

Self-Reflection Outcome is Sensitive to Prompt Construction

Fengyuan Liu¹, Nouar AlDahoul¹, Gregory Eady², Yasir Zaki¹,
Bedoor AlShebli^{1,*}, Talal Rahwan^{1,*}

¹New York University Abu Dhabi, UAE ²University of Copenhagen, Denmark

*Joint senior authors. Correspondence: talal.rahwan@nyu.edu, bedoor@nyu.edu

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) demonstrate impressive zero-shot and few-shot reasoning capabilities. Some propose that such capabilities can be improved through self-reflection, i.e., letting LLMs reflect on their own output to identify and correct mistakes in the initial responses. However, despite some evidence showing the benefits of self-reflection, recent studies offer mixed results. Here, we aim to reconcile these conflicting findings by first demonstrating that the outcome of self-reflection is sensitive to prompt wording; e.g., LLMs are more likely to conclude that it has made a mistake when explicitly prompted to find mistakes. Consequently, idiosyncrasies in reflection prompts may lead LLMs to change correct responses unnecessarily. We show that most prompts used in the self-reflection literature are prone to this bias. We then propose different ways of constructing prompts that are conservative in identifying mistakes and show that self-reflection using such prompts results in higher accuracy. Our findings highlight the importance of prompt engineering in self-reflection tasks. We release our code at <https://github.com/Michael98Liu/mixture-of-prompts>.

1 Introduction

Previous research demonstrated that the reasoning capability of language models can be improved through self-reflection, i.e., prompting the model to reflect on its own response to identify and correct potential mistakes, devoid of any external feedback (Chen et al., 2023; Madaan et al., 2024). However, several recent studies have challenged the benefits of self-reflection by pointing out issues with some of the earlier experiments and providing evidence that self-reflection may actually deteriorate performance (Chen et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023; Stechly et al., 2023; Valmeekam et al., 2023).

Table 1 summarizes the prompts used in the self-reflection literature. Looking at the table, it be-

comes apparent that there are two issues with how prompts are commonly constructed. Firstly, with the exception of Zhang et al.’s (2024), studies on self-reflection tend to rely on a single prompt that is constructed at will. Secondly, most prompts contain phrases that explicitly prompt language models to look for mistakes, but it is not clear whether such phrases bias language models to declare mistakes even when the original response was correct. Huang et al. (2023) hypothesized that correction prompts might introduce biases that skew language models away from generating optimal responses. However, the degree to which self-reflection is sensitive to prompt construction has not been systematically investigated to date.

Against this background, we conduct experiments to show that self-reflection can indeed yield outcomes with varying level of accuracy, depending on the prompts being used. Overall, prompts with higher false positive rates of self-correction (i.e., tendency to declare mistakes even when the original response was correct) are negatively correlated with the final accuracy. We then proposed a framework called Mixture of Prompts (MoP) to account for biases inherent in self-reflection prompts. Our experiments reveal that self-reflection using MoP results in higher accuracy compared with prompting LLMs to identify mistakes.

2 Background and Related Work

Self-reflection. Language models could correct their own response using self-reflection while incorporating external feedback from humans (Zheng et al., 2023), tools (Gou et al., 2023), external metrics, or other language models (Paul et al., 2023). Another way to self-reflect is to rely on the model’s own reasoning capability (Pan et al., 2024). Here, we focus on verbal reflection without external feedback, akin to us human editing a draft of our own writing to improve its quality. This approach has

Reference	Self-Reflection Prompt
Gou et al.’s (2023)	<i>What’s the problem with the above answer?</i>
Huang et al.’s (2023)	Assume that this answer could be either correct or incorrect. Review the answer carefully and <i>report any serious problems you find</i> .
Li et al.’s (2024)	Please review and <i>critique</i> your previous response.
Stechly et al.’s (2023)	Please check if this coloring is <i>correct</i> ... If it is, say ‘Verifier confirmed success.’ Do not provide anything else in your response. If it is incorrect, please point out which same-color vertices share an edge.
Zhang et al.’s (2024)	Please carefully examine the previous responses for <i>correctness</i> , and provide detailed feedback.
Zhang et al.’s (2024)	Please review your previous responses for any <i>errors</i> , and provide detailed feedback.
Zhang et al.’s (2024)	Do you think the previous response is correct or not, and if not please point out <i>where is wrong</i> .
Zhang et al.’s (2024)	Please carefully evaluate the quality of the previous response and point out if you feel something is <i>not appropriate</i> .
Zhang et al.’s (2024)	Please double-check the previous response for any <i>errors</i> . If there are any errors, please point them out.

Table 1: Prompts used in self-reflection experiments. Phrases that we hypothesize may bias self-reflection outcome are italicized. Zhang et al. (2024) adopted 10 different reflection prompts but only the first five are listed here.

been shown to improve the performance of language models in various tasks (Chen et al., 2023).

However, more recent studies challenged these claims by presenting mixed results when it comes to the benefit of self-reflection (Li et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2023). Notably, Huang et al. (2023) pointed out three major issues with some earlier experiments and concluded that the observed performance gain should not be attributed to self-reflection but rather to various exogenous factors. In our study, we actively avoid the same mistakes documented in Huang et al.’s (2023), e.g., by refraining from providing additional information in the self-reflection prompt.

LLMs are sensitive to prompt construction.

Studies have shown that prompt construction is crucial to elicit the reasoning ability of language models. Meanwhile, adversarially constructed prompts could hurt performance by simply changing a few words in the prompt (Arakelyan et al., 2024; Verma et al., 2024). Our study contributes to this line of research by documenting a specific case of sensitivity introduced by prompts, and proposing a novel framework to mitigate such sensitivity.

3 Experiments

3.1 Data

The main results in this study are obtained using the Massive Multitask Language Understand-

ing (MMLU), a benchmark dataset consisting of thousands of multiple choice questions drawn from 57 academic subjects across STEM, the humanities, the social sciences (Hendrycks et al., 2020). In our experiments, we use a random set of 1,000 questions sampled from the test set. We further evaluate different ways of constructing self-reflection prompts using two additional datasets: GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) and CommonSenseQA (Talmor et al., 2018), whose results are reported in the Appendix. Following Kim et al. (2024) and Huang et al. (2023), these results are obtained using the test set of GSM8K and the dev set of CommonSenseQA.

3.2 Setup

Experiments are performed using Llama-3 8B with 8-bit quantization. We use multinomial sampling for text generation while setting temperature = 0.4, top_k = 10, and top_p = 0.7. For each question in the dataset, we first prompt the large language model (LLM) to provide an initial answer using chain-of-thought (Wei et al., 2022) and four-shot prompting (Brown et al., 2020), where the few-shot examples are taken from the dev from MMLU, and the train set from GSM8K and CommonSenseQA. We then prompt the LLM with different self-reflection prompts to obtain an updated answer. We employ the self-consistency method and sample seven reasoning

Prompts	Acc.	✓ → ✗
Original answer w/o refl.	64.4%	
Refl. w/ prompt in Gou et al.’s (2023)	57.8%	18.9%
Refl. w/ modified prompt	63.5%	7.6%
Refl. w/ prompt in Zhang et al.’s (2024)	47.4%	40.4%
Refl. w/ modified prompt	53.6%	29.8%
Refl. w/ prompt in Li et al.’s (2024)	55.6%	23.4%
Refl. w/ modified prompt	57.5%	21.3%
Refl. w/ prompt in Zhang et al.’s (2024)	53.2%	32.5%
Refl. w/ modified prompt	54.3%	27.3%

Table 2: Comparison of accuracy after self-reflection using prompts in Table 1 and the modified versions of the corresponding prompts. Here, acc. stands for accuracy, and ✓ → ✗ means false positive rate.




Figure 1: Correlation between accuracy and false positive rate in Table 2. Each data point correspond to a prompt. Pearson’s correlation coefficient and its p-value are reported.

paths when prompting the LLM (Wang et al., 2022). Data and code to reproduce our results can be found at <https://github.com/Michael98Liu/mixture-of-prompts>.

4 Reflection Outcome is Sensitive to Prompt Wording

Self-reflection has been regarded as a promising method to identify and correct mistakes in LLMs’ responses. Hence, we let the LLM self-reflect using four different prompts found in the literature that contain explicit terms such as “problem”, “mistake” or “wrong” (Table 1 and Appendix) in the first set of experiments. Additionally, we modify these prompts to let the LLM verify whether its initial answers are correct instead of looking for mistakes. In Table 2, we report the accuracy, defined as the percentage of final answers that are correct, and the false positive rate of self-correction, defined as

Experiments	Acc.	✓ → ✗	✗ → ✗
Original answer w/o refl.	64.1%	-	-
p_{\uparrow}	59.9%	17.0%	62.7%
p_{\downarrow}	65.0%	0.3%	96.0%
MoP (vote)	65.1%	0.9%	94.9%
MoP (unbiased)	65.2%	1.2%	91.7%
MoP (array)	61.5%	5.3%	94.9%

Table 3: The accuracy, false positive rate, and false negative rate of initial answer (w/o self-reflection) versus self-reflection using prompt to verify correctness (p_{\downarrow}), prompt to identify mistakes (p_{\uparrow}), and three variants of MoP, on the MMLU benchmark.

the percentage of correct initial response that are falsely identified as wrong.

As can be seen, comparing each pair of prompts, the modified prompts result in higher accuracy and lower false-positive rates across all experiments. Overall, accuracy has a strong negative correlation with the false positive rate of self-correction (Figure 1). Among all prompts tested, the highest false positive rate is 40.4%, which means that over 40% of correct answers are turned into incorrect ones during the self-reflection rate, while the lowest false positive rate is 7.6%, suggesting that the outcome of self-reflection is extremely sensitive to prompt wording.

5 Mitigating Biases with Mixture of Prompts

5.1 Method

Having demonstrated that the accuracy of self-correction can be influenced by specific phrases in a prompt, we propose a framework called Mixture of Prompts (MoP) to mitigate such biases (Figure 2). In a nutshell, instead of letting the LLM generate a reflection based on a single prompt, we allow it to self-reflect using multiple prompts.

Formally, we hypothesize that a prompt may either bias a language model towards over-correction (i.e., identifying correct answers as wrong) or under-correction (i.e., falling to identify wrong answers). The former type of prompts is denoted as p_{\uparrow} , and the latter, p_{\downarrow} . Hence, for a questions, we want to find the most likely final answer (ans) given the initial answer (ans_0), as well as both p_{\uparrow} and p_{\downarrow} for self-reflection. That is:

$$ans = \arg \max_{ans} P(ans|ans_0, p_{\uparrow}, p_{\downarrow}) \quad (1)$$




Figure 2: Illustration of using Mixture of Prompts to address prompt biases during self-reflection.

Next, we consider three variations of MoP, which differ in the way they aggregate the outcomes of different prompts.

Plurality vote. Unlike self-consistency (Wang et al., 2022), which samples multiple reasoning paths given a single prompt, here, we sample multiple reasoning paths conditional on p_{\uparrow} and p_{\downarrow} . When there is a tie (i.e., no single answer has the plurality vote), the original answer is kept unchanged.

Single balanced prompt. The second variation of MoP uses a carefully constructed prompt that explicitly prompts the LLM to verify the correctness of its original answer and look for mistakes.

Prompt array. The third variation of MoP considers two different contexts simultaneous, one corresponding to p_{\uparrow} and the other corresponding to p_{\downarrow} while sampling the next token. Formally, given two prompts, p_{\uparrow} and p_{\downarrow} , we repeatedly sample the next token W based on the below probability distribution until reaching end-of-sentence. Experiments with prompt array are conducted using an open source software `PromptArray` which was released under Apache License 2.0.

$$W_T = \arg \max_W \left[P(W_T | p_{\uparrow}, W_{1:T-1}) * P(W_T | p_{\downarrow}, W_{1:T-1}) \right] \quad (2)$$

5.2 Results

Paradoxically, although self-reflection is proposed as a method of identifying mistakes, prompts that explicitly look for errors (denoted as p_{\uparrow}) result in the highest false positive rate (more than 10x as high as the alternative approaches) while resulting in the lowest accuracy (Table 3).

Meanwhile, prompts with low false positive rate tend to have high false negative rate, which means that they fail to identify an incorrect responses, showing limited ability of intrinsic self-correction. Overall, self-reflection can at best marginally increase the accuracy by about 1% compared to the initial answer without reflection.

6 Conclusion

Our study is the first to show conclusive results that prompting LLMs to identify mistakes in their own responses deteriorates their accuracy. This is due to the high false positive rates (i.e., falsely identify correct responses as incorrect) introduced by such prompts. We also find that although conservative or balanced prompts result in lower false positive rate, they lead to high false negative rate (i.e., fail to identify incorrect responses). Taken together, this suggests that LLMs are not able to distinguish between correct and incorrect responses, which limits their intrinsic self-correction ability.

Limitations

Our study demonstrates that self-reflection outcome is sensitive to prompt construction using a single strategy, i.e., verbal self-reflection without any external feedback. Hence it is important future work to examine whether more complex self-reflection strategies are also susceptible to the same type of biases (Pan et al., 2024). As long as human interact with language models via natural language prompting, prompts may introduce biases that skew language models to generate sub-optimal responses. Hence, it remains to be shown whether more complex self-reflection tasks can benefit from the balanced prompting strategy offered by MoP.

References

- Erik Arakelyan, Zhaoqi Liu, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2024. Semantic sensitivities and inconsistent predictions: Measuring the fragility of nli models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14440*.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Teaching large language models to self-debug. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05128*.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Yujiu Yang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. Critic: Large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11738*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*.
- Jie Huang, Xinyun Chen, Swaroop Mishra, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Adams Wei Yu, Xinying Song, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Large language models cannot self-correct reasoning yet. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01798*.
- Geunwoo Kim, Pierre Baldi, and Stephen McAleer. 2024. Language models can solve computer tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Yanhong Li, Chenghao Yang, and Allyson Ettinger. 2024. When hindsight is not 20/20: Testing limits on reflective thinking in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09129*.
- Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. 2024. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Liangming Pan, Michael Saxon, Wenda Xu, Deepak Nathani, Xinyi Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2024. Automatically correcting large language models: Surveying the landscape of diverse automated correction strategies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:484–506.
- Debjit Paul, Mete Ismayilzada, Maxime Peyrard, Beatriz Borges, Antoine Bosselut, Robert West, and Boi Faltings. 2023. Refiner: Reasoning feedback on intermediate representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01904*.
- Kaya Stechly, Matthew Marquez, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2023. Gpt-4 doesn’t know it’s wrong: An analysis of iterative prompting for reasoning problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12397*.
- Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant. 2018. CommonsenseQA: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00937*.
- Karthik Valmeekam, Matthew Marquez, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2023. Can large language models really improve by self-critiquing their own plans? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08118*.
- Mudit Verma, Siddhant Bhabri, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2024. On the brittle foundations of react prompting for agentic large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13966*.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Wenqi Zhang, Yongliang Shen, Linjuan Wu, Qiuying Peng, Jun Wang, Yueting Zhuang, and Weiming Lu. 2024. Self-contrast: Better reflection through inconsistent solving perspectives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02009*.
- Chuanyang Zheng, Zhengying Liu, Enze Xie, Zhenguo Li, and Yu Li. 2023. Progressive-hint prompting improves reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09797*.

A Supplementary tables

Here, we report additional results using GSM8k (Table 4) and CommonSenseQA (Table 5).

Experiments	Acc.	✓ → ✗	✗ → ✗
Original answer w/o refl.	82.5%	-	-
p _↑	64.3%	24.6%	60.3%
p _↓	82.6%	1.4%	95.0%
MoP (vote)	82.3%	1.9%	93.5%
MoP (unbiased)	81.3%	3.1%	90.5%
MoP (array)	66.6%	20.1%	75.9%

Table 4: The same as Table 3 but using the GSM8K dataset.

Experiments	Acc.	✓ → ✗	✗ → ✗
Original answer w/o refl.	76.1%	-	-
p _↑	71.1%	12.7%	66.8%
p _↓	76.2%	0.3%	98.2%
MoP (vote)	76.5%	0.8%	94.1%
MoP (unbiased)	76.3%	0.6%	95.9%
MoP (array)	75.4%	1.1%	97.0%

Table 5: The same as Table 3 but using the CommonSenseQA dataset.

B Prompts used to obtain initial answers

B.1 MMLU

You are an advanced reasoning agent tasked with answer some multiple choice questions. Let’s think step by step. Firstly, provide an explanation of why some answers are wrong and why a particular answer is correct. Secondly, identify the correct answer. Finally output your final decision starting with “Therefore, my final decision is: ”, followed by a, b, c, or d.

B.2 CommonSenseQA

You are an advanced reasoning agent tasked with answer some multiple choice questions. Let’s think step by step. Firstly, provide an explanation of why

some answers are wrong and why a particular answer is correct. Secondly, identify the correct answer. Finally output your final decision starting with “Therefore, my final decision is: ”, followed by a, b, c, d, or e.

B.3 GSM8k

You are an advanced reasoning agent tasked with solving the following math problem. Let’s think step by step. Finally output your final decision starting with “####”, followed by the answer to the math problem using a single number.

C Prompts used for experiments in Section 4

1. What’s the problem with the response below?
2. Verify that the response below is correct.
3. Do you think the previous response is wrong or not, and if so please point out what is wrong.
4. Do you think the previous response is correct or not, and if so please point out what is correct.
5. Please review and critique your previous response.
6. Please review and appraise your previous response.
7. Please carefully examine the previous responses to identify any errors, and provide detailed feedback.
8. Please carefully examine the previous responses, and provide detailed feedback.

Each of the above prompt is followed by You will be provided with the

input and your previous response. Read them carefully and explain your rationale. Finally output your final decision starting with "Therefore, my final decision is: ", followed by a, b, c, or d. The input was: <question> Your decision was: <final-answer> Your response was: <reasoning-path>. in order to ensure chain-of-thought reasoning and the natural language output from the LLM is parsable.

D Prompts used for self-reflection in Section 5

D.1 MMLU and CommonSenseQA

Biased prompt p_{\uparrow} : You are an advanced reasoning agent that can identify mistakes in multiple choice answers. You were asked to answer some multiple choice questions. Let's think step by step. Given the input and the answer, check if the answer is wrong and explain your rationale. Finally output your final decision starting with "Therefore, my final decision is: ", followed by a, b, c, or d. The input was: <question> Your decision was: <final-answer> Your response was: <reasoning-path>.

Biased prompt p_{\downarrow} : You are an advanced reasoning agent that can verify the correctness of multiple choice answers. You were asked to answer some multiple choice questions. Let's think step by step. Given the input and the answer, verify if the answer is correct and explain your rationale. Finally output your final decision starting with "Therefore, my final decision is: ", followed by a, b, c, or d. The input was: <question> Your decision was: <final-answer> Your response was: <reasoning-path>.

Prompt array: You are an advanced

reasoning agent that can { identify mistakes in multiple choice answers. You were asked to answer some multiple choice questions. Let's think step by step. Given the input and the answer, check if the answer is wrong & verify the correctness of multiple choice answers. You were asked to answer some multiple choice questions. Let's think step by step. Given the input and the answer, verify if the answer is correct}. Finally output your final decision starting with "Therefore, my final decision is: ", followed by a, b, c, or d. The input was: <question> Your decision was: <final-answer> Your response was: <reasoning-path>. First explain your rationale and then output your final decision starting with "Therefore, my final decision is: ", followed by a, b, c, or d.

Single balanced prompt: You are an advanced reasoning agent that can verify the correctness of, or identify mistakes in, multiple choice answers. You were asked to answer some multiple choice questions. Let's think step by step. Given the input and the answer, check if the answer is wrong or correct and explain your rationale. Finally output your final decision starting with "Therefore, my final decision is: ", followed by a, b, c, or d. The input was: <question> Your decision was: <final-answer> Your response was: <reasoning-path>.

Experiments with MMLU are carried out using the prompts above. Experiments with CommonSenseQA are carried out using similar prompts, with the only difference being that there are five different choices: a, b, c, d, and e.

D.2 GSM8K

Biased prompt p_{\uparrow} : You are an advanced reasoning agent that can identify

mistakes in solutions to math problems. You were asked to solve the following math problem. Let's think step by step. Given the input and the answer, check if the answer is wrong and explain your rationale. Finally output your final decision starting with "####", followed by the answer to the math problem using a single number. The input was: <question> Your decision was: <final-answer> Your response was: <reasoning-path>.

Biased prompt p₁: You are an advanced reasoning agent that can verify the correctness of solutions to math problems. You were asked to solve the following math problem. Let's think step by step. Given the input and the answer, verify if the answer is correct and explain your rationale. Finally output your final decision starting with "####", followed by the answer to the math problem using a single number. The input was: <question> Your decision was: <final-answer> Your response was: <reasoning-path>.

Prompt array: You are an advanced reasoning agent that can {identify mistakes in solutions to math problems. You were asked to solve the following math problem. Let's think step by step. Given the input and the answer, check if the answer is wrong & verify the correctness of solutions to math problems. You were asked to solve the following math problem. Let's think step by step. Given the input and the answer, verify if the answer is correct}. Finally output your final decision starting with "####", followed by the answer to the math problem using a single number. The input was: <question> Your decision was: <final-answer> Your response was:

<reasoning-path>. First explain your rationale and then output your final decision starting with "####", followed by the answer using a single number.

Single balanced prompt: You are an advanced reasoning agent that can verify the correctness of, or identify mistakes in, solutions to math problems. You were asked to solve the following math problem. Let's think step by step. Given the input and the answer, check if the answer is wrong or correct and explain your rationale. Finally output your final decision starting with "####", followed by the answer to the math problem using a single number. The input was: <question> Your decision was: <final-answer> Your response was: <reasoning-path>.