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.09
959	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 0, 0, 1)	0.11
972	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.17
973	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.19
974	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.21
975	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.25
976	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.22
977	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.21
978	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.20
979	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.22
980	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.20
981	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.20
982	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.17
983	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 0, 1, 0)	0.17
984	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.19
985	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.17
986	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.15
987	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.13
988	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.13
989	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.12
990	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.12
991	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.12
992	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.11
993	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.11
994	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.10
995	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 0, 1, 1)	0.09
1020	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
1021	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
1022	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.06

1023	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.04
1024	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
1025	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
1026	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
1027	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
1028	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.06
1029	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.05
1030	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.08
1031	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 1, 0, 0)	0.07
1032	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.15
1033	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.15
1034	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.13
1035	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.12
1036	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.13
1037	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.13
1038	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.13
1039	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.12
1040	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.12
1041	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.14
1042	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.11
1043	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 1, 0, 1)	0.11
1056	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1057	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1058	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1059	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1060	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1061	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1062	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1063	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1064	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1065	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1066	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1067	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 1, 1, 0)	0.00
1068	Llama 3	0.00	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1069	Llama 3	0.10	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1070	Llama 3	0.20	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1071	Llama 3	0.30	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1072	Llama 3	0.40	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1073	Llama 3	0.50	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1074	Llama 3	0.60	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1075	Llama 3	0.70	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1076	Llama 3	0.80	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1077	Llama 3	0.90	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1078	Llama 3	1.00	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00
1079	Llama 3	1.50	(1, 1, 1, 1)	0.00