

Chain-of-Probe: Examining the Necessity and Accuracy of CoT Step-by-Step

Zezhong Wang^{1*}, Xingshan Zeng², Weiwen Liu², Yufei Wang², Liangyou Li²,
Yasheng Wang², Lifeng Shang², Xin Jiang², Qun Liu², Kam-Fai Wong¹

¹The Chinese University of Hong Kong, ²Huawei Noah’s Ark Lab

{zzwang, kfwong}@se.cuhk.edu.hk

{zeng.xingshan, liuweiw8, wang.yufei1, liliangyou}@huawei.com

{wangyasheng, Shang.Lifeng, Jiang.Xin, qun.liu}@huawei.com

Abstract

Current research found the issue of Early Answering in large language models (LLMs), where the models already have an answer before generating the Chain-of-Thought (CoT). This phenomenon suggests a potential lack of necessary dependency between the predicted answer and the reasoning process. Consequently, two important questions arise: (1) Is CoT still necessary if the model already has an answer? (2) Can the correctness of the answer serve as valid evidence for the correctness of CoT? To address these questions, we propose a method, namely Chain-of-Probe (CoP), to probe changes in the mind during the model’s reasoning. The probing results show that in a significant number of question-answer cases, CoT appears to be unnecessary, and this necessity correlates with the simplicity of the task, defined by reasoning steps required. Furthermore, by analyzing patterns in mind change, we examine the correctness of the model’s reasoning. Our validation reveals that many responses, although correct in their final answer, contain errors in their reasoning process. To this end, we propose a strategic approach based on CoP to prioritize answers with correct reasoning among multiple candidates, thereby bolstering the reliability of the model’s reasoning.

1 Introduction

Chain-of-Thought (CoT) has been widely proven to effectively improve the accuracy of Large Language Models (LLMs) in reasoning tasks. However, recent research (Lanham et al., 2023; Turpin et al., 2023) found the issue of Early Answering in LLMs, where LLMs have already predicted an answer before generating the CoT. This implies that in many cases, the contribution of CoT to the model’s final prediction is limited (Lyu et al., 2023; Ben-tham et al., 2024; Parcalabescu and Frank, 2024;




Figure 1: Diagram of early answering and Chain-of-Probe. Line graphs illustrate several typical patterns of confidence changes.

Yeo et al., 2024), or even unnecessary. On the other hand, if the model’s predicted answer does not necessarily depend on the CoT, we cannot judge the correctness of the model’s reasoning by examining the answers. Even if the model predicts correct answers, it is unreliable if the CoT is incorrect (Zhang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024; Sui et al., 2024).

In order to effectively evaluate the necessity and accuracy of CoT, we propose a probing method, namely Chain-of-Probe (CoP), to detect the changes in the model’s thought during reasoning. Specifically, after the model completes each step of reasoning, we ask it to output a prediction based on the current reasoning and record its confidence. We believe that the changes in confidence can help us understand the impact of each step of reasoning on the model’s decision-making process.

Based on CoP, we investigate the issue of early answering, with the goal to analyze the underlying causes of early answering, thereby determining when the CoT is necessary. We first conduct statistical analysis on multiple-choice reasoning datasets. Results show that all LLMs exhibit the issue of early answering (i.e., choosing the same answer throughout the entire reasoning process) on a large number of question-answer cases. More surprisingly, the accuracy of the predictions when the models exhibit early answering is significantly higher than the accuracy obtained when changing

*Work done during the internship at Huawei Noah’s Ark Lab.

their minds during the reasoning process (generally exceeding 20%). This seems to contradict the view that CoT can improve model performance.

We further analyze the correlation between early answering and accuracy and find that early answering is linked to question difficulty: the model tends to predict answers in advance for simpler questions. This suggests that CoT is often unnecessary for simple questions. For challenging questions, CoT is more likely to alter the model’s initial choice, though not always positively. Our analysis also indicates that higher model confidence during reasoning correlates with a higher likelihood of correctness. Based on this, we propose the CoP Score to evaluate and select CoTs, aiming for more positive improvements. Experiments demonstrate that selecting responses based on the CoP Score achieves accuracy comparable to majority voting.

Selection based on the CoP score is relatively optimal among the candidates. However, it does not guarantee the correctness of the processes within CoT. The correctness of CoT is equally crucial as part of the model’s output, reflecting the reliability of the answers. Our further experiments reveal that about 20% of CoTs with correct answers include reasoning errors. In subsequent case studies combining CoP, we observe a significant decrease in confidence when the model makes incorrect steps in its reasoning process. Based on this insight, we extract features from CoP to train a decision tree, called CoP Tree, which is used to identify CoT that may contain errors. We propose to resample if errors are identified by the CoP Tree. Such inference method improves the model’s overall accuracy by 13% in average across different models when evaluating also considering CoT correctness.

We summarize our contribution into the following three key points:

- We propose a novel method, Chain-of-Probe (CoP), to detect changes in model thoughts.
- We identify that the problem of early answering in the model is due to the simplicity of the questions, making CoT unnecessary.
- We find that the change pattern of confidence during the model’s reasoning can be used to examine the correctness of the model’s CoT and answers, thus improve overall accuracy.

2 Related Works

Extensive research has shown that CoT techniques significantly improve the reasoning abilities of

LLMs (Wei et al., 2023). However, Lanham et al. (2023) highlights an issue known as early answering, where models arrive at the answer before the CoT is fully generated. Their experiments found that even if the CoT is forcibly interrupted or erroneous information is added, the model still arrives at the same answer. Additionally, Turpin et al. (2023)’s research suggests that models often “pre-think” the answer and then generate the CoT around that answer. These early answering phenomena suggest that the model’s final prediction does not necessarily rely on the CoT it generates. Similarly, some work (Parcalabescu and Frank, 2024; Paul et al., 2024) found that LLMs are not always faithful in using their intermediate reasoning steps when generating answers. Li et al. (2024) discovered that while the CoT sometimes misses critical context, the model often recalls this information directly from the context when answering. These observations suggest that LLMs often answer questions without depending on CoT (Lyu et al., 2023; Bentham et al., 2024; Yeo et al., 2024).

Besides, as the model’s final prediction might not necessarily depend on the generated CoT, evaluating the accuracy of the CoT based on the final answer becomes inaccurate. The quality of the CoT, as part of the model’s response, is equally important (Lightman et al., 2023). Deriving correct answers from flawed reasoning remains unreliable (Zhang et al., 2023). As a result, increasing efforts focus on improving the accuracy of the model’s reasoning process rather than just the accuracy of the prediction results (Radhakrishnan et al., 2023). FiDeLiS (Sui et al., 2024) uses an external knowledge graph to enhance CoT accuracy. Another, the Selection-Inference (SI) model (Creswell and Shanahan, 2022), includes a value function to assess the quality of reasoning steps, guiding beam search to improve reasoning quality. Additionally, there are some methods (Ji et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2023) that allow models to recheck their reasoning and correct any errors after generating CoT to ensure its accuracy. While these methods improve CoT accuracy, they introduce significant additional costs, such as requiring an external module or an extra round of inference.

3 Methodology

In this section, we propose a Probing method, namely, CoP. Essentially, after the model generates each step of reasoning, we prompt it to predict




Figure 2: The pipeline of Chain-of-Probe with a running example. Yellow boxes represent each reasoning step in the CoT. Gray boxes denote predefined probing strings. In this case, {A, B, C, D} serves as the target token set, with each probing collecting the model’s predicted probabilities for these four tokens (illustrated by yellow bar charts).

an answer and record the corresponding confidence. Figure 2 illustrates the process of CoP.

We denote the input to the model as x , i.e., the prompt, and the i -th step in the CoT generated by the model as s_i . We also introduce a probing string a_* , such as, "So, the answer is (" . We expect the model to predict an answer after concatenating a_* to each step, like a choice index A or B for multiple-choice questions. We then define a target token set \mathcal{V} that includes all the possible answers, such as {A, B, C, D}, etc. This set needs to be customized based on the specific used datasets. After the model generates the i -th step of reasoning s_i , we concatenate a_* to s_i , using the model to predict the word distribution of the next token:

$$P(y|x; s_{1:i}; a_*) = \text{softmax LLM}(x; s_{1:i}; a_*) \quad (1)$$

We extract the probabilities corresponding to the tokens defined in the set \mathcal{V} from the word distribution, which serves as the confidence set for the i -th step encompassing all possible final predictions:

$$c_i = [p_i^v \mid v \in \mathcal{V}] \quad (2)$$

where $p_i^v = P(y = v \mid x; s_{1:i}; a_*)$

Notably, we also do a probe before the model’s reasoning (i.e., the model only read the prompt). The result of this initial probe is denoted as c_0 , which can be regarded as the direct answer without any CoT. Then, we divide the reasoning process according to sentences, and after each sentence, we probe once based on Equation (1) and (2). At the end of the CoT generation, we can collect a confidence matrix $c = [c_0, \dots, c_k] \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1) \times |\mathcal{V}|}$, where k is the number of reasoning steps.

In practice, we propose a **cache fallback** algorithm to reduce redundant calculations, thereby conserving substantial computational resources. Specifically, we only maintain the Key-Value (KV) cache (Vaswani et al., 2017) generated during the CoT process, denoted as \mathcal{M} . The KV cache generated after the i -th reasoning step is $\mathcal{M}_i = \{m_x, m_{s_1}, \dots, m_{s_i}\}$, where $m_{(*)}$ represents the cache produced by the corresponding sequence encoding. During probing, m_{a_*} is generated and temporarily added to KV cache, $\mathcal{M}_i \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_i \cup \{m_{a_*}\}$. After obtaining the probing result, m_{a_*} is removed from \mathcal{M}_i , allowing the process to revert from probing back to the CoT generation, and continue with the next step. In this way, we circumvent redundant calculations, thereby conserving substantial computational resources. The additional computational overhead during the probing process is reduced to the generation of $k \times l$ tokens, where l represents the length of the probing string.

4 Experiments

4.1 Settings

We mainly conduct our experiments on the following three datasets:

- **Massive Multitask Language Understanding (MMLU)** includes approximately 16,000 multiple-choice questions across 57 academic subjects, which are categorized into four super categories: STEM, Humanities, Social Science, and Other. (Hendrycks et al., 2021).
- **AI2 Reasoning Challenge (ARC)** is a set of grade-school science questions, consisting of two subsets: ARC-Easy with 2,376 sam-




Figure 3: The left figure shows the early answering ratio in the model on the MMLU and BBH datasets. The right two figures compare the model’s accuracy on these datasets, distinguishing between cases with early answering (EA) issues and those without (Not EA).

ples and ARC-Challenge with 1,172 samples. (Clark et al., 2018).

- **BIG-Bench Hard Multiple-Choice (BBH MC)** is the multiple-choice subset of BBH (Suzgun et al., 2022), including 4074 samples of 17 tasks from BBH.

All experiments use a 5-shot setup. CoT for demonstrations in MMLU and BBH experiments come from the *Chain-of-Thought Hub* (Fu et al., 2023), while for ARC experiments, it is manually annotated by our team. For detailed information, including prompting templates and ARC demonstrations, please refer to Appendix A.1. In all experiments, we use half-precision (float16) for inference. For the experiments using sampling decoding, we set the temperature to 0.7, top-k to 40, and top-p to 0.9.

The models used in the experiments include LLaMA-2 (7B, 13B, 70B) (Touvron et al., 2023), Vicuna 7B (Chiang et al., 2023), Mistral 7B (Jiang et al., 2023), LLaMA-3 8B (Meta Team, 2024), and Qwen2 7B (Qwen Team, 2024) (Refer to Appendix A.2 for detailed checkpoint versions).

In the following sections, we use CoP to first analyze the causes of early answering in LLMs. Next, we examine the correlation between model confidence and accuracy, and design a candidate answer selection strategy, validating it across three datasets. Finally, through case analysis and pattern recognition, we identify abnormal changes in model confidence during reasoning, allowing us to exclude CoT with potential reasoning errors.

4.2 Early Answering Issue Analysis

In this experiment, we systematically conduct a statistical analysis of the early answering issue in open-source models and examined the causes.

4.2.1 Early Answering Criterion

We define the early answering issue as the model consistently choosing the same answer throughout the entire reasoning process. Given the confidence matrix $c = [c_0, \dots, c_k]$ obtained from probing, we take the index of the highest probability in each row as the prediction for that step, i.e.,

$$\hat{j} = [j_0, \dots, j_k],$$

where $j_i = \arg \max_j (c_{ij} \mid j = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{V}|)$. (3)

If the prediction for each step matches the model’s final prediction, we consider that the model has not changed its choice during the reasoning, indicating an early answering issue. The process can be described as follows:

$$y = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j_i = j^* \text{ for all } i \in \{0, \dots, k\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $y = 1$ indicates that the early answering issue occurred, and $y = 0$ indicates that it did not.

4.2.2 Early Answering Statistical Analysis

Based on this criterion, we conduct experiments on four models across three datasets and reported the **Early Answering Ratio (EAR)**, indicating the percentage of instances where the model exhibits early answering issues.

From the first sub-figure of Figure 3, we find that early answering is a common issue across all models instead of an isolated incident. For example, on MMLU, multiple models exhibit early answering in nearly half of the cases, indicating that half of the CoTs might be unnecessary. We further analyze the accuracy of the models both when early answering occurs and when it does not, as shown in Figure 3. Surprisingly, when the model changes its decision after generating a CoT, its accuracy tends




Figure 4: Relationship between EAR and accuracy. The two graphs on the left show the results of four models on the MMLU and BBH datasets. The right part shows the results of the LLaMA-2 7b model on the MMLU dataset, categorized by disciplines. Gaussian smoothing, with $\sigma=1$ and $\text{order}=0$, was applied to each line to better observe overall trends.




Figure 5: The ratio of CoT changing answers from True to False versus from False to True.

to be lower. This contradicts the belief that CoT enhances performance.

4.2.3 Cause of Early Answering

To investigate the reasons behind the "negative effect of CoT," we further analyze the relationship between EAR and accuracy and plot the experimental results of the MMLU and BBH datasets on Figure 4. From the left two sub-figures, we can observe a positive correlation between EAR and accuracy across all models in both datasets. This observation is consistent with our previous finding that models achieve higher accuracy when the early answering issue occurs. If we use accuracy as an indicator of task difficulty — i.e., higher accuracy indicating that the task is relatively easy for the model, and vice versa — we can draw the following finding:

Finding 1: Easier tasks (i.e., those with higher accuracy) are more likely to lead to early answering. This suggests that CoT may not be necessary for those easy tasks.

Intuitively, simpler questions require less reasoning steps and can often be answered directly. We

further categorize the results of LLaMA-2 7b on the MMLU dataset to investigate the relationship between EAR and Accuracy across various disciplines. The results are shown in the right sub-figure of Figure 4. Overall, the trend observed across disciplines remains consistent: higher accuracy correlates with a higher EAR. By comparing the curves of different disciplines, we find that STEM, in particular, shows a lower EAR compared to others, which implies that STEM may require more reasoning compared to other disciplines. This observation also aligns with our intuition.

In essence, the questions where CoT can be effective tend to be more challenging, resulting in naturally lower accuracy, rather than CoT having negative effects. In fact, when CoT influences model decisions, there are generally more correct adjustments than incorrect ones on a macro scale (refer to Figure 5 and Appendix B.1). This is why CoT can enhance model performance. Hence, could we discern whether a CoT is a positive or negative process, thus eliminating CoTs that lead to incorrect adjustments? We explore the answer in the next two subsections.

4.3 Positive CoTs discrimination

4.3.1 CoP Score

To select positive CoT, we attempt to identify indicators from probing results that evaluate the quality of CoT and assign corresponding scores. According to Equation (3) and (4), early answering essentially refers to the model maintaining high confidence in its predictions throughout the entire reasoning process. We hypothesize that there is also a correlation between confidence and accuracy, such as higher confidence in reasoning being

Acc (%)	Vicuna 7b	Mistral 7b	LLaMA-3 8b	Qwen2 7b	LLaMA-2 7b	LLaMA-2 13b	LLaMA-2 70b	Avg.
<i>MMLU</i>								
GS	52.5	62.7	67.2	70.5	49.7	55.9	69.0	61.1
Maj@5	53.6	64.5	69.1	73.0	51.3	57.7	70.6	62.8
CoPS@5	54.7 (+1.1)	64.4 (-0.1)	70.2 (+1.1)	72.1 (-0.9)	52.7 (+1.4)	59.0 (+1.3)	69.9 (-0.7)	63.3
<i>BBH</i>								
GS	45.7	56.5	71.4	65.7	44.1	48.2	63.1	56.4
Maj@5	46.9	59.2	74.0	68.7	44.6	49.6	68.5	58.8
CoPS@5	48.5 (+1.6)	58.9 (-0.3)	73.4 (-0.6)	70.1 (+1.4)	45.5 (+0.9)	50.8 (+1.2)	69.5 (+1.0)	59.5
<i>ARC-Easy</i>								
GS	81.0	89.4	93.5	94.9	83.0	88.4	93.4	89.1
Maj@5	83.3	90.9	94.2	95.7	84.5	88.7	94.5	90.3
CoPS@5	84.3 (+1.0)	92.2 (+1.3)	95.2 (+1.0)	96.9 (+1.2)	84.8 (+0.3)	89.0 (+0.3)	95.8 (+1.3)	91.2
<i>ARC-Challenge</i>								
GS	66.9	82.2	86.1	88.7	69.2	73.2	84.0	78.6
Maj@5	72.2	82.8	87.1	91.0	71.4	77.4	88.1	81.4
CoPS@5	73.0 (+0.8)	84.1 (+1.3)	87.4 (+0.3)	91.3 (+0.3)	73.3 (+1.9)	78.4 (+1.0)	88.4 (+0.3)	82.3
Avg.	+1.1	+0.6	+0.5	+0.5	+1.1	+0.9	+0.5	+0.7

Table 1: The comparison results of CoT selection. GS, Maj@5, and $S@5$ indicate the settings of greedy search, 5-time sampling with majority vote, and 5-time sampling with the CoP score (our method), respectively. The best result is highlighted in **bold**. The improvements of $S@5$ compared with Maj@5 are listed in parentheses, with the positive improvements marked in **red**. The last row shows the average improvement of $S@5$ compared to Maj@5.




Figure 6: The correlation between CoP Score and Accuracy. Positive correlation is found between them.

more likely to yield accurate answers. To verify this, we track the confidence associated with the final prediction v^* at each step of probing to observe the trend of the model’s confidence during reasoning. Then, we defined a metric, namely **CoP Score** as:

$$\text{CoPS} = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{i=0}^k p_i^{v^*} + \frac{1}{k} \underbrace{(p_k^{v^*} - p_0^{v^*})}_{\sum_{i=1}^k (p_i^{v^*} - p_{i-1}^{v^*})} \quad (5)$$

The first term measures the model’s average confidence during the reasoning process, while the second evaluates the average change in confidence. Intuitively, higher confidence or greater increases in confidence suggest that CoT benefits the final prediction, making these CoTs more likely to have a positive impact.

To further verify whether the CoP Score accu-

rately reflects the quality of CoT, we perform a correlation analysis between the CoP Score and Accuracy. Based on the probing results, we compute a CoP Score for each CoT and sorted them accordingly. Then, we partition the sorted CoT set into 10 sections and calculate the accuracy within each section. We plot a line graph in Figure 6 using the accuracy and average CoP Score of each section as coordinates.

Figure 6 reveals a clear positive correlation between the CoP score and accuracy. As the CoP score essentially represents model confidence, we can further draw the following finding:

Finding 2: *The model is confident during the inference process (high CoP Score), often resulting in accurate predictions.*

This result also validates our hypothesis: using the CoP Score to guide the selection of better CoTs is potentially feasible.

4.3.2 CoT Selection Strategy

Based on the correlation analysis, we evaluate CoP Score’s ability to select CoT across three datasets: MMLU, BBH, and ARC. For each question, we have LLMs sample five responses and extract the corresponding CoP. Then, we calculate the CoP Score for each response based on the CoP, and select the response with the highest CoP Score as the final prediction. We compare our method ($S@5$) against five-time sampling with majority voting (Maj@5) and greedy search (GS). The experiment

Model	TAFCR (%)	GS (%)	CoPS@3(%)	CoPT (%)	P (%)	R (%)	F1(%)	# Samp.
Vicuna 7b	26.7	49.1	55.3	67.6	84.1	67.2	74.7	4.17
Mistral 7b	22.5	63.7	70.7	76.4	89.6	69.3	78.1	3.89
LLaMA-3 8b	21.7	67.4	70.6	78.9	91.0	70.3	79.3	3.53
Qwen2 7b	19.5	71.4	75.3	82.8	91.2	70.6	79.6	3.12
LLaMA-2 7b	19.9	55.4	60.1	68.7	81.4	72.5	76.7	4.34
LLaMA-2 13b	17.4	60.5	65.3	72.8	87.5	67.1	76.0	3.87
LLaMA-2 70b	20.4	66.9	76.8	81.1	91.1	71.1	79.8	4.03
Avg.	21.1	62.0	67.7	75.5	88.0	69.7	77.7	3.89

Table 2: Results of reasoning step correctness verification on ARC-Challenge. TA-FCR stands for True Answer with False CoT Ratio. GS, CoPS@3, and CoPT represent the CoT accuracy under the greedy search, 3-time sampling with the CoP score, and CoP Tree resampling settings, respectively. P, R, and F1 represent precision, recall, and F1-score of the prediction of the CoP Tree, respectively. The groundtruth labels are derived from GPT-4. "# sample" indicates the average sampling times with the decision tree resampling strategy.

result is shown in Table 1. The results show that choosing answers based on the CoP score yields marginally better accuracy compared to using multiple voting. Compared to Maj@5, S@5 achieves an average improvement of over 1% across several models (Vicuna 7b and LLaMA-2 7b). When compared across different models, selecting answers based on CoP Score yields even greater improvements for weaker models (earlier or smaller models). Furthermore, based on the CoP score, we can directly choose the best model’s response. In contrast, multiple voting can only guide the selection of the final answer, e.g. A, B, C, or D.

Notably, selection based on the CoP score is relatively optimal among the candidates. While it is more likely to contain the correct answer and the model has higher confidence in it, we still cannot ensure that every reasoning step is accurate. As part of the model output, the correctness of the CoT is equally important. Obtaining numerous correct answers based on flawed reasoning remains unreliable. To delve deeper into the correctness of each step within CoT, we transition from macro-level correlation analysis to examining the underlying patterns of confidence.

4.4 Reasoning Step Correctness Verification

4.4.1 True Answer, False CoT

We first investigate the ratio of responses with correct answers but false CoT. We collect responses generated by the seven models for the questions in the ARC-Challenge dataset. Then we ask GPT-4¹ (OpenAI et al., 2024) to check whether those responses are correct, considering any CoT with even a single error as incorrect (refer to Appendix A.3

for details). We define a metric, namely True Answer with False CoT Ratio (TAFCR), to evaluate this situation:

$$\text{TAFCR} = \frac{\#\text{TA} \cap \text{FC}}{\#\text{TA}} \quad (6)$$

We report TAFCR in Table 2. The results show that around 20% of the "correct" responses contain errors in their CoT. However, according to the Exact Match (EM) metric for answers, these cases are marked as correct in the current benchmark. We summarize the following findings:

Finding 3: Due to the limitations of current reasoning evaluating benchmark, many models are overestimated. Relying solely on answer matching to assess LLMs’ reasoning abilities lacks rigor and reliability.

Ensuring the correctness of the reasoning is crucial, but using AI tools like GPT-4 for verification is too expensive. There is a need for a more lightweight method to examine the correctness of the CoT.

4.4.2 Case Study

We assume that the model’s confidence may change when it makes incorrect assertions. To verify this assumption, we begin with a case study analysis, randomly sampling instances where the model made correct predictions. For each case, we plot a line graph to show changes in the model’s confidence over time. By comparing each line segment with the corresponding reasoning steps, we observe that significant drops in confidence often occur when the reasoning steps are not supportive of, or even contradicted, the final chosen answer.

Two real cases are shown in Figure 7. In Case 1, the model’s confidence drops sharply after the second reasoning step. On the right-hand side, during

¹We utilized gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09 from <https://cuhk-api-dev1-apim1.developer.azure-api.net>




Figure 7: Analysis of two real cases: The line plot shows changes in the model’s confidence in its final prediction over the reasoning steps. On the right are the corresponding cases, including the question and the response generated by the model. We add numerical indices to indicate probing points, helping readers match the line plot with the CoT. The step causing the significant drop is marked in red.

this step, the model states *the primary cause is the relation between the earth and the moon* (marked in red), aligning with choice (A), which contradicts its final prediction (C). In fact, this statement is indeed incorrect. A similar pattern is also observed in Case 2.

4.4.3 CoP with Decision Tree

To objectively describe this pattern, we train a decision tree to automatically learn classification conditions based on features extracted from the CoP. Specifically, we sample 200 responses from LLaMA-2 7b in the ARC-Challenge dataset and consider GPT-4’s annotation as the ground truth. Then, we extract three features from the model’s confidence based on CoP: the maximum value, i.e., $\max(p_1^{v^*}, \dots, p_k^{v^*})$, the minimum value, i.e., $\min(p_1^{v^*}, \dots, p_k^{v^*})$, and the minimum change in confidence, i.e., $\min(p_1^{v^*} - p_0^{v^*}, \dots, p_k^{v^*} - p_{k-1}^{v^*})$, which could be a large negative number. Using these features and labels, we train a decision tree, namely **CoP Tree**, with 20 leaf nodes to identify potentially incorrect CoT.

After training, we use CoP Tree for CoT screening experiments. Specifically, the model repeatedly generates responses to the same question until the decision tree confirms the CoT as correct or the maximum number of samples is reached. We collect the selected response, along with the response

obtained under greedy search (GS) settings, and 3-time sampling with the CoP score, as a control. We use the annotations from GPT-4 as the ground truth to determine if the CoT contains any errors. Then, we assess the **CoT Accuracy**, which measures the proportion of responses with completely correct CoT across all questions, within the selected responses under these three settings.

The experiment reveals a 13% average enhancement in CoT accuracy following CoP Tree filtering of responses. Remarkably, CoP Tree was trained based on confidence features extracted from 200 CoTs generated by the LLaMA-2 7b model, yet it demonstrates outstanding generalization in cross-model predictions. On the other hand, this also suggests a commonality among confidence features in the model. Furthermore, we combine all samples from each model and use GPT-4 annotations as the ground truth to calculate the precision of the decision tree. The results reveal an average precision of 88%, indicating its high performance in identifying correct CoTs according to the CoP features.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce CoP, a probing method to detect changes in confidence during the reasoning process of LLMs. Using CoP, we analyze the necessity and accuracy of CoT. We find that the early answering issue in the LLMs is often due to

task simplicity, indicating that CoT is unnecessary for simple tasks. We then propose the CoP Score to identify CoTs that lead to positive improvements. Finally, through case analysis and pattern recognition, we develop the CoP Tree to detect errors in the LLM’s reasoning process.

Limitations

We summarize the limitations in three points.

CoP currently only applies to multiple-choice questions or questions where the answer is a single token. This is because the confidence detected by CoP comes from a single token. If the target token set includes words that span more than one token, such as *carbonated*, which is tokenized into `[_carbon, ated]` or even a number like *100*, which is tokenized into `[_, 1, 0, 0]`, defining the model’s confidence in the final prediction becomes challenging when the target word exceeds one token. We are exploring the use of the perplexity of multiple tokens instead of the probability of a single token to make CoP applicable to a wider range of tasks. We look forward to presenting more findings in future work.

Secondly, regarding the necessity of CoT, we can only provide a general conclusion: simple tasks do not require CoT. However, it is difficult to determine in advance whether a task is simple, making it impossible to pre-judge whether CoT is needed for a particular question.

Lastly, concerning the accuracy of CoT, the CoP Tree has high precision but relatively low recall. This means it is a strict classifier. Consequently, the resampling strategy of the CoP Tree may reject some correct CoTs, leading to an increase in the number of samples needed.

Ethic Statement

In this research, GPT-4 was employed as an evaluator in a manner consistent with ethical guidelines. Transparency about its usage, accountability for its outputs, and mitigation of potential biases were prioritized. Data privacy and security were strictly maintained, and the AI’s limitations were acknowledged, ensuring it supplemented rather than replaced human judgment. This approach aimed to enhance the research quality while upholding academic integrity and ethical standards. Refer to Appendix A.3 for the detailed implementation of the GPT-4 evaluation.

References

- Oliver Bentham, Nathan Stringham, and Ana Marasović. 2024. [Chain-of-thought unfaithfulness as disguised accuracy](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.14897.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality](#).
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. [Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1803.05457.
- Antonia Creswell and Murray Shanahan. 2022. [Faithful reasoning using large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2208.14271.
- Yao Fu, Litu Ou, Mingyu Chen, Yuhao Wan, Hao Peng, and Tushar Khot. 2023. [Chain-of-thought hub: A continuous effort to measure large language models’ reasoning performance](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.17306.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2009.03300.
- Ziwei Ji, Tiezheng Yu, Yan Xu, Nayeon Lee, Etsuko Ishii, and Pascale Fung. 2023. [Towards mitigating LLM hallucination via self reflection](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 1827–1843, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.06825.
- Tamera Lanham, Anna Chen, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Benoit Steiner, Carson Denison, Danny Hernandez, Dustin Li, Esin Durmus, Evan Hubinger, Jackson Kernion, Kamilė Lukošiuūtė, Karina Nguyen, Newton Cheng, Nicholas Joseph, Nicholas Schiefer, Oliver Rausch, Robin Larson, Sam McCandlish, Sandipan Kundu, Saurav Kadavath, Shannon Yang, Thomas Henighan, Timothy Maxwell, Timothy Telleen-Lawton, Tristan Hume, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Jared Kaplan, Jan Brauner, Samuel R. Bowman, and Ethan Perez. 2023. [Measuring faithfulness in chain-of-thought reasoning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.13702.
- Jiachun Li, Pengfei Cao, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2024. [Towards faithful chain-of-thought: Large language models are bridging reasoners](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.18915.

- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. 2023. *Let's verify step by step*. Preprint, arXiv:2305.20050.
- Qing Lyu, Shreya Havaldar, Adam Stein, Li Zhang, Delip Rao, Eric Wong, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023. *Faithful chain-of-thought reasoning*. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 3rd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 305–329, Nusa Dua, Bali. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Meta Team. 2024. Meta LLAMA 3. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>. Accessed: 2024-06-14.
- OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeef Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O'Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. 2024. *Gpt-4 technical report*. Preprint, arXiv:2303.08774.
- Letitia Parcalabescu and Anette Frank. 2024. *On measuring faithfulness or self-consistency of natural language explanations*. Preprint, arXiv:2311.07466.
- Debjit Paul, Robert West, Antoine Bosselut, and Boi Faltings. 2024. *Making reasoning matter: Measuring and improving faithfulness of chain-of-thought reasoning*. Preprint, arXiv:2402.13950.
- Qwen Team. 2024. Qwen 2. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen2/>. Accessed: 2024-06-14.
- Ansh Radhakrishnan, Karina Nguyen, Anna Chen, Carol Chen, Carson Denison, Danny Hernandez, Esin Durmus, Evan Hubinger, Jackson Kernion, Kamilė Lukošiuėtė, Newton Cheng, Nicholas Joseph, Nicholas Schiefer, Oliver Rausch, Sam McCandlish, Sheer El Showk, Tamera Lanham, Tim Maxwell, Venkatesa Chandrasekaran, Zac Hatfield-Dodds,

- Jared Kaplan, Jan Brauner, Samuel R. Bowman, and Ethan Perez. 2023. [Question decomposition improves the faithfulness of model-generated reasoning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.11768.
- Yuan Sui, Yufei He, Nian Liu, Xiaoxin He, Kun Wang, and Bryan Hooi. 2024. [Fidelis: Faithful reasoning in large language model for knowledge graph question answering](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.13873.
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Denny Zhou, , and Jason Wei. 2022. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09261*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Miles Turpin, Julian Michael, Ethan Perez, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2023. [Language models don't always say what they think: Unfaithful explanations in chain-of-thought prompting](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.04388.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2201.11903.
- Wei Jie Yeo, Ranjan Satapathy, Rick Siow Mong Goh, and Erik Cambria. 2024. [How interpretable are reasoning explanations from prompting large language models?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.11863.
- Muru Zhang, Ofir Press, William Merrill, Alisa Liu, and Noah A. Smith. 2023. [How language model hallucinations can snowball](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.13534.
- Chuanyang Zheng, Zhengying Liu, Enze Xie, Zhenguo Li, and Yu Li. 2023. [Progressive-hint prompting improves reasoning in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2304.09797.

A Experiment Details

A.1 Prompting Template

For all reasoning experiments, we use the following prompting template.

```
{INSTRUCTION}
Question: {DEMO QUES. 1}
Answer: Let's think step by step. {DEMO ANS. 1}

...

Question: {DEMO QUES. 5}
Answer: Let's think step by step. {DEMO ANS. 5}

Question: {QUES.}
Answer:
```

Table 3: The prompting template used in experiments. The placeholders within the blue braces need to be filled with corresponding data during the experiment.

For experiments with BBH and MMLU, the instructions and demonstrations used are identical to those used in the Chain-of-Thought hub experiment setup (Fu et al., 2023). For example, the instruction for the *tracking shuffled three objects* task is:

A task requiring determining the final positions of a set of objects given their initial positions and a description of a sequence of swaps.

The instructions and demonstrations used for the ARC dataset are shown in Table 6.

A.2 LLMs Checkpoints

We provide the detailed version of checkpoints in Table 4.

LLM	Checkpoints
Vicuna 7b	vicuna-7b-v1.5
Mistral 7b	Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3
LLaMA-3 8b	Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct
Qwen2 7b	Qwen2-7B-Instruct
LLaMA-2 7b	llama-2-7b-chat
LLaMA-2 13b	llama-2-13b-chat
LLaMA-2 70b	llama-2-70b-chat
GPT-4	gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09

Table 4: LLMs involved in the experiments and the corresponding checkpoints.

```
### Instruction
```

Below is a question paired with an answer provided by an AI assistant. With reference to the ground truth, you are tasked with examining the assistant's response. The primary focus of your evaluation should be to discern whether there are any inconsistencies or assertions within the reasoning that contradict established facts, rather than merely assessing the correctness of the answer itself. If no issues are found in the response, reply with

```
<Evaluation Results: Pass>
```

Should you identify problematic statements, please indicate the portions of its answer that are problematic and respond in the following format:

```
<Evaluation Results: Fail>
```

```
<Start of problematic description 1>
```

```
...
```

```
<End of problematic description 1>
```

```
<Start of problematic description 2>
```

```
...
```

```
<End of problematic description 2>
```

```
...
```

```
### Input
```

```
Question: {QUES. }
AI Answer: {ANS. }
```

```
### Output
```

Table 5: The prompting template for GPT-4 evaluation.

A.3 GPT-4 Evaluation

A.3.1 Instructions for GPT-4

We use GPT-4 as an evaluator to examine whether the CoT generated by the model contains potential errors (refer to Table 4 for the detailed version). Briefly, we ask GPT-4 to check for contradictory statements or statements that do not align with facts in the CoT. For the instructions, refer to Table 5.

A.3.2 Human Evaluation

To ensure the reliability of GPT-4's evaluation, we randomly selected 50 samples from the responses of all models on ARC-Challenge for manual annotation. We recruited four PhD students to annotate the golden answers of whether both CoT and final answers are correct. All the answers are consistently validated by all four annotators. The Pearson correlation coefficient between GPT-4's annotations and the golden answers is **0.879**, proving that GPT-4 is a capable evaluator.

Prompt for ARC dataset

Given a question, please reason through it step by step and then provide an answer.

Question: Juan and LaKeisha roll a few objects down a ramp. They want to see which object rolls the farthest. What should they do so they can repeat their investigation?

- (A) Put the objects in groups.
- (B) Change the height of the ramp.
- (C) Choose different objects to roll.
- (D) Record the details of the investigation.

Answer: Let's think step by step. To make sure Juan and LaKeisha can repeat their investigation, they need to keep everything consistent except for what they are directly testing, which is how far the objects roll. So recording the details of the investigation is crucial because it allows them to remember exactly what they did, including the objects used, the height of the ramp, and any other conditions. This way, they can duplicate those conditions in future trials.

So, the answer is (D).

Question: High-pressure systems stop air from rising into the colder regions of the atmosphere where water can condense. What will most likely result if a high-pressure system remains in an area for a long period of time?

- (A) fog
- (B) rain
- (C) Drought
- (D) tornado

Answer: Let's think step by step. High-pressure systems prevent air from rising, which is necessary for the formation of clouds and precipitation. If a high-pressure system stays in one area for a long time, this means that the atmospheric conditions will be dry and stable, inhibiting the development of weather systems that bring rain or storms. Therefore, the lack of rising air and subsequent condensation of water vapor will lead to a lack of precipitation.

So, the answer is (C).

Question: Which topic area would be the best to research to find ways of reducing environmental problems caused by humans?

- (A) converting sunlight into electricity
- (B) looking for new coal reserves
- (C) finding reservoirs that contain oil
- (D) converting forests into farmland

Answer: Let's think step by step. To address environmental problems caused by humans, we should focus on solutions that mitigate pollution, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote sustainability. Among the options provided, converting sunlight into electricity (solar energy) is a renewable and clean source of power that can help reduce reliance on fossil fuels, thereby decreasing pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

So, the answer is (A).

Question: Which characteristic of a cheetah is more likely to be learned rather than inherited?

- (A) speed
- (B) a spotted coat
- (C) hunting strategies
- (D) claws that do not retract

Answer: Let's think step by step. Characteristics of animals can generally be divided into two categories: inherited traits, which are passed down genetically, and learned behaviors, which are acquired through experience or teaching. Hunting strategies involve behavior and techniques that can be improved upon with practice and experience. While some instinctual hunting behavior is innate, the specifics of how to hunt effectively can be learned over time, making this the most likely learned characteristic among the options given.

So, the answer is (C).

Question: Approximately 50 million acres of tropical rainforest are cleared each year. Which effect most likely would result from the clearing of these forests?

- (A) a decrease in soil erosion
- (B) a decrease in biodiversity
- (C) an improvement in air quality
- (D) an improvement in water quality

Answer: Let's think step by step. Tropical rainforests are incredibly biodiverse ecosystems, hosting a vast array of plant and animal species. When these forests are cleared, the habitat for these species is destroyed, leading to a decline in biodiversity. Clearing also disrupts the natural cycles, often increasing soil erosion due to the loss of root structures that hold the soil in place, and can lead to decreased water quality as runoff carries sediment and pollutants into waterways. Additionally, the act of clearing, typically through burning, releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, contributing to climate change and not improving air quality.

So, the answer is (B).

Table 6: The prompts used for reasoning on ARC dataset.

B Experiments Results Supplement

B.1 Positive & Negative Effect of CoT

We analyzed the proportion of answers that changed from false to true and from true to false after the model’s reasoning on the MMLU and BBH datasets. Specifically, in our CoP, the results obtained from probing at step 0 are considered the model’s predictions without any reasoning, i.e., j_0 . The final generated answers are considered the model’s predictions after full reasoning, i.e., j^* . Hence, we define the effect of CoT as the following equation,

$$\text{Effect} = \begin{cases} \text{Pos.} & \text{if } j_0 \text{ is False and } j^* \text{ is True} \\ \text{Neg.} & \text{if } j_0 \text{ is True and } j^* \text{ is False} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

We further compute the ratio of positive CoT and negative CoT and present the results in Figure 5. Overall, the positive effects of CoT are more evident, although there are still a number of cases where the model’s reasoning changes a correct answer to an incorrect one.