
Verbalized Probabilistic Graphical Modeling with Large Language Models

Hengguan Huang^{1*} Xing Shen¹ Songtao Wang¹ Dianbo Liu¹ Hao Wang²
¹National University of Singapore ²Rutgers University

Abstract

Faced with complex problems, the human brain demonstrates a remarkable capacity to transcend sensory input and form latent understandings of perceived world patterns. However, this cognitive capacity is not explicitly considered or encoded in current large language models (LLMs). As a result, LLMs often struggle to capture latent structures and model uncertainty in complex compositional reasoning tasks. This work introduces a novel Bayesian prompting approach that facilitates training-free Bayesian inference with LLMs by using a verbalized Probabilistic Graphical Model (PGM). While traditional Bayesian approaches typically depend on extensive data and predetermined mathematical structures for learning latent factors and dependencies, our approach efficiently reasons latent variables and their probabilistic dependencies by prompting LLMs to adhere to Bayesian principles. We evaluated our model on several compositional reasoning tasks, both closed-ended and open-ended. Our results indicate that the model effectively enhances confidence elicitation and text generation quality, demonstrating its potential to improve AI language understanding systems, especially in modeling uncertainty.

1 Introduction

In addressing complex reasoning problems, such as finding answers to challenging science questions, the human brain is thought to have the capability to surpass mere sensory input, potentially forming insights into latent patterns of the world. This cognitive capability suggests that humans might possess a sophisticated ability to interpret underlying structures and uncertainties Tenenbaum et al. [2011], although this remains a subject of ongoing research and debate. As of now, such depth of understanding demonstrated by humans has not been fully achieved in artificial intelligence (AI) systems Lake et al. [2017], Bender and Koller [2020], Zheng et al. [2021], Summers et al. [2023].

While large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated unparalleled abilities in processing and generating human language Devlin et al. [2018], Brown et al. [2020], Achiam et al. [2023], their performance is often constrained by the scope of their training data. These models, built primarily on vast corpora of text, excel at identifying patterns and generating responses that are syntactically coherent and contextually relevant within the confines of their training. However, when faced with tasks that require an understanding of implicit knowledge, or the ability to integrate and reason with undisclosed information from multiple sources—skills that humans typically employ in complex reasoning—LLMs often struggle. This limitation stems from their reliance on explicit data patterns and their inability to navigate uncertainties or infer underlying structures not overtly represented in their training datasets.

To address these limitations, our research investigates the integration of uncertainty modeling and latent structure learning into LLMs. We introduce a novel Bayesian prompting approach, utilizing a verbalized Probabilistic Graphical Model (vPGM), which enables LLMs to perform Bayesian

*Correspondence to: Hengguan Huang <huang.hengguan@u.nus.edu>




Figure 1: Example of inference using the vPGM with GPT-3.5. The Chameleon model erroneously assigns high confidence to the answer despite its LLM agents capturing irrelevant information. Conversely, our vPGM accurately identifies this discrepancy and assigns low confidence. Here, we show a simplified prompt for vPGM. See Appendix for a more detailed description in Table 9.

inference without extensive training. This method contrasts sharply with traditional Bayesian inference frameworks Griffiths et al. [2008], Bielza and Larrañaga [2014], Wang and Yeung [2020], Abdullah et al. [2022], which typically require data-intensive learning and predefined latent factors and dependencies.

While existing Bayesian structure learning methods Kitson et al. [2023] facilitate the discovery of Bayesian graphs, they often demand substantial domain expertise for manual validation of statistical dependencies or utilize computationally expensive scoring systems to assess the network’s fit to the data. Our approach leverages the knowledge and reasoning capabilities of LLMs, employing structured prompting to guide LLMs indirectly applying Bayesian reasoning principles, thus significantly reducing the reliance on extensive data curation and expert input.

Specifically, the LLMs are first prompted to identify a PGM, encapsulating the latent variables and their probabilistic dependencies based on available constraints or prior knowledge, along with a set of data samples. Once the PGM is ‘learned,’ the method infers the posterior distribution of each latent variable in the context of new testing samples. The final prediction is then approximated by averaging the posterior probabilities of the samples drawn from the target variable of the PGM. Notably, these posterior probabilities also serve directly as measures of confidence.

The effectiveness of the vPGM is assessed through both quantitative and qualitative evaluations. Our method is tested on several compositional reasoning tasks, designed in both close-ended and open-ended answering formats. We observe a substantial improvement in the LLMs’ performance, reflected in their confidence elicitation abilities and the quality of generated text.

2 Related Work

Prompting methods in Large Language Models (LLMs) represent a significant research domain, where the focus is on tailoring model responses for specific tasks. In this landscape, two prominent strategies have emerged: in-context learning Brown et al. [2020], where models are provided with relevant task-specific examples, and instruction prompting Wang et al. [2022b], Ouyang et al. [2022], which embed explicit task instructions within prompts.

A key development in this field is the Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting Wei et al. [2022]. This paradigm enhances complex reasoning in LLMs by incorporating a series of rationale steps within the

prompting process. Building upon this, the zero-shot CoT approach Kojima et al. [2022] extends CoT to handle tasks without exemplars or rationale steps. Further advancements include the automation of rationale chain generation (auto-CoT) Zhang et al. [2022], Shum et al. [2023], and the self-consistency method Wang et al. [2022a], which aims to maintain coherence across rationale steps. Additionally, Xiong et al. [2023] built upon the consistency-based method and conducted an empirical study on confidence elicitation for LLMs. In contrast, our proposed vPGM tackles the confidence elicitation problem from the perspective of Bayesian inference, which follows the principles of a more theoretically grounded Bayesian inference framework, PGM.

Closely related to our approach is ThinkSum Ozturkler et al. [2022], which presents a two-step probabilistic inference methodology for prompting. ThinkSum enhances LLMs’ probabilistic reasoning by working over sets of objects or facts, involving “Think” (retrieval of associations) and “Sum” (probabilistic inference) stages. While ThinkSum necessitates manually crafted prompts tailored to each question type, limiting its efficacy in complex compositional reasoning tasks featuring a diverse array of question types, it also struggles with tasks that require leveraging external tools, such as our problem settings. This work addresses these shortcomings by integrating Bayesian principles from PGMs into our prompting strategy. This integration not only enables handling of a broader spectrum of general reasoning tasks but also effectively captures uncertainties and latent structures inherent in complex compositional reasoning tasks, where ThinkSum fails to solve.

Prompt for PGM Discovery in Solving Multiple-Choice Science Questions

Develop a Bayesian inference framework, denoted as $P(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z})$, to achieve the task: { Task Description }. This entails identifying and defining a set of latent variables, $\mathbf{Z} = \{Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n\}$, with $n \leq 4$. These variables should capture the decision-making process of a science expert evaluating an answer option.

Task Description: systematically determine the most probable answer \mathbf{Y} among a set of options for a given science question \mathbf{X} along with background context, such as image caption, OCR and relevant knowledge.

Context: {Context}

Input-Output Data Pairs: {Input-Output Data Pairs}

Prior Knowledge and Constraints: {Prior Knowledge and Constraints}

Table 1: This is an example prompt for PGM discovery in the context of compositional reasoning tasks.

3 Background: Probabilistic Graphical Models in Bayesian Inference

Probabilistic Graphical Models (PGMs) serve as foundational tools for representing intricate probabilistic relationships across various complex reasoning tasks. These models efficiently encode uncertainties and conditional dependencies among variables, facilitating advanced inference and learning in a multitude of domains, including medicine, genetics, economics, and social sciences; notably, their application in diagnostic systems, genetic association studies, and economic prediction models highlights their pivotal role in driving forward empirical and theoretical research Koller and Friedman [2009], Murphy [2012].

PGMs are classified into two primary types: undirected graphical models, which depict relationships through non-directional edges, and directed graphical models, or Bayesian Networks (BNs), which this work focuses on, utilize directional edges to express functional dependencies among variables.

In the domain of PGMs, particularly BNs, a central element is the directed acyclic graph (DAG). Each node in a DAG corresponds to a random variable, and the directed edges between these nodes represent probabilistic dependencies. This structure is crucial for defining the relationships among variables and is foundational for the network’s capacity to model complex systems. Formally, a Bayesian network for a set of n latent variables $\mathbf{Z} = \{Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n\}$ is structured through a set of directed edges E . Each edge in the network conveys directional influence from one variable to another.

Discovered Latent Variables for PGM in Solving Multiple-Choice Science Questions

Discovered latent variables:

1. Z_1 **Relevance Assessment:** This variable quantifies the relevance of input data, including image captions, OCR results, and textual content, to the posed question. It encapsulates the conditional probabilities of the data being pertinent to understanding or answering the question effectively.
2. Z_2 **Knowledge Quality Evaluation:** Z_2 measures the reliability and adequacy of external knowledge sources. This variable assesses how well external data supports the interpretation of the question and the associated data, facilitating a Bayesian update of belief based on external evidence.
3. Z_3 **Question Clarity:** This variable evaluates the clarity and comprehensibility of the question. Z_3 captures the likelihood that the question can be clearly understood and processed to yield a definite outcome, influencing the interpretability and ease of response generation.
4. Z_4 **Logical Reasoning:** Z_4 is concerned with the logical analysis of each answer option. It involves a probabilistic assessment of the correctness of each option based on synthesized insights from the relevant data and external knowledge. This variable underpins the decision-making process by evaluating how logically coherent and supported each answer choice is given the available information.

Table 2: The response of the PGM discovery prompt from the GPT-4, it provides a comprehensive list of required latent variables and their composition for constructing a PGM.

BNs distinctly specify the joint probability distribution of all random variables through a product of conditional probability distributions (CPDs), reflecting the dependencies encoded by the graph:

$$P(\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(Z_i | \text{Pa}(Z_i)), \quad (1)$$

where $\text{Pa}(Z_i)$ represents the parent nodes of Z_i in the graph. This factorization allows the joint distribution to be decomposed into local distributions associated with each variable. This approach not only facilitates efficient computation of the overall distribution but also simplifies the process of model learning and inference.

Understanding the dynamics of Bayesian updating in PGMs is critical for addressing complex reasoning tasks. Initially, models begin with prior distributions that reflect assumptions or expert knowledge about the CPDs. As new data or evidence is introduced, these priors are updated to posteriors, encapsulating revised beliefs in light of new information. Additionally, learning in PGMs typically involves training or optimization over the parameters of the CPDs to fit to observed data. However, traditional PGM training not only demands extensive data, but also requires a predetermined DAG, which can limit the practical application of PGMs where data is scarce and expert knowledge to define DAG is limited. Therefore, exploring how to leverage the training-free prompting of Large Language Models (LLMs) to overcome these limitations is a major focus of this research.

4 Our Method: Verbalized Probabilistic Graphical Modeling (vPGM)

Verbalized Probabilistic Graphical Modeling (vPGM) is a novel Bayesian prompting approach that enhances Large Language Models’ (LLMs) reasoning capabilities by enabling them to perform Bayesian inference in a training-free manner. This method facilitates the LLMs to reason latent variables and their probabilistic dependencies by guiding them to follow the principles of Probabilistic Graphical Models (PGM). vPGM’s strength lies in its ability to bypass the traditional requirements of data-intensive learning and predefined latent factors and dependencies, thereby offering a more efficient approach to Bayesian reasoning.




Figure 2: Overview of the vPGM learning framework. CPDs represent conditional probabilistic distributions. The LLM in the figure refers to GPT-4, which is employed in the prompt construction step to adapt the resultant PGM into an inference prompt for GPT-3.5. We emit the observed variable \mathbf{X} for clarity.

Exemplar Identified Dependencies of Latent Variables for PGM Construction

Identified dependencies of variables ($a \rightarrow b$ means b depends on a):

1. $\mathbf{X} \rightarrow Z_1, \mathbf{X} \rightarrow Z_2, \mathbf{X} \rightarrow Z_3, \mathbf{X} \rightarrow Z_4$
2. $Z_1 \rightarrow Z_3$
3. $Z_2 \rightarrow Z_3, Z_2 \rightarrow Z_4$
4. $Z_3 \rightarrow Z_4$
5. $Z_4 \rightarrow \mathbf{Y}$

Table 3: This shows an example of obtained variable dependencies from the GPT-4. Each edge in the directed graph is presented as a condition distribution between distinct variables.

4.1 Overview of vPGM

The vPGM framework leverages large language models (LLMs) to perform complex reasoning tasks, structured around three main steps, as illustrated in Figure 2 and Figure 1: (1) **Graphical Structure Discovery or “Learning”**: vPGM prompts the LLM to generate textual descriptions that define the probabilistic graphical model (PGM), including the identification of latent variables and their dependencies. The probabilistic interpretations of these elements are treated as “parameters” of the model. (2) **Prompting-based Inference**: This involves constructing prompts to reason about each latent variable’s posterior distribution in vPGM based on testing input data. (3) **Predictions under Uncertainty**: The final step involves calculating the expectation of final predictions or answers over latent variables in vPGM.

4.2 “Learning” or Discovery of Probabilistic Graphical Structures

To infer the structure of a PGM, our approach begins by constructing a specialized prompt (illustrated in Table 1) aimed at uncovering a set of latent variables for tackling compositional reasoning tasks. This prompt encompasses several key elements:

- **General Task Description**: Articulating the specific reasoning task under consideration.
- **Input-Output Data Pairs**: Offering representative data examples pertinent to the task.
- **Contextual Information**: Incorporating relevant external context to enrich the understanding of the task.
- **Prior Knowledge and Constraints**: Integrating any prior knowledge or constraints about the latent variables, such as the maximum number of latent variables.

Assuming $\mathbf{Z} = \{Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n\}$ as the discovered set of latent variables, as exemplified in Table 2, we employ further prompting of LLMs to identify the dependencies for each latent variable. An illustrative example of this can be seen in Table 3, using the prompt “Please identify the dependency of the above latent variables.” Similar to traditional PGMs, the structure of our verbalized PGM (vPGM) is captured through a series of conditional probability distributions (CPDs), such as $P(Z_i | \text{Pa}(Z_i))$. However, unlike conventional PGMs that apply specific distribution forms for each CPD, vPGM

employs a “verbalized distribution,” where distribution details are defined using natural language descriptions, as depicted in Table 10.

This methodology contrasts with traditional Bayesian inference frameworks by leveraging natural language to guide PGM discovery. This approach reduces the necessity for deep domain expertise and extensive parameter estimation typically required during training phases, thus making the process of PGM structure elucidation more accessible and less reliant on specialized statistical training.

4.3 Inference as Prompt Generation

In the context of Large Language Models (LLMs), the concepts of inference acquire a distinctive interpretation compared to their traditional roles in the Bayesian inference framework. Traditionally, Bayesian inference is concerned with estimating the distributions of model parameters given observed data. However, within LLMs, inference are re-conceptualized as the generation of prompts that enable the drawing of samples from the vPGM. This approach leverages the generative abilities of LLMs such as GPT-4 to create prompts that initiate a series of reasoning steps, simulating the Bayesian inference process. An example of this might be, *"Generate a sequence that guides GPT-3.5 through step-by-step probabilistic reasoning based on the provided task description and testing data."*

4.4 Quantifying Prediction Uncertainty in Complex Reasoning

In complex reasoning tasks, where decisions are made under conditions of uncertainty, quantifying the confidence in predictions becomes critical. The vPGM framework extends this capability, enabling the quantification of predictive uncertainty through posterior distributions. This process mirrors the principles of uncertainty estimation found in traditional probabilistic models but is adapted for integration with LLMs.

Consider the predicted responses conditioned on latent variables, denoted as $P(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z})$. Assuming $P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X})$ is specified by vPGM, we evaluate the uncertainty associated with these predictions using the posterior probability distributions as a measure of confidence. If the distribution $P(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z})$ is known, we can estimate this posterior probability by calculating the expected value of $P(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z})$ across the posterior distribution of latent variables:

$$\mathbb{E}_{P(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[P(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z})] \approx \sum_{\mathbf{Z}} P(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z})P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X}), \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{X} represents the observational inputs; the samples of \mathbf{Z} are drawn from vPGM. In scenarios where $P(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z})$ is not directly accessible, vPGM enables the construction of a verbalized distribution for $P(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{Z})$. These posterior probabilities can then be approximated by averaging numerical probability values obtained from multiple candidate responses generated by vPGM.

5 Experiments

We evaluate the efficacy of vPGM in capturing structural patterns and modeling uncertainty across two compositional reasoning tasks. The first, a closed-ended task named ScienceQA Lu et al. [2022], and the second, an open-ended task named ChatCoach Huang et al. [2024], both require reasoning with undisclosed information from multiple sources. See Appendix for the more detailed experimental configurations.

5.1 Science Question Answering

The Science Question Answering (ScienceQA) benchmark, introduced by Lu et al. [2022], serves as a comprehensive benchmark for multi-modal question answering across a diverse range of scientific disciplines, including physics, mathematics, biology, and the humanities. It features 4,241 question-answer pairs that cover various topics and contexts. This task demands the integration of information from multiple sources, a process that can introduce errors and increase the complexity of reasoning. Given these challenges, ScienceQA serves as an ideal testbed for evaluating how effectively vPGM identifies latent structures and manages inherent uncertainties. We follow the experiment settings from Lu et al. [2023].

Baseline Methods We compare vPGM with the following baseline methods:




Figure 3: Reliability diagrams of (a) Chameleon + Self-Random + Avg-Conf and (b) vPGM on ScienceQA. vPGM achieves a much lower ECE comparing to Chameleon + Self-Random + Avg-Conf and approaches to the ideal confidence calibration curve (the diagonal dashed line).

- **Chain-of-Thought** This is one of the non-tool-augmented LLMs: Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting Wei et al. [2022] equipped with verbalized confidence estimation by prompting it to provide a numerical confidence for the selected answer.
- **Chameleon** This is based on a tool-augmented LLM: Chameleon Lu et al. [2023], and we equip it with verbalized confidence estimation.
- **Chameleon + Self-Random + Avg-Conf** It extends Chameleon with a state-of-art uncertainty quantification framework based on the combination of verbalized confidence estimation and self-consistency measurement Wang et al. [2022a], as recommended in Xiong et al. [2023].

Evaluation Metrics In line with previous evaluation settings in Naeini et al. [2015], Guo et al. [2017], Xiong et al. [2023] on accessing prediction uncertainty and confidence calibration, we adopt the **Expected Calibration Error (ECE)** to evaluate model confidence, represented as numeric probabilistic predictions. The ECE quantifies the divergence between the predicted probabilities and the observed accuracy across each confidence levels (bins). Throughout our experiments, we fix the number of confidence bins as 10 with uniform confidence contribution across bins. In addition, we evaluate the capability of a given method in solving problems correctly by measuring the **Accuracy**.

Table 4: Results on ScienceQA. M represents number of sampled candidate responses. The best-performing method for each metric is highlighted in **bold**.

Method	Accuracy ($\times 10^2$) \uparrow	ECE ($\times 10^2$) \downarrow
CoT (M=1)	81.39	19.69
Chameleon (M=1)	81.25	11.80
Chameleon + Self-Random + Avg-Conf (M=3)	79.68	10.32
vPGM (M=3, Ours)	82.01	3.58

Overall Results on ScienceQA Table 4 details the performance of different methods on the ScienceQA dataset. It shows that the CoT method results in the highest ECE of 19.69, indicating serious overconfidence issues in handling complex reasoning tasks. In contrast, the Chameleon method substantially outperforms CoT in terms of ECE, suggesting that integrating external tools such as Bing search and advanced image captioners can enhance confidence estimation. Further enhancements, employing advanced confidence elicitation techniques like “Self-Random + Avg-Conf,” result in decreased accuracy but lower ECE, suggesting a potential trade-off between accuracy and confidence encountered by Chameleon as an LLM agent framework. In comparison, our vPGM outperforms these methods in both accuracy and ECE, likely due to its superior ability to capture latent structural information that other baseline methods overlook. Figure 3 shows the reliability diagram for vPGM, demonstrating its near-perfect alignment with the ideal calibration curve across all bins, highlighting its precision in confidence calibration.

Qualitative Study on the Inferred Latent Variables We present a case study of vPGM’s inference capabilities (Figure 1) to qualitatively assess the model’s ability to utilize latent structural information for enhancing confidence estimation. As shown in Figure 1, vPGM employs its latent variables to critically assess the relevance of retrieved information. For example, when faced with irrelevant data from external tools such as Bing search or inaccurate captions from image captioners, the baseline

Table 5: Evaluation of the correlation (numerical probabilities and verbalized reasoning) between latent variable Z_i and the final selected answer option in vPGM on ScienceQA. Both Z_1 and Z_2 are proved to be informative for the reasoning process, and their uncertainties reflect the uncertainty of the selected answer option.

Latent variable	Spearman’s	Avg. cosine similarity
Z_1	0.4896	0.7069
Z_2	0.4126	0.5730

method, Chameleon, erroneously sustains high confidence in its predictions. In contrast, vPGM carefully adjusts its confidence, assigning lower probabilities when essential contextual knowledge is missing or incorrect, a process that is particularly effective through the inference of latent variables Z_1 and Z_2 . These observations highlight the significance of inferring latent structures to improve the reliability of compositional reasoning systems. Moreover, due to the natural language representation of the latent variables, vPGM also enhances system interpretability, explaining how predictions and associated confidences are derived.

Quantitative Study on the Inferred Latent Variables To quantitatively evaluate the effectiveness of latent variables in vPGM, we analyzed their probabilistic dependencies by examining the correlations between their posterior probabilities and those of the chosen answers within the ScienceQA dataset. Spearman’s rank correlation was utilized to quantify the strength and direction of these relationships, complemented by average cosine similarity to gauge the semantic similarity between the latent variables’ verbal interpretations and the text of the selected answers (see Table 5). These metrics show that latent variables Z_1 and Z_2 influence the reasoning process, with Z_1 demonstrating more substantial impact through higher correlation and cosine similarity scores. This confirms the critical role of inferring latent structures in enhancing both the predictive accuracy and interpretability of vPGM, essential for effective reasoning in complex reasoning tasks.

Ablation Study and Effects of Latent Variables When the number of latent variables in the PGM is reduced to zero, our model reverts to the vanilla Chameleon framework. Consequently, we conducted an ablation study on a subset of 102 testing questions from the ScienceQA dataset to evaluate the performance impact of varying the number of latent variables in vPGM, as detailed in Table 6. vPGM equipped with 2 latent variables outperforms the vanilla Chameleon (vPGM with 0 latent variables), highlighting the benefits of integrating vPGM into the Chameleon framework, a specialized LLM agent framework. Increasing the number of latent variables to 4 further reduces the ECE, albeit at the cost of decreased accuracy, illustrating the inherent trade-off between accuracy and calibration in complex reasoning tasks.

Table 6: Ablation study of vPGM, where n represents the number of latent variables. The best-performing configuration for each metric is highlighted in **bold**.

Metric	$n = 0$	$n = 2$	$n = 4$
Accuracy ($\times 10^2$) \uparrow	77.45	80.39	75.49
ECE ($\times 10^2$) \downarrow	9.68	8.34	5.25

Table 7: Results of various methods on the detection and correction of medical terminology errors.

Method	Detection			Correction		
	BLEU-2	Rouge-L	BERTScore	BLEU-2	Rouge-L	BERTScore
Instruction Prompting	27.4	3.3	67.6	1.4	2.1	61.6
Vanilla CoT	17.7	2.7	64.1	0.1	2.3	58.1
Zero-shot CoT	27.6	1.9	69.0	3.0	0.9	58.8
GCoT	34.2	3.7	72.4	1.6	2.0	65.4
vPGM (Ours)	37.2	2.3	76.3	1.7	2.0	68.3
Human	76.6	6.0	90.5	33.5	3.6	84.1

5.2 Communicative Medical Coaching

The Communicative Medical Coaching benchmark, ChatCoach, introduced in Huang et al. [2024], establishes a complex multi-agent dialogue scenario involving doctors, patients, and a medical coach across 3,500 conversation turns. The medical coach is tasked with detecting inaccuracies in medical terminology used by doctors and suggesting appropriate corrections. These tasks require integrating

external medical knowledge, inherently introducing uncertainty into response formulation. This benchmark was chosen to rigorously test vPGM’s ability to generalize across complex open-ended reasoning tasks. For more details on experiments and implementation, refer to the Appendix.

Baseline Methods For comparative analysis, we benchmark vPGM against these approaches:

- **Vanilla Instruction Prompting:** This method involves prompting the LLM with direct instructions for dialogue generation.
- **Zero-shot Chain of Thought (CoT) Kojima et al. [2022]:** A straightforward CoT approach where the LLM is prompted to sequentially articulate a reasoning chain.
- **Vanilla CoT Wei et al. [2022]:** This method builds upon the basic CoT by providing the LLM with a set of examples that include detailed reasoning steps.
- **Generalized CoT (GCoT) Huang et al. [2024]:** An advanced version of CoT, designed to improve the generation of structured feedback and integration of external knowledge effectively. It represents a state-of-the-art method in the ChatCoach benchmark.

Evaluation Metrics We follow Huang et al. [2024] to employ conventional automated metrics **BLEU-2**, **ROUGE-L**, and **BERTScore**. BLEU-2 is employed to measure the precision of bi-gram overlaps, offering insights into the lexical accuracy of the generated text against reference answers. ROUGE-L is used to assess sentence-level similarity, focusing on the longest common subsequence to evaluate structural coherence and the alignment of sequential n-grams. Additionally, BERTScore is applied for a semantic similarity assessment, utilizing BERT embeddings to compare the generated outputs and reference texts on a deeper semantic level. As specified in Huang et al. [2024], we use GPT-4 to extract medical terminology errors and corresponding corrections in the feedback from Coach Agents. Automated metrics are then calculated based on these extracted elements in comparison to human annotations. To supplement our quantitative assessments, we also conduct human evaluations to further validate the quality of model predictions.

Results We present the performance of various methods in Table 7. The noticeable difference between machine-generated outputs and human benchmarks across all metrics highlights the inherent challenges in communicative medical coaching. In the detection of medical terminology errors, vPGM leads with superior BLEU-2 (37.2) and BERTScore (76.3), underscoring its proficiency in identifying inaccuracies. In the correction task, while vPGM achieves a standout BERTScore of 68.3, surpassing all baselines, it scores lower on BLEU-2 and ROUGE-L. This variation is attributed to the ambiguity in doctors’ inputs, which can yield multiple valid responses, affecting metrics that rely on exact matches.

Human Evaluation To qualitatively assess vPGM’s capability for latent structure inference and open-ended reasoning, we randomly selected 10% (126 instances) of the testing set for evaluation. Feedback generated by different methods was assessed by two evaluators who rated each item on a 1-to-4 scale, focusing on metrics that gauge vPGM’s capability: PGM alignment (how accurately the “discovered” PGM structure represents necessary dependencies and relationships) and interpretability of latents (how well latent variables capture essential information for the given task and data). Additional feedback metrics included constructiveness, clarity, and overall quality of the generated responses. Table 8 shows the average scores for these 5 criteria. Notably, only vPGM, which infers latent variables and their dependencies, was scored for alignment and interpretability. The results show that vPGM excels in constructiveness and achieves reasonable clarity, outperforming CoT but trailing GCoT. This performance variation is attributed to vPGM’s requirement to generate probabilistic reasoning steps within responses, whereas only the final feedback from the Coach is considered the final response. These results show vPGM’s potential in leveraging latent structures and probabilistic dependencies to enhance decision-making in complex reasoning tasks.

Table 8: Human evaluation of coach feedback generated by various methods.

Metric	CoT	GCoT	vPGM(ours)
PGM Alignment	-	-	2.9
Interpretability	-	-	3.0
Clarity	2.2	3.1	2.8
Constructiveness	2.4	2.7	2.8
Overall	2.2	2.5	2.9

6 Conclusion

We introduce a novel Bayesian prompting method that incorporates a verbalized Probabilistic Graphical Model (PGM) into LLMs, enabling them to perform training-free Bayesian inference. This approach sidesteps the traditional need for extensive datasets and predefined latent structuring required by Bayesian models. Our empirical results on compositional reasoning tasks demonstrate substantial improvements in terms of both confidence elicitation and text generation quality. These results highlight the potential of merging Bayesian principles with LLMs to enhance AI systems' capacity for modeling uncertainty and reasoning under uncertainty. However, the effectiveness of vPGM is linked to the quality of the prompts used for PGM discovery. Achieving optimal performance thus requires precise prompt engineering. Future work could explore methods to automate prompt optimization, further enhancing the applicability of this approach across varied scenarios.

References

- Abdullah A Abdullah, Masoud M Hassan, and Yaseen T Mustafa. A review on bayesian deep learning in healthcare: Applications and challenges. *IEEE Access*, 10:36538–36562, 2022.
- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Emily M Bender and Alexander Koller. Climbing towards nlu: On meaning, form, and understanding in the age of data. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 5185–5198, 2020.
- Concha Bielza and Pedro Larrañaga. Bayesian networks in neuroscience: a survey. *Frontiers in computational neuroscience*, 8:131, 2014.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- Thomas L Griffiths, Charles Kemp, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. Bayesian models of cognition. In *Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, 2004; This chapter is based in part on tutorials given by the authors at the aforementioned conference as well as the one held in 2006*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017.
- Hengguan Huang, Songtao Wang, Hongfu Liu, Hao Wang, and Ye Wang. Benchmarking large language models on communicative medical coaching: a novel system and dataset. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, 2024.
- Neville Kenneth Kitson, Anthony C Constantinou, Zhigao Guo, Yang Liu, and Kiattikun Chobtham. A survey of bayesian network structure learning. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 56(8):8721–8814, 2023.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 22199–22213, 2022.
- Daphne Koller and Nir Friedman. *Probabilistic graphical models: principles and techniques*. MIT press, 2009.
- Brenden M Lake, Tomer D Ullman, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Samuel J Gershman. Building machines that learn and think like people. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 40:e253, 2017.

- Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tanglin Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:2507–2521, 2022.
- Pan Lu, Baolin Peng, Hao Cheng, Michel Galley, Kai-Wei Chang, Ying Nian Wu, Song-Chun Zhu, and Jianfeng Gao. Chameleon: Plug-and-play compositional reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09842*, 2023.
- Kevin P Murphy. *Machine learning: a probabilistic perspective*. MIT press, 2012.
- Mahdi Pakdaman Naeini, Gregory Cooper, and Milos Hauskrecht. Obtaining well calibrated probabilities using bayesian binning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 29, 2015.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 27730–27744, 2022.
- Batu Ozturkler, Nikolay Malkin, Zhen Wang, and Nebojsa Jojic. Thinksum: Probabilistic reasoning over sets using large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01293*, 2022.
- KaShun Shum, Shizhe Diao, and Tong Zhang. Automatic prompt augmentation and selection with chain-of-thought from labeled data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12822*, 2023.
- Theodore R Sumers, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Thomas L Griffiths. Cognitive architectures for language agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.02427*, 2023.
- Joshua B Tenenbaum, Charles Kemp, Thomas L Griffiths, and Noah D Goodman. How to grow a mind: Statistics, structure, and abstraction. *science*, 331(6022):1279–1285, 2011.
- Hao Wang and Dit-Yan Yeung. A survey on bayesian deep learning. *ACM computing surveys (csur)*, 53(5):1–37, 2020.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*, 2022a.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-instruct: Aligning language model with self generated instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560*, 2022b.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Miao Xiong, Zhiyuan Hu, Xinyang Lu, Yifei Li, Jie Fu, Junxian He, and Bryan Hooi. Can llms express their uncertainty? an empirical evaluation of confidence elicitation in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13063*, 2023.
- Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03493*, 2022.
- Lucia Zheng, Neel Guha, Brandon R Anderson, Peter Henderson, and Daniel E Ho. When does pretraining help? assessing self-supervised learning for law and the casehold dataset of 53,000+ legal holdings. In *Proceedings of the eighteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and law*, pages 159–168, 2021.

A Impact Statement

This work’s integration of Bayesian principles with Probabilistic Graphical Models (PGMs) into Large Language Models (LLMs) primarily enhances the reliability of AI in processing complex reasoning tasks. While the societal impacts may unfold gradually, the potential for these advancements to improve decision-making accuracy and reduce over-confidence issues in LLMs is significant. By fostering more reliable AI language models, this research aims to set a foundation for safer AI deployments, thereby contributing to the progress of AI technologies that societies and industries can confidently utilize.

B More Detailed Experiment Setup

We use GPT-4 for PGM discovery and constructing inference prompts for vPGM, while GPT-3.5-turbo-0613 is used for all our prompting-based methods during testing. Due to ChatGPT’s safety mechanisms, responses to potentially inappropriate content are restricted and thus excluded from our evaluation of all prompting-based methods. Unless otherwise specified, we set the temperature to 0.2. Additionally, we generate three candidate responses for estimating vPGM’s confidence.

B.1 Science Question Answering

In this section, we provide a detailed example of inference using the vPGM, as shown in Table 9. Additionally, Table 10 illustrates the inference prompt for vPGM with 4 latent variables, while Table 11 demonstrates the prompt for a vPGM with 2 latent variables.

B.2 Communicative Medical Coaching

B.2.1 Prompts of Our Baseline Approaches

In this section, we present the prompts used for each baseline approach: Instruction Prompting (see Table 12), Vanilla CoT (see Table 13), Zero-shot CoT (see Table 14), and GCoT (see Table 15).

B.2.2 Prompt of vPGM Inference

Table 16 shows the prompt of vPGM inference for ChatCoach


Question	<p>Which solution has a higher concentration of pink particles?</p>  <p>Solvent volume: 25 mL Solvent volume: 25 mL</p> <p>Solution A Solution B</p>
Answer options	<p>(A) Neither; their concentrations are the same ✗ (B) Solution B ✓ (C) Solution A ✗</p>
Image caption	<p>A close up picture of a wii game controller.</p>
Chameleon+Self-Random+Avg-Conf	<p>To determine which solution has a higher concentration of pink particles, we need some experimental data to compare their concentrations...Therefore, the answer is A. Probability: 0.852 <i>(Continue to obtain 2 more samples)</i> Final Answer: (A) ✗ Marginalized Probability Across 3 Samples: $P(\mathbf{Y} = A \mid \mathbf{X}) = 0.852$</p>
vPGM ($n = 2$)	<p>Understanding Knowledge and Context (Variable Z_1): Comparing the concentration of pink particles in two solutions...Given the lack of retrieved knowledge and Bing search response, the probability of Z_1 capturing the essential knowledge and context accurately is low. $P(Z_1 \mid \mathbf{X}) = 0.200$</p> <p>Analyzing Textual and Visual Information (Variable Z_2): Detected Text: None provided. Image Caption: Mentions a wii game controller, which is not relevant to the question or the context...Given the lack of detected text and the irrelevant image caption, the probability of Z_2 accurately reflecting the meaning difference and assigning appropriate weightage is low. $P(Z_2 \mid Z_1, \mathbf{X}) = 0.200$</p> <p>Make a Decision with Confidence: Option A (neither): Not supported. Without any information about the concentration of pink particles in the solutions, it cannot be concluded...Option B (Solution B): Not supported. Without any information about the concentration of pink particles...Option C (Solution A): Not supported...Given the lack of information about the concentration of pink particles in the solutions, the confidence in each option being correct is as follows. $P(\mathbf{Y} = A \mid Z_1, Z_2) = 0.333$ $P(\mathbf{Y} = B \mid Z_1, Z_2) = 0.333$ $P(\mathbf{Y} = C \mid Z_1, Z_2) = 0.333$ <i>(Continue to obtain 2 more samples)</i> Final Answer: (B) ✓ Marginalized Probability Across 3 Samples: $P(\mathbf{Y} = A \mid Z_1, Z_2) = 0.239$ $P(\mathbf{Y} = B \mid Z_1, Z_2) = 0.522$ $P(\mathbf{Y} = C \mid Z_1, Z_2) = 0.239$</p>

Table 9: ScienceQA case study example. vPGM ($n = 2$) captures discrepancies and produces a lower confidence comparing to Chameleon+Self-Random+Avg-Conf.

Prompt for Inference of vPGM with 4 Latent Variables

Using Bayesian inference, evaluate the probability of each answer option being correct. Consider step-by-step reasoning the following conditional distributions:

1. **Calculate** $P(Z_1 | \mathbf{X})$: Analyze the image caption, OCR results, and text data. Determine the relevance of each piece of data to the question.
 2. **Calculate** $P(Z_2 | \mathbf{X})$: Assess the provided external knowledge and determine its adequacy in interpreting the question and data.
 3. **Calculate** $P(Z_3 | Z_1, Z_2, \mathbf{X})$: Using the relevance of input data and the quality of external knowledge, evaluate how clear the question is.
 4. **Calculate** $P(Z_4 | Z_2, Z_3, \mathbf{X})$: Perform logical reasoning for answer option with input data and qualified knowledge.
 5. **Calculate** $P(\mathbf{Y} | Z_4)$: Combine the evaluations to construct a probability distribution over the answer options.
-

Table 10: This is an example prompt for vPGM (with 4 latent variables) inference in the context of compositional reasoning tasks.

Prompt for Inference of vPGM with 2 Latent Variables

Perform step-by-step probabilistic reasoning given the following conditional distributions:

1. **Estimate** $P(Z_1 | \mathbf{X})$: Begin by analyzing the question and its associated context. Consider the relevance of external knowledge derived from knowledge retrieval outputs to the posed question.
 2. **Estimate** $P(Z_2 | Z_1, \mathbf{X})$: Review the OCR results and image caption. Use the insights from Z_1 to evaluate the likelihood of discrepancies between the visual information and the textual context or question.
 3. **Estimate** $P(\mathbf{Y} | Z_1, Z_2)$: Combine the assessments and reasoning derived from Z_1 and Z_2 . For each answer option, assign a probability reflecting your confidence in its correctness.
-

Table 11: This is an example prompt for vPGM (with 2 latent variables) inference in the context of compositional reasoning tasks.

Vanilla Instruction Prompting

Instruction: As a linguistic coach for a junior doctor, evaluate the doctor’s statement: {doctor’s statement} against the given medical context: {medical context}. If there are discrepancies, guide the doctor. If not, provide positive feedback.

Table 12: Instruction prompting for ChatCoach.

Vanilla Chain-of-thought

Instruction: As a linguistic coach for a junior doctor, evaluate the doctor’s statement: {doctor’s statement} against the given medical context: {medical context}. You should provide your response based on the following examples of input, thinking steps and output.

Example 1:

Input:

{doctor’s statement for Example 1}
{medical context for Example 1}

Thinking steps:

{thinking steps for Example 1}

Output:

{coach’s feedback for Example 1}

Example 2: {example2}

Example 3: {example3}

Input:

{doctor’s statement}
{medical context}

Table 13: Vanilla CoT for ChatCoach.

Zero-shot Chain-of-thought

Instruction: As a linguistic coach for a junior doctor, evaluate the doctor’s statement: {doctor’s statement} against the given medical context: {medical context}. If there are discrepancies, guide the doctor. If not, provide positive feedback.

Please think step by step.

Table 14: Zero-shot CoT for ChatCoach

Generalized Chain-of-thought (GCoT)

Instruction: As a linguistic coach for a junior doctor, your task is to evaluate the doctor’s statement: {doctor’s statement} against the provided medical context: {Medical Context}. Your evaluation should identify any discrepancies within the doctor’s communication. Where discrepancies arise, guide the doctor towards more accurate medical terminology and understanding. If the statements align well with the medical context, provide positive reinforcement and additional advice if necessary.

Thinking steps:

Identify Key Medical Terms:

Extract medical terms from the doctor’s statement, including diseases, symptoms, medications, and treatments.

Compare with Medical Context:

Check these terms against the medical context for accuracy in:

- Disease/symptom identification.
- Medication/treatment recommendation.

Feedback:

- *If Incorrect:* Point out the error and provide the correct term from the medical context. Use simple corrections like “Instead of [incorrect symptom], it should be [correct symptom]”, “Instead of [incorrect medication name], it should be [correct medication name]” or “Instead of [incorrect disease name], it should be [correct disease name]”.
- *If Correct:* Affirm with "Your diagnosis/treatment aligns well with the medical context. Good job."

Note: <correct symptom>, <correct medication name> and <correct medication name> are extracted from medical context

Table 15: GCoT prompt for ChatCoach.

Prompt for vPGM inference for ChatCoach

Given the {doctor's statement} and the {medical context} provided:

Assess the Probability of Incorrect Terminology ($P(Z_1)$):

Analyze the medical terms used in the {doctor's statement}. Estimate the probability that any given medical term is used incorrectly based on the medical context.

If medical term is irrelevant to medical context then it was considered incorrect. List the medical terms along with their corresponding numerical probability of being incorrect.

Identify Specific Errors ($P(Z_2|Z_1)$):

For medical terms with a high probability of being incorrect, identify the specific term(s) that are used inappropriately. Provide a brief explanation for each identified error, referencing the {medical context}.

Determine Correction Requirement ($P(Z_3|Z_2, Z_1)$):

Based on the errors identified, decide if a correction is needed for each term. For each term that requires correction, state the appropriate medical term extracted from medical context that should be used. For each step, provide your reasoning and the associated probabilities (give real numbers ranging from 0 to 1), if applicable, to mimic the process of Bayesian inference.

Conclude by generating the coach feedback (in Chinese) that assesses the doctor's statement against a provided medical context and guides the physician by pointing out the particular medical terminology errors and providing the corresponding corrections if discrepancies arise, if no mistakes occurred, then encouraging the doctor and provide further medical advice.

Table 16: Prompt of vPGM inference for ChatCoach

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: See Abstract and Sec. 1

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: See Sec. 6.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: This paper does not include theoretical results.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental Result Reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: See Sec. 5.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [No]

Justification: We utilized publicly available data for the experiment. We commit to releasing the code for the camera-ready version.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental Setting/Details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: See Supplements and Sec. 5.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment Statistical Significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [No]

Justification: Error bars are not provided because it is too computationally expensive.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).

- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments Compute Resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: See Supplement for the detailed experimental configurations.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines?>

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The paper does not include harmful content nor involves experiments that may lead to harmful actions.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader Impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: See Sec. Impact Statement.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.

- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not pose such risk.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The paper includes citations to the existing datasets and existing models.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.

- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset’s creators.

13. **New Assets**

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our work does not release new assets.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. **Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects**

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: This is not Human Subjects Research.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human Subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: This is not Human Subjects Research; therefore IRB reviews are not applicable.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.