

Benchmarking Uncertainty Quantification Methods for Large Language Models with LM-Polygraph

Roman Vashurin¹ \diamond Ekaterina Fadeeva^{3,5} \diamond Artem Vazhentsev^{3,4} \diamond Akim Tsvigun²
Daniil Vasilev⁵ Rui Xing¹ Abdelrahman Boda Sadallah¹ Lyudmila Rvanova⁴
Sergey Petrakov³ Alexander Panchenko^{3,4} Timothy Baldwin^{1,6} Preslav Nakov¹
Maxim Panov¹ Artem Shelmanov¹

¹MBZUAI ²University of Amsterdam ³Center for Artificial Intelligence Technology ⁴AIRI
⁵HSE University ⁶The University of Melbourne
roman.vashurin@mbzuai.ac.ae esfadeeva@hse.ru vazhentsev@airi.net
{maxim.panov, artem.shelmanov}@mbzuai.ac.ae

Abstract

Uncertainty quantification (UQ) is becoming increasingly recognized as a critical component of applications that rely on machine learning (ML). The rapid proliferation of large language models (LLMs) has stimulated researchers to seek efficient and effective approaches to UQ in text generation tasks, as in addition to their emerging capabilities, these models have introduced new challenges for building safe applications. As with other ML models, LLMs are prone to make incorrect predictions, “hallucinate” by fabricating claims, or simply generate low-quality output for a given input. UQ is a key element in dealing with these challenges. However research to date on UQ methods for LLMs has been fragmented, with disparate evaluation methods. In this work, we tackle this issue by introducing a novel benchmark that implements a collection of state-of-the-art UQ baselines, and provides an environment for controllable and consistent evaluation of novel techniques by researchers in various text generation tasks. Our benchmark also supports the assessment of confidence normalization methods in terms of their ability to provide interpretable scores. Using our benchmark, we conduct a large-scale empirical investigation of UQ and normalization techniques across nine tasks and shed light on the most promising approaches.

in AI applications. It supports the rejection of uncertain model predictions, and handling of the associated inputs through different means, e.g., by dispatching them to a more advanced model or a human. This behaviour is crucial in areas where the cost of errors is high, such as healthcare.

A plethora of UQ techniques have been developed for classification and regression models (Gal, 2016). There has also been a surge of research devoted to UQ specifically in the context of encoder-only language models (LMs) such as BERT (Zhang et al., 2019; He et al., 2020; Shelmanov et al., 2021; Xin et al., 2021a; Vazhentsev et al., 2022; Kotelevskii et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022; Kuzmin et al., 2023). The rapid proliferation of large language models (LLMs) has stimulated researchers to seek efficient and effective approaches to UQ in text generation tasks, in an attempt to make them safer to use in downstream applications. As with any ML model, LLMs can make incorrect predictions, “hallucinate” by fabricating claims (Xiao and Wang, 2021; Dziri et al., 2022), or simply generate low-quality outputs. These problems stem partially from the peculiarities of the LLM training objective, and are partially inherited from the nature of ML models in general. All ML models are susceptible to errors due to limited amount training data, and the inherent ambiguity of the task they are designed to solve.

Several well-known methods exist for censoring the outputs of large LLMs. These include filtering using stop-word lists, post-processing using classifiers (Xu et al., 2023), rewriting toxic outputs (Logacheva et al., 2022), and extended fine-tuning with reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF). However, these techniques alone are insufficient to entirely eliminate incorrect/inap-

1 Introduction

Uncertainty quantification (UQ) is increasingly being recognized as a critical safety component

\diamond Equal contribution

appropriate outputs. For instance, fact-checkers target a very narrow sub-problem, and usually require external knowledge sources such as knowledge bases that are generally incomplete. Building an efficient external system to verify LLM output for every possible task is currently infeasible.

Uncertainty quantification promises a more general approach to the problem based on the internal capabilities of the model itself without access to external knowledge, which also opens up the possibility for computational efficiency. Several recent studies have focused on developing UQ methods for LLMs in text generation tasks (Malinin and Gales, 2021; van der Poel et al., 2022; Kuhn et al., 2023; Ren et al., 2023; Vazhentsev et al., 2023b; Lin et al., 2023; Fadeeva et al., 2024). However, the current landscape of this research is quite fragmented, with many non-comparable and concurrent studies. Researchers have proposed highly divergent methods for benchmarking UQ techniques, making it challenging to consolidate research findings and draw general conclusions.

In this work, we strive to bridge these disparate research efforts and to resolve some issues found in their evaluation protocols by developing a benchmark for UQ techniques in text generation tasks. The benchmark implements state-of-the-art UQ baselines in a unified way, enabling a large-scale, consistent comparison of methods developed in recent work. The benchmark includes the tasks of: selective prediction (question-answering [QA]), selective generation (machine translation [MT] and text summarization [TS]), and claim-level fact-checking. For the latter, we developed an automatic fact-checking pipeline for four languages: English, Chinese, Arabic, and Russian. Besides common metrics related to UQ performance, we also introduce a metric related to the calibration of confidence scores. This metric allows us to evaluate confidence normalization methods according to their ability to provide interpretable scores. We propose a strong baseline for normalization and investigate its performance in comparison to simpler approaches. Using the developed benchmark, we conduct a large-scale empirical investigation of UQ and normalization techniques across nine datasets.

This work both lowers the barrier to entry into UQ research for individual researchers and developers, and enables more robust, reliable, and trustworthy LLM deployment for end-users.

Our **contributions** are as follows:

- We propose a new comprehensive benchmark for UQ evaluation for LLMs across a range of text generation tasks: selective classification/generation, fact-checking/hallucination detection, and calibration/normalization.¹
- We propose a novel multilingual automatic benchmark for token-level and claim-level UQ methods based on claim-level fact-checking, encompassing English, Mandarin Chinese, Arabic, and Russian.
- We develop methods for producing user-friendly bounded confidence scores, and propose methods for confidence calibration that perform identically to raw uncertainty while being highly interpretable for the end user.
- We perform large-scale empirical evaluation of state-of-the-art UQ techniques using the proposed benchmark.

2 Methods

2.1 Background

Uncertainty is a fundamental concept in machine learning and statistics, indicating that model predictions have a degree of variability due to the lack of complete information. Estimating predictive uncertainty helps in a variety of tasks, e.g., for selective classification tasks: abstention from model prediction if there is not enough confidence for it. Instances with uncertain predictions could be handled through alternative processes, such as being escalated to a human or to a more advanced system (Xin et al., 2021b).

Despite recent efforts to establish a common definition of predictive uncertainty (Kotelevskii and Panov, 2024; Hofman et al., 2024), multiple approaches to its quantification exist based on probabilities, entropies, distances, risks, etc. From a practical perspective, any of these scores could serve as a measure of uncertainty as long as they accurately reflect the relevant properties and help to solve reliability tasks.

While there are principled ways of expressing and reasoning about uncertainty, e.g., in terms of information theory and the Bayesian modelling framework (Blundell et al., 2015), they are often difficult to implement. Therefore, UQ practitioners usually rely on approximations or even heuristics. For example, one of the popular approaches to UQ

¹All code is published under an MIT license and available at: <https://github.com/IINemo/lm-polygraph>

is ensembling (Ashukha et al., 2019). For classification tasks, it is considered a very strong baseline. However, ensembling introduces large computational overhead due to the need for repetitive inference and storing multiple versions of weights. One of the main research questions that has been addressed in recent work related to classification and UQ in general is how to perform it efficiently, while keeping the performance of the scores reliably high (Shelmanov et al., 2021).

UQ for LLMs in generation tasks represents a greater challenge than in classification. In generation, a model makes multiple predictions: one for each token. Therefore, the uncertainty scores for each token should be somehow aggregated into a single value. At the same time, in many cases, we would like to have an uncertainty score not for the entire output, but for text fragments such as individual claims. Another problem is that the raw probability distributions of LLMs reflect multiple types of uncertainty, some of which might be irrelevant for a given generation task. Usually, we should not take into account uncertainty related to the choice of the surface forms of the answer, as long as they convey the same meaning (Kuhn et al., 2023). Similarly, uncertainty related to the type of conveyed information might be irrelevant, as long as it is correct and we care only about its veracity (Fadeeva et al., 2024). Finally, the predictions of LLMs are not conditionally independent (Zhang et al., 2023), and thus incorrect claims generated by an LLM at the start of an output may cause flown-on hallucinations through the subsequent generation process.

2.2 Uncertainty Quantification for LLMs

Here, we summarize the UQ baselines implemented in our benchmark, as listed in Table 1. To implement the methods, we use the LM-Polygraph framework (Fadeeva et al., 2023), extended to include a number of recently-proposed approaches.

There are two major types of techniques: white-box and black-box. *White-box* methods require access to logits, internal layer outputs, or the LLM itself. *Black-box* only need access to the generated texts, and can easily be integrated with third-party online services such as OpenAI’s API. We note that methods differ in terms of their computational requirements: some techniques pose high computational or memory overheads, e.g., due to repeated inference, making them less suitable for practical usage. The application of some methods can also

be hindered by the need to access the model’s training data. Finally, different methods might be restricted only to UQ of the whole text (sequence level), while others might be also applicable to text fragments such as atomic claims (claim level).

2.2.1 White-box Methods

Let us consider the input sequence \mathbf{x} and the output sequence $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ of length L , where \mathcal{Y} is a set of all possible output sequences. Then the probability of an output sequence given an input sequence for autoregressive language models is given by

$$P(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{l=1}^L P(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (1)$$

where the distribution of each y_l is conditioned on all previous tokens in a sequence $\mathbf{y}_{<l} = \{y_1, \dots, y_{l-1}\}$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ denotes model parameters.

We start the discussion from **information-based methods** that are based on token $P(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and sequence $P(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ probabilities obtained from a single model prediction. A notable example is *entropy*, which can be calculated at the token or the sequence level. The crucial difference between these cases is that the entropy at the token level can be computed exactly, while sequence-level entropy can only be calculated through approximate Monte Carlo estimation, based on sampling several sequences $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}, k = 1, \dots, K$. The advantage of information-based methods is that they are simple to implement and relatively cheap to compute, while often providing competitive performance compared to more sophisticated methods.

Recently, enhanced information-theoretic approaches have been proposed that consider the semantics of natural language. For example, one may cluster words by meaning and adjust the probabilities by aggregating them over the clusters. Such an approach is the basis of the *semantic entropy* (Kuhn et al., 2023) uncertainty measure. Further extensions of this approach include other measures that consider **meaning diversity** to adjust information-theoretic uncertainty measures (Duan et al., 2023; Fadeeva et al., 2024).

The third category of white-box techniques is **ensemble-based methods**, which leverage the diversity of output predictions made by multiple different versions of models. Let us assume that M models are available with parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, i = 1, \dots, M$. These parameters can be obtained via independent training of models. Then, one can use token $P(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$ and sequence $P(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$

Uncertainty Quantification Method	Type	Category	Compute	Memory	Need Training Data?	Level		
Maximum sequence probability (MSP)			Low	Low	No	Seq./claim		
Perplexity (Fomicheva et al., 2020)			Low	Low	No	Seq./claim		
Mean/max token entropy (TE) (Fomicheva et al., 2020)			Low	Low	No	Seq./claim		
Monte Carlo sequence entropy (MC-SE) (Kuhn et al., 2023)			High	Low	No	Seq.		
Monte Carlo norm. seq. entropy (MC-NSE) (Malinin and Gales, 2021)	White-box	Information-based	High	Low	No	Seq.		
Pointwise mutual information (PMI) (Takayama and Arase, 2019)			Medium	Low	No	Seq./claim		
Conditional PMI (van der Poel et al., 2022)			Medium	Medium	No	Seq.		
Rényi divergence (Darrin et al., 2023)			Low	Low	No	Seq.		
Fisher-Rao distance (Darrin et al., 2023)			Low	Low	No	Seq.		
TokenSAR (Duan et al., 2023)			Medium	Low	No	Seq.		
Semantic entropy (Kuhn et al., 2023)			High	Low	No	Seq.		
CCP (Fadееva et al., 2024)			White-box	Meaning diversity	Low	Low	No	Seq./claim
SentenceSAR (Duan et al., 2023)					High	Low	No	Seq.
SAR (Duan et al., 2023)					High	Low	No	Seq.
Sentence-level ensemble-based measures (Malinin and Gales, 2021)	White-box	Ensembling	High	High	Yes	Seq.		
Token-level ensemble-based measures (Malinin and Gales, 2021)			High	High	Yes	Seq.		
Mahalanobis distance (MD) (Lee et al., 2018)			Low	Low	Yes	Seq.		
Robust density estimation (RDE) (Yoo et al., 2022)	White-box	Density-based	Low	Low	Yes	Seq.		
Relative Mahalanobis distance (RMD) (Ren et al., 2023)			Low	Low	Yes	Seq.		
Hybrid Uncertainty Quantification (HUQ) (Vazhentsev et al., 2023a)			Low	Low	Yes	Seq.		
$p(\text{True})$ (Kadavath et al., 2022)	White-box	Reflexive	Medium	Low	No	Seq./claim		
Number of semantic sets (NumSets) (Lin et al., 2023)			High	Low	No	Seq.		
Sum of eigenvalues of the graph Laplacian (EigV) (Lin et al., 2023)			High	Low	No	Seq.		
Degree matrix (Deg) (Lin et al., 2023)	Black-box	Meaning diversity	High	Low	No	Seq.		
Eccentricity (Ecc) (Lin et al., 2023)			High	Low	No	Seq.		
Lexical similarity (LexSim) (Fomicheva et al., 2020)			High	Low	No	Seq.		
			High	Low	No	Seq.		

Table 1: UQ methods implemented in the benchmark.

probabilities to compute various measures that assess the discrepancy between model predictions such as *mutual information*.

Density-based methods leverage latent representations of instances (embeddings) and, usually, approximate the distribution of embeddings for the training data using one or multiple Gaussian distributions. They can provide a probability or an unnormalized score that determines how likely it is that the instances belong to the training data distribution. As such, they are good at spotting out-of-distribution (OOD) instances (Vazhentsev et al., 2023b). Several variations of these methods have been proposed recently (Lee et al., 2018; Yoo et al., 2022; Kotelevskii et al., 2022; Ren et al., 2023).

The primary advantage of these methods is that they are computationally efficient: they do not need additional model inference, and the memory overhead for storing additional parameters is minimal. The drawback is that they require access to the model’s training data to fit auxiliary models. For example, the Mahalanobis distance approximates the distribution of the embeddings as a mixture of Gaussians, which requires constructing data centroids and covariance matrices.

Finally, one can also combine information-based and density-based methods as suggested by Vazhentsev et al. (2023a) and Ren et al. (2023).

More specifically, we implement the *hybrid uncertainty quantification (HUQ)* method (Vazhentsev et al., 2023a), which performs a ranking-based aggregation and leverages the strengths of both information-based methods that detect ambiguous instances and density-based methods that detect OOD instances.

Directly **asking the model to validate its answer** is another option for UQ (Kadavath et al., 2022). In this method, one asks models first to propose answers, and subsequently to evaluate the probability $P(\text{True})$ that their answers are correct. Kadavath et al. (2022) showed that this method achieves reasonable performance on a variety of tasks, including question answering. We note that this method requires two-pass model inference: first to generate an answer, and second to process its own output. Even though the second inference is usually faster than the first one, it still takes considerable computation time.

2.2.2 Black-Box Methods

In contemporary models, there are instances where the model’s architecture and hidden states are unavailable or there is no access to logits during response generation. Nevertheless, a whole class of black-box methods only needs to access the model’s response. In this paper, we consider sev-

eral black-box approaches, including Lexical Similarity, Number of Semantic Sets, Sum of Eigenvalues of the Graph Laplacian, Degree Matrix, and Eccentricity, all of which have been shown to perform well in other studies (Fomicheva et al., 2020; Kuhn et al., 2023). We use the same methodological approach as Lin et al. (2023):

- Obtain K responses y_1, \dots, y_K for a particular input x .
- Compute $K \times K$ similarity matrix S between responses, where $S_{ij} = s(y_i, y_j)$ for some similarity score s (Natural Language Inference score or Jaccard score).
- Based on the similarity matrix S , we compute the final uncertainty score.

2.2.3 Claim-Level Extensions

While the methods discussed above provide uncertainty scores for entire generated sequences, it is often desirable to quantify the uncertainty for individual atomic claims within texts. Consider that claims are already extracted from the text sentences and there is a mapping between them and tokens in the original text, so we know probability distributions for each token in each claim. Many sequence-level methods can be modified to operate on the claim level (Fadeeva et al., 2024), but not all of them. For example, repetitive sampling methods cannot work on the claim level because sampled texts may differ too much and miss some claims.

Let C denote a set of token indices corresponding to a claim. To adapt MSP to the claim level, we can compute the joint probability of tokens in the claim only instead of the whole sequence, $\prod_{l \in C} P(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \theta)$. Similarly, instead of considering the entropy of the entire sequence, we can focus on the maximum entropy among the tokens within a claim. Sequence-level Perplexity and PMI can also be naturally extended to the claim level in the similar way. P(true) could be adapted by asking LLM about correctness of each claim individually.

The Claim-Conditioned Probability (CCP) method, proposed by Fadeeva et al. (2024) is designed specifically for the claim level (but also could be applied to sequence level). It assesses the semantic similarity between the original claim and perturbed versions where individual tokens are replaced with their alternative generations. This approach provides a more nuanced understanding of uncertainty by considering the potential impact of different word choices on the overall meaning of the claim. Details about claim-level UQ methods

could be found in Appendix A.3.

2.3 Uncertainty Normalization

Raw uncertainty scores are good for ranking outputs by their potential quality, but can be confusing to an end user. To mitigate this problem, we consider several approaches to obtaining confidence scores bounded in the range $[0, 1]$.

All of the considered approaches require fitting on a held-out calibration set $\mathcal{D}_{calib} = \{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^N$. For each sample $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$, we assume that some uncertainty score is computed $u_i = U(\mathbf{x}_i)$ as well as the generation quality $f(\mathbf{x}_i)$: $q_i = Q(f(\mathbf{x}_i), \mathbf{y}_i)$.

Among simple *normalization* approaches we consider **linear scaling** and **quantile scaling**, as they provide simple rules to normalize uncertainty scores in $[0, 1]$ based solely on uncertainty values u_i ; see Appendix B for more detail.

However, to provide meaningful information about the model’s confidence to the end user, the confidence score should not only be bounded to the fixed interval of values, but it should also be directly tied to the expected quality of the model’s output. We call the extent of this relation *confidence calibration*, as opposed to simple confidence normalization. To facilitate this, we propose two methods of such calibration, which we call **Performance-Calibrated Confidence (PCC)**.

The first approach, **Binned PCC**, splits the calibration set into non-intersecting bins based on the values of uncertainty u_i and considers the confidence to be an estimate of the mean quality of the outputs in the bin, as measured by some quality measure of choice. The downside of this approach to confidence estimation is that the ordering of the points based on raw uncertainty and bounded confidence scores can be different, and thus the quality of uncertainty estimation using such confidence can vary substantially and unpredictably.

To address this problem, we propose a second approach: **Isotonic PCC**. It fits Centered Isotonic Regression (CIR) (Oron and Flournoy, 2017) on pairs of uncertainty and quality values from the calibration set. CIR produces a monotonic piecewise linear function, which allows to make use of the relationship between uncertainty and quality, while keeping the order of the inputs intact.

Both approaches in the PCC family produce calibrated confidence scores as a local estimate of some quality measure in the neighborhood of the raw uncertainty estimate. This directly ties the confidence,

that is presented to the user with the estimated quality of the output, thus making it easier to explain and to justify the confidence to the end user. We provide a more detailed discussion on the specifics of the normalization methods in Appendix B.

3 Approaches to Evaluating Uncertainty Quantification Methods

In the past few years, researchers have introduced many diverse approaches to benchmarking UQ methods for generative LLMs. In general, a valid UQ technique should produce scores that are well correlated with some measure of output quality. Thus, the most straightforward way of comparing different UQ methods is to measure the rank correlation between some generation quality metric (e.g., ROUGE-L) and uncertainty scores (Fomicheva et al., 2020; Ren et al., 2023). However, this way of evaluating UQ is not very informative of the performance gain that a particular UQ method achieves.

One of the most popular approaches is based on designating outputs as correct and incorrect by selecting a threshold on a quality metric, and measuring how well uncertainty scores can predict the output as being one or the other (Kuhn et al., 2023; Duan et al., 2023). This reduces the uncertainty score to being a predictor in a binary classification task, and thus, one can use ROC-AUC or PR-AUC as a measure of how well a UQ method performs. The problem with this approach, which makes results across different work incomparable, lies in the fact that it requires selecting the quality threshold, and the choice of such a threshold has been quite arbitrary in the literature.

A more comprehensive approach is usually called *rejection verification* (Malinin and Gales, 2021; Lin et al., 2023). It does not require thresholding the quality metric to formulate a binary classification task. Instead, it computes the average quality of the outputs for which uncertainty is relatively low. By continuously lowering the uncertainty threshold above which the data points are discarded, one obtains a set of average quality values of outputs with progressively lower maximum uncertainty. These pairs of uncertainty thresholds and associated average output quality give a prediction–rejection curve, and the area under this curve demonstrates the overall quality of a UQ method (Malinin et al., 2017).

One of the common problems with the majority of evaluation approaches used in previous work

on UQ for LLMs is the usage of n -gram output quality metrics such as ROUGE-L, which often do not reflect the actual quality of the generated output. For example, this discrepancy occurs when the gold standard answer and the LLM output differ only by a negation. In this case, n -gram metrics would rank such a model answer higher than it deserves, failing to capture the substantial semantic difference caused by the negation. In addition to n -gram metrics, we suggest to use the recently proposed AlignScore (Zha et al., 2023), where the gold-standard answer and the LLM output are compared by another LLM. The authors show that this metric has better correlation with human annotators due to its ability to capture deeper semantic similarities and differences between texts.

Another issue with evaluation protocols in recent work is their tendency to overlook simple yet effective baselines. For instance, the maximum probability often proves difficult to surpass in tasks with short outputs. Many studies neglect this baseline, favoring comparisons with entropy-based metrics, which frequently perform worse. By not adequately considering these straightforward baselines, the evaluation protocols may give an incomplete picture of UQ performance.

There are few studies on UQ for text fragments such as sentences (Manakul et al., 2023). In these studies, the authors manually annotated texts generated by one model, e.g., GPT-3. Then they evaluated the UQ performance for a proxy model by inferring the probability distributions of the tokens for the fixed output and calculating standard classification measures such as PR-AUC with uncertainty scores as predictors. However, such an approach introduces a big discrepancy between the generated text and what a proxy LLM actually wants to generate, which results in biased UQ performance. In contrast, we suggest to perform unrestricted generation from LLMs, thus mitigating this discrepancy. To mitigate the problem of variability of generations, we suggest an automatic evaluation pipeline for UQ in the fact-checking task.

4 Evaluation Benchmark

Our benchmark features three sections: (1) evaluation of the UQ performance in selective classification/generation; (2) evaluation of UQ performance in fact-checking; and (3) evaluation of confidence calibration.




Figure 1: The mean rank \downarrow aggregated over all selective classification tasks for each LLM separately (the lower the better). Column *Mean Rank* corresponds to the mean of the ranks across all LLMs.

4.1 Selective Classification / Generation

In this section of the benchmark, we evaluate how well the uncertainty scores of the considered methods detect low-quality LLM generations.

Datasets. For selective classification, we use four QA datasets: CoQA (Reddy et al., 2019) with free-form answers about conversations; TriviaQA (Joshi et al., 2017) with complex and compositional questions without context; MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021) – a multitask dataset structured as multiple-choice QA; and GSM8k (Cobbe et al., 2021), consisting of grade school math word problems. The first two datasets are used in many works on UQ, while the last two are popular datasets for evaluating the English-language generation quality of LLMs. For selective generation, we use two MT datasets: WMT-14 French to English (Bojar et al., 2014), WMT-19 German to English (Barrault et al., 2019), and one text summarization dataset – XSum (Narayan et al., 2018).

For each dataset, we limit the number of instances from the evaluation set to 2,000. We also reserve 1,000 instances from the training set for UQ techniques that require “pre-training”, such as density-based methods. More detailed statistics about the datasets are given in Appendix D.

For prompting LLMs, we mainly follow the prompt format from the lm-evaluation-harness framework (Gao et al., 2023). For TriviaQA, MMLU, and GSM8k, we use a 5-shot prompt. For XSUM, WMT-14 Fr-En, and WMT-19 De-En, we use a zero-shot prompt. For CoQA, we use a few-

shot prompt with all preceding questions for the conversation before the target question.

Metrics. Following previous work on UQ in text generation (Malinin and Gales, 2021; Vazhentsev et al., 2022), we compare the methods using the Prediction Rejection Ratio (PRR) metric (Malinin et al., 2017). Consider a test dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}$. Let $f(\mathbf{x}_i)$ be the output generated by a LLM and $U(\mathbf{x}_i)$ be the uncertainty score of a prediction. The prediction rejection (PR) curve indicates how the average quality $Q(f(\mathbf{x}_i), \mathbf{y}_i)$ of the instances having uncertainty $U(\mathbf{x}_i) < a$ depends on the value of the rejection parameter a . PRR computes the ratio of the area between the PR curves for a considered uncertainty score and a random score and the area between the oracle (best possible uncertainty that sorts instances according to their text quality metric) and a random score:

$$PRR = \frac{AUCPR_{\text{unc}} - AUCPR_{\text{rnd}}}{AUCPR_{\text{oracle}} - AUCPR_{\text{rnd}}}. \quad (2)$$

Higher PRR indicates a better uncertainty score.

The choice of the generation quality measure $Q(f(\mathbf{x}_i), \mathbf{y}_i)$ depends on the dataset. Compared to previous work that uses n -gram based measures, in our benchmark, we mostly adhere to LLM-based measures such as AlignScore (Zha et al., 2023) and COMET (Rei et al., 2020) and keep n -gram measures for comparability with previous work. For MT datasets, we use COMET and AlignScore. For GSM8K and MMLU, we use accuracy. For CoQA and TriviaQA, we use accuracy and AlignScore. For XSum, we use ROUGE-L and AlignScore.




Figure 2: The mean rank \downarrow aggregated over all selective generation tasks for each LLM separately (the lower the better). Column *Mean Rank* corresponds to the mean of the ranks across all LLMs.

4.2 Claim-Level Fact-Checking

In this part of the benchmark, we evaluate claim-level UQ techniques and their ability to spot hallucinations on the task of generating biographies, as proposed by Fadeeva et al. (2024). The difference over previous work such as Manakul et al. (2023) is that in our benchmark, we perform unrestricted generation using the LLM, which is much closer to the practical use-case. However, this raises the problem that each generation is unique and needs to be reannotated, posing a significant challenge for human annotation.

Evaluation pipeline. To enable evaluation of UQ methods on unrestricted LLM outputs, we implement an automatic benchmarking pipeline. The pipeline supports English, Mandarin Chinese, Arabic, and Russian. It starts with generating LLM responses to biography prompts such as *Give me a biography of <person name>*. The set of people was generated by asking GPT-4 to list the most famous people since 1900. The maximum generation length is set to 256 tokens.

The generated texts are then decomposed into atomic claims. For each claim, we also map all its words back to the generated text to access the corresponding token logits. These two steps are done using GPT-4 with a language-specific prompt. Usually, about 5% of claims do not successfully match because GPT-4 abstains from responding or outputs words not present in the original text. The further evaluation considers only successfully matched claims.

The annotation of the extracted claims is also done automatically using GPT-4. We use a language-specific prompt that facilitates chain-of-thought reasoning to ask whether the presented claims are supported, unsupported, or unknown. Usually, the percentage of claims classified as unknown is negligible; these claims are discarded from the evaluation. The obtained LLM annotation is used to calculate the performance metrics.

To assess the quality of automatic annotation, we manually annotated a random subset of claims for each language. Table 6 in the Appendix summarizes the binary performance metrics of GPT-4 against human labels. The results show that GPT-4 obtains good performance, confirming it can serve as a ground truth for UQ techniques.

Metrics. The performance of the claim-level uncertainty is evaluated using ROC-AUC and PR-AUC with unsupported claims as a positive class.

4.3 Effect of Uncertainty Normalization

This section of the benchmark is designed to analyze how uncertainty normalization procedures (as presented in Section 2.3) impact on the performance of the scores and their correlation with quality of generated text.

Datasets. The reserved training partitions of the datasets from the selective classification and generation section are used as calibration sets for normalization methods. Evaluation of the normalization methods can be performed both on concatenated test partitions and on each of them individually.

Metrics. The benchmark offers two metrics: PRR before and after normalization to ensure that performance does not degrade; and the metric similar to ECE that measures “calibration”, i.e. the ability of normalized uncertainty scores represent the expected quality of the output in a bounded range – Mean Squared Error (MSE) between a normalized quality metric and a confidence score. Lower MSE indicates better confidence “calibration”.

5 Experiments

Using our benchmark, we performed evaluation of the implemented UQ and normalization baselines.

Models. We conducted the experiments on selective classification/generation using Mistral-7B-v0.2 (Jiang et al., 2023a) and StableLM-12B-v2 (Bellagente et al., 2024). The experiments on the fact-checking task were conducted using the instruct versions of Mistral 7B v0.1 (Jiang et al., 2023b) and Jais 13B (Sengupta et al., 2023). The generation hyperparameters are provided in Appendix C. Text generation quality of the models is presented in Tables 12 and 13 in Appendix G.

5.1 Selective Classification/Generation

Selective classification. Tables 7 and 8 in Appendix E present results on the selective classification task for the StableLM 12B v2 and Mistral 7B v0.2 models, respectively. For CoQA and MMLU, the basic MSP marginally outperforms other methods in terms of accuracy-based PRR for StableLM and in terms of both metrics for Mistral. HUQ-MD and Perplexity achieve the best results on TriviaQA, slightly outperforming MSP for Mistral, and are on par with MSP for StableLM. However, for GSM8k, where the models generate a long chain of thoughts, MSP significantly falls behind the state-of-the-art methods based on meaning diversity. SAR, Semantic Entropy, HUQ-MD, and Lexical Similarity significantly outperform other techniques.

Figure 1 presents mean ranks for each model separately and the mean rank of ranks aggregated for both models for selective classification. For the selective classification with the Mistral model, SAR, SentenceSAR, Lexical Similarity, and MSP appear to be the best methods in terms of the mean rank. For StableLM, these methods also demonstrate good results, but they appear to be almost on par with many other black-box techniques. Considering the average rank across both models, MSP and meaning diversity based methods such as

UQ Method	Output length in symbols						
	1-2	3-6	7-24	25-85	86-138	139-210	211-1k
MSP	0.69	0.61	0.62	0.57	0.54	0.38	0.26
Perplexity	0.69	0.58	0.66	0.56	0.41	0.27	0.26
Mean Token Entropy	0.66	0.27	0.55	0.47	0.39	0.22	0.17
MC-SE	0.60	0.37	0.50	0.54	0.68	0.60	0.33
MC-NSE	0.60	0.43	0.64	0.54	0.57	0.52	0.36
PMI	0.41	0.22	0.17	-0.23	-0.27	-0.15	0.02
Conditional PMI	0.22	-0.14	-0.25	-0.12	-0.12	-0.11	-0.12
RenyiNeg	0.00	0.08	-0.56	0.18	0.21	-0.06	-0.15
FisherRao	0.04	0.09	-0.29	-0.06	0.09	0.21	0.23
TokenSAR	0.69	0.59	0.66	0.56	0.40	0.26	0.26
CCP	0.69	0.63	0.53	0.54	0.56	0.50	0.36
Semantic Entropy	0.62	0.43	0.61	0.63	0.72	0.68	0.44
SentenceSAR	0.66	0.56	0.67	0.52	0.28	0.22	0.23
SAR	0.65	0.54	0.71	0.64	0.68	0.67	0.52
MD – Decoder	0.07	-0.10	-0.50	-0.14	-0.23	-0.18	-0.14
RMD – Decoder	-0.11	0.04	0.05	0.13	0.12	-0.03	-0.14
RDE – Decoder	0.11	0.15	0.22	-0.11	-0.22	0.05	0.09
HUQ – MD – Decoder	0.64	0.51	0.32	0.02	-0.03	0.01	0.10
HUQ – RMD – Decoder	0.57	0.47	0.30	0.00	-0.04	0.01	0.13
P(True)	-0.11	-0.25	-0.55	-0.23	-0.37	-0.16	-0.03
NumSemSets	0.59	0.47	0.64	0.43	0.48	0.47	0.17
EigValLaplacian NLI entail.	0.61	0.53	0.70	0.71	0.77	0.77	0.62
EigValLaplacian NLI contra.	0.60	0.51	0.65	0.58	0.58	0.49	0.22
EigValLaplacian Jaccard	0.57	0.47	0.67	0.61	0.69	0.66	0.51
DegMat NLI entail.	0.62	0.55	0.73	0.71	0.77	0.78	0.63
DegMat NLI contra.	0.61	0.53	0.63	0.58	0.58	0.47	0.20
DegMat Jaccard	0.63	0.52	0.68	0.62	0.70	0.68	0.55
Eccentricity NLI entail.	0.58	0.48	0.69	0.70	0.77	0.77	0.64
Eccentricity NLI contra.	0.57	0.51	0.66	0.59	0.57	0.47	0.21
Eccentricity Jaccard	0.58	0.45	0.62	0.59	0.68	0.64	0.49
Lexical Similarity Rouge–1	0.62	0.54	0.71	0.64	0.71	0.69	0.54
Lexical Similarity Rouge–L	0.62	0.54	0.71	0.64	0.72	0.71	0.57
Lexical Similarity BLEU	0.63	0.50	0.61	0.58	0.69	0.68	0.56

Table 2: PRR \uparrow is aggregated over all selective classification/generation tasks and both considered LLMs, totaling 33K samples. The aggregation is performed on output text lengths within specific quantile-based intervals, with each interval representing an approximately equal number of samples.

SAR, SentenceSAR, as well as Lexical Similarity, achieve the best results. We also should note that despite MSP is often not the best method for considered datasets individually, it demonstrates robust performance across them all and remains to be a very strong baseline for selective classification.

Selective Generation. Tables 9 and 10 in Appendix E present results on the selective generation task for StableLM 12B v2 and Mistral 7B v0.2, respectively. For both models, on the text summarization task, the best results are achieved by black-box techniques and the SAR method in terms of both metrics. Interestingly, Conditional PMI substantially outperforms other methods for StableLM, and is on par with black-box techniques for Mistral in terms of ROUGE-L-based PRR. Other information-based methods have negative PRR, which indicates that they perform worse than random choice. On the task of MT for both datasets, MSP and SAR achieve the best results in terms of COMET-based PRR. Nevertheless, black-box techniques are substantially better in terms of AlignScore-based PRR.

Figure 2 presents mean ranks for each model individually and the mean rank of ranks aggregated for both models for selective generation. For the selective generation with Mistral, SAR performs the best followed by Semantic Entropy, while for

UQ Method	Mistral 7b		Jais 13b	
	ROC-AUC	PR-AUC	ROC-AUC	PR-AUC
Maximum probability	0.57 ± 0.01	0.18 ± 0.02	0.69 ± 0.02	0.27 ± 0.01
Perplexity	0.59 ± 0.02	0.15 ± 0.02	0.61 ± 0.01	0.20 ± 0.02
Maximum token entropy	0.59 ± 0.01	0.19 ± 0.03	0.65 ± 0.01	0.28 ± 0.01
Pointwise Mutual Information	0.59 ± 0.01	0.16 ± 0.02	0.45 ± 0.01	0.16 ± 0.01
p(True)	0.60 ± 0.01	0.16 ± 0.01	0.62 ± 0.01	0.21 ± 0.01
CCP	0.63 ± 0.02	0.22 ± 0.01	0.74 ± 0.02	0.35 ± 0.01

Table 3: ROC-AUC \uparrow and PR-AUC \uparrow (with unsupported claims as the positive class) for the Mistral 7b v0.1 and Jais 13b LLMs on the English claim-level fact-checking benchmark. Darker colors indicate better results.

results with StableLM, the order is reversed. When considering the average rank for both models, all meaning diversity-based methods are strong performers, with SAR and Semantic Entropy at the top. These are followed closely by black-box methods such as EigValLaplacian, DegMet, and Lexical Similarity, which perform comparably to each other. MSP trails slightly behind but still demonstrates good performance.

Output Length Impact. Table 2 presents PRR scores for both considered LLMs and all datasets aggregated by the length of LLM output. For short generations (< 7 symbols), information-based methods (Maximum Probability, Perplexity, PMI, CCP, and TokenSAR) perform the best. Conversely, for longer outputs, black-box methods based on entailment and lexical similarity achieve superior performance. SAR, despite being inferior to black-box techniques for long outputs and slightly inferior to information-based techniques for short outputs, demonstrates the most robust results across all output lengths.

5.2 Fact-Checking

In the fact-checking experiment, we generated English biographies for 100 people, which resulted in 3,824 atomic claims for Mistral 7b v0.1 and 1,407 for Jais 13b. For Mistral, 9.5% of the claims annotated as unsupported by the automatic pipeline, and for Jais 13b – 13%. About 6% of the claims were classified as unknown for the both models used in evaluation. Table 3 presents the results for the fact-checking in the biographies generation task. For both models, CCP demonstrates the best performance. This method outperforms the closest baseline Maximum Token Entropy by 0.03 PR-AUC on Mistral and by 0.07 PR-AUC on Jais.




Figure 3: MSE \downarrow between AlignScore and various confidence scores derived from uncertainty scores with various normalization methods. Normalizations are trained on concatenated train partitions of all considered datasets. MSE is calculated over concatenated test partitions.

5.3 Effect of Uncertainty Normalization

The calibration of confidence scores in terms of MSE before and after applying various normalization techniques is presented in Figure 3. We can see that both variants of suggested PCC method (binned and isotonic) confidently outperform the linear and the quantile normalization for almost all of considered UQ techniques.

To verify that the quality of the normalized scores does not degrade after normalization, we also evaluate their performance in selective classification / generation tasks (see Table 11 in appendix). We compute PRR for raw and normalized uncertainty scores and analyze the difference. Our observations indicate that scores normalized using linear, quantile, and isotonic PCC methods perform similarly to the raw uncertainty scores, which is anticipated due to their monotonic properties.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we proposed a comprehensive benchmark for evaluating UQ techniques in text generation tasks. The conducted empirical investigation on the developed benchmark provides several useful insights. We see that the performance of UQ methods depends on the length of the LLM output. For the tasks with shorter answers, we can recommend using information-based methods, while for the tasks that assume longer outputs, methods based on semantic diversity such as Semantic Entropy or Lexical Similarity are preferable. It is

worth highlighting that SAR consistently stands out as one of the most effective methods. For the fact-checking task, the best method is CPP. We also should note that MSP appears to be a very strong and robust baseline across all tasks and should not be discarded from the evaluation protocols. For generating human-interpretable confidence scores, we suggest normalization based on isotonic PCC as it improves the confidence calibration and does not degrade the performance in terms of PRR.

References

- Arsenii Ashukha, Alexander Lyzhov, Dmitry Molchanov, and Dmitry Vetrov. 2019. [Pitfalls of in-domain uncertainty estimation and ensembling in deep learning](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Loïc Barrault, Ondřej Bojar, Marta R. Costa-jussà, Christian Federmann, Mark Fishel, Yvette Graham, Barry Haddow, Matthias Huck, Philipp Koehn, Shervin Malmasi, Christof Monz, Mathias Müller, Santanu Pal, Matt Post, and Marcos Zampieri. 2019. [Findings of the 2019 Conference on Machine Translation \(WMT19\)](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourth Conference on Machine Translation (Volume 2: Shared Task Papers, Day 1)*, pages 1–61, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marco Bellagente, Jonathan Tow, Dakota Mahan, Duy Phung, Maksym Zhuravinskyi, Reshith Adithyan, James Baicoianu, Ben Brooks, Nathan Cooper, Ashish Datta, Meng Lee, Emad Mostaque, Michael Pieler, Nikhil Pinnaraju, Paulo Rocha, Harry Saini, Hannah Teufel, Niccolò Zanichelli, and Carlos Riquelme. 2024. [Stable LM 2 1.6b technical report](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17834*.
- Charles Blundell, Julien Cornebise, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Daan Wierstra. 2015. [Weight uncertainty in neural network](#). In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1613–1622. PMLR.
- Ondrej Bojar, Christian Buck, Christian Federmann, Barry Haddow, Philipp Koehn, Johannes Leveling, Christof Monz, Pavel Pecina, Matt Post, Herve Saint-Amand, Radu Soricut, Lucia Specia, and Ale s Tamchyna. 2014. [Findings of the 2014 workshop on statistical machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Ninth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, pages 12–58, Baltimore, Maryland, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. [Training verifiers to solve math word problems](#). *CoRR*, abs/2110.14168.
- Maxime Darrin, Pablo Piantanida, and Pierre Colombo. 2023. [RainProof: An umbrella to shield text generator from out-of-distribution data](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5831–5857, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jinhao Duan, Hao Cheng, Shiqi Wang, Alex Zavalny, Chenan Wang, Renjing Xu, Bhavya Kaillkhura, and Kaidi Xu. 2023. [Shifting attention to relevance: Towards the uncertainty estimation of large language models](#). *arXiv cs.CL 2307.01379*.
- Nouha Dziri, Sivan Milton, Mo Yu, Osmar Zaiane, and Siva Reddy. 2022. [On the origin of hallucinations in conversational models: Is it the datasets or the models?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5271–5285, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ekaterina Fadeeva, Aleksandr Rubashevskii, Artem Shelmanov, Sergey Petrakov, Haonan Li, Hamdy Mubarak, Evgenii Tsymbalov, Gleb Kuzmin, Alexander Panchenko, Timothy Baldwin, Preslav Nakov, and Maxim Panov. 2024. [Fact-checking the output of large language models via token-level uncertainty quantification](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ekaterina Fadeeva, Roman Vashurin, Akim Tsvigun, Artem Vazhentsev, Sergey Petrakov, Kirill Fedyanin, Daniil Vasilev, Elizaveta Goncharova, Alexander Panchenko, Maxim Panov, Timothy

- Baldwin, and Artem Shelmanov. 2023. **Lm-polygraph: Uncertainty estimation for language models**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 446–461.
- Marina Fomicheva, Shuo Sun, Lisa Yankovskaya, Frédéric Blain, Francisco Guzmán, Mark Fishel, Nikolaos Aletras, Vishrav Chaudhary, and Lucia Specia. 2020. **Unsupervised quality estimation for neural machine translation**. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:539–555.
- Yarin Gal. 2016. *Uncertainty in Deep Learning*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Anthony DiPofi, Charles Foster, Laurence Golding, Jeffrey Hsu, Alain Le Noac’h, Haonan Li, Kyle McDonell, Niklas Muennighoff, Chris Ociepa, Jason Phang, Laria Reynolds, Hailey Schoelkopf, Aviya Skowron, Lintang Sutawika, Eric Tang, Anish Thite, Ben Wang, Kevin Wang, and Andy Zou. 2023. **A framework for few-shot language model evaluation**. <https://zenodo.org/records/10256836>.
- Jianfeng He, Xuchao Zhang, Shuo Lei, Zhiqian Chen, Fanglan Chen, Abdulaziz Alhamadani, Bei Xiao, and Chang-Tien Lu. 2020. **Towards more accurate uncertainty estimation in text classification**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2020, Online, November 16-20, 2020*, pages 8362–8372. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. **DeBERTa: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention**. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. **Measuring massive multitask language understanding**. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Paul Hofman, Yusuf Sale, and Eyke Hüllermeier. 2024. **Quantifying aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty with proper scoring rules**. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12215*.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de Las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023a. **Mistral 7b**. *CoRR*, abs/2310.06825.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023b. **Mistral 7b**. *CoRR*, abs/2310.06825.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. **TriviaQA: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension**. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, Scott Johnston, Sheer El Showk, Andy Jones, Nelson Elhage, Tristan Hume, Anna Chen, Yuntao Bai, Sam Bowman, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Danny Hernandez, Josh Jacobson, Jackson Kernion, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Sam Ringer, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, and Jared Kaplan. 2022. **Language models (mostly) know what they know**. *CoRR*, abs/2207.05221.
- Nikita Kotelevskii, Aleksandr Artemenkov, Kirill Fedyanin, Fedor Noskov, Alexander Fishkov, Artem Shelmanov, Artem Vazhentsev, Aleksandr Petiushko, and Maxim Panov. 2022. **Nonpara-**

- metric uncertainty quantification for single deterministic neural network. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 36308–36323. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Nikita Kotelevskii and Maxim Panov. 2024. Predictive uncertainty quantification via risk decompositions for strictly proper scoring rules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10727*.
- Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. 2023. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net.
- Gleb Kuzmin, Artem Vazhentsev, Artem Shelmanov, Xudong Han, Simon Suster, Maxim Panov, Alexander Panchenko, and Timothy Baldwin. 2023. Uncertainty estimation for debiased models: Does fairness hurt reliability? In *Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 3rd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 744–770, Nusa Dua, Bali. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kimin Lee, Kibok Lee, Honglak Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. 2018. A simple unified framework for detecting out-of-distribution samples and adversarial attacks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*, volume 31, pages 7167–7177.
- Zhen Lin, Shubhendu Trivedi, and Jimeng Sun. 2023. Generating with confidence: Uncertainty quantification for black-box large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2305.19187.
- Varvara Logacheva, Daryna Dementieva, Sergey Ustyantsev, Daniil Moskovskiy, David Dale, Irina Krotova, Nikita Semenov, and Alexander Panchenko. 2022. ParaDetox: Detoxification with parallel data. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6804–6818, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrey Malinin and Mark J. F. Gales. 2021. Uncertainty estimation in autoregressive structured prediction. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Andrey Malinin, Anton Ragni, Kate Knill, and Mark Gales. 2017. Incorporating uncertainty into deep learning for spoken language assessment. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 45–50, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark Gales. 2023. SelfCheckGPT: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9004–9017.
- Shashi Narayan, Shay B. Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Don’t give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, pages 1797–1807. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aleksandr Nikolich, Konstantin Korolev, and Artem Shelmanov. 2024. Vikhr: The family of open-source instruction-tuned large language models for russian. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13929*.
- Assaf P. Oron and Nancy Flournoy. 2017. Centered isotonic regression: Point and interval estimation for dose–response studies. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*, 9:258 – 267.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:140:1–140:67.
- Siva Reddy, Danqi Chen, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. CoQA: A conversational question answering challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:249–266.

- Ricardo Rei, Craig Stewart, Ana C Farinha, and Alon Lavie. 2020. [COMET: A neural framework for MT evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2685–2702, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jie Ren, Jiaming Luo, Yao Zhao, Kundan Krishna, Mohammad Saleh, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, and Peter J Liu. 2023. [Out-of-distribution detection and selective generation for conditional language models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Peter J Rousseeuw. 1984. [Least median of squares regression](#). *Journal of the American statistical association*, 79(388):871–880.
- Neha Sengupta, Sunil Kumar Sahu, Bokang Jia, Satheesh Katipomu, Haonan Li, Fajri Koto, William Marshall, Gurpreet Gosal, Cynthia Liu, Zhiming Chen, Osama Mohammed Afzal, Samta Kamboj, Onkar Pandit, Rahul Pal, Lalit Pradhan, Zain Muhammad Mujahid, Massa Baali, Xudong Han, Sondos Mahmoud Bsharat, Alham Fikri Aji, Zhiqiang Shen, Zhengzhong Liu, Natalia Vassilieva, Joel Hestness, Andy Hock, Andrew Feldman, Jonathan Lee, Andrew Jackson, Hector Xuguang Ren, Preslav Nakov, Timothy Baldwin, and Eric Xing. 2023. [Jais and Jaischat: Arabic-centric foundation and instruction-tuned open generative large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2308.16149.
- Artem Shelmanov, Evgenii Tsymbalov, Dmitri Puzyrev, Kirill Fedyanin, Alexander Panchenko, and Maxim Panov. 2021. [How certain is your transformer?](#) In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 1833–1840, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Junya Takayama and Yuki Arase. 2019. [Relevant and informative response generation using pointwise mutual information](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on NLP for Conversational AI*, pages 133–138, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Liam van der Poel, Ryan Cotterell, and Clara Meister. 2022. [Mutual information alleviates hallucinations in abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5956–5965, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Artem Vazhentsev, Gleb Kuzmin, Artem Shelmanov, Akim Tsvigun, Evgenii Tsymbalov, Kirill Fedyanin, Maxim Panov, Alexander Panchenko, Gleb Gusev, Mikhail Burtsev, Manvel Avetisian, and Leonid Zhukov. 2022. [Uncertainty estimation of transformer predictions for misclassification detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8237–8252, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Artem Vazhentsev, Gleb Kuzmin, Akim Tsvigun, Alexander Panchenko, Maxim Panov, Mikhail Burtsev, and Artem Shelmanov. 2023a. [Hybrid uncertainty quantification for selective text classification in ambiguous tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11659–11681, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Artem Vazhentsev, Akim Tsvigun, Roman Vashurin, Sergey Petrakov, Daniil Vasilev, Maxim Panov, Alexander Panchenko, and Artem Shelmanov. 2023b. [Efficient out-of-domain detection for sequence to sequence models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 1430–1454, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yuxia Wang, Daniel Beck, Timothy Baldwin, and Karin Verspoor. 2022. [Uncertainty estimation and reduction of pre-trained models for text regression](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:680–696.
- Yijun Xiao and William Yang Wang. 2021. [On hallucination and predictive uncertainty in conditional language generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2734–2744, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ji Xin, Raphael Tang, Yaoliang Yu, and Jimmy Lin. 2021a. [The art of abstention: Selective prediction and error regularization for natural language](#)

- processing. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1040–1051, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ji Xin, Raphael Tang, Yaoliang Yu, and Jimmy Lin. 2021b. **The art of abstention: Selective prediction and error regularization for natural language processing**. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1040–1051, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weijia Xu, Sweta Agrawal, Eleftheria Briakou, Marianna J. Martindale, and Marine Carpuat. 2023. **Understanding and detecting hallucinations in neural machine translation via model introspection**. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:546–564.
- Yi. 2023. A series of large language models trained from scratch by developers at 01-ai. <https://github.com/01-ai/Yi>.
- KiYoon Yoo, Jangho Kim, Jiho Jang, and Nojun Kwak. 2022. **Detection of adversarial examples in text classification: Benchmark and baseline via robust density estimation**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 3656–3672, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yuheng Zha, Yichi Yang, Ruichen Li, and Zhit-ing Hu. 2023. **AlignScore: Evaluating factual consistency with a unified alignment function**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11328–11348, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tianhang Zhang, Lin Qiu, Qipeng Guo, Cheng Deng, Yue Zhang, Zheng Zhang, Chenghu Zhou, Xinbing Wang, and Luoyi Fu. 2023. **Enhancing uncertainty-based hallucination detection with stronger focus**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 915–932.
- Xuchao Zhang, Fanglan Chen, Chang-Tien Lu, and Naren Ramakrishnan. 2019. **Mitigating uncertainty in document classification**. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 3126–3136, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Method Description

Here, we summarize UE methods implemented in LM-Polygraph; see also Table 1.

A.1 White-box Methods

A.1.1 Information-based methods

Maximum sequence probability score simply leverages the probability of the most likely sequence generation: $\text{MSP}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - P(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

Length-normalized log probability computes the average negative log probability of generated tokens. If the score is exponentiated it corresponds to *perplexity*. The resulting quantity is computed as

$$P(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{L} \log P(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right\},$$

while it is convenient also to denote length-normalized sequence probability by $\bar{P}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \exp\left\{\frac{1}{L} \log P(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\right\}$.

We also provide the *mean token entropy*, where we simply average entropy of each individual token in the generated sequence:

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \mathcal{H}(y_l \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

where $\mathcal{H}(y_l \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is an entropy of the token distribution $P(y_l \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

The other possibility to compute entropy-based uncertainty measure is to compute it on the level of whole sequences via $\mathbb{E}[-\log P(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})]$, where expectation is taken over the sequences \mathbf{y} randomly generated from the distribution $P(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$. In practice, one needs to use Monte-Carlo integration, i.e. generate several sequences $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$ via randoms sampling and compute the resulting *Monte Carlo Sequence Entropy*:

$$\mathcal{H}_S(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \log P(\mathbf{y}^{(k)} \mid \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (3)$$

The same procedure can be done by substituting $P(\mathbf{y}^{(k)} \mid \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ with its length-normalized version $\bar{P}(\mathbf{y}^{(k)} \mid \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ leading to a more reliable uncertainty measure in some applications.

Finally, one can consider negative mean *Pointwise Mutual Information* (PMI; Takayama and Arase (2019)) which is given by

$$\text{PMI}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \log \frac{P(y_l \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{P(y_l \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}.$$

This method was extended in (van der Poel et al., 2022) by considering only those marginal probabilities for which the entropy of the conditional distribution is above certain threshold: $\mathcal{H}(y_l \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq \tau$. It leads to the negative mean *Conditional Pointwise Mutual Information* (CPMI) measure that is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CPMI}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = & -\frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \log P(y_l \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ & + \frac{\lambda}{L} \sum_{l: \mathcal{H}(y_l \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq \tau} \log P(y_l \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is another tunable parameter.

Another approach to quantify uncertainty based on token probabilities is *Rényi divergence* (Darrin et al., 2023). This method computes the divergence between the probability distribution for each token and the uniform distribution as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RD}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = & \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{P(y_i \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^\alpha}{\mathbf{q}_i^{\alpha-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is tunable parameter, N is the number of tokens in vocabulary, and $\mathbf{q} = [\frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{1}{N}]$ is a probability vector with uniform distribution over vocabulary.

The other way to compute the distance between probability distributions is the *Fisher-Rao distance* (Darrin et al., 2023), which is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FR}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = & \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{2}{\pi} \arccos \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{P(y_i \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \mathbf{q}_i}. \end{aligned}$$

A.1.2 Methods based on meaning diversity

Generalizing length-normalized log probability, *TokenSAR* (Duan et al., 2023) computes the weighted average of the negative log probability of generated tokens based on their relevance for the entire generated text. For a given sentence similarity function $g(\cdot, \cdot)$ and token relevance function $R_T(y_k, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = 1 - g(\mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y} \setminus y_k)$, the resulting estimate is given by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TokenSAR}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = & \\ & - \sum_{l=1}^L \tilde{R}_T(y_l, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \log P(y_l \mid \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{R}_T(y_k, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{R_T(y_k, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{l=1}^L R_T(y_l, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})}$.

Another entropy-based uncertainty measure is *Semantic Entropy* proposed by Kuhn et al. (2023). The method aims to deal with the generated sequences that have similar meaning while having different probabilities according to the model, which can significantly affect the resulting entropy value (3). The idea is to cluster generated sequences $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$ into several semantically homogeneous clusters \mathcal{C}_m , $m = 1, \dots, M$ with $M \leq K$ with bi-directional entailment algorithm and average the sequence probabilities within the clusters. The resulting estimate of entropy is given by the following formula:

$$\text{SE}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = - \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{|\mathcal{C}_m|}{K} \log \hat{P}_m(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

where $\hat{P}_m(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}_m} P(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

One more approach, which used multiple generated sequences is *SentenceSAR* (Duan et al., 2023). This method enlarges the probability of those sentences that are more relevant and convincing than others. Given sentence relevance measure $g(\mathbf{y}^{(j)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ of $\mathbf{y}^{(j)}$ with respect to $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$ SentenceSAR is computed as:

$$\text{R}_S(\mathbf{y}^{(j)}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{k \neq j} g(\mathbf{y}^{(j)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)}) P(\mathbf{y}^{(k)} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Then the resulting formula is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SentSAR}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = & \\ & - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \log \left(P(\mathbf{y}^{(k)} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{1}{t} \text{R}_S(\mathbf{y}^{(k)}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where t is a temperature parameter used to control the scale of shifting to relevance.

Additionally, *SentenceSAR* and *TokenSAR* can be combined into a single method *SAR*. To achieve that, we replace the generative probability $P(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ to token-shifted probability $P'(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \exp\{-\text{TokenSAR}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})\}$ in the $\text{SentSAR}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ formula.

A.1.3 Ensemble-based methods

For the ensembling on a sequence level, we consider two uncertainty measures: total uncertainty measured via average sequence probability $\bar{P}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{P}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$:

$$\text{MSP}_S(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = 1 - \bar{P}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) \quad (4)$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_S(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \log \frac{P(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})}{P(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)}, \quad (5)$$

which is known as *reverse mutual information (RMI)*.

Next we discuss token level uncertainty measures and start with a total uncertainty estimate via entropy:

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{l=1}^L \mathcal{H}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{H}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x})$ is an entropy of the token distribution $P(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M P(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$.

Additionally, for the ensemble one can compute the variety of other token level uncertainty measures including average entropy of ensemble members (also known as *Data Uncertainty*):

$$\mathcal{D}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathcal{H}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i),$$

Mutual Information (MI):

$$\mathcal{I}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{H}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}) - \mathcal{D}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x})$$

and *Expected Pairwise KL Divergence (EPKL)*:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}) = & \binom{M}{2}^{-1} \\ & \cdot \sum_{i \neq j} \mathcal{KL}(P(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i) \| P(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{KL}(P \| Q)$ refers to a KL-divergence between distributions P and Q .

Finally, *Reverse Mutual Information (RMI)* also can be computed on the token level via a simple equation

$$\mathcal{M}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{K}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}) - \mathcal{I}(y_l | \mathbf{y}_{<l}, \mathbf{x}).$$

The resulting token-level uncertainties computed via Data Uncertainty, MI, EPKL and RMI can be plugged-in in equation (6) on the place of entropy leading to corresponding sequence level uncertainty estimates.

A.1.4 Density-based Methods

Let $h(\mathbf{x})$ be a hidden representation of an instance \mathbf{x} . The *Mahalanobis Distance* (MD; Lee et al. (2018)) method fits a Gaussian centered at the training data centroid μ with an empirical covariance

matrix Σ . The uncertainty score is the Mahalanobis distance between $h(\mathbf{x})$ and μ :

$$\text{MD}(\mathbf{x}) = (h(\mathbf{x}) - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (h(\mathbf{x}) - \mu).$$

We suggest using the last hidden state of the encoder averaged over non-padding tokens or the last hidden state of the decoder averaged over all generated tokens as $h(\mathbf{x})$.

The Robust Density Estimation (RDE; Yoo et al. (2022)) method improves over MD by reducing the dimensionality of $h(\mathbf{x})$ via PCA decomposition. Additionally, computing of the covariance matrix Σ for each individual class is done by using the Minimum Covariance Determinant estimation (Rousseeuw, 1984). The uncertainty score is computed as the Mahalanobis distance between but in the space of reduced dimensionality.

Ren et al. (2023) showed that it might be useful to adjust the Mahalanobis distance score by subtracting from it the other Mahalanobis distance $\text{MD}_0(\mathbf{x})$ computed for some large general purpose dataset covering many domains like C4 (Raffel et al., 2020). The resulting resulting *Relative Mahalanobis Distance* score is

$$\text{RMD}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{MD}(\mathbf{x}) - \text{MD}_0(\mathbf{x}).$$

A.2 Black-box Methods

In this work, we follow Lin et al. (2023) and consider two approaches to compute the similarity for the generated responses. The first one is *Jaccard similarity* $s(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}') = |\mathbf{y} \cap \mathbf{y}'| / |\mathbf{y} \cup \mathbf{y}'|$, where the sequences \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{y}' are considered just as sets of words.

The other similarity measure considered is Natural Language Index (NLI) which employs a classification model to identify whether two responses are similar. We follow Kuhn et al. (2023) and use the DeBERTa-large model (He et al., 2021) that, for each pair of input sequences, provides two probabilities: $\hat{p}_{\text{entail}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')$ that measures the degree of entailment between the sequences and $\hat{p}_{\text{contra}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')$ that measures the contradiction between them. Then one can use $s_{\text{entail}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}') = \hat{p}_{\text{entail}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')$ or $s_{\text{contra}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}') = 1 - \hat{p}_{\text{contra}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}')$ as a measure of similarity between sequences \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{y}' .

Number of Semantic Sets illustrates whether answers are semantically equivalent. We adopt an iterative approach by sequentially examining

responses from the first to the last while making pairwise comparisons between them (each pair has indexes j_1 and j_2 , $j_2 > j_1$). The number of semantic sets initially equals the total number of generated answers K . If the condition $\hat{p}_{\text{entail}}(\mathbf{y}_{j_1}, \mathbf{y}_{j_2}) > \hat{p}_{\text{contra}}(\mathbf{y}_{j_1}, \mathbf{y}_{j_2})$ and $\hat{p}_{\text{entail}}(\mathbf{y}_{j_2}, \mathbf{y}_{j_1}) > \hat{p}_{\text{contra}}(\mathbf{y}_{j_2}, \mathbf{y}_{j_1})$ is fulfilled we put this two sentences into one cluster. The computation is done for all the pairs of answers, and then the resulting number of distinct sets $U_{\text{Num.Sem.Sets}}$ is reported. It is worth noting that a higher number of semantic sets corresponds to an increased level of uncertainty, as it suggests a higher number of diverse semantic interpretations for the answer.

Nonetheless, it is essential to acknowledge a limitation of this measure: it can only take integer values. Additionally, it cannot be assumed that the semantic equivalence derived from the NLI model is always transitive. Consequently, the authors of (Lin et al., 2023) suggest the consideration of a continuous counterpart of this metric. They propose the *Sum of Eigenvalues of the Graph Laplacian* as a potential alternative approach.

Let’s consider a similarity matrix $S_{j_1 j_2} = (s(\mathbf{y}_{j_1}, \mathbf{y}_{j_2}) + s(\mathbf{y}_{j_2}, \mathbf{y}_{j_1})) / 2$. Averaging is done to obtain better consistency. Matrix S has the following formula $L = I - D^{-\frac{1}{2}} S D^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, where D is a diagonal matrix and $D_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^K S_{ij}$. Consequently, the following formula is derived: $U_{\text{EigV}} = \sum_{k=1}^K \max(0, 1 - \lambda_k)$. This value is a continuous analogue of $U_{\text{Num.Sem.Sets}}$. In extreme case if adjacency matrix S is binary these two measures will coincide.

Of course, from a theoretical and practical point of view, U_{EigV} is a much more flexible approach compared to $U_{\text{Num.Sem.Sets}}$. Still, they have a common disadvantage: they can not provide uncertainty for each answer. However, authors of (Lin et al., 2023) demonstrate that we can take it from *Degree Matrix* D computed above. The idea is that the total uncertainty of the answers might be measured as a corrected trace of the diagonal matrix D because elements on the diagonal of matrix D are sums of similarities between the given answer and other answers. Thus, it is an average pairwise distance between all answers, and a larger value will indicate larger uncertainty because of the larger distance between answers. The resulting uncertainty measure becomes $U_{\text{Deg}} = 1 - \text{trace}(D) / K^2$.

A drawback of previously considered methods is the limited knowledge of the actual embedding

space for the different answers since we only have measures of their similarities. Nevertheless, we can overcome this limitation by taking advantage of the inferential capabilities of the graph Laplacian, which makes it easier to obtain the coordinates of the answers. Let us introduce $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k \in R^K$ as the eigenvectors of L that correspond to k smallest eigenvalues. We can efficiently construct an informative embedding $\mathbf{v}_j = [\mathbf{u}_{1,j}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{k,j}]$ for an answer y_j . Authors of (Lin et al., 2023) demonstrate that this approach allows the usage of the average distance from the center as an uncertainty metric and to consider the distance of each response from the center as a measure of (negative) confidence. In mathematical terms, the estimates for *Eccentricity* can be defined as follows: $U_{Ecc} = \|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1^T, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_K^T\|_2$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j = \mathbf{v}_j - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{\ell=1}^K \mathbf{v}_\ell$.

Last but not least, *Lexical Similarity* is a measure proposed by (Fomicheva et al., 2020) that computes how similar two words or phrases are in terms of their meaning. Since the original article is dedicated to machine translation, this measure calculates the average similarity score between all pairs of translation hypotheses in a set, using a similarity measure based on the overlap of their lexical items. Different metrics can be used, such as ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, ROUGE-L, and BLEU. For our task, this measure iterates over all responses and calculates the average score with other answers.

A.3 Claim-level Methods

While the previous methods operate on the entire generated sequence, it is often desirable to estimate uncertainty for individual claims within the text. Suppose C denotes a set of token indices corresponding to a particular claim. Many UQ methods allow for straightforward generalization for the claim-level by simply considering only subset of tokens corresponding to the set C instead of all tokens in the sequence. We consider claim-level generalization for MSP, Maximum Token Entropy, Perplexity, and PMI in this way.

$P(\text{True})$, adapting the approach from (Kadavath et al., 2022) to the claim level, quantifies claim uncertainty by prompting the LLM to assess the truthfulness of the generated claim. It is implemented as the model’s confidence in generating the token “True” as the first token y_1 of a separate response, given the generated claim as context:

$$P_{\text{True}}(C | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - P(y_1 = \text{“True”} | C, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Claim-Conditioned Probability (CCP) quantifies uncertainty by evaluating the semantic similarity between the original claim and perturbed versions where each token is replaced with its alternative generations. CCP utilizes a Natural Language Inference (NLI) model to compare the original claim $y_{i \in C, i \leq j}$ with variations where token y_j is replaced with top- K alternatives y_j^k from the model’s output distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CCP}(y_j | \mathbf{y}_{<j}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \\ &= \frac{\sum_{k: \text{NLI}(y_j^k, y_j) = \text{‘e’}} P(y_j^k | \mathbf{y}_{<j}, \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{k: \text{NLI}(y_j^k, y_j) \in \{\text{‘e’}, \text{‘c’}\}} P(y_j^k | \mathbf{y}_{<j}, \mathbf{x})}, \\ \text{CCP}(C | \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= 1 - \prod_{j \in C} \text{CCP}(y_j | \mathbf{y}_{<j}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\text{NLI}(y_j^k, y_j) = \text{‘e’}$ denotes that the NLI model predicts an entailment relation between the original claim and the modified claim where y_j is replaced with y_j^k . CCP effectively measures the proportion of high-probability token alternatives that preserve the original claim’s semantic meaning according to the NLI model.

B Uncertainty Normalization Details

Linear scaling first reverses the order of UQ values in calibration set to get raw confidences $c_i = -u_i$. Then, for a new model output with corresponding uncertainty score u and confidence $c(u) = -u$, scaled confidence is $c_s(u) = (c(u) - \min_i c_i) / (\max_i c_i - \min_i c_i)$.

Depending on the generality of the calibration set, new uncertainty values may exceed maximum uncertainty, or be less than minimum uncertainty observed in a calibration set. For such outliers, obtained scaled uncertainty will be greater than 1 and lesser than 0 respectively. To bound confidence strictly within $[0, 1]$ interval we clip such outliers and resulting confidence $c(u)$ is then obtained as:

$$c(u) = \begin{cases} 0, & c_s(u) < 0, \\ c_s(u), & 0 \leq c_s(u) \leq 1, \\ 1, & c_s(u) > 1. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Quantile scaling computes confidence as $c(u) = 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}(u_i \leq u)$, where N is the number of data points in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}}$ and $u_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{calib}}$. Resulting confidence is 1 - value of uncertainty CDF estimated using calibration data.

Dataset	Task	Max Input Length	Generation Length	Temperature	Top-p	Do Sample	Beams	Repetition Penalty
CoQA	QA	-	20	1.0	1.0	False	1	1
TriviQA			20					
MMLU			3					
GSM8k			256					
XSum	TS		56					
WMT14 Fr-En	NMT		107					
WMT19 De-En			107					

Table 4: Text generation hyperparameters for both LLMs Mistral-7B-v0.2 and StableLM-12B-v2.

Dataset	Type	Num. instances	Av. document len.	Av. target len.	Language
CoQA	QA	7199 / 500 / -	405.9	4	English
TriviaQA	QA	138384 / 17944 / 17210	18.8	4.3	English
MMLU	QA	99842 / 1531 / 14042	64.9	3	English
GSM8k	QA	7473 / - / 1319	64.2	128.6	English
WMT'14	NMT	40.8M / 3000 / 3003	49.3	32.9	French-to-English
WMT'19	NMT	34.8M / 2998 / -	52.5	33.5	German-to-English
XSum	ATS	204045 / 11332 / 11334	544.2	30.4	English

Table 5: Quantitative information regarding the datasets from experiments. It includes the count of instances available for the training, validation, and **test** sets, as well as the mean lengths of both texts and targets (answers / translations / summaries) measured in terms of tokens according to Mistral 7B v0.2 tokenizer. In addition, the languages of the source and target texts are also specified.

This approach naturally bounds the output confidence between 0 and 1 and does this with consideration to the distribution of uncertainty values in the calibration set.

Binned PCC splits the calibration set into non-intersecting bins based on values of uncertainty u_i . Thus, a bin is a set of indices $\mathcal{B}^j = \{i: b_{\min}^j \leq u_i < b_{\max}^j\}$, where b_{\min}^j and b_{\max}^j are left and right boundaries of the j -th bin respectively.

Then, for a new data point with a raw uncertainty score u , a calibrated confidence score is $c(u) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}^j|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}^j} q_i$, where \mathcal{B}^j is the calibration bin, for which the following holds: $b_{\min}^j \leq u < b_{\max}^j$.

To remedy this problem we propose the second approach, **Isotonic PCC**, confidence score is obtained as $c(u) = \text{CIR}(u)$, where CIR is a fitted Centered Isotonic Regression that predicts quality of the response based on its raw uncertainty score, maintaining strict monotonicity, i.e. higher uncertainty always produces lower confidence.

C Generation Hyperparameters

Table 4 presents the hyperparameters used for experiments with LLMs Mistral-7B-v0.2 and StableLM-12B-v2 on various datasets and tasks. Maximum length of generated sequence was set for each dataset as the 99th percentile of target sequence length on the respective train set.

Language	Acc.	F1 score	# claims	% of false claims
English	0.98	0.93	97	16.5%
Chinese	0.77	0.74	100	39.0%
Arabic	0.89	0.80	132	28.3%
Russian	0.89	0.80	275	15.6%

Table 6: Classification metrics of GPT-4 annotation against manual annotation (unsupported claims represent a positive class).

D Dataset Statistics

Table 5 presents the statistics of the benchmark datasets. All test set instances were used, while density-based methods were trained on 1,000 randomly selected training instances.

Table 6 presents the quality of annotation using GPT-4 in the claim-level fact-checking benchmark. English texts are generated using Mistral-7B-v0.1, Arabic texts – using Jais 13B, Chinese texts – using Yi 7B (Yi, 2023), Russian texts – using Vikhr 7B-0.2 (Nikolich et al., 2024).

E Detailed Experimental Results for Uncertainty Quantification Methods

UQ Method	CoQA		TriviaQA		MMLU	GSM8k	Mean Rank↓
	Accuracy	AlignScore	Accuracy	AlignScore	Accuracy	Accuracy	
Maximum Sequence Probability	0.68±0.01	0.46±0.01	0.74±0.01	0.70±0.01	0.60±0.01	0.35±0.01	7.9
Perplexity	0.39±0.01	0.44±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.70±0.01	0.45±0.01	0.51±0.01	11.1
Mean Token Entropy	0.31±0.01	0.44±0.01	0.75±0.01	0.71±0.01	-0.16±0.01	0.52±0.01	13.0
Monte Carlo Sequence Entropy	0.58±0.01	0.46±0.01	0.66±0.01	0.64±0.01	0.28±0.01	0.49±0.01	14.5
Monte Carlo Normalized Sequence Entropy	0.44±0.01	0.42±0.01	0.67±0.01	0.64±0.01	0.26±0.01	0.49±0.01	17.2
Pointwise Mutual Information	-0.32±0.01	-0.02±0.01	-0.01±0.01	-0.06±0.01	0.08±0.01	0.08±0.02	24.1
Conditional Pointwise Mutual Information	-0.47±0.01	-0.23±0.01	-0.35±0.01	-0.33±0.01	0.05±0.01	-0.60±0.01	27.3
RenyiNeg	0.24±0.01	-0.03±0.01	-0.12±0.01	-0.01±0.01	0.41±0.01	-0.31±0.01	22.6
FisherRao	0.24±0.01	-0.02±0.01	-0.12±0.01	-0.01±0.01	0.42±0.01	-0.25±0.01	21.9
TokenSAR	0.41±0.01	0.45±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.45±0.01	0.50±0.01	12.7
CCP	0.49±0.01	0.37±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.72±0.01	0.50±0.01	0.46±0.01	11.2
Semantic Entropy	0.58±0.01	0.48±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.34±0.01	0.49±0.01	12.0
SentenceSAR	0.64±0.01	0.51±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.72±0.01	0.52±0.01	0.17±0.01	6.5
SAR	0.50±0.01	0.52±0.01	0.72±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.46±0.01	0.58±0.01	5.4
Mahalanobis Distance – Decoder	-0.02±0.01	0.01±0.01	-0.12±0.01	-0.20±0.01	0.05±0.01	0.39±0.01	23.3
Relative Mahalanobis Distance – Decoder	-0.05±0.01	0.04±0.01	-0.12±0.01	-0.20±0.01	-0.03±0.01	0.39±0.01	23.8
RDE – Decoder	-0.03±0.01	-0.04±0.01	-0.04±0.01	-0.10±0.01	-0.05±0.01	0.41±0.01	23.7
HUQ–MD – Decoder	0.35±0.01	0.43±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.70±0.01	0.45±0.01	0.62±0.01	10.0
P(True)	-0.04±0.01	-0.01±0.01	0.20±0.01	0.23±0.01	-0.62±0.01	0.15±0.01	23.5
NumSemSets	0.18±0.01	0.24±0.01	0.64±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.34±0.01	0.14±0.01	19.8
EigVallaplacian NLI Score entail.	0.52±0.01	0.53±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.42±0.01	0.39±0.01	9.6
EigVallaplacian Jaccard Score	0.44±0.01	0.45±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.36±0.01	0.52±0.01	13.8
DegMat NLI Score entail.	0.42±0.01	0.51±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.76±0.01	0.45±0.01	0.47±0.01	8.0
DegMat Jaccard Score	0.54±0.01	0.49±0.01	0.72±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.44±0.01	0.54±0.01	7.8
Eccentricity NLI Score entail.	0.53±0.01	0.50±0.01	0.72±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.39±0.01	0.53±0.01	8.6
Eccentricity Jaccard Score	0.58±0.01	0.49±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.68±0.01	0.37±0.01	0.52±0.01	11.4
Lexical Similarity Rouge–L	0.53±0.01	0.51±0.01	0.72±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.47±0.01	0.60±0.01	5.8
Lexical Similarity BLEU	0.57±0.01	0.48±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.67±0.01	0.46±0.01	0.56±0.01	9.8

Table 7: PRR↑ with various generation quality metrics for UQ methods in selective classification tasks with the StableLM 12b v2 model. Darker color indicates better results.

UQ Method	CoQA		TriviaQA		MMLU	GSM8k	Mean Rank
	Accuracy	AlignScore	Accuracy	AlignScore	Accuracy	Accuracy	
Maximum Sequence Probability	0.68±0.01	0.50±0.01	0.78±0.01	0.76±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.24±0.02	6.0
Perplexity	0.43±0.01	0.47±0.01	0.80±0.01	0.77±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.13±0.01	9.1
Mean Token Entropy	0.32±0.01	0.42±0.01	0.79±0.01	0.77±0.01	0.68±0.01	0.17±0.02	11.4
Monte Carlo Sequence Entropy	0.54±0.01	0.44±0.01	0.68±0.01	0.68±0.01	0.60±0.01	0.48±0.01	13.1
Monte Carlo Normalized Sequence Entropy	0.43±0.01	0.42±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.60±0.01	0.41±0.02	15.3
Pointwise Mutual Information	-0.40±0.01	-0.12±0.01	-0.01±0.01	-0.02±0.01	0.62±0.01	0.06±0.02	22.1
Conditional Pointwise Mutual Information	-0.58±0.01	-0.25±0.01	-0.37±0.01	-0.37±0.01	0.38±0.01	-0.18±0.01	26.0
RenyiNeg	0.09±0.01	-0.05±0.01	-0.55±0.01	-0.57±0.01	0.15±0.01	-0.28±0.01	25.2
FisherRao	0.09±0.01	-0.04±0.01	-0.57±0.01	-0.60±0.01	0.15±0.01	-0.29±0.01	25.4
TokenSAR	0.43±0.01	0.47±0.01	0.78±0.01	0.76±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.13±0.01	10.2
CCP	0.45±0.01	0.42±0.01	0.74±0.01	0.72±0.01	0.69±0.01	0.31±0.01	11.8
Semantic Entropy	0.55±0.01	0.48±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.62±0.01	0.47±0.01	8.3
SentenceSAR	0.63±0.01	0.51±0.01	0.77±0.01	0.77±0.01	0.66±0.01	0.06±0.01	7.3
SAR	0.47±0.01	0.49±0.01	0.77±0.01	0.78±0.01	0.65±0.01	0.49±0.01	5.2
Mahalanobis Distance – Decoder	0.02±0.01	-0.03±0.01	-0.14±0.01	-0.22±0.01	0.07±0.01	0.31±0.02	22.7
Relative Mahalanobis Distance – Decoder	0.01±0.01	-0.04±0.01	-0.14±0.01	-0.22±0.01	-0.14±0.01	0.31±0.02	23.4
RDE – Decoder	0.03±0.01	0.05±0.01	0.02±0.01	0.00±0.01	0.10±0.01	0.28±0.02	21.3
HUQ–MD – Decoder	0.41±0.01	0.45±0.01	0.80±0.01	0.77±0.01	0.64±0.01	0.43±0.01	8.8
P(True)	-0.17±0.01	-0.07±0.01	-0.12±0.01	-0.16±0.01	-0.02±0.01	-0.11±0.01	25.0
NumSemSets	0.14±0.01	0.23±0.01	0.66±0.01	0.74±0.01	0.57±0.01	0.19±0.02	18.5
EigVallaplacian NLI Score entail.	0.46±0.01	0.48±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.76±0.01	0.60±0.01	0.33±0.01	11.7
EigVallaplacian Jaccard Score	0.39±0.01	0.41±0.01	0.70±0.01	0.72±0.01	0.58±0.01	0.42±0.01	16.3
DegMat NLI Score entail.	0.45±0.01	0.49±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.78±0.01	0.61±0.01	0.40±0.01	9.1
DegMat Jaccard Score	0.52±0.01	0.47±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.74±0.01	0.62±0.01	0.44±0.01	9.6
Eccentricity NLI Score entail.	0.51±0.01	0.47±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.75±0.01	0.57±0.01	0.45±0.01	10.8
Eccentricity Jaccard Score	0.55±0.01	0.45±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.57±0.01	0.40±0.02	13.8
Lexical Similarity Rouge–L	0.51±0.01	0.49±0.01	0.73±0.01	0.74±0.01	0.62±0.01	0.51±0.01	7.9
Lexical Similarity BLEU	0.54±0.01	0.46±0.01	0.71±0.01	0.72±0.01	0.62±0.01	0.45±0.01	10.9

Table 8: PRR↑ with various generation quality metrics for UQ methods in selective classification tasks with the Mistral 7b v0.2 model. Darker color indicates better results.

UQ Method	XSUM		WMT14 Fr-En		WMT19 De-En		Mean Rank	Mean Rank (w/o XSUM)↓
	Rouge-L	AlignScore	Comet	AlignScore	Comet	AlignScore		
Maximum Sequence Probability	-0.48±0.01	-0.15±0.00	0.45±0.01	0.23±0.01	0.59±0.00	0.18±0.01	12.4	4.6
Perplexity	-0.20±0.01	-0.05±0.00	0.36±0.01	0.11±0.01	0.38±0.00	0.13±0.01	20.7	19.3
Mean Token Entropy	-0.25±0.01	0.00±0.00	0.38±0.01	0.13±0.01	0.41±0.00	0.18±0.01	15.5	13.1
Monte Carlo Sequence Entropy	0.09±0.01	-0.01±0.00	0.43±0.01	0.21±0.01	0.56±0.00	0.22±0.01	7.6	5.8
Monte Carlo Normalized Sequence Entropy	0.06±0.01	0.03±0.00	0.39±0.01	0.09±0.01	0.44±0.00	0.12±0.01	15.6	17.3
Pointwise Mutual Information	0.12±0.01	0.09±0.00	0.01±0.01	-0.03±0.01	0.01±0.00	-0.05±0.01	18.2	25.5
Conditional Pointwise Mutual Information	0.27±0.01	0.05±0.00	-0.15±0.01	-0.02±0.01	-0.19±0.01	-0.16±0.01	19.6	26.3
RenyiNeg	0.05±0.01	-0.07±0.00	-0.28±0.01	-0.01±0.01	-0.27±0.01	-0.17±0.01	24.5	27.1
FisherRao	0.03±0.01	-0.07±0.00	-0.26±0.01	-0.01±0.01	-0.27±0.01	-0.17±0.01	24.8	26.9
TokenSAR	-0.26±0.01	-0.01±0.00	0.37±0.01	0.12±0.01	0.41±0.00	0.15±0.01	18.3	16.5
CCP	-0.13±0.01	-0.06±0.00	0.39±0.01	0.17±0.01	0.40±0.00	0.16±0.01	16.4	13.0
Semantic Entropy	0.09±0.01	-0.01±0.00	0.44±0.01	0.24±0.01	0.58±0.00	0.28±0.01	6.1	3.5
SentenceSAR	-0.03±0.01	-0.04±0.00	0.44±0.01	0.23±0.01	0.58±0.00	0.21±0.01	9.8	4.9
SAR	0.07±0.01	0.07±0.00	0.45±0.01	0.16±0.01	0.51±0.00	0.22±0.01	7.0	6.6
Mahalanobis Distance – Decoder	-0.06±0.01	-0.08±0.00	0.05±0.01	0.18±0.01	0.10±0.01	0.16±0.01	19.5	17.1
Relative Mahalanobis Distance – Decoder	0.04±0.01	-0.06±0.00	0.07±0.01	0.18±0.01	0.09±0.00	0.16±0.01	17.8	17.3
RDE – Decoder	-0.04±0.01	0.11±0.00	0.08±0.01	0.16±0.01	0.10±0.01	0.22±0.01	13.9	15.3
HUQ–MD – Decoder	-0.19±0.01	-0.04±0.00	0.35±0.01	0.20±0.01	0.39±0.00	0.13±0.01	18.3	16.4
P(True)	-0.06±0.01	-0.03±0.00	0.21±0.01	0.15±0.01	0.22±0.00	0.16±0.01	18.2	17.1
NumSemSets	0.02±0.01	0.05±0.00	-0.01±0.01	0.09±0.01	0.02±0.00	0.12±0.01	20.6	23.8
EigValLaplacian NLI Score entail.	0.07±0.01	0.06±0.00	0.37±0.01	0.28±0.01	0.49±0.00	0.45±0.01	7.6	6.9
EigValLaplacian Jaccard Score	0.09±0.01	0.12±0.00	0.41±0.01	0.11±0.01	0.49±0.00	0.16±0.01	9.7	12.9
DegMat NLI Score entail.	0.07±0.01	0.06±0.00	0.37±0.01	0.28±0.01	0.49±0.00	0.45±0.01	7.6	6.9
DegMat Jaccard Score	0.09±0.01	0.11±0.00	0.43±0.01	0.12±0.01	0.51±0.00	0.16±0.01	8.7	7.0
Eccentricity NLI Score entail.	0.06±0.01	0.06±0.00	0.37±0.01	0.28±0.01	0.49±0.00	0.44±0.01	8.3	11.3
Eccentricity Jaccard Score	-0.01±0.01	-0.00±0.00	0.3±0.01	0.06±0.01	0.45±0.00	0.15±0.01	17.8	18.5
Lexical Similarity Rouge–L	0.10±0.01	0.10±0.00	0.43±0.01	0.12±0.01	0.52±0.00	0.20±0.01	7.3	9.3
Lexical Similarity BLEU	0.04±0.01	0.07±0.00	0.38±0.01	0.10±0.01	0.44±0.00	0.15±0.01	14.3	16.3

Table 9: PRR↑ with various generation quality metrics for UQ methods in selective generation tasks with the StableLM 12b v2 model. Darker color indicates better results.

UQ Method	XSUM		WMT14 Fr-En		WMT19 De-En		Mean Rank	Mean Rank (w/o XSUM)
	Rouge-L	AlignScore	Comet	AlignScore	Comet	AlignScore		
Maximum Sequence Probability	-0.14±0.00	-0.08±0.01	0.42±0.02	0.23±0.01	0.57±0.01	0.25±0.01	10.2	3.8
Perplexity	-0.26±0.00	-0.00±0.01	0.41±0.02	0.20±0.01	0.51±0.01	0.23±0.01	12.8	8.3
Mean Token Entropy	-0.18±0.00	-0.04±0.01	0.42±0.02	0.21±0.01	0.50±0.01	0.23±0.01	12.1	7.6
Monte Carlo Sequence Entropy	0.12±0.01	0.02±0.01	0.36±0.02	0.21±0.01	0.51±0.01	0.24±0.01	9.2	8.8
Monte Carlo Normalized Sequence Entropy	0.12±0.00	0.04±0.01	0.39±0.02	0.16±0.01	0.50±0.01	0.22±0.01	10.7	11.9
Pointwise Mutual Information	-0.02±0.00	0.02±0.01	0.06±0.02	-0.01±0.01	0.08±0.01	0.03±0.01	19.7	22.5
Conditional Pointwise Mutual Information	0.15±0.01	-0.00±0.01	-0.10±0.02	-0.03±0.01	-0.06±0.01	0.03±0.01	20.2	25.1
RenyiNeg	-0.20±0.00	-0.10±0.01	-0.21±0.03	-0.07±0.01	-0.26±0.01	-0.09±0.01	26.9	27.3
FisherRao	-0.18±0.00	-0.09±0.01	-0.22±0.03	-0.06±0.01	-0.27±0.01	-0.11±0.01	26.6	27.8
TokenSAR	-0.19±0.00	-0.05±0.01	0.41±0.02	0.20±0.01	0.50±0.01	0.24±0.01	13.2	8.4
CCP	-0.49±0.00	-0.12±0.01	0.37±0.02	0.19±0.01	0.44±0.01	0.21±0.01	18.5	13.8
Semantic Entropy	0.12±0.00	0.02±0.01	0.38±0.02	0.24±0.01	0.54±0.01	0.30±0.01	6.7	5.0
SentenceSAR	-0.13±0.01	-0.01±0.01	0.37±0.02	0.21±0.01	0.52±0.01	0.22±0.01	12.3	9.0
SAR	0.17±0.00	0.09±0.01	0.42±0.02	0.24±0.01	0.55±0.01	0.30±0.01	3.2	3.3
Mahalanobis Distance – Decoder	0.03±0.01	-0.06±0.00	0.04±0.02	0.14±0.01	0.08±0.01	0.18±0.01	19.4	20.4
Relative Mahalanobis Distance – Decoder	-0.02±0.01	0.02±0.01	0.02±0.02	0.12±0.01	-0.03±0.01	0.10±0.01	19.8	22.8
RDE – Decoder	-0.10±0.00	0.08±0.01	-0.08±0.02	0.09±0.01	-0.14±0.01	-0.07±0.01	20.3	24.8
HUQ–MD – Decoder	-0.20±0.00	-0.05±0.01	0.41±0.02	0.20±0.01	0.52±0.01	0.23±0.01	13.0	7.8
P(True)	-0.12±0.00	-0.07±0.01	0.14±0.02	0.07±0.01	0.03±0.01	-0.00±0.01	22.4	22.9
NumSemSets	0.08±0.00	0.10±0.01	0.04±0.02	0.08±0.01	0.03±0.01	0.15±0.01	17.0	22.3
EigValLaplacian NLI Score entail.	0.07±0.01	0.11±0.01	0.28±0.02	0.30±0.01	0.42±0.01	0.42±0.01	9.5	11.0
EigValLaplacian Jaccard Score	0.15±0.01	0.06±0.01	0.32±0.02	0.13±0.01	0.44±0.01	0.20±0.01	13.7	17.6
DegMat NLI Score entail.	0.09±0.01	0.13±0.01	0.30±0.02	0.31±0.01	0.44±0.01	0.44±0.01	8.1	9.6
DegMat Jaccard Score	0.15±0.01	0.07±0.01	0.37±0.02	0.17±0.01	0.50±0.01	0.21±0.01	10.2	12.8
Eccentricity NLI Score entail.	-0.02±0.01	0.04±0.01	0.32±0.02	0.32±0.01	0.47±0.01	0.46±0.01	9.5	8.1
Eccentricity Jaccard Score	-0.03±0.00	-0.04±0.01	0.36±0.02	0.18±0.01	0.49±0.01	0.20±0.01	15.7	14.4
Lexical Similarity Rouge–L	0.18±0.01	0.06±0.01	0.36±0.02	0.17±0.01	0.50±0.01	0.23±0.01	9.6	12.3
Lexical Similarity BLEU	0.02±0.00	0.02±0.01	0.35±0.02	0.14±0.01	0.44±0.01	0.19±0.01	15.8	17.3

Table 10: PRR↑ with various generation quality metrics for UQ methods in selective generation tasks with the Mistral 7b v0.2 model. Darker color indicates better results.

F Additional Experimental Results with Uncertainty Normalization

UQ Method	Linear	Quantile	Binned PCC	Isotonic PCC
MaximumSequenceProbability	0.000	0.000	-0.050	0.000
Perplexity	0.000	0.000	0.018	0.000
MeanTokenEntropy	0.000	0.000	-0.009	0.000
MonteCarloSequenceEntropy	0.000	0.000	-0.068	0.000
MonteCarloNormalizedSequenceEntropy	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.001
MeanPointwiseMutualInformation	0.000	0.000	-0.314	0.000
MeanConditionalPointwiseMutualInformation	0.000	0.000	-0.224	0.009
RenyiNeg	0.000	0.000	-0.144	0.000
FisherRao	0.000	0.001	-0.146	0.000
TokenSAR	0.000	0.000	0.024	0.000
CCP	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
SemanticEntropy	0.000	0.000	-0.024	0.000
SentenceSAR	0.000	0.000	-0.013	0.000
SAR	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
PTrue	0.000	0.000	-0.761	-0.009
NumSemSets	0.000	0.000	0.528	0.000
EigValLaplacian_NLI_score_entail	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.001
EigValLaplacian_Jaccard_score	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
DegMat_NLI_score_entail	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.001
DegMat_Jaccard_score	0.000	0.001	0.068	0.000
Eccentricity_NLI_score_entail	0.000	0.001	0.017	0.000
Eccentricity_Jaccard_score	0.000	-0.001	0.096	0.023
LexicalSimilarity_rougeL	0.000	0.001	0.073	0.000

Table 11: The difference between PRR of raw uncertainty and bounded confidence obtained with various normalization techniques. The lower is better; negative values represent cases when confidence performs better than raw uncertainty scores.

G LLM Text Generation Quality

CoQA		TriviaQA		MMLU	GSM8k	XSum		WMT14 Fr-En		WMT19 De-En	
Accuracy	AlignScore	Accuracy	AlignScore	Accuracy	Accuracy	Rouge-L	AlignScore	Comet	AlignScore	Comet	AlignScore
0.57	0.79	0.64	0.74	0.61	0.38	0.23	0.04	0.86	0.84	0.86	0.81

Table 12: Generation quality metrics for the Mistral 7 v0.2 model for various tasks.

CoQA		TriviaQA		MMLU	GSM8k	XSum		WMT14 Fr-En		WMT19 De-En	
Accuracy	AlignScore	Accuracy	AlignScore	Accuracy	Accuracy	Rouge-L	AlignScore	Comet	AlignScore	Comet	AlignScore
0.47	0.77	0.57	0.70	0.51	0.55	0.21	0.09	0.87	0.85	0.88	0.84

Table 13: Generation quality metrics for the StableLM 12b v2 model for various tasks.