

# A Hopfieldian View-based Interpretation for Chain-of-Thought Reasoning

Lijie Hu<sup>1,2</sup>, Liang Liu<sup>1,3</sup>, Shu Yang<sup>1,2</sup>, Xin Chen<sup>1,4</sup>, Hongru Xiao<sup>1,5</sup>,  
Mengdi Li<sup>1,6</sup>, Pan Zhou<sup>1,7</sup>, Muhammad Asif Ali<sup>1,2</sup>, and Di Wang<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Provable Responsible AI and Data Analytics (PRADA) Lab

<sup>2</sup>KAUST <sup>3</sup>Soochow University <sup>4</sup>University of Southampton <sup>5</sup>Tongji University

<sup>6</sup>Universität Hamburg <sup>7</sup>Huazhong University of Science and Technology

## Abstract

Chain-of-Thought (CoT) holds a significant place in augmenting the reasoning performance for large language models (LLMs). While some studies focus on improving CoT accuracy through methods like retrieval enhancement, yet a rigorous explanation for why CoT achieves such success remains unclear. In this paper, we analyze CoT methods under two different settings by asking the following questions: (1) For zero-shot CoT, why does prompting the model with “let’s think step by step” significantly impact its outputs? (2) For few-shot CoT, why does providing examples before questioning the model could substantially improve its reasoning ability? To answer these questions, we conduct a top-down explainable analysis from the Hopfieldian view and propose a Read-and-Control approach for controlling the accuracy of CoT. Through extensive experiments on seven datasets for three different tasks, we demonstrate that our framework can decipher the inner workings of CoT, provide reasoning error localization, and control to come up with the correct reasoning path.

## 1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated exceptional capabilities in adhering to the natural language instructions (Ouyang et al., 2022; Mishra et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022a; Jin et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2024b,a), and various downstream tasks (Koccon et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023b; Hu et al., 2023a; Yang et al., 2024c). An increasing amount of efforts are dedicated to exploring how these models can be utilized to perform more complex tasks, such as commonsense and mathematical reasoning (Rae et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2023; Imani et al., 2023). For this, Chain-of-Thought (CoT) techniques (Wei et al., 2022b; Kojima et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023d; Zhou et al., 2023; Qiao et al., 2023) have emerged as a simple yet effective method for enhancing the performance of LLMs in tasks requiring logical thinking.

Recently, there have been multiple endeavors focused on improving the accuracy of CoT, *e.g.*, efficient prompt design (Zhang et al., 2023a; Shi et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023c), process optimization (Wang et al., 2023d; Madaan et al., 2023; Shinn et al., 2023), extra engine usage (Schick et al., 2023; Lyu et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2023), knowledge enhancement (Liu et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2022; He et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023), *etc.* Likewise, there have been numerous research attempts to identify the key factors or elements that help CoT to augment the reasoning capabilities of LLMs (Kojima et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023a; Tang et al., 2023; Merrill and Sabharwal, 2023). However, the majority of these studies primarily rely on designing datasets encompassing different features and/or using additional tools and knowledge to enhance the reasoning abilities of LLMs. Although some works have attempted to research the faithfulness of CoT (Lyu et al., 2023; Lanham et al., 2023), these studies have not fundamentally explained the key factors underlying the success of CoT.

To bridge this gap, in this work, we propose an explainable framework to identify the pivotal elements influencing CoT performance for LLMs. Specifically, we build our framework on the top of *Hopfieldian view* (Barack and Krakauer, 2021). As shown in Figure 1a, the *Hopfieldian view* explains cognition as the result of transformations between, or movements within, representational spaces implemented by *neural populations* in response to *stimuli*. In this view, we no longer consider the interaction process between neurons, rather we only need to understand the impact of the representational changes on the final actions, thus offering a natural setting to study LLMs.

As shown in Figure 2, our framework encompasses three core components: (i) *Concept Modeling*, (ii) *Concept Simulation*, and (iii) *Analysis based on Hopfieldian View*. The *Concept Modeling* emphasizes that during pre-training LLMs learn latent concepts (both concrete and abstract) that pertain to specific names or domains. The *Concept Simulation* highlights that we can use zero-shot or few-shot prompts as stimuli for the LLMs in order to induce and/or activate specific concepts. These




Figure 1: Illustration of mechanisms in the cognitive brain (Barack and Krakauer, 2021) and neural network.

activated concepts collectively determine the final action of the model. Finally, we perform analysis based on *Hopfieldian view* to analyze the representations responsible for the activation of concepts when the model is stimulated. Specifically, it uses a *Read* operation to read concept-specific representations for reasoning and error localization; followed by a *Control* operation to guide and/or rectify the reasoning direction of LLM.

We apply our proposed approach to answer the following key questions: (i) For zero-shot CoT (Kojima et al., 2022), why prompting the model with stimulus like “let’s think step by step” before inference can make LLMs’ outputs more accurate? (ii) For few-shot CoT (Wei et al., 2022b), why providing example demonstrations before questioning significantly enhances the LLMs’ reasoning ability?

Experimental evaluation on three different tasks: *i.e.*, (i) arithmetic reasoning, (ii) commonsense reasoning, and (iii) symbolic reasoning, reveals that our framework can provide intuitive and interpretable analysis for CoT reasoning helpful in tracing and control the errors LLMs made during the CoT process.

We summarize the key contributions of our work as follows:

1. We propose a novel framework employing *Hopfieldian view* to identify the key factors responsible for the success of CoT under zero-shot and few-shot settings.
2. To the best of our knowledge, this work is an initial attempt at interpretability in CoT that employs concept-level representation read operations to localize errors in CoT followed by control operation to rectify LLMs’ reasoning paths.
3. We conduct a comprehensive experimental evaluation for our framework by employing seven different data sets across three different tasks. Results showcase that our framework can offer faithful explanations with error localization and control for CoT.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Chain of Thought (CoT)

The CoT is a prompting technique that engages LLMs in step-by-step reasoning rather than directly providing the answers (Nye et al., 2021). Studies show that intermediate steps or learning from demonstration can significantly improve the reasoning performance of LLMs (Wei et al., 2022b; Kojima et al., 2022). Owing to the success of CoT, numerous studies focus on using CoT to solve complex problems, such as commonsense, arithmetic, symbolic reasoning (Wang et al., 2023d; Zhou et al., 2023; Wang and Zhou, 2024), and logic tasks (Creswell and Shanahan, 2022; Pan et al., 2023; Weng et al., 2023). Recently, numerous endeavors have been made to identify the key factors through which CoT enhances the reasoning capabilities of LLMs (Wang et al., 2023a; Dutta et al., 2024). For instance, Kim et al. (2023) corrected the erroneous parts of the chain by using a query-based approach. Zhao et al. (2023) proposed a knowledge-enhanced method to augment the factual correctness for multi-pole open-domain QA tasks. Lyu et al. (2023) introduce faithful CoT, *i.e.*, a faithful by-construction framework to first translate natural language query to symbolic reasoning chain, later solve the problem via with CoT.

Likewise, numerous research attempts have focused on the sequence and quantity of demonstrations within the context, investigating their contributions to the final reasoning performance. For this, Min et al. (2022) discovered that even random labels or ineffective reasoning steps can still improve the model’s reasoning performance. Lanham et al. (2023) demonstrated the impact of intervening in the CoT process by adding mistakes or paraphrases. Pfau et al. (2024) showed that using meaningless filler tokens in place of a chain-of-thought can help improve the performance.

These studies have led to concerns such as whether LLMs truly acquire the ability to learn inductive, deductive, and abductive reasoning skills

from demonstrations and instructions (Stechly et al., 2024; Jin et al., 2024). In this paper, we will use a top-down interpretability method to analyze the operating mechanism of CoT reasoning.

## 2.2 Interpretability of LLMs

Interpretability plays a key role in a deeper understanding of LLMs to identify potential risks and better meet human requirements (Zou et al., 2023). Current widely used strategies for interpretability include: (i) salience maps, relying on highlighting the regions in the input that are attended by the model (Simonyan et al., 2014; Smilkov et al., 2017; Clark et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2023c,b; Lai et al., 2023); (ii) feature visualization, creating representative inputs indicative of particular neurons’ activations (Szegedy et al., 2014; Nguyen et al., 2016, 2019; Fong and Vedaldi, 2018), and (iii) mechanistic interpretability, employing reverse-engineering tools to explain the network in terms of circuits and node-to-node connections (Olah et al., 2020; Olsson et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023b). However, these methods require a lot of human intervention and are limited in terms of interpretability, especially for the neural network models (Jain and Wallace, 2019; Fong and Vedaldi, 2018; Hu et al., 2024). Thus, these methods cannot be directly used to interpret CoTs. Meanwhile, current approaches are limited to the analysis at the representation level and do not consider the relationship between representations and the features/concepts learned during pre-training (Bricken et al., 2023; Templeton et al., 2024).

Other dominant works in this regard investigate the location and representation of concepts in the network (Kim et al., 2018; Li et al., 2024), linear classifier probing to probe properties in the input (Belinkov, 2022), locating and editing facts (Meng et al., 2022; Zhong et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2024a,b), concept erasure (Shao et al., 2023; Gandikota et al., 2023), corrective analysis (Burns et al., 2023), *etc.* These observations are aligned with RepE (Zou et al., 2023) that emphasized that representations within the LLM are almost secretly linear (Park et al., 2023). However, none of them consider the inner workings of the Chain-of-Thought Reasoning.

## 3 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly introduce the notation followed by a quick background on the core concepts required for this work. More background can be found in Appendix A.

**Notations.** We use  $\mathcal{M}_\theta$  to denote an LLM parameterized by  $\theta$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$  to represent set of concepts, and  $c_i$  an individual concept,  $T$  to represent the prompt template,  $\mathcal{S}$  to denote a set of *stimulus*  $s$  in the prompt (*i.e.*, example input-output demonstra-

tions in a few-shot scenario and “*think step by step*” in a zero-shot scenario), and  $x$  denotes the query for which the LLM is asked to provide a response. Thus, we can use  $T([\mathcal{S}, x])$  to denote the prompt  $p$ , which includes both a set of stimuli  $\mathcal{S}$  and query  $x$ , providing the full context to LLM in order to generate a response.

**Hopfieldian View.** Hopfieldian view aims to scale/extend the traditional mechanistic interpretability for AI-cognition (*i.e.*, neurons and circuits) to a much broader perspective in attempts to explain complex phenomena. It considers representation as a basic unit and explains cognition as the result of transformations between or movement within representational spaces implemented via neural populations (Barack and Krakauer, 2021).

We provide an intuitive explanation in this regard in Figure 1, which emphasizes that Hopfieldian view allows us with the provision to analyze and control the network as a function of external stimulus the akin to the functionality of cognitive brain. For further details refer to recent work by Zou et al. (2023) that employed Hopfieldian view to propose a top-down approach to interpretability.

**In-context Learning(ICL) and Bayesian Inference.** Bayesian inference is a method for statistical inference that is used to compute the posterior probability based on the likelihood and prior. It has gained attraction in the analysis and interpretation of LLMs in order to systematically update the knowledge and beliefs for a network with the acquisition of new information. Further details exhibiting the impact of Bayesian analysis peculiarly focused on LLMs is available in (Falck et al., 2024).

The in-context learning ability of models may also be represented via Bayesian inference as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(r|p) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbb{P}(r|c, p) \mathbb{P}(c|p) d(c). \quad (1)$$

This equation illustrates the *conditional probability* of generating a response  $r$  given a prompt  $p$ , as a function of the concepts  $c$  that the model has learned during pre-training. By integrating over these concepts, the model dynamically adjusts its responses based on the likelihood of various concepts being relevant to the given prompt. This probabilistic approach not only helps in understanding the model’s decision-making process but also in enhancing its performance on complex reasoning tasks. Our work extends this formula by incorporating the Hopfieldian view, describing the role of prompts in model reasoning as stimuli that activate specific populations of neurons.




Figure 2: Our CoT explanation framework based on Hopfieldian view.

## 4 CoT Explanation from Hopfieldian View

In this section, we will dive into details about our motivation from the Hopfieldian view and a general introduction of our framework.

**Motivation.** Existing literature has confirmed that CoT can improve the reasoning ability of LLMs (Kojima et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022b). However, few studies have conducted a comprehensive analysis of the interpretability of CoT. This is mainly because reasoning is a complex task, and the model’s final performance is influenced by numerous factors. Analyzing internal activations in isolation or from the perspective of individual neurons of LLMs is challenging. Inspired by work related to representation engineering (Zou et al., 2023), we consider LLM from a higher-level cognition perspective (Hopfieldian view), *i.e.*, specific external stimuli activate representations within the model, thereby causing the model to exhibit different behaviors that represent the population activation behavior of neurons within the model. Meanwhile, many studies have shown that the representations of LLM are almost secretly linear inside, and can be controlled via linear probe methods (Park et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2024). These phenomena indicate that we can analyze the interpretability of CoT from the perspective of representation and control the reasoning process of LLM.

**Framework.** As we are targeting at exploiting the Hopfieldian view to provide an explanation for LLMs’ CoT reasoning, we have to build a bridge from the components in the cognitive brain to CoTs. We begin from introducing the definition of stimulus in CoT, which is the prompt text (*i.e.*, example input-output demonstrations in a few-shot scenario and “*think step by step*” in a zero-shot scenario). Then use these stimuli to activate specific “neural populations” for CoT.

For neural populations, ideally, we can leverage humanly comprehensible concepts within LLMs’ representations. To model these concepts, our

framework has two phases: (i) *Concept Modeling*, and (ii) *Concept Simulation*. In the Concept Modeling phase (Section 5.1), LLMs will learn latent (both concrete and abstract) concepts from pertaining documents, and these concepts might pertain to specific names or domains, such as “medical” or “climate change”. They could also represent more abstract notions derived from document-level modeling, such as “positive language”, “careful reasoning”, or “affirmative expression”. Likewise, in the Concept Simulation stage (Section 5.2), zero-shot or few-shot prompts serve as stimuli for the LLM, inducing the activation of specific concepts. These activated concepts collectively determine the final action of this model.

However, directly extracting activated concepts would consume a tremendous amount of computational resources, and individual concepts alone cannot determine the model’s overall action. Therefore, our framework uses representations to denote the activation of concepts when the model is stimulated. For this, our framework employs *Representations Reading* (Section 5.3) and *Representations Controlling* (Section 5.4) as the core modeling components.

Next, we will give details about individual model components. Later, we explain how this framework can be used to improve the CoT reasoning abilities of LLMs. See Figure 2 for an illustration of our framework.

## 5 Details of the Framework

### 5.1 Concept Modeling

Previous research (Xie et al., 2022) reveals that during pre-training LLMs can learn a set of latent document-level concepts  $c \in C$  that in turn help large language models to generate coherent next tokens. This motivates our design of stimuli. We provide some examples of these concepts in Figure 2. The activation and intensity of specific concepts determine the model’s final response. However, searching and controlling individual concepts is a prohibitively expensive process. In order to circum-

vent that, we instead use representations as a basic unit indicative of latent concepts learned by the model. We cover the definitions and relationships between these representations and concepts in the next subsections.

## 5.2 Concept Stimulation

From the Hopfield view, we need specific stimulus to trigger the model’s specific action. Since CoT reasoning is primarily activated through prompts, we posit that CoT prompts  $p$  containing a set of stimulus  $S$  that can activate the model’s reasoning capabilities. So, we use the following formula based on Bayesian inference to illustrate the entire process from the LLM receiving an input to generating a specified output, as shown in Figure 2:

$$\mathbb{P}(r|p) = \int_c \mathbb{P}(r|c, T([\mathcal{S}, x])) \mathbb{P}(c|T([\mathcal{S}, x])) d(c), \quad (2)$$

where,  $T([\mathcal{S}, x])$  is the prompt template based on specific Stimulus  $S$  and query  $x$ .  $\mathbb{P}(r|c, T([\mathcal{S}, x]))$  is the likelihood of response  $r$  given  $c$ , and  $\mathbb{P}(c|T([\mathcal{S}, x]))$  is the prior probability of the  $c$  for a given prompt template  $T([\mathcal{S}, x])$ .

This equation governs the conditional probability of a response  $r$  given prompt  $p$  guided by concept *i.e.*, ( $c \in C$ ) learned by the model.

## 5.3 Representations Reading

The end goal of reading representations is to look for and/or locate the representations for key concepts within a network. We sub-divided its process into: (i) concepts reading, and (ii) reasoning error localization. Details about each component are explained in the following sub-sections.

### 5.3.1 Concepts Reading

This module aims to locate and highlight the core concepts within the network. The concepts output/generated by this module act as a foundation for the subsequent steps, *i.e.*, representation evaluation followed by representation control. However, in CoT-style prompting, the definition of concepts is abstract, and how to define high-level concepts is crucial. For this, we utilize a Linear Artificial Tomography (LAT), similar to (Zou et al., 2023), in order to identify the directions of the key concept, as illustrated in Algorithm 1. It encompasses two different modules: (i) Stimuli Selection; (ii) Neural Activity Monitoring; and (iii) Concept Identification, with each module explained as follows:

**(i) Stimuli Selection.** To elucidate the sensitivity of LLMs to different CoT prompts, in this step we will employ various “*stimuli*” encompassing one or more concepts for inducing diverse model behaviors under both zero-shot and few-shot settings. Our objective is to analyze how the concepts

---

### Algorithm 1: LAT Process-flow

---

**Input:** Stimulus set  $S$ , model  $\mathcal{M}_\theta$ , function  $Rep(.,.)$   
**Output:** Reading vector  $v$

```

1  $A_c \leftarrow []$  // neural activity list
2 for  $s_i$  in  $S$  do
3   |  $A_c \leftarrow A_c + [Rep(s_i, \mathcal{M}_\theta)[-1]]$ 
4 end
5  $i \leftarrow 0$ 
6  $D \leftarrow []$  // difference list
7 while  $i < len(S) - 1$  do
8   |  $D \leftarrow D + [A_c[i + 1] - A_c[i]]$ 
9   |  $i \leftarrow i + 2$ 
10 end
11  $v \leftarrow PCA(D)[0]$ 
12 return  $v$ 
```

---

corresponding to a specific stimulus are processed and transferred within large models, as illustrated in Figure 1, from the perspective of cognitive neuroscience.

We implement the impact of stimulus in Hopfieldian view as follows: a set of stimuli (*i.e.*, the prompt text)  $S = \{s_0^-, s_0^+, s_1^-, s_1^+, \dots, s_n^+\}$ , when an LLM receives a positive stimulus  $s^+$ , it generates a specific output/response  $r$ , across a query  $x$ , and falls into the corresponding action space  $A^+$ . Conversely, when it receives a negative stimulus  $s^-$  or no stimulus at all, the model’s output falls into a different action space  $A^-$  or  $A$ .

An example of a pair of specific prompt template for  $T([\mathcal{S}, x])$ , and example demonstrations are shown in Appendix C.

**(ii) Neural Activity Monitoring.** After receiving the task-specific prompt stimuli set, the next step is to capture corresponding representations from the LLM. Given that LLMs rely on transformer-based architecture to store distinct rep-

---

### Algorithm 2: Control Representations

---

**Input:** Query  $x$ , reading vector  $v$ , control layers  $L$ , model  $\mathcal{M}_\theta$   
**Output:** Model’s logits after control

```

1 // get the representations of  $x$ 
2  $H \leftarrow Rep(x, \mathcal{M}_\theta)$ 
3 for  $layer$  in  $\mathcal{M}_\theta$  do
4   | if  $layer$  in  $L$  then
5     |  $H[layer] \leftarrow H[layer] + v[layer]$ 
6   | end
7 end
8 // transform  $H$  into the logits of model
9  $logits \leftarrow trans\_into\_logits(H)$ 
10 return  $logits$ 
```

---




Figure 3: A real case of reasoning error localization by using LLaMA-2-7B-chat in a zero-shot scenario for the GSM8K dataset using our framework. The **green** bar indicates that the reasoning snippet is correct, and the **red** bar means that the reasoning snippet may be wrong.

representations intended for different purposes. In order to capture the representations for the specific task, we first need to identify suitable design choices for the extraction process. For decoder-only/auto-regressive architecture models, one natural choice is to choose the position of the *last token* as the representation of each concept.

Formally, given a set of stimuli  $S$ , a language model  $\mathcal{M}_\theta$ , and a function  $\text{Rep}$ , we compute the neural activity  $A_c$  as follows:

$$A_c = \{\text{Rep}(s_i, \mathcal{M}_\theta)[-1] \mid s_i \in S\}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\text{Rep}(\dots)$  is a function that takes stimulus  $s_i \in S$  and LLM  $\mathcal{M}_\theta$  as input and returns the representations from all token positions.

**(iii) Concept Identification.** Concept identification aims to identify a direction that accurately predicts the underlying concept solely based on the neural activity recorded via (3).

For this, we employ Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to the set of difference vectors that can yield superior results when the stimuli in each pair share similarities except for the target concept. Specifically, we compute the principal components of the representation  $\{A_c^{i+1} - A_c^i\}$  (as depicted in line 8 of Algorithm 1), and define the leading principal vector derived from this as “reading vector”, denoted by  $v$ . Intuitively, we can compute the dot product between the reading vector  $v$  and each representation  $\text{Rep}(s_i, \mathcal{M}_\theta)$  as an indicator of the relevance between the stimulus representation and latent concepts.

### 5.3.2 Reasoning Error Localization

In this section, we consider the visualization of reasoning error localization, given a query  $x$ , we format it using the stimulus prompting template  $T$  and represent it as  $p$ . Then, we use  $p$  to generate a base reasoning path  $R$  with  $\mathcal{M}_\theta$ .

After the representations reading (section 5.3.1), we get the reading vector  $v$ . Then, we com-

pute the dot product between the representations  $\text{Rep}(p, \mathcal{M}_\theta)$  and our reading vector  $v$  yielding a set of scores, which serve as the basis for reasoning error localization. We use the score of each token compared against a threshold  $\delta$  to locate errors in the reasoning path. Specifically, we use the following criterion to access and/or evaluate the quality of the rationales:

$$\text{scores}_{\text{norm}} = \text{normalize}(\text{Rep}(R, \mathcal{M}_\theta)^T v - \delta). \quad (4)$$

Note, in the above equation, using multiple different values for  $\delta$  provides us with the provision to effectively adjust and use a wide range of scores. Then, we use a clip function to set the value greater than 0 in the score array, *i.e.*,  $(\text{scores}_{\text{norm}})_+$  to 0. Our salience map is based on this score, therefore, when the score is less than 0, it will appear in red, indicating that there is a potential wrong reasoning location.

An example of visualization is shown in Figure 3, LLaMA-2-7B-chat did not really understand the meaning of the given question and misinterpreted “the distance covered by each train” as “the total distance covered by both trains”, thus giving an incorrect reasoning path.

### 5.4 Representations Controlling

Here we aim to correct the direction of the concept which may lead to CoT errors, as shown in the top right part of Figure 2.

Given a query  $x$ , we adopt a simple process to control the direction of CoT. Specifically, as depicted in Algorithm 2, during the generation phase, we first acquire the reading vector  $v$  from the concept identification phase. Subsequently, we get the representations  $H$  for the query  $x$ , and then we incorporate  $v$  into the original representation weights of the corresponding control layers  $L$  (as shown in line 5 of Algorithm 2). Finally, we transform the controlled representations  $H$  into the logits of model for generation.




Figure 4: A real case predicted by LLaMA-3-8B-instruct with few-shot CoT on the coin flip dataset. The purple part is an example of input-output pairs given by user. The segment highlighted in blue represents the correct output of the model. The red part shows that the model starts to reason in the wrong direction without control, while the green portion indicates the model reason in the correct direction after adding control.

## 6 Experiments

### 6.1 Experimental Setup

**Dataset.** We consider 7 datasets for 3 different tasks: Arithmetic Reasoning, Commonsense Reasoning, and Symbolic Reasoning. Specifically, for arithmetic reasoning, we select the GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), SVAMP (Patel et al., 2021) and AQuA (Miao et al., 2020) datasets; for commonsense reasoning, we choose the benchmarks of strategyQA (Geva et al., 2021) and CSQA (Talmor et al., 2019); and for symbolic reasoning, we pick the Coin Flip (Wei et al., 2022b) and Random Letter datasets (constructed from the last letter dataset (Wei et al., 2022b)). Further details and statistics of the data sets are given in Appendix B.1.

**Baselines.** We use three LLMs for evaluation, *i.e.*, (i) Mistral-instruct-7B (Jiang et al., 2023), (ii) LLaMA-2-7B-chat (Touvron et al., 2023), (iii) LLaMA-3-8B-instruct (Meta, 2024).

**Evaluation Metrics.** We use accuracy metrics for all dataset benchmarks. The answer extraction process is based on the methodology outlined by Kojima et al. (2022). Detailed procedures and results are provided in the Appendix C.3.

**Implementation Details.** In our study, we pick the last ten layers to control the reasoning direction of the LLM and select different numbers of stimulus samples according to different tasks. Specifically, We conducted experiments using three distinct reading set sizes: 128, 256, and 512 samples, details shown in Appendix B.2. For experimentation, we

use a value of threshold  $\delta = 3.5$ . We use float16 to load large models. We employ greedy search as our decoding strategy and set max new tokens of 512 for all datasets. All experiments are conducted using NVIDIA L20 GPU.

### 6.2 Utility Evaluation

In this section, we use the reading vector  $v$  to control the generation of CoT reasoning paths. As shown in Table 1, 2 and 3, we present the performance comparison between our approach and baselines on each task. From these tables, we can see the following interesting findings.

(i) **Our framework can guide/correct the reasoning direction of LLM.** For example, for zero-shot CoT, our approach demonstrates superior performance, surpassing Mistral-7B-instruct by 4% on the SVAMP dataset, and for few-shot CoT, our approach achieves a significant improvement over LLaMA-2-7B-chat by 2.95% on the CSQA dataset. This is mainly because our approach demonstrates that our methodology effectively directs the correct reasoning path of LLM, thereby improving the accuracy of reasoning. This highlights the effectiveness our interpretability in CoT, which employs concept-level representation read operations to localize errors in CoT, followed by control operations to rectify LLMs' reasoning paths.

(ii) **Few-shot CoT have stereotypes in the reasoning phase.** From these tables, we observe that, except for the commonsense reasoning task,

Model	Arithmetic Reasoning		
	GSM8K	SVAMP	AQuA
	zero-shot CoT		
Mistral-7B-instruct	45.03 / <b>47.08</b>	57.33 / <b>61.33</b>	25.59 / <b>30.71</b>
LLaMA-2-7B-chat	26.31 / <b>27.37</b>	46.00 / <b>46.67</b>	27.95 / <b>30.71</b>
LLaMA-3-8B-instruct	74.45 / <b>75.89</b>	82.67 / <b>84.00</b>	42.13 / <b>45.67</b>
Avg.	48.60 / 50.11 ( <b>1.51</b> ↑)	62.00 / 64.00 ( <b>2.00</b> ↑)	31.89 / 35.70 ( <b>3.81</b> ↑)
	few-shot CoT		
Mistral-7B-instruct	46.78 / <b>47.16</b>	61.33 / <b>61.67</b>	34.65 / <b>35.04</b>
LLaMA-2-7B-chat	5.00 / <b>5.16</b>	38.67 / <b>39.00</b>	22.44 / <b>23.62</b>
LLaMA-3-8B-instruct	72.71 / <b>74.83</b>	82.00 / <b>83.67</b>	52.76 / <b>53.21</b>
Avg.	41.50 / 42.38 ( <b>0.88</b> ↑)	60.67 / 61.45 ( <b>0.78</b> ↑)	36.61 / 37.29 ( <b>0.68</b> ↑)

Table 1: Results on the Arithmetic Reasoning task for different models. The left side shows scores without control, and the right side shows scores after control.

Model	Commonsense Reasoning	
	StrategyQA	CSQA
	zero-shot CoT	
Mistral-7B-instruct	63.01 / <b>63.97</b>	67.57 / <b>67.98</b>
LLaMA-2-7B-chat	62.66 / <b>63.49</b>	55.45 / <b>56.59</b>
LLaMA-3-8B-instruct	67.42 / <b>68.03</b>	<b>45.29</b> / 44.39
Avg.	64.36 / 65.16 ( <b>0.80</b> ↑)	56.10 / 56.32 ( <b>0.22</b> ↑)
	few-shot CoT	
Mistral-7B-instruct	63.49 / <b>65.55</b>	52.83 / <b>54.87</b>
LLaMA-2-7B-chat	55.63 / <b>55.72</b>	55.61 / <b>58.56</b>
LLaMA-3-8B-instruct	66.38 / <b>68.47</b>	67.24 / <b>68.47</b>
Avg.	61.83 / 63.25 ( <b>1.42</b> ↑)	58.56 / 60.63 ( <b>2.07</b> ↑)

Table 2: Results on the Commonsense Reasoning task for different models.

Model	Symbolic Reasoning	
	Coin Flip	Random Letter
	zero-shot CoT	
Mistral-7B-instruct	<b>50.80</b> / 48.95	18.33 / <b>19.66</b>
LLaMA-2-7B-chat	52.20 / <b>55.75</b>	17.33 / <b>17.66</b>
LLaMA-3-8B-instruct	90.45 / <b>90.55</b>	38.00 / <b>38.00</b>
Avg.	64.48 / 65.10 ( <b>0.62</b> ↑)	24.55 / 25.11 ( <b>0.56</b> ↑)
	few-shot CoT	
Mistral-7B-instruct	<b>78.73</b> / 78.19	33.67 / <b>33.67</b>
LLaMA-2-7B-chat	50.74 / <b>50.84</b>	29.67 / <b>30.00</b>
LLaMA-3-8B-instruct	77.02 / <b>77.59</b>	53.67 / <b>54.67</b>
Avg.	68.83 / 68.87 ( <b>0.04</b> ↑)	39.00 / 39.45 ( <b>0.45</b> ↑)

Table 3: Results on the Symbolic Reasoning task for different models.

our approach generally performs better on zero-shot control than on few-shot control. This is mainly due to the fact that it is affected by the few-shot examples. To investigate why the performance of the few-shot concept is inferior to that of the zero-shot prompt, we analyzed instances where the few-shot CoT concept failed. As illustrated in figure 4, it shows that the model answered incorrectly in the red part by the few-shots learning while initially stating a correct fact of the question in the blue part. It was affected by the few shots that someone even flipped the coin. Afterward, this behavior reinforces the incorrect cognition by adding the few-shots control that the model is wrong initially stating a fact. After adding the zero-shot control, the model accurately answered the question by stating the correct facts. These results indicate that few-shot learning produces the stereotype when reasoning.

### 6.3 Interpretability Visualization

To further demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach, we provide additional cases in three models on arithmetic, commonsense, and symbolic reasoning tasks in Appendix D (See Figure 7, 8, 9, and 10).

For zero-shot CoT, Figure 7 displays the real prediction of a case by the model both without control and control. From this figure, we can observe that the model is wrong when simplifying the equation, and the reasoning path is offset. As shown in the red part, the reason for the mistake of the model is that multiple steps have been performed in the process of simplification, which leads to calculation errors. After adding control to the model, the direction of the reasoning path of the model will be corrected to achieve the calculation error that occurs when the control is not added.

For few-shots CoT, Figure 8 demonstrates the real prediction of a case by the model both without control and with control on the strategyQA dataset. From this figure, we can observe that the model initially makes a correct inference regarding the elevation of Mount Fuji and the depth of the Sea of Japan. However, the model erroneously concludes that Mount Fuji would not be out of the sea due to a miscalculation in comparing the mountain’s height with the sea’s depth as illustrated in the red segment. After adding control to the model, the reasoning path leads to the correct conclusion that the top of Mount Fuji would indeed be out of the Sea of Japan, as highlighted in the green segment.

The results highlight our interpretability in CoT, which employs concept-level representation read operations to localize errors in CoT, followed by control operations to rectify LLMs’ reasoning paths. This intuitive interpretable analysis for CoT reasoning is helpful in tracing and controlling the errors LLMs made during the CoT process.

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we propose a framework to analyze and understand the CoT reasoning from *Hopfieldian*



*view* under zero-shot and few-shot settings. Experimental results show our framework can improve the accuracy of reasoning, highlighting that our framework can provide intuitive and interpretable analysis for CoT reasoning, which is helpful in tracing and controlling the errors LLMs make during the CoT process, rectifying LLMs’ reasoning paths, and enhancing CoT’s transparency.

## Limitations

Our current problem formulation is primarily focused on text data. We consider multi-modal scenarios, *i.e.*, analyzing concepts from multiple different modalities as a future research direction.

## Ethics Statement

Our framework can provide intuitive and interpretable analysis for CoT reasoning, which is helpful in tracing and controlling the errors LLMs made during the CoT process. This poses an impact on rectifying LLMs’ reasoning paths and enhancing CoT’s transparency.

## References

- David L Barack and John W Krakauer. 2021. [Two views on the cognitive brain](#). *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 22(6):359–371.
- Yonatan Belinkov. 2022. [Probing classifiers: Promises, shortcomings, and advances](#). *Comput. Linguistics*, 48(1):207–219.
- Trenton Bricken, Adly Templeton, Joshua Batsion, Brian Chen, Adam Jermy, Tom Conerly, Nicholas L Turner, Cem Anil, Carson Denison, Amanda Askell, et al. 2023. [Towards monosemanticity: Decomposing language models with dictionary learning](#). *Transformer Circuits Thread*.
- Collin Burns, Haotian Ye, Dan Klein, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2023. [Discovering latent knowledge in language models without supervision](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR 2023*.
- Keyuan Cheng, Muhammad Asif Ali, Shu Yang, Gang Ling, Yuxuan Zhai, Haoyang Fei, Ke Xu, Lu Yu, Lijie Hu, and Di Wang. 2024a. [Leveraging logical rules in knowledge editing: A cherry on the top](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15452*.
- Keyuan Cheng, Gang Lin, Haoyang Fei, Lu Yu, Muhammad Asif Ali, Lijie Hu, Di Wang, et al. 2024b. [Multi-hop question answering under temporal knowledge editing](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00492*.
- Kevin Clark, Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. [What does BERT look at? an analysis of bert’s attention](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2019*, pages 276–286.
- 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](#). *CoRR*, abs/2110.14168.
- Antonia Creswell and Murray Shanahan. 2022. [Faithful reasoning using large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2208.14271.
- Subhabrata Dutta, Joykirat Singh, Soumen Chakrabarti, and Tanmoy Chakraborty. 2024. [How to think step-by-step: A mechanistic understanding of chain-of-thought reasoning](#). *CoRR*, abs/2402.18312.
- Fabian Falck, Ziyu Wang, and Christopher C Holmes. 2024. [Are large language models bayesian? a martingale perspective on in-context learning](#). In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Secure and Trustworthy Large Language Models*.
- Ruth Fong and Andrea Vedaldi. 2018. [Net2vec: Quantifying and explaining how concepts are encoded by filters in deep neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of CVPR 2018*, pages 8730–8738.
- Rohit Gandikota, Joanna Materzynska, Jaden Fiotto-Kaufman, and David Bau. 2023. [Erasing concepts from diffusion models](#). In *Proceedings of ICCV 2023*, pages 2426–2436.
- Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023. [PAL: program-aided language models](#). In *Proceedings of ICML 2023*, pages 10764–10799.
- Mor Geva, Daniel Khashabi, Elad Segal, Tushar Khot, Dan Roth, and Jonathan Berant. 2021. [Did aristotle use a laptop? A question answering benchmark with implicit reasoning strategies](#). *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics*, 9:346–361.
- Hangfeng He, Hongming Zhang, and Dan Roth. 2023. [Rethinking with retrieval: Faithful large language model inference](#). *CoRR*, abs/2301.00303.
- Lijie Hu, Ivan Habernal, Lei Shen, and Di Wang. 2023a. [Differentially private natural language models: Recent advances and future directions](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.09112*.
- Lijie Hu, Yixin Liu, Ninghao Liu, Mengdi Huai, Lichao Sun, and Di Wang. 2023b. [Improving faithfulness for vision transformers](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17983*.
- Lijie Hu, Yixin Liu, Ninghao Liu, Mengdi Huai, Lichao Sun, and Di Wang. 2023c. [Seat: stable and explainable attention](#). In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37(11), pages 12907–12915.

- Lijie Hu, Chenyang Ren, Zhengyu Hu, Cheng-Long Wang, and Di Wang. 2024. Editable concept bottleneck models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15476*.
- Shima Imani, Liang Du, and Harsh Shrivastava. 2023. [Mathprompter: Mathematical reasoning using large language models](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2023*, pages 37–42.
- Sarthak Jain and Byron C. Wallace. 2019. [Attention is not explanation](#). In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2019*, pages 3543–3556.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de Las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.06825.
- Mingyu Jin, Qinkai Yu, Dong Shu, Haiyan Zhao, Wenyue Hua, Yanda Meng, Yongfeng Zhang, and Mengnan Du. 2024. [The impact of reasoning step length on large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2401.04925.
- Been Kim, Martin Wattenberg, Justin Gilmer, Carrie J. Cai, James Wexler, Fernanda B. Viégas, and Rory Sayres. 2018. [Interpretability beyond feature attribution: Quantitative testing with concept activation vectors \(TCAV\)](#). In *Proceedings of ICML 2018*, pages 2673–2682.
- Seungone Kim, Se June Joo, Yul Jang, Hyungjoo Chae, and Jinyoung Yeo. 2023. [Cotever: Chain of thought prompting annotation toolkit for explanation verification](#). In *Proceedings of EACL 2023*, pages 195–208.
- Jan Kocon, Igor Cichecki, Oliwier Kaszyca, Mateusz Kochanek, Dominika Szydło, Joanna Baran, Julita Bielaniec, Marcin Gruza, Arkadiusz Janz, Kamil Kanclerz, et al. 2023. [Chatgpt: Jack of all trades, master of none](#). *Inf. Fusion*, 99:101861.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. [Large language models are zero-shot reasoners](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS 2022*.
- Songning Lai, Lijie Hu, Junxiao Wang, Laure Berti-Equille, and Di Wang. 2023. [Faithful vision-language interpretation via concept bottleneck models](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Tamera Lanham, Anna Chen, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Benoit Steiner, Carson Denison, Danny Hernandez, Dustin Li, Esin Durmus, Evan Hubinger, Jackson Kernion, et al. 2023. [Measuring faithfulness in chain-of-thought reasoning](#). *CoRR*, abs/2307.13702.
- Jia Li, Lijie Hu, Zhixian He, Jingfeng Zhang, Tianhang Zheng, and Di Wang. 2024. [Text guided image editing with automatic concept locating and forgetting](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19708*.
- Jiacheng Liu, Alisa Liu, Ximing Lu, Sean Welleck, Peter West, Ronan Le Bras, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. [Generated knowledge prompting for commonsense reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2022*, pages 3154–3169.
- Pan Lu, Liang Qiu, Wenhao Yu, Sean Welleck, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2023. [A survey of deep learning for mathematical reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2023*, pages 14605–14631.
- Qing Lyu, Shreya Havaldar, Adam Stein, Li Zhang, Delip Rao, Eric Wong, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023. [Faithful chain-of-thought reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of IJCNLP 2023*, pages 305–329.
- Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhunoye, Yiming Yang, et al. 2023. [Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS 2023*.
- Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2022. [Locating and editing factual associations in GPT](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS 2022*.
- William Merrill and Ashish Sabharwal. 2023. [The expressive power of transformers with chain of thought](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.07923.
- Meta. 2024. [Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date](#). *Meta blog*.
- Shen-Yun Miao, Chao-Chun Liang, and Keh-Yih Su. 2020. [A diverse corpus for evaluating and developing english math word problem solvers](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2020*, pages 975–984.
- Sewon Min, Xinxin Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. [Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work?](#) In *Proceedings of EMNLP 2022*, pages 11048–11064.
- Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. [Cross-task generalization via natural language crowdsourcing instructions](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2022*, pages 3470–3487.
- Anh Nguyen, Jason Yosinski, and Jeff Clune. 2019. [Understanding neural networks via feature visualization: A survey](#). In *Proceedings of LNCS 2019*, pages 55–76.
- Anh Mai Nguyen, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Jason Yosinski, Thomas Brox, and Jeff Clune. 2016. [Synthesizing the preferred inputs for neurons in neural networks via deep generator networks](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS 2016*, pages 3387–3395.

- Maxwell I. Nye, Anders Johan Andreassen, Guy Gur-Ari, Henryk Michalewski, Jacob Austin, David Bieber, David Dohan, Aitor Lewkowycz, Maarten Bosma, David Luan, et al. 2021. [Show your work: Scratchpads for intermediate computation with language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2112.00114.
- Chris Olah, Nick Cammarata, Ludwig Schubert, Gabriel Goh, Michael Petrov, and Shan Carter. 2020. [Zoom in: An introduction to circuits](#). *Distill*, 5(3):e00024–001.
- Catherine Olsson, Nelson Elhage, Neel Nanda, Nicholas Joseph, Nova DasSarma, Tom Henighan, Ben Mann, Amanda Askell, Yuntao Bai, Anna Chen, et al. 2022. [In-context learning and induction heads](#). *CoRR*, abs/2209.11895.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS 2022*.
- Liangming Pan, Alon Albalak, Xinyi Wang, and William Wang. 2023. [Logic-lm: Empowering large language models with symbolic solvers for faithful logical reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of EMNLP 2023*, pages 3806–3824.
- Kiho Park, Yo Joong Choe, and Victor Veitch. 2023. [The linear representation hypothesis and the geometry of large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2311.03658.
- Arkil Patel, Satwik Bhattamishra, and Navin Goyal. 2021. [Are NLP models really able to solve simple math word problems?](#) In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2021*, pages 2080–2094.
- Jacob Pfau, William Merrill, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2024. [Let’s think dot by dot: Hidden computation in transformer language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2404.15758.
- Shuofei Qiao, Yixin Ou, Ningyu Zhang, Xiang Chen, Yunzhi Yao, Shumin Deng, Chuanqi Tan, Fei Huang, and Huajun Chen. 2023. [Reasoning with language model prompting: A survey](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2023*, pages 5368–5393.
- Jack W. Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, H. Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susannah Young, et al. 2021. [Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher](#). *CoRR*, abs/2112.11446.
- Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Eric Hambro, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS 2023*.
- Shun Shao, Yftah Ziser, and Shay B. Cohen. 2023. [Gold doesn’t always glitter: Spectral removal of linear and nonlinear guarded attribute information](#). In *Proceedings of EACL 2023*, pages 1603–1614.
- Freda Shi, Mirac Suzgun, Markus Freitag, Xuezhi Wang, Suraj Srivats, Soroush Vosoughi, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Sebastian Ruder, Denny Zhou, Dipanjan Das, and Jason Wei. 2023. [Language models are multilingual chain-of-thought reasoners](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR 2023*.
- Noah Shinn, Beck Labash, and Ashwin Gopinath. 2023. [Reflexion: an autonomous agent with dynamic memory and self-reflection](#). *CoRR*, abs/2303.11366.
- Karen Simonyan, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. 2014. [Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR 2014*.
- Daniel Smilkov, Nikhil Thorat, Been Kim, Fernanda B. Viégas, and Martin Wattenberg. 2017. [Smoothgrad: removing noise by adding noise](#). *CoRR*, abs/1706.03825.
- Kaya Stechly, Karthik Valmeekam, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2024. [Chain of thoughtlessness: An analysis of cot in planning](#). *CoRR*, abs/2405.04776.
- Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian J. Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. 2014. [Intriguing properties of neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR 2014*.
- Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant. 2019. [Commonsenseqa: A question answering challenge targeting common-sense knowledge](#). In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2019*, pages 4149–4158.
- Xiaojuan Tang, Zilong Zheng, Jiaqi Li, Fanxu Meng, Song-Chun Zhu, Yitao Liang, and Muhan Zhang. 2023. [Large language models are in-context semantic reasoners rather than symbolic reasoners](#). *CoRR*, abs/2305.14825.
- Adly Templeton, Tom Conerly, Jonathan Marcus, Jack Lindsey, Trenton Bricken, Brian Chen, Adam Pearce, Craig Citro, Emmanuel Ameisen, Andy Jones, et al. 2024. [Scaling monosemanticity: Extracting interpretable features from claude 3 sonnet](#). *Transformer Circuits Thread*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288.

- Boshi Wang, Sewon Min, Xiang Deng, Jiaming Shen, You Wu, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Huan Sun. 2023a. [Towards understanding chain-of-thought prompting: An empirical study of what matters](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2023*, pages 2717–2739.
- Kevin Ro Wang, Alexandre Variengien, Arthur Conmy, Buck Shlegeris, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2023b. [Interpretability in the wild: a circuit for indirect object identification in GPT-2 small](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR 2023*.
- Lei Wang, Wanyu Xu, Yihuai Lan, Zhiqiang Hu, Yunshi Lan, Roy Ka-Wei Lee, and Ee-Peng Lim. 2023c. [Plan-and-solve prompting: Improving zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning by large language models](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2023*, pages 2609–2634.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023d. [Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR 2023*.
- Xuezhi Wang and Denny Zhou. 2024. [Chain-of-thought reasoning without prompting](#). *CoRR*, abs/2402.10200.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. 2022a. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR 2022*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022b. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS 2022*.
- Yixuan Weng, Minjun Zhu, Fei Xia, Bin Li, Shizhu He, Shengping Liu, Bin Sun, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2023. [Large language models are better reasoners with self-verification](#). In *Proceedings of EMNLP 2023*, pages 2550–2575.
- Zhengxuan Wu, Aryaman Arora, Zheng Wang, Atticus Geiger, Dan Jurafsky, Christopher D. Manning, and Christopher Potts. 2024. [Reft: Representation finetuning for language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2404.03592.
- Sang Michael Xie, Aditi Raghunathan, Percy Liang, and Tengyu Ma. 2022. [An explanation of in-context learning as implicit bayesian inference](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR 2022*.
- Shu Yang, Muhammad Asif Ali, Cheng-Long Wang, Lijie Hu, and Di Wang. 2024a. [Moral: Moe augmented lora for llms’ lifelong learning](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11260*.
- Shu Yang, Lijie Hu, Lu Yu, Muhammad Asif Ali, and Di Wang. 2024b. [Human-ai interactions in the communication era: Autophagy makes large models achieving local optima](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11271*.
- Shu Yang, Jiayuan Su, Han Jiang, Mengdi Li, Keyuan Cheng, Muhammad Asif Ali, Lijie Hu, and Di Wang. 2024c. [Dialectical alignment: Resolving the tension of 3h and security threats of llms](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00486*.
- Zhicheng Yang, Jinghui Qin, Jiaqi Chen, Liang Lin, and Xiaodan Liang. 2022. [Logicsolver: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with logical prompt-enhanced learning](#). In *Proceedings of EMNLP 2022*, pages 1–13.
- Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. 2023a. [Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR 2023*.
- Ziyin Zhang, Chaoyu Chen, Bingchang Liu, Cong Liao, Zi Gong, Hang Yu, Jianguo Li, and Rui Wang. 2023b. [A survey on language models for code](#). *CoRR*, abs/2311.07989.
- Ruochen Zhao, Xingxuan Li, Shafiq Joty, Chengwei Qin, and Lidong Bing. 2023. [Verify-and-edit: A knowledge-enhanced chain-of-thought framework](#). In *Proceedings of ACL 2023*, pages 5823–5840.
- Zexuan Zhong, Zhengxuan Wu, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Potts, and Danqi Chen. 2023. [Mquake: Assessing knowledge editing in language models via multi-hop questions](#). In *Proceedings of EMNLP 2023*, pages 15686–15702.
- Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc V. Le, and Ed H. Chi. 2023. [Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR 2023*.
- Wenhao Zhu, Hongyi Liu, Qingxiu Dong, Jingjing Xu, Lingpeng Kong, Jiajun Chen, Lei Li, and Shujian Huang. 2023. [Multilingual machine translation with large language models: Empirical results and analysis](#). *CoRR*, abs/2304.04675.
- Andy Zou, Long Phan, Sarah Chen, James Campbell, Phillip Guo, Richard Ren, Alexander Pan, Xuwang Yin, Mantas Mazeika, Ann-Kathrin Dombrowski, et al. 2023. [Representation engineering: A top-down approach to AI transparency](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.01405.

## A Chain-of-Thought

**Zero-shot CoT.** Zero-shot Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Kojima et al., 2022) is a reasoning approach where a language model generates a step-by-step explanation or thought process to solve a problem without requiring prior examples or specific training. Given a problem  $Q$ , we aim to derive the answer using the zero-shot CoT method in a generate function  $f$ :

$$A = f(Q, P). \quad (5)$$

where  $P = \text{“Let’s think step by step”}$  in this research. The example of zero-shot CoT is shown in Figure 5




Figure 5: A example of using Zero-shot CoT.

**Few-shots CoT.** Few-shots Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022b) is a prompting technique used in large language models where a few examples of step-by-step reasoning processes are provided. Given a problem  $Q$ , we aim to derive the answer using the few-shot CoT method in a generate function  $f$ :

$$A = f(T, Q). \quad (6)$$

where  $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\}$  and  $t_i$  represents the  $i$ -th example in the prompt. The example of zero-shot CoT shown on Figure 6,  $T$  can be shown in Appendix C.4.




Figure 6: A example of using Few-shot CoT.

## B Other Experimental Details

### B.1 Dataset

The statistics of the data is shown in Table 4. The details about each data set are as follows:

**Arithmetic Reasoning.** The arithmetic reasoning benchmarks aim to analyze and/or understand the model’s mathematical reasoning skills. These include: (i) GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), a math word problems benchmark encompassing a variety of reasoning steps; (ii) SVAMP (Patel et al., 2021),

containing math word problems with multiple structures; (iii) AQuA (Miao et al., 2020), containing algebraic applications and mathematical reasoning problems.

**Commonsense Reasoning.** These data sets aim to analyze the ability of the model on commonsense reasoning tasks. These include: (i) StrategyQA (Geva et al., 2021), a commonsense benchmark requiring multi-level strategy to answer the question; (ii) CSQA (Talmor et al., 2019) benchmark dataset of multiple-choice questions that require different types of commonsense knowledge to predict the correct answers.

**Symbolic Reasoning.** These data sets aim to test the abilities of the model requiring advanced symbolic capabilities. For this task, we curated two new datasets, as follows. (i) Coin Flip dataset, we employ the data curation strategy of a previous study (Wei et al., 2022b) using the number of operations as 2, 4 and 7 to come up with the complete dataset; (ii) Random Letter, an advanced version of the last letter concatenation with reference to the previously studied form of word assembly (Wei et al., 2022b), where 2-4 words are randomly formed and characters are randomly drawn from them, instead of taking the beginning or the end of each word at a fixed point.

Dataset	Task Domain	$N$	Answer Format
GSM8K	Arithmetic	1319	Number
SVAMP	Arithmetic	300	Number
AQuA	Arithmetic	254	Multiple Choices
StrategyQA	Commonsense	2290	Yes or No
CSQA	Commonsense	1221	Multiple Choices
Coin Flip	Symbolic	2000	Yes or No
Random Letter	Symbolic	300	Letter

Table 4: Statistics of the data set.  $N$  represents the number of evaluation examples.

### B.2 The number of reading set sizes

The table 5 below presents the sizes of reading sets utilized in our study providing the different set sizes employed during the reading phase on zero-shot and few-shots CoT.

Dataset	Zero-shot	Few-shots
GSM8K	128	512
SVAMP	512	256
AQuA	256	256
StrategyQA	512	256
CSQA	512	256
Coin Flip	128	512
Random Letter	128	128

Table 5: The number of reading set sizes in the experiment.

## C Prompts

### C.1 Postive and Negative Stimulus

*positive stimulus*

USER: Would a greyhound be able to outrun a greyhound bus?

ASSISTANT: Let’s think step by step.

*negative stimulus*

USER: Would a greyhound be able to outrun a greyhound bus?

ASSISTANT:

zero-shot CoT	USER: <question>
	ASSISTANT: <b>Let’s think step by step.</b>
few-shot CoT	USER: <question>
	ASSISTANT:
	USER: <b>&lt;n different examples&gt;</b>
	<question>
	ASSISTANT:
	USER: <question>
	ASSISTANT:

Table 6: The stimulus prompting design for CoT-style methods.

### C.2 Prompt Templates

Table 6 illustrates the design of stimulus prompts utilized for Chain of Thought (CoT) prompting, distinguishing between zero-shot CoT and few-shot CoT methodologies. In the zero-shot CoT approach, the model is presented with a question devoid of preceding examples, in contrast to the few-shot CoT method, where the model is furnished with multiple exemplars. For each method, the first row is a positive prompt and the second is a negative prompt. Red indicates stimulus token.

Task	Extraction Template
GSM8K	Therefore, the answer (arabic numerals) is
SVAMP	Therefore, the answer (arabic numerals) is
AQuA	Therefore, among A through E, the answer is
StrategyQA	Therefore, the answer (Yes or No) is
CSQA	Therefore, among A through E, the answer is
Coin Flip	Therefore, the answer (Yes or No) is
Random Letter	Therefore, the answer is

Table 7: Extraction templates and answer cleansing approaches for various tasks.

### C.3 Answer Extract Prompts

The demonstration of our answer extraction method and answer clearing approach is in Table 7.

### C.4 Example Prompts for Few-shot Setting

We demonstrate our example prompts for few-shot setting in Table 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13.

## D Case Demonstrations

We show our additional cases in three models on arithmetic, commonsense, and symbolic reasoning tasks in Figure 7, 8, 9, and 10.

---

**PROMPT FOR GSM8K AND SVAMP**

**Q:** There are 15 trees in the grove. Grove workers will plant trees in the grove today. After they are done, there will be 21 trees. How many trees did the grove workers plant today?

**A:** There are 15 trees originally. Then there were 21 trees after some more were planted. So there must have been  $21 - 15 = 6$ . The answer is 6.

**Q:** If there are 3 cars in the parking lot and 2 more cars arrive, how many cars are in the parking lot?

**A:** There are originally 3 cars. 2 more cars arrive.  $3 + 2 = 5$ . The answer is 5.

**Q:** Leah had 32 chocolates and her sister had 42. If they ate 35, how many pieces do they have left in total?

**A:** Originally, Leah had 32 chocolates. Her sister had 42. So in total they had  $32 + 42 = 74$ . After eating 35, they had  $74 - 35 = 39$ . The answer is 39.

**Q:** Jason had 20 lollipops. He gave Denny some lollipops. Now Jason has 12 lollipops. How many lollipops did Jason give to Denny?

**A:** Jason started with 20 lollipops. Then he had 12 after giving some to Denny. So he gave Denny  $20 - 12 = 8$ . The answer is 8.

**Q:** Shawn has five toys. For Christmas, he got two toys each from his mom and dad. How many toys does he have now?

**A:** Shawn started with 5 toys. If he got 2 toys each from his mom and dad, then that is 4 more toys.  $5 + 4 = 9$ . The answer is 9.

**Q:** There were nine computers in the server room. Five more computers were installed each day, from Monday to Thursday. How many computers are now in the server room?

**A:** There were originally 9 computers. For each of 4 days, 5 more computers were added. So  $5 * 4 = 20$  computers were added.  $9 + 20$  is 29. The answer is 29.

**Q:** Michael had 58 golf balls. On Tuesday, he lost 23 golf balls. On Wednesday, he lost 2 more. How many golf balls did he have at the end of Wednesday?

**A:** Michael started with 58 golf balls. After losing 23 on Tuesday, he had  $58 - 23 = 35$ . After losing 2 more, he had  $35 - 2 = 33$  golf balls. The answer is 33.

**Q:** Olivia has \$23. She bought five bagels for \$3 each. How much money does she have left?

**A:** Olivia had 23 dollars. 5 bagels for 3 dollars each will be  $5 * 3 = 15$  dollars. So she has  $23 - 15$  dollars left.  $23 - 15$  is 8. The answer is 8.

---

Table 8: Few-shot exemplars for full chain of thought prompt for the arithmetic reasoning task.

---

**PROMPT FOR AQUA ALGEBRAIC WORD PROBLEMS**

**Q:** John found that the average of 15 numbers is 40. If 10 is added to each number then the mean of the numbers is?

Answer Choices: (a) 50 (b) 45 (c) 65 (d) 78 (e) 64

**A:** If 10 is added to each number, then the mean of the numbers also increases by 10. So the new mean would be 50. The answer is (a).

**Q:** If  $a / b = 3/4$  and  $8a + 5b = 22$ , then find the value of a.

Answer Choices: (a)  $1/2$  (b)  $3/2$  (c)  $5/2$  (d)  $4/2$  (e)  $7/2$

**A:** If  $a / b = 3/4$ , then  $b = 4a / 3$ . So  $8a + 5(4a / 3) = 22$ . This simplifies to  $8a + 20a / 3 = 22$ , which means  $44a / 3 = 22$ . So a is equal to  $3/2$ . The answer is (b).

**Q:** A person is traveling at 20 km/hr and reached his destiny in 2.5 hr then find the distance?

Answer Choices: (a) 53 km (b) 55 km (c) 52 km (d) 60 km (e) 50 km

**A:** The distance that the person traveled would have been  $20 \text{ km/hr} * 2.5 \text{ hrs} = 50 \text{ km}$ . The answer is (e).

**Q:** How many keystrokes are needed to type the numbers from 1 to 500?

Answer Choices: (a) 1156 (b) 1392 (c) 1480 (d) 1562 (e) 1788

**A:** There are 9 one-digit numbers from 1 to 9. There are 90 two-digit numbers from 10 to 99. There are 401 three-digit numbers from 100 to 500.  $9 + 90(2) + 401(3) = 1392$ . The answer is (b).

---

Table 9: Few-shot exemplars for full chain of thought prompt for AQUA.

---

**PROMPT FOR STRATEGYQA**

**Q:** Do hamsters provide food for any animals?

**A:** Hamsters are prey animals. Prey are food for predators. Thus, hamsters provide food for some animals. So the answer is yes.

**Q:** Could Brooke Shields succeed at University of Pennsylvania?

**A:** Brooke Shields went to Princeton University. Princeton University is about as academically rigorous as the University of Pennsylvania. Thus, Brooke Shields could also succeed at the University of Pennsylvania. So the answer is yes.

**Q:** Yes or no: Hydrogen's atomic number squared exceeds number of Spice Girls?

**A:** Hydrogen has an atomic number of 1. 1 squared is 1. There are 5 Spice Girls. Thus, Hydrogen's atomic number squared is less than 5. So the answer is no.

**Q:** Yes or no: Is it common to see frost during some college commencements?

**A:** College commencement ceremonies can happen in December, May, and June. December is in the winter, so there can be frost. Thus, there could be frost at some commencements. So the answer is yes.

**Q:** Yes or no: Could a llama birth twice during War in Vietnam (1945-46)?

**A:** The War in Vietnam was 6 months. The gestation period for a llama is 11 months, which is more than 6 months. Thus, a llama could not give birth twice during the War in Vietnam. So the answer is no.

**Q:** Yes or no: Would a pear sink in water?

**A:** The density of a pear is about  $0.6g/cm^3$ , which is less than water. Objects less dense than water float. Thus, a pear would float. So the answer is no.

---

Table 10: Few-shot exemplars for full chain of thought prompt for StrategyQA.



---

**PROMPT FOR CSQA**

**Q:** What do people use to absorb extra ink from a fountain pen? Answer Choices: (a) shirt pocket (b) calligrapher's hand (c) inkwell (d) desk drawer (e) blotter

**A:** The answer must be an item that can absorb ink. Of the above choices, only blotters are used to absorb ink. So the answer is (e).

**Q:** What home entertainment equipment requires cable?

Answer Choices: (a) radio shack (b) substation (c) television (d) cabinet

**A:** The answer must require cable. Of the above choices, only television requires cable. So the answer is (c).

**Q:** The fox walked from the city into the forest, what was it looking for? Answer Choices: (a) pretty flowers (b) hen house (c) natural habitat (d) storybook

**A:** The answer must be something in the forest. Of the above choices, only natural habitat is in the forest. So the answer is (b).

**Q:** Sammy wanted to go to where the people were. Where might he go? Answer Choices: (a) populated areas (b) race track (c) desert (d) apartment (e) roadblock

**A:** The answer must be a place with a lot of people. Of the above choices, only populated areas have a lot of people. So the answer is (a).

**Q:** Where do you put your grapes just before checking out? Answer Choices: (a) mouth (b) grocery cart (c)super market (d) fruit basket (e) fruit market

**A:** The answer should be the place where grocery items are placed before checking out. Of the above choices, grocery cart makes the most sense for holding grocery items. So the answer is (b).

**Q:** Google Maps and other highway and street GPS services have replaced what? Answer Choices: (a) united states (b) mexico (c) countryside (d) atlas

**A:** The answer must be something that used to do what Google Maps and GPS services do, which is to give directions. Of the above choices, only atlases are used to give directions. So the answer is (d).

**Q:** Before getting a divorce, what did the wife feel who was doing all the work? Answer Choices: (a) harder (b) anguish (c) bitterness (d) tears (e) sadness

**A:** The answer should be the feeling of someone getting divorced who was doing all the work. Of the above choices, the closest feeling is bitterness. So the answer is (c).

---

Table 11: Few-shot exemplars for full chain of thought prompt for CSQA. There are newlines between the answer choices that are omitted in the table for space reasons.

---

**PROMPT FOR RNDOM LETTER CONCATENATION**

**Q:** Take the first letters of the words in "James Hickman " and concatenate them.

**A:** The first letter of "James" is "J". The first letter of "Hickman" is "H". Concatenating them is "JH". The answer is JH.

**Q:** Take the second letters of the words in "Carl Mccall Bonilla " and concatenate them.

**A:** The second letter of "Carl" is "a". The second letter of "Mccall" is "c". The second letter of "Bonilla" is "o". Concatenating them is "aco". The answer is aco.

**Q:** Take the third letters of the words in "Randy Tanner " and concatenate them.

**A:** The third letter of "Randy" is "n". The third letter of "Tanner" is "n". Concatenating them is "nn". The answer is nn.

**Q:** Take the first letters of the words in "Kenny Kim " and concatenate them.

**A:** The first letter of "Kenny" is "K". The first letter of "Kim" is "K". Concatenating them is "KK". The answer is KK.

---

Table 12: Few-shot exemplars for full chain of thought prompt for the random letter concatenation task.

---

**PROMPT FOR COIN FLIP**

**Q:** A coin is heads up. Ka flips the coin. Sherrie flips the coin. Is the coin still heads up?

**A:** The coin was flipped by Ka and Sherrie. So the coin was flipped 2 times, which is an even number. The coin started heads up, so after an even number of flips, it will still be heads up. So the answer is yes.

**Q:** A coin is heads up. Jamey flips the coin. Teresa flips the coin. Is the coin still heads up?

**A:** The coin was flipped by Jamey and Teresa. So the coin was flipped 2 times, which is an even number. The coin started heads up, so after an even number of flips, it will still be heads up. So the answer is yes.

**Q:** A coin is heads up. Maybelle flips the coin. Shalonda does not flip the coin. Is the coin still heads up?

**A:** The coin was flipped by Maybelle. So the coin was flipped 1 time, which is an odd number. The coin started heads up, so after an odd number of flips, it will be tails up. So the answer is no.

**Q:** A coin is heads up. Millicent does not flip the coin. Conception flips the coin. Is the coin still heads up?

**A:** The coin was flipped by Conception. So the coin was flipped 1 time, which is an odd number. The coin started heads up, so after an odd number of flips, it will be tails up. So the answer is no.

**Q:** A coin is heads up. Sal flips the coin. Raymond does not flip the coin. Is the coin still heads up?

**A:** The coin was flipped by Sal. So the coin was flipped 1 time, which is an odd number. The coin started heads up, so after an odd number of flips, it will be tails up. So the answer is no.

**Q:** A coin is heads up. Conception flips the coin. Kristian does not flip the coin. Is the coin still heads up?

**A:** The coin was flipped by Conception. So the coin was flipped 1 time, which is an odd number. The coin started heads up, so after an odd number of flips, it will be tails up. So the answer is no.

**Q:** A coin is heads up. Inga does not flip the coin. Elanor does not flip the coin. Is the coin still heads up?

**A:** The coin was flipped by no one. So the coin was flipped 0 times. The coin started heads up, and it was not flipped, so it is still heads up. So the answer is yes.

**Q:** A coin is heads up. Ryan flips the coin. Shaunda flips the coin. Is the coin still heads up?

**A:** The coin was flipped by Ryan and Shaunda. So the coin was flipped 2 times, which is an even number. The coin started heads up, so after an even number of flips, it will still be heads up. So the answer is yes.

---

Table 13: Few-shot exemplars for full chain of thought prompt for the coin flip task.

Q: The original price of an item is discounted 22%. A customer buys the item at this discounted price using a \$20-off coupon. There is no tax on the item, and this was the only item the customer bought. If the customer paid \$1.90 more than half the original price of the item, what was the original price of the item?  
Answer Choices: (A) \$61 (B) \$65 (C) \$67.40 (D) \$70 (E) \$78.20



**Let's think step by step.**

Let the original price of the item be  $x$ .  
The item is discounted 22%, so the discounted price is  $0.78x$  (since  $1 - 0.22 = 0.78$ ).  
The customer uses a \$20-off coupon, so the price they pay is  $0.78x - 20$ .  
The customer pays \$1.90 more than half the original price, so we can set up the equation:  $0.78x - 20 = 0.5x + 1.90$

Simplifying the equation, we get:  $0.28x = 22.90$   
Dividing both sides by 0.28, we get:  $x = 81.79$

So the original price of the item is approximately \$81.79.

None of the answer choices match this value, so we can conclude that the correct answer is not among the options provided. ❌



**Let's think step by step.**

Let the original price of the item be  $x$ .  
The item is discounted 22%, so the discounted price is  $0.78x$  (since  $1 - 0.22 = 0.78$ ).  
The customer uses a \$20-off coupon, so the price the customer pays is  $0.78x - 20$ .  
The customer pays \$1.90 more than half the original price, so we can set up the equation:  $0.78x - 20 = 0.5x + 1.90$

We can add 20 to both sides:  $0.78x = 0.5x + 21.90$   
We can subtract  $0.5x$  from both sides:  $0.28x = 21.90$   
We can divide both sides by 0.28:  $x = 78.20$

So the original price of the item is \$78.20.

The correct answer is (E) \$78.20. ✅

+ Control




Figure 7: A real case predicted by LLaMA-3-8B-instruct with zero-shot CoT on the AQuA dataset. The segment highlighted in blue represents the correct output of the model. The red part shows that the model starts to reason in the wrong direction without control, while the green portion indicates the model reason in the correct direction after adding control.

Q: Do hamsters provide food for any animals?  
 A: Hamsters are prey animals. Prey are food for predators. Thus, hamsters provide food for some animals. So the answer is yes.


Q: Could Brooke Shields succeed at University of Pennsylvania?  
 A: Brooke Shields went to Princeton University. Princeton University is about as academically rigorous as the University of Pennsylvania. Thus, Brooke Shields could also succeed at the University of Pennsylvania. So the answer is yes.  
 .....

Q: Would the top of Mount Fuji stick out of the Sea of Japan?




Mount Fuji is the highest mountain in Japan, with an elevation of approximately 3,776.24 meters (12,389 feet).  
 The Sea of Japan has an average depth of around 1,200 meters (3,937 feet).

Since the height of Mount Fuji is significantly less than the average depth of the Sea of Japan, the top of Mount Fuji would not stick out of the sea.  
 Therefore, the answer is no. ❌



Mount Fuji is the highest mountain in Japan, with an elevation of approximately 3,776.24 meters (12,389 feet).  
 The Sea of Japan has an average depth of about 1,200 meters (3,937 feet).

Since the height of Mount Fuji is greater than the average depth of the Sea of Japan, the top of Mount Fuji would stick out of the sea.  
 Therefore, the answer is yes. ✅



+ Control

Figure 8: A real case predicted by Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 with few-shots CoT on the strategyQA dataset. The purple part is an example of input-output pairs given by user. The segment highlighted in blue represents the correct output of the model. The red part shows that the model starts to reason in the wrong direction without control, while the green portion indicates the model reason in the correct direction after adding control.




Figure 9: A real case predicted by Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct with few-shots CoT on the coin flip dataset. The purple part is an example of input-output pairs given by user. The segment highlighted in blue represents the correct output of the model. The red part shows that the model starts to reason in the wrong direction without control, while the green portion indicates the model reason in the correct direction after adding control.




Figure 10: An example illustrating the sensitivity of LLaMA-2-7B-chat in the one-shot scenario. The parts highlighted in green are the instruction and reasoning path. The key difference between the two input-output pairs is highlighted in blue: The example in the first row has a final answer of “yes”, while the example in the second row has a final answer of “no”. We can find that the final output of the model tends to match the example, even if the example’s result is incorrect. The model adjusts its reasoning steps (highlighted in red) to achieve this consistency.