

DebUnc: Mitigating Hallucinations in Large Language Model Agent Communication with Uncertainty Estimations

Luke Yoffe Alfonso Amayuelas William Yang Wang
 University of California, Santa Barbara
 {lukeyoffe, amayuelas}@ucsb.edu, william@cs.ucsb.edu

Abstract

To enhance Large Language Model (LLM) capabilities, multi-agent debates have been introduced, where multiple LLMs discuss solutions to a problem over several rounds of debate. However, LLMs often produce incorrect responses that appear deceptively confident, which can mislead other agents. This is partly because agents do not express their confidence levels during standard debates. To address this, we introduce DebUnc, a multi-agent debate framework that uses uncertainty metrics to assess agent confidence levels. We adapted the LLM attention mechanism to adjust token weights based on confidence levels and also explored using textual prompts to convey confidence. Our evaluations across various benchmarks show that attention-based methods are particularly effective, and that as uncertainty metrics evolve, performance will continue to increase. The code is available at <https://github.com/lukeyoffe/debunc>.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have shown impressive performance in various fields, including law, academia, and coding (OpenAI, 2024). To handle more complex tasks, LLM-powered agents have been developed. These agents observe their environment and take actions, such as communicating with other agents, using tools, or performing reasoning (Wu et al., 2023). The potential of LLM agents increases when multiple agents collaborate, which can take different forms.

One approach involves agents assuming different roles, such as designer, programmer, tester, or manager, within a software development team of LLM agents (Qian et al., 2024). Alternatively, agents may all assume the same role, collaborating to solve problems through multi-agent debates. This can help address LLM’s tendency to generate incorrect responses, known as hallucinations (Du et al., 2023), and is the focus of this paper.

Initial Prompt



A food caterer was told to prepare gourmet hot dogs for 36 guests. While most people would only eat one hotdog, he prepared enough for half of the guests to be able to have two hotdogs. However, 40 guests showed up, and everyone wanted a second hotdog. How many guests did not get a second hotdog?

DebUnc: Debate with Uncertainty Metrics




Figure 1: Illustration of a three-agent mathematical debate. Each agent uses a large language model (LLM) to generate text responses and assesses its confidence using an uncertainty metric, highlighted in yellow. The responses and confidence information is shared among the agents, enabling them to decide whom to trust when responses differ. Correct answers are marked in green, while incorrect ones are shown in red.

Hallucinations undermine the trustworthiness and utility of LLMs in real-world applications (Rawte et al., 2023). For example, an LLM tutor providing incorrect information could harm a student’s learning, and an LLM customer service agent giving incorrect advice could mislead a customer. In fields like healthcare or financial services, inaccurate information from an LLM could have even more severe consequences, ranging from financial losses to health risks. Multi-agent debates aim to solve this issue by allowing agents to first generate diverse answers to a problem, then discuss each other’s responses, and finally converge on a final answer (Liang et al., 2023).

While agents often converge on the same final solution, it is not always correct, possibly due to flawed communication between agents (Du et al., 2023). Currently, LLM agents communicate through text, with one agent generating an answer that is then included in another agent’s prompt in the next round. However, LLMs often respond with a highly confident tone, regardless of whether or not their answer is correct. This poses a significant problem in multi-agent systems because a confidently incorrect response from one agent can mislead the others, eventually leading all agents to converge on the incorrect answer. In human debates, participants often qualify their statements with phrases like "I am sure that..." or "I am not sure, but...", which, while not perfect, help others assess the reliability of their responses. Recognizing that LLMs have difficulty expressing their own confidence, uncertainty metrics have been developed to quantify their uncertainty.

Building on these insights, we present DebUnc, a novel multi-agent debate framework that enhances multi-agent **Debates** with model **Uncertainty** metrics. After each debate round, we measure each agent’s uncertainty with an uncertainty metric. In the following round, each agent’s response and uncertainty will be communicated to all other agents. We explore two methods for conveying agent uncertainty: (1) incorporating the uncertainty directly into the textual prompt alongside the agent responses, as shown in Figure 2, and (2) adjusting the LLM’s attention towards agents’ responses based on their uncertainty, as depicted in Figure 3. We extensively evaluate DebUnc across multiple LLMs, benchmarks, and uncertainty metrics, analyzing the results of each uncertainty metric and method of uncertainty communication.

Our key contributions are outlined as follows:

- We introduce DebUnc, a framework that quantifies and communicates LLM agent uncertainty in multi-agent debates.
- We adapt the LLM attention mechanism to adjust token weights based on confidence levels and also explore the use of textual prompts to communicate confidence.
- We evaluate DebUnc across multiple LLMs, benchmarks, and uncertainty metrics, and find that the attention-scaling method consistently outperforms unmodified debates.
- We offer insights into how performance will be impacted as uncertainty metrics evolve.

2 Related Work

Large Language Models (LLMs) are characterized by their overconfidence and propensity to always provide a response to user queries. This often results in the generation of inaccurate content, a phenomenon known as hallucination, where the models produce information that is not supported by their training data or the given input (Liang et al., 2024; Yadkori et al., 2024; Duan et al., 2024; Yao et al., 2023; Aichberger et al., 2024). Addressing hallucinations is highly important for developing trust in LLM-based systems and facilitating their deployment in more real-world applications. As a result, there has been a significant increase in research aimed at understanding the mechanisms behind hallucinations and developing strategies to mitigate them (Ji et al., 2023; McDonald et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2023).

2.1 Uncertainty in LLMs

Some current research efforts to mitigate hallucinations focus on measuring the model’s uncertainty and enhancing their self-awareness (Kadavath et al., 2022; Amayuelas et al., 2023; Yin et al., 2023). By accurately evaluating their uncertainty, end-users can make more informed decisions about when to trust the model’s generated output (Lin et al., 2022a; Xu et al., 2024). However, accurately measuring model uncertainty remains an unsolved problem, and ongoing research is exploring new uncertainty metrics. We identify three primary approaches to this problem:

Token Probability-Based Uncertainty Metrics evaluate uncertainty based on the probabilities assigned to each token generated by the model. High token probabilities (close to 1) indicate strong model confidence, whereas lower token probabilities suggest a spread of probability across several tokens, signifying uncertainty about the correct choice. Prominent methods in this category include Mean Token Entropy, Perplexity (Fomicheva et al., 2020), SAR (Duan et al., 2023), RDE (Vazhentsev et al., 2023), and Claim-Conditioned Probability (Fadeeva et al., 2024).

LLM-Generated Uncertainty Metrics involve the model explicitly expressing its uncertainty in its response. This can be achieved in multiple ways, including by training the model. This was the approach taken by Lin et al. (2022a), who fine-tuned GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) to provide its answer to a question along with its confidence level.

Alternatively, the model can be prompted to express its uncertainty without prior training. Tian et al. (2023) found that this approach can outperform token-probability-based methods when applied to LLMs fine-tuned with reinforcement learning from human feedback (Christiano et al., 2017). However, Xiong et al. (2023) report slightly inferior performance compared to token-probability-based methods on GPT-3.

Sampling-Based Uncertainty Metrics assess uncertainty by generating multiple outputs through sampling, analyzing the distribution of meanings across the outputs. A consistent meaning across multiple samples suggests high confidence, while variations indicate lower confidence. This approach can identify different sequences that convey the same meaning, which token-probability-based metrics do not account for. However, the need for multiple generations makes these methods more resource-intensive than the others described. Examples include Semantic Entropy (Kuhn et al., 2023), LUQ (Zhang et al., 2024), and other metrics that evaluate meaning diversity (Lin et al., 2023).

2.2 Multi-Agent Debate

With the increased accessibility of LLMs and improvements in their inference times, LLMs are being integrated into more complex systems as autonomous agents (Wu et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Hong et al., 2023). A critical component of these agent-based systems is the collaboration mechanism, where models engage in debate with one another. These mechanisms are currently being studied (Zhang et al., 2023) and have been shown to foster more divergent thinking (Liang et al., 2023), enhance reasoning and factual accuracy (Du et al., 2023), and lead to more reliable evaluations (Chan et al., 2023). Through discussions, the LLMs can refine their outputs, ultimately achieving higher levels of agreement and producing more factually accurate text (Sun et al., 2024; Feng et al., 2024).

ReConcile (Chen et al., 2023) explored the integration of agent confidence in multi-agent debates, relying on LLM agents to self-report their confidence, which was communicated to other agents through prompts. This led to marginal performance improvements due to the confidence estimation. Building on their approach, we employ uncertainty metrics to estimate agent confidence and explore both prompting and attention scaling to convey this confidence. We found these enhancements to significantly improve multi-agent debate performance.

3 Method

In human debates, it is often possible to gauge someone’s expertise on a subject by observing the fluency of their responses, their body language, and other cues. This helps in identifying whose arguments to consider more seriously when there are conflicting opinions. On the other hand, in multi-agent LLM debates, agents frequently generate inaccurate responses that sound confident, which can mislead other agents and result in a consensus on an incorrect response (Du et al., 2023). Our goal is to advise agents on which other agents’ opinions to prioritize based on their confidence levels.

Our modified debate pipeline, depicted in Figure 2, operates as follows: in each round of debate, every agent generates a response, and its uncertainty is estimated. In the next round, the responses and uncertainties from each agent are shared with every other agent. We test three uncertainty metrics and three approaches to communicate agent uncertainty.

3.1 Uncertainty Metrics

Uncertainty metrics gauge an LLM’s confidence in its responses; high uncertainty signifies low confidence and potential unreliability, while low uncertainty indicates high confidence and greater reliability. These metrics typically fall into one or more of three categories: Token Probability-Based, LLM-Generated, and Sampling-Based methods. For more information about these categories, refer to [Uncertainty in LLMs](#)

In our experiments, we focus on token probability-based metrics due to their computational efficiency and flexibility. These metrics require only a single generation and are effective regardless of the model’s ability to express its own uncertainty. We specifically chose Mean Token Entropy (Fomicheva et al., 2020) for its simplicity and TokenSAR (Duan et al., 2023), which incorporates a heuristic recognizing that certain tokens contribute more significantly to the sequence’s meaning than others. We utilize the implementations from LM-Polygraph, a framework with implementations for many state of the art uncertainty metrics (Fadeeva et al., 2023). Additionally, to evaluate the potential of more advanced methods and to prepare for future improvements in uncertainty metrics, we have included a third "oracle" uncertainty metric in our analysis.




Figure 2: Illustration of the modified multi-agent debate involving three agents. In the first round, each agent independently generates a response to the question, which is evaluated for confidence using an uncertainty metric. The prompt for following rounds includes the responses from other agents in the previous round. Sections of the prompt highlighted in green are used only with the Confidence in Prompt method. Each agent retains access to its complete chat history throughout the debate. After the final round, a majority vote determines the final answer.

3.1.1 Mean Token Entropy

Mean Token Entropy (Fomicheva et al., 2020) is the average entropy across all tokens generated, with the entropy of a single token X defined as:

$$H(X) = - \sum_{x \in V} p(x) \log p(x)$$

Here, V denotes the vocabulary of the model. Entropy is maximized when $p(x)$ is uniform over all tokens in the vocabulary, indicating maximum uncertainty. Conversely, it is minimized when one token has a probability of 1 and all other tokens have a probability of 0, indicating complete certainty in the selected token. This method is highly computationally efficient, requiring minimal computation to determine the uncertainty once the text has been generated.

3.1.2 TokenSAR

TokenSAR (Duan et al., 2023) is defined as the weighted average of the negative log probabilities for each generated token, where the weights are the relevance scores of the tokens:

$$\text{TokenSAR} = \sum_i^N -\log p(t_i) R(t_i)$$

Here, N represents the number of tokens generated, t_i is the i -th token, and $R(t_i)$ is the relevance of token t_i .

To compute each token's relevance, RoBERTa-large (Liu et al., 2019) must be run N times in total. This is more computationally expensive than calculating mean token entropy, but still far less costly than metrics requiring multiple generations.

3.1.3 Oracle

While the aforementioned uncertainty metrics offer useful insights into agent uncertainty, they are not perfect. To mimic an ideal uncertainty metric, we also include an "Oracle" uncertainty metric in our evaluation. This metric yields low uncertainty when the agent is correct and high uncertainty when the agent is incorrect. It is defined as follows:

$$\text{uncertainty} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if the response is correct} \\ \infty & \text{if the response is incorrect} \end{cases}$$

In practice, using 0 and ∞ could cause issues with our uncertainty communication methods, so we detail exactly how this metric is applied in the following subsection. It is also important to note that this metric requires knowledge of the ground truth answer, making it impractical for real-world use. Instead, it serves to evaluate the effectiveness of our uncertainty communication methods independently of the performance of the uncertainty metrics themselves, and allows us to anticipate how improvements in uncertainty metrics could affect debate performance.




Figure 3: Illustration of the **Attention-All** method from the perspective of Agent 1. As the second debate round begins, the model’s context includes the initial prompt and each agent’s responses. Agent 2 provided a correct response with lower uncertainty than Agents 1 and 3, who responded incorrectly. Because Agent 2 had a lower uncertainty, the attention weights for tokens constituting Agent 2’s response will be increased, while those for tokens from Agent 1 and Agent 3’s responses will be decreased. This led Agent 1 to switch to the correct answer.

3.2 Incorporating Uncertainty into Debate

After computing the uncertainty of each agent, we explore multiple methods to incorporate these uncertainties into the following debate round.

3.2.1 Confidence in Prompt

One approach is to include the uncertainties directly in the text prompt for the next debate round. Mean Token Entropy and TokenSAR yield non-negative uncertainties. For Mean Token Entropy, the range of uncertainties depends on the model’s vocabulary size, while for TokenSAR, the maximum uncertainty is unbounded. Therefore, the exact uncertainty values are less informative than the relative differences in uncertainty between agents.

Rather than expressing their uncertainty, humans often express their confidence on 1 to 10 scale. Since LLMs are trained on human data, they may exhibit the same preference. As a result, we convert the uncertainties into confidence values. Given a list of uncertainties u for n agents, where u_i is the uncertainty of agent i , we first invert them to obtain raw confidence values r . We then scale these values so that the average confidence s_i of all agents is 5. We then clamp the confidence levels to the range of 1 to 10. Finally, we round to the nearest integer:

$$r_i = \frac{1}{u_i}$$

$$s_i = \frac{r_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n r_j} \cdot (5n - 1) + \frac{1}{n}$$

$$c_i = \text{round}(\text{clamp}(s_i, 1, 10))$$

When using the Oracle uncertainty metric, we set the confidence to 1 if the agent was incorrect and to 10 if the agent was correct. The computed confidence scores are then included in the text prompt to each agent, as illustrated in Figure 2.

3.2.2 Attention Scaling

As an alternative to including confidence levels in the prompt, we can modify the LLM’s token-generation process to account for each agent’s confidence. Many LLMs use Transformer decoder layers that generate an embedding for the last token and use this embedding to predict the next token (Radford et al., 2018). This embedding is determined by the attention mechanism, which creates "query," "key," and "value" vectors for each token.

The similarity between the "query" vector of the last token and the "key" vector of each token is used to compute a weight for every token. These weights are normalized with a softmax function to ensure they sum to 1, and are used to create the output embedding, which is the weighted sum of the value vectors of each token (Vaswani et al., 2017). The weight of each token determines its influence on the next token generated. By modifying these weights, we can adjust the model’s focus on each token in the input.

In multi-agent debates, this allows us to shift the model’s focus towards more confident agents. After each debate round, we will have responses from every agent. In the next round, each agent’s prompt will include these responses. We also compute the uncertainty of each agent using an uncertainty metric.

Estimator	Method	MMLU-0	MMLU-5	GSM8k	Arithmetic	TruthfulQA	Avg.
N/A	Standard	0.520	0.544	0.512	0.478	0.604	0.532
Entropy	Prompt	0.522	0.546	0.536	0.482	0.602	0.538
	Attn-Others	0.540	0.566	0.488	0.518	0.608	0.544
	Attn-All	0.526	0.570	0.536	0.518	0.604	0.551
TokenSAR	Prompt	0.538	0.548	0.504	0.464	0.616	0.534
	Attn-Others	0.526	0.560	0.496	0.500	0.626	0.542
	Attn-All	0.532	0.552	0.528	0.500	0.610	0.544
Oracle	Prompt	0.562	0.560	0.548	0.542	0.626	0.568
	Attn-Others	0.606	0.666	0.640	0.654	0.630	0.639
	Attn-All	0.618	0.684	0.656	0.732	0.648	0.668

Table 1: Accuracy comparison across various benchmarks using different uncertainty estimators and methods with Mistral-7B. ‘MMLU-0’ denotes zero-shot performance on MMLU, while ‘MMLU-5’ represents 5-shot performance. The other benchmarks used zero-shot prompting. The ‘Avg.’ column shows the average performance for all tests.

After the LLM computes the normalized attention weights, we multiply the weight of every token from agent j by the inverse of agent j ’s uncertainty when using Mean Token Entropy or TokenSAR. When using the Oracle metric, to avoid divide-by-zero errors, we set the multiplier to 10^{-5} if the agent was incorrect and 1 if the agent was correct.

Formally, the attention weight for token i a_i is:

$$a_i = \begin{cases} w_i \cdot m_j & \text{if } i \in t_j, \text{ for any agent } j \\ w_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here, t_j is the set of token indices from agent j . We then normalize the scaled attention weights to ensure that the sum of all token weights equals 1, while leaving the weights of other tokens unchanged. The final weight f_i for every token i is calculated as follows:

$$f_i = \begin{cases} a_i \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k \in t_j} w_k}{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k \in t_j} a_k} & \text{if } i \in t_j, \\ & \text{for any agent } j \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We only apply attention scaling to the responses from the previous round. For instance, in a three-round debate, attention would be rescaled for the responses from the first round during the second round, and for the responses from the second round during the third round. In the third round of debate, attention would not be rescaled to the first-round responses. Additionally, in order to prevent divide-by-zero errors during normalization, attention is not scaled when computing the embeddings for tokens within the prompt; it is only scaled when generating new tokens.

We explore two variants of attention scaling:

- **Attention-Others**, where agent i only rescales attention to other agents’ response tokens $t_j \mid j \neq i$
- **Attention-All**, where agent i rescales attention to other agents and itself, illustrated in Figure 3

4 Experiment Design

To evaluate these methods, an open-source LLM is required, as implementing the attention scaling requires modifications to the model source code. Additionally, the uncertainty metrics used rely on token probabilities, which may not be readily available from closed-source models. We performed most of our experiments using Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 (Jiang et al., 2023), and add a small evaluation on Llama-3-8B-Instruct (AI@Meta, 2024) to verify that the results are applicable to other models. Tokens were sampled with a temperature of 1 to ensure variability in the responses. The methods were evaluated on multiple benchmarks:

1. **MMLU** (Hendrycks et al., 2021): A dataset of multiple-choice questions across various subjects.
2. **GSM8k** (Cobbe et al., 2021): A dataset of free-response grade school math problems.
3. **TruthfulQA** (Lin et al., 2022b): A multiple-choice dataset testing the model’s susceptibility to common misconceptions.
4. **Arithmetic**: An randomly generated set of arithmetic problems in the form $a + b \cdot c + d$ where $0 \leq a, b, c, d < 30$.




Figure 4: Plots of the ratio of accuracy improvement over a standard debate against the uncertainty metric AUROC. A higher AUROC indicates better metric performance, see [Uncertainty Incorporation Methods](#) for more details. Each point represents the results on one of the benchmarks (MMLU-0, MMLU-5, GSM8k, Arithmetic, and TruthfulQA). The plots are organized by the method of uncertainty incorporation method (as titled) and the uncertainty metric used (color-coded). The trendlines show that attention-based methods, especially Attention-All, lead to more substantial performance gains as AUROC increases compared to methods that incorporate confidence directly into the prompt.

For MMLU, we tested both zero-shot and 5-shot prompting, using samples from the original MMLU repository¹. For the remaining benchmarks, we used only zero-shot prompting. The exact prompts used are shown in [Appendix C](#).

Instead of evaluating on the full datasets, which would be too expensive, we sampled 100 questions from each. We evaluated every combination of uncertainty metric and uncertainty incorporation method on these samples five times, and report the average accuracy across the five runs.

The debates involved three agents and three rounds, with all agents using the same LLM. In the first round, each agent answered the question individually. In the following rounds, each agent was given other agents’ responses, and used this information to refine their answers. A full example debate is shown in [Appendix A](#). The final answer was determined by a majority vote after the third round. This workflow is illustrated in [Figure 2](#).

5 Results

In this section, we first analyze the effectiveness of each uncertainty incorporation method, and then analyze the effectiveness of the uncertainty metrics.

5.1 Uncertainty Incorporation Methods

[Table 1](#) presents a comparison of the results obtained using different combinations of uncertainty metrics (Mean Token Entropy, TokenSAR, and Oracle) and methods (Confidence in Prompt, Attention-

Others, and Attention-All). As a baseline, the performance of a standard 3-agent, 3-round debate without any uncertainty metrics is also shown. Overall, Attention-All was the top-performing method, achieving the highest average accuracy across all three uncertainty metrics. It was the only method that consistently matched or exceeded the performance of the standard multi-agent debate on all benchmarks.

As shown in [Figure 4](#), Attention-All demonstrates the most significant accuracy improvements as the AUROC of the uncertainty metric increases, with a slope of 0.59 compared to 0.45 for Attention-Others and 0.17 for Confidence in Prompt. The accuracy improvement ratio compares the method’s accuracy to the accuracy observed in a standard debate. AUROC, the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve, represents the probability that a correct answer is assigned a lower uncertainty than an incorrect one. A random uncertainty metric would have an AUROC of 0.5, while a perfect one would have an AUROC of 1.

5.2 Uncertainty Metrics

The best-performing uncertainty metric was the Oracle metric. Mean Token Entropy ranked next, with debates using it consistently achieving higher average accuracies than debates using TokenSAR, as shown in [Table 1](#). Mean Token Entropy achieved an average AUROC across all experiments of 0.627, compared to 0.617 for TokenSAR. Full AUROC results are shown in [Appendix B](#).

¹<https://github.com/hendrycks/test>

Distribution of Uncertainties for Correct and Incorrect Responses




Figure 5: Distribution of uncertainties for correct and incorrect answers across all experiments, as measured by the uncertainty metrics Mean Token Entropy and TokenSAR. Generally, correct answers exhibit lower uncertainties than incorrect ones, indicating that although not perfect, uncertainty metrics are useful for distinguishing between accurate responses and those where the agent may be hallucinating.

To further analyze the uncertainty metrics and understand their impact, Figure 5 presents the distributions of uncertainties for responses containing correct answers versus incorrect answers across all benchmarks and uncertainty incorporation methods. The left plot illustrates the uncertainties when using Mean Token Entropy, while the right plot depicts uncertainties when using TokenSAR. As shown in Table 1, Mean Token Entropy achieved slightly higher accuracy than TokenSAR on average. Examining the average uncertainties for correct and incorrect responses, Mean Token Entropy has a ratio of average correct to average incorrect of 1.264, compared to 1.258 for TokenSAR. This suggests that Mean Token Entropy slightly outperforms TokenSAR in differentiating between correct and incorrect responses, while also being less computationally demanding. However, the performance difference is minimal and possibly falls within the margin of error.

5.3 Llama Evaluation

Finally, Table 2 presents the results of a small-scale test using Llama-3-8B-Instruct on the MMLU benchmark with zero-shot prompting. The results demonstrate that Attention-All, paired with the Oracle uncertainty metric, consistently delivers the highest performance. However, performance drops when using Mean Token Entropy as the uncertainty estimator. While a more extensive evaluation is required to make definitive conclusions about DebUnc performance on Llama-3, the consistently high performance of Attention-All with the noise-free Oracle metric indicates its effectiveness in conveying agent uncertainty.

Estimator	Method	MMLU-0
N/A	Standard	0.663
Entropy	Prompt	0.650
	Attention-Others	0.670
	Attention-All	0.633
Oracle	Prompt	0.687
	Attention-Others	0.720
	Attention-All	0.753

Table 2: Performance comparison of different methods and uncertainty estimators on the MMLU benchmark using zero-shot prompting and Llama-3 as the LLM.

6 Conclusion

We present DebUnc, a framework that integrates confidence estimations into multi-agent debates. This addresses the challenge of determining who to trust when agents present different answers. Incorporating confidence levels into the debate provides agents with a method to evaluate the reliability of the other agents. We use uncertainty metrics to estimate the LLM’s confidence based on the probability distribution generated for each token. To communicate confidence, we adjusted the LLM attention mechanism to modify token weights based on confidence levels, and we also explored using textual prompts for this purpose. Our findings indicate that adjusting attention is more effective, which shows that information can be conveyed to LLMs through methods beyond traditional text prompts. Attention scaling can be applied whenever parts of the input should be prioritized, and we hope future work explores this idea further.

7 Limitations

One key limitation of the methods presented is the reliance on open-source LLMs, as attention scaling requires modifications to the model’s source code. Additionally, obtaining token probabilities can be challenging with proprietary LLMs, making it difficult to compute uncertainty. While open-source LLMs such as Mistral 7B (Jiang et al., 2023) and Llama 3 (AI@Meta, 2024) are quite powerful, they do not yet match the performance of leading proprietary models.

In addition, the attention scaling method is sensitive to the order of agent responses in the prompt. For example, if agent 2’s response appears before agent 3’s response, then the embeddings for tokens from agent 3 will have been influenced by agent 2’s response, but not vice versa due to the unidirectional attention used. This could allow information from agent 2 to leak through, even if we focus entirely on agent 3.

Lastly, our experimental setup always uses the same LLM for each agent, with each agent being given the same role. Although this is effective for multi-agent debates, it may be worthwhile to explore combinations of different LLMs, such as pairing smaller LLMs fine-tuned on specific domains with larger LLMs that have broader knowledge.

Ethics Statement

Deploying large language models (LLMs) to the general public requires them to be trustworthy and reliable, particularly in high-risk scenarios. This concern gains more importance when LLMs interact within agent frameworks. We foresee a future where LLMs interact with other LLMs to achieve complex tasks. In this work, we take a step towards achieving reliable communication among agents by incorporating uncertainty estimations.

References

Lukas Aichberger, Kajetan Schweighofer, Mykyta Ielanskyi, and Sepp Hochreiter. 2024. [Semantically diverse language generation for uncertainty estimation in language models](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2406.04306.

AI@Meta. 2024. [Llama 3 model card](#).

Alfonso Amayuelas, Liangming Pan, Wenhua Chen, and William Wang. 2023. [Knowledge of knowledge: Exploring known-unknowns uncertainty with large language models](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2305.13712.

Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.

Chi-Min Chan, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Jianxuan Yu, Wei Xue, Shanghang Zhang, Jie Fu, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2023. [Chateval: Towards better llm-based evaluators through multi-agent debate](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2308.07201.

Justin Chih-Yao Chen, Swarnadeep Saha, and Mohit Bansal. 2023. [Reconcile: Round-table conference improves reasoning via consensus among diverse llms](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13007*.

Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, Tom Brown, Miljan Martic, Shane Legg, and Dario Amodei. 2017. [Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences](#). *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.

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](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2110.14168.

Yilun Du, Shuang Li, Antonio Torralba, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Igor Mordatch. 2023. [Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multiagent debate](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.14325.

Hanyu Duan, Yi Yang, and Kar Yan Tam. 2024. [Do llms know about hallucination? an empirical investigation of llm’s hidden states](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2402.09733.

Jinhao Duan, Hao Cheng, Shiqi Wang, Alex Zavalny, Chenan Wang, Renjing Xu, Bhavya Kailkhura, and Kaidi Xu. 2023. [Shifting attention to relevance: Towards the uncertainty estimation of large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.01379.

Ekaterina Fadeeva, Aleksandr Rubashevskii, Artem Shelmanov, Sergey Petrakov, Haonan Li, Hamdy Mubarak, Evgenii Tsymbalov, Gleb Kuzmin, Alexander Panchenko, Timothy Baldwin, et al. 2024. [Fact-checking the output of large language models via token-level uncertainty quantification](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2403.04696.

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](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.07383.

Shangbin Feng, Weijia Shi, Yike Wang, Wenxuan Ding, Vidhisha Balachandran, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2024. [Don’t hallucinate, abstain: Identifying llm knowledge gaps via multi-llm collaboration](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2402.00367.

- 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.
- 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.
- Sirui Hong, Xiawu Zheng, Jonathan Chen, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, et al. 2023. [Metagpt: Meta programming for multi-agent collaborative framework](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2308.00352.
- 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.
- Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, et al. 2022. [Language models \(mostly\) know what they know](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2207.05221.
- Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. 2023. [Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2302.09664.
- Guohao Li, Hasan Abed Al Kader Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. 2023. [Camel: Communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large scale language model society](#).
- Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Wenxiang Jiao, Xing Wang, Yan Wang, Rui Wang, Yujiu Yang, Zhaopeng Tu, and Shuming Shi. 2023. [Encouraging divergent thinking in large language models through multi-agent debate](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2305.19118.
- Yuxin Liang, Zhuoyang Song, Hao Wang, and Jiaxing Zhang. 2024. [Learning to trust your feelings: Leveraging self-awareness in llms for hallucination mitigation](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2401.15449.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022a. [Teaching models to express their uncertainty in words](#).
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022b. [TruthfulQA: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhen Lin, Shubhendu Trivedi, and Jimeng Sun. 2023. [Generating with confidence: Uncertainty quantification for black-box large language models](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2305.19187.
- Fuxiao Liu, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Yaser Yacoob, and Lijuan Wang. 2023. [Mitigating hallucination in large multi-modal models via robust instruction tuning](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. [Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1907.11692.
- Daniel McDonald, Rachael Papadopoulos, and Leslie Benningfield. 2024. [Reducing llm hallucination using knowledge distillation: A case study with mistral large and mmlu benchmark](#). *Authorea Preprints*.
- OpenAI. 2024. [Gpt-4 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.08774.
- Chen Qian, Wei Liu, Hongzhang Liu, Nuo Chen, Yufan Dang, Jiahao Li, Cheng Yang, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Xin Cong, Juyuan Xu, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024. [Chatdev: Communicative agents for software development](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.07924.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. [Improving language understanding by generative pre-training](#).
- Vipula Rawte, Amit Sheth, and Amitava Das. 2023. [A survey of hallucination in large foundation models](#). *ArXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05922*.
- Xiaoxi Sun, Jinpeng Li, Yan Zhong, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2024. [Towards detecting llms hallucination via markov chain-based multi-agent debate framework](#). *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2406.
- Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Allan Zhou, Archit Sharma, Rafael Rafailov, Huaxiu Yao, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher D Manning. 2023. [Just ask for calibration: Strategies for eliciting calibrated confidence scores from language models fine-tuned with human feedback](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14975*.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 5998–6008.

- Artem Vazhentsev, Gleb Kuzmin, Akim Tsvigun, Alexander Panchenko, Maxim Panov, Mikhail Burtsev, and Artem Shelmanov. 2023. [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.
- Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Ryen W White, Doug Burger, and Chi Wang. 2023. [Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.08155.
- Miao Xiong, Zhiyuan Hu, Xinyang Lu, Yifei Li, Jie Fu, Junxian He, and Bryan Hooi. 2023. [Can llms express their uncertainty? an empirical evaluation of confidence elicitation in llms](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13063*.
- Tianyang Xu, Shujin Wu, Shizhe Diao, Xiaoze Liu, Xingyao Wang, Yangyi Chen, and Jing Gao. 2024. [Sayself: Teaching llms to express confidence with self-reflective rationales](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2405.20974.
- Yasin Abbasi Yadkori, Ilja Kuzborskij, András György, and Csaba Szepesvári. 2024. [To believe or not to believe your llm](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2406.02543.
- Jia-Yu Yao, Kun-Peng Ning, Zhen-Hui Liu, Mu-Nan Ning, and Li Yuan. 2023. [Llm lies: Hallucinations are not bugs, but features as adversarial examples](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2310.01469.
- Zhangyue Yin, Qiushi Sun, Qipeng Guo, Jiawen Wu, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. 2023. [Do large language models know what they don't know?](#) *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2305.18153.
- Caiqi Zhang, Fangyu Liu, Marco Basaldella, and Nigel Collier. 2024. [Luq: Long-text uncertainty quantification for llms](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2403.20279.
- Jintian Zhang, Xin Xu, and Shumin Deng. 2023. [Exploring collaboration mechanisms for llm agents: A social psychology view](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2310.02124.

A Example Debate

This is a full debate on zero-shot MMLU using Mistral-7B as the LLM. It uses the Confidence in Prompt method for incorporating uncertainty with the Oracle uncertainty metric. For conciseness, the user prompts for rounds 2 and 3 use “<agent *i* response>” to reference the response from agent *i* in the previous round.

Agent 1	Agent 2	Agent 3
<i>User, Round 1</i>		
<p>Answer the following multiple choice question. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: SLETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of ABCD. Think step by step before answering.</p> <p>Which of these combinations of clinical features is most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation?</p> <p>A. Displaced apex beat; soft first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; short mid-diastolic murmur B. Irregularly, irregular pulse; displaced apex beat; ejection systolic murmur; short mid-diastolic murmur C. Displaced apex beat; normal first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur D. Tapping apex beat; loud first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur</p>		
<i>Assistant, Round 1</i>		
<p>Based on the given clinical features, option C: Displaced apex beat; normal first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur is least suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation.</p> <p>The features most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Displaced apex beat: This can occur due to chronic volume overload or dilatation of the left ventricle from mitral regurgitation. 2. Soft or absent first heart sound: This can be due to the decreased force of mitral valve closure during diastole. 3. Pan-systolic murmur: This is typically heard in mitral regurgitation due to the continuous regurgitant jet throughout the cardiac cycle. 4. Long mid-diastolic murmur: This can occur due to the continued mitral regurgitant jet during diastole. <p>Therefore, the correct answer is:</p> <p>A. Displaced apex beat; soft first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur</p> <p>Answer: A</p>	<p>Based on the given clinical features, the combination most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation would be:</p> <p>C. Displaced apex beat; normal first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur</p> <p>Explanation: The presence of a displaced apex beat and a pan-systolic murmur points towards mitral valve disease. However, the duration and timing of the additional diastolic murmur helps distinguish the underlying etiology. A long mid-diastolic murmur is more suggestive of functional mitral regurgitation, which is a component of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation. Therefore, option C is the correct answer.</p> <p>Answer: C</p>	<p>The combination of a displaced apex beat, a pan-systolic murmur, and a long mid-diastolic murmur is most suggestive of mitral stenosis. Thus, the answer to the question is D. however, we were asked for a combination that is most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation. With this in mind, the correct answer is: C. Displaced apex beat; normal first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur</p> <p>Explanation: Mixed mitral valve disease refers to a condition in which both mitral regurgitation and mitral stenosis are present. The presence of a predominantly regurgitant jet suggests a more advanced state of the disease. A displaced apex beat can be seen in conditions of volume overload, such as mitral regurgitation, and is less common in mitral stenosis. A normal first heart sound and a long mid-diastolic murmur are more likely to be heard in mitral regurgitation than mitral stenosis, as they represent the opening and closing of the mitral valve during diastole. Therefore, option C, with a displaced apex beat, normal first heart sound, and a long mid-diastolic murmur, is the most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation.</p> <p>Answer: C.</p>

Agent 1 (cont.)	Agent 2 (cont.)	Agent 3 (cont.)
<i>User, Round 2</i>		
<p>These are solutions and confidence values from 1 to 10 (higher means more confident) to the problem from other agents:</p>	<p>These are solutions and confidence values from 1 to 10 (higher means more confident) to the problem from other agents:</p>	<p>These are solutions and confidence values from 1 to 10 (higher means more confident) to the problem from other agents:</p>
<p>One agent solution (confidence level is 1): “<agent 2 response>”</p>	<p>One agent solution (confidence level is 10): “<agent 1 response>”</p>	<p>One agent solution (confidence level is 10): “<agent 1 response>”</p>
<p>One agent solution (confidence level is 1): “<agent 3 response>”</p>	<p>One agent solution (confidence level is 1): “<agent 3 response>”</p>	<p>One agent solution (confidence level is 1): “<agent 2 response>”</p>
<p>Based off the opinion of other agents, can you give an updated response? Do not mention your confidence. Think step by step before answering. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of ABCD.</p>	<p>Based off the opinion of other agents, can you give an updated response? Do not mention your confidence. Think step by step before answering. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of ABCD.</p>	<p>Based off the opinion of other agents, can you give an updated response? Do not mention your confidence. Think step by step before answering. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of ABCD.</p>
<i>Assistant, Round 2</i>		
<p>Based on the information provided by the other agents, the combination most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation is:</p>	<p>Based on the clinical features provided and the consensus of other agents, option C: Displaced apex beat; normal first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur is the most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation.</p>	<p>Based on the discussions among different agents, the most suggestive combination of clinical features for mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation is:</p>
<p>A. Displaced apex beat; soft first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur.</p>	<p>Answer: C.</p>	<p>A. Displaced apex beat; soft first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur</p>
<p>The presence of a displaced apex beat, soft first heart sound, and prolonged pan-systolic murmur indicate mitral valve disease. The duration and timing of the diastolic murmur can be used to distinguish between mitral stenosis and mitral regurgitation. A long, holodiastolic murmur is more commonly heard in mitral regurgitation than mitral stenosis. Therefore, the presence of a long mid-diastolic murmur with a displaced apex beat and soft first heart sound suggests mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation.</p>		<p>Explanation: Mixed mitral valve disease is characterized by the co-existence of mitral stenosis and mitral regurgitation. The presence of a displaced apex beat, soft first heart sound, pan-systolic murmur, and long mid-diastolic murmur can suggest a diagnosis of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation. The displaced apex beat can occur due to chronic volume overload or dilatation of the left ventricle, as seen in mitral regurgitation. The soft or absent first heart sound can be due to the decreased force of mitral valve closure in mitral regurgitation. The pan-systolic murmur is typically heard in mitral regurgitation due to the continuous regurgitant jet throughout the cardiac cycle. The long mid-diastolic murmur can occur due to the continued mitral regurgitant jet during diastole. Therefore, the combination of these clinical findings, A. Displaced apex beat; soft first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur, is most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation.</p>
<p>Answer: A.</p>		<p>Answer: A.</p>

Agent 1 (cont.)	Agent 2 (cont.)	Agent 3 (cont.)
<i>User, Round 3</i>		
<p>These are solutions and confidence values from 1 to 10 (higher means more confident) to the problem from other agents:</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is 1): “<agent 2 response>”</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is 10): “<agent 3 response>”</p> <p>Based off the opinion of other agents, can you give an updated response? Do not mention your confidence. Think step by step before answering. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of ABCD.</p>	<p>These are solutions and confidence values from 1 to 10 (higher means more confident) to the problem from other agents:</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is 10): “<agent 1 response>”</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is 10): “<agent 3 response>”</p> <p>Based off the opinion of other agents, can you give an updated response? Do not mention your confidence. Think step by step before answering. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of ABCD.</p>	<p>These are solutions and confidence values from 1 to 10 (higher means more confident) to the problem from other agents:</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is 10): “<agent 1 response>”</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is 1): “<agent 2 response>”</p> <p>Based off the opinion of other agents, can you give an updated response? Do not mention your confidence. Think step by step before answering. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of ABCD.</p>
<i>Assistant, Round 3</i>		
<p>Based on the discussions among different agents, the combination of clinical features most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation is:</p> <p>A. Displaced apex beat; soft first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur.</p> <p>Explanation: Mixed mitral valve disease is defined as the presence of both mitral stenosis and mitral regurgitation. The clinical presentation of mixed mitral valve disease can vary depending on the severity and predominance of each component.</p> <p>A displaced apex beat, soft first heart sound, pan-systolic murmur, and long mid-diastolic murmur are more indicative of mitral regurgitation than mitral stenosis. The displaced apex beat can result from the increased volume load in the left ventricle due to mitral regurgitation. A soft or absent first heart sound may be heard in mitral regurgitation due to the decreased force of mitral valve closure, while the pan-systolic murmur and long mid-diastolic murmur are characteristic features of mitral regurgitation.</p> <p>Therefore, the combination of these clinical findings, A. Displaced apex beat; soft first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur, is most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation.</p> <p>Answer: A.</p>	<p>Based on the consensus of other agents, the combination most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation is:</p> <p>A. Displaced apex beat; soft first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur.</p> <p>Answer: A.</p>	<p>Based on the information provided by various agents and the consensus reached, the combination of clinical features most suggestive of mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation is:</p> <p>A. Displaced apex beat; soft first heart sound; pan-systolic murmur; long mid-diastolic murmur</p> <p>Here's the explanation: The presence of a displaced apex beat and a pan-systolic murmur suggest mitral valve disease. However, the duration and timing of the diastolic murmur can help distinguish between mitral stenosis and mitral regurgitation. Mitral regurgitation is more commonly associated with a long, holodiastolic or mid-diastolic murmur, while mitral stenosis typically has a short, mid-diastolic murmur. In this scenario, the long mid-diastolic murmur, along with the displaced apex beat and soft first heart sound, makes mixed mitral valve disease with a predominance of mitral regurgitation the most likely diagnosis. Therefore, the answer is:</p> <p>Answer: A.</p>

B Full Uncertainty Metric Results

Estimator	Method	MMLU-0	MMLU-5	GSM8k	Arithmetic	TruthfulQA	Avg.
Entropy	Prompt	0.630	0.637	0.711	0.631	0.585	0.639
	Attn-Others	0.628	0.611	0.696	0.598	0.563	0.619
	Attn-All	0.647	0.618	0.716	0.573	0.568	0.624
TokenSAR	Prompt	0.633	0.612	0.710	0.615	0.566	0.627
	Attn-Others	0.622	0.602	0.694	0.600	0.557	0.615
	Attn-All	0.621	0.592	0.684	0.591	0.553	0.608
Oracle	Prompt	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Attn-Others	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Attn-All	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 3: This table displays the uncertainty metric AUROC values for each experiment run with Mistral-7B. ‘MMLU-0’ denotes zero-shot prompting on MMLU, while ‘MMLU-5’ represents 5-shot prompting. The other benchmarks used zero-shot prompting. The ‘Avg.’ column shows the average AUROC for all tests. By definition, the Oracle metric achieved perfect AUROC scores. Among the remaining metrics, Mean Token Entropy delivered slightly better performance than TokenSAR despite being cheaper to run.

C Prompts

The table below displays the prompts used to facilitate the debates. Text in **green** is only included when using the Confidence in Prompt method, and text in **blue** is specific to each debate.

Benchmark	Prompt Type	Prompt
MMLU	Initial, 0-shot	<p>Answer the following multiple choice question. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of ABCD. Think step by step before answering.</p> <p><question></p>
	Initial, 5-shot	<p>Answer the following multiple choice question.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p><5 example questions and answers></p> <p>—</p> <p>YOUR TASK</p> <p>Answer the following question. Think step by step before answering. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of ABCD.</p> <p><question></p>
	Debate	<p>These are solutions and confidence values from 1 to 10 (higher means more confident) to the problem from other agents:</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is <i>c</i>): <agent response></p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is <i>c</i>): <agent response></p> <p>Based off the opinion of other agents, can you give an updated response? Do not mention your confidence. Think step by step before answering. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of ABCD.</p>
GSM8k	Initial	<p>Answer the following math problem. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$INTEGER' (without quotes) where INTEGER is the integer answer. Think step by step before answering.</p> <p><question></p>
	Debate	<p>These are solutions and confidence values from 1 to 10 (higher means more confident) to the problem from other agents:</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is <i>c</i>): <agent response></p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is <i>c</i>): <agent response></p> <p>Based off the opinion of other agents, can you provide an updated response? The original problem is:</p> <p><question></p> <p>Do not mention your confidence. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$INTEGER' (without quotes) where INTEGER is the integer answer.</p>

Benchmark	Prompt Type	Prompt
Arithmetic	Initial	What is the result of $\langle a+b*c+d \rangle$? State the final answer at the end of your response.
	Debate	<p>These are solutions and confidence values from 1 to 10 (higher means more confident) to the problem from other agents:</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is c): $\langle \text{agent response} \rangle$</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is c): $\langle \text{agent response} \rangle$</p> <p>Based off the opinion of other agents, can you provide an updated answer? Do not mention your confidence. State the final answer at the end of your response.</p>
TruthfulQA	Initial	<p>Answer the following multiple choice question:</p> <p>$\langle \text{question} \rangle$</p> <p>Think step by step before answering. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of $\langle \text{options} \rangle$.</p>
	Debate	<p>These are the selections and confidence values from 1 to 10 (higher means more confident) from other agents:</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is c): $\langle \text{agent response} \rangle$</p> <p>One agent solution (confidence level is c): $\langle \text{agent response} \rangle$</p> <p>Can you double check that your response is correct? Do not mention your confidence. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$LETTER' (without quotes) where LETTER is one of $\langle \text{options} \rangle$.</p>