

CoT Rerailer: Enhancing the Reliability of Large Language Models in Complex Reasoning Tasks through Error Detection and Correction

Guangya Wan^{1*} and Yuqi Wu^{2*} and Jie Chen² and Sheng Li¹

¹School of Data Science, University of Virginia

²Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Alberta

³Academy for Engineering & Technology, Fudan University

{wxr9et, shengli}@virginia.edu, {yuqi14, jc65}@ualberta.ca

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in complex reasoning tasks, particularly when employing Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting. However, the intermediate steps in CoT reasoning can introduce hallucinations and compounding errors, compromising the reliability of LLM outputs. This paper introduces CoT Rerailer, a novel framework designed to enhance the accuracy, efficiency, and trustworthiness of LLM reasoning. Our approach combines a Derailment Identifier, which efficiently filters potentially flawed reasoning paths, with a Rerailment Process that employs multi-agent debates for rigorous error detection and correction. We evaluate CoT Rerailer across more than 20 different categories of question-answering datasets, including domains from commonsense, mathematical, and symbolic Reasoning. Results demonstrate that CoT Rerailer consistently outperforms existing techniques achieving improvement in overall accuracy and efficiency. Moreover, human evaluation confirms that CoT Rerailer produces higher quality intermediate reasoning steps than state-of-the-art methods. The CoT Rerailer offers a promising solution to mitigate hallucinations and improve the reliability of LLM-generated content in complex reasoning tasks¹.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have revolutionized the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP), demonstrating unprecedented capabilities in text generation, reasoning, and complex linguistic tasks. Pretrained Models (Radford et al., 2018) like GPT-4 (OpenAI et al., 2024), Claude (Anthropic, 2024), and Llama2 (Touvron et al., 2023) can produce human-like responses across a wide

range of applications. However, a significant challenge in deploying LLMs for real-world tasks is their tendency to generate misleading or unfounded content, commonly referred to as "hallucinations" (Huang et al., 2023).

The phenomenon of hallucination poses a significant risk to the reliability and trustworthiness of LLM-generated content. To address hallucinations, the Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022) method has been developed to encourage step-by-step reasoning through proper prompting. Building upon this idea, Self-Consistency (SC) (Wang et al., 2023) encourages sampling a diverse set of reasoning paths (RP) to refine the final answer. While these approaches have shown promise in producing better answers with plausible explanations, they are not directly designed to verify and improve the quality of RP. Occasionally, these methods can still produce inconsistent RP, even when generating correct final answers (Turpin et al., 2023a). Thus, hallucinations are not limited to the final outputs (Li et al., 2023b), and such inconsistencies in reasoning and answers undermine the trustworthiness and reliability of the models. Moreover, in complex reasoning tasks, such as mathematical problem-solving or multi-step logical deductions, hallucinations in intermediate steps can occur and compound, leading to entirely incorrect conclusions (Zhang et al., 2024). This emphasizes the need to not only detect hallucinations in the final output but also vigilantly monitor and verify each step of the reasoning process.

Recognizing these concerns and the importance of process supervision in LLMs (Lightman et al., 2024), some researchers have explored methods for self-correction and self-verification on the RP. Approaches like Self-Check (Miao et al., 2024) and Deductive Verification of Chain-of-Thought Reasoning (Ling et al., 2024) aim to further improve the RP step by step by prompting LLMs themselves to detect potential mistakes in the RP. How-

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

¹Code available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/rerailer-0031/Readme.md>

ever, recent studies found that LLMs frequently exhibit overconfidence or high randomness when self-evaluating, suggesting that large language models cannot yet effectively self-correct reasoning (Huang et al., 2024). Moreover, the step-wise corrections introduced by these methods are complex and often incur significantly higher computational and API costs.

To address these concerns, we propose CoT Rerailer, a novel framework designed to improve both the reasoning and outputs of LLMs from three key aspects: efficiency, accuracy, and trustworthiness. Our approach is inspired by how a student might solve a difficult math problem, first quickly scanning their work for obvious errors, then meticulously reviewing each step, and perhaps consulting with peers on challenging parts. It is technically motivated by two key insights: recent advancements showing that Multi-Agent Systems (MAS) (Li et al., 2023a; Talebirad and Nadiri, 2023) is a superior alternative to self-verification and resampling methods, and the tendency of hallucinated facts to produce divergent responses when sampled stochastically (Manakul et al., 2023). Drawing an analogy between reasoning and a train on a track, our framework employs a two-stage process: a Derailment Identifier and a Rerailment Process. The Derailment Identifier efficiently filters questions requiring complex processing and performs consistency checks to identify potentially flawed reasoning. The Derailment Process, applied only when the RP is detected as “derailed,” then employs rigorous error identification on the flawed RP and leverages multi-agent systems to detect and improve the factualness of each intermediate reasoning step before generating a new answer.

Experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of CoT Rerailer across diverse question-answering datasets, consistently outperforming existing techniques in accuracy while maintaining competitive computational efficiency and trustworthiness. In summary, our contributions include:

1. A novel two-stage pipeline that enhances LLM reliability by identifying potentially flawed reasoning chains and selectively applying correction mechanisms.
2. An adaptive framework that integrates consistency checks for filtering flawed reasoning and multi-agent systems for targeted error detection and correction.




Figure 1: LLMs problem-solving approaches schematics. The rectangle box represents intermediate steps generated by LLMs when solving the problem.

3. Empirical evidence of improved accuracy, trustworthiness, and efficiency over existing methods, shown through extensive experiments on diverse QA datasets.

2 Related Work

2.1 LLM Reasoning with Chain of Thought

Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting (Wei et al., 2022) has revolutionized language model reasoning by generating intermediate steps, inspiring numerous works on step-by-step reasoning (Diao et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023b; Kojima et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2023). This approach, along with Self-Consistency (SC) (Wang et al., 2023), which samples multiple reasoning paths and uses majority voting to focus on higher quality outputs, has shown promise in mitigating hallucinations and producing more human-interpretable outputs. However, SC’s sampling approach can be computationally expensive, which limits its practical application. Moreover, recent studies suggest that these methods may still produce inconsistent reasoning paths and compound errors in intermediate steps (Zhang et al., 2024). Some work found that models often “pre-think” the answer and then generate the CoT around it, suggesting that the model’s final prediction may not necessarily rely on the generated CoT (Turpin et al., 2023b). These findings highlight the need for vigilant monitoring of each reasoning step to enhance the reliability and trustworthiness of language models in complex reasoning tasks. Building upon these insights, our proposed CoT Rerailer focuses on step-by-step verification and improvement, aiming to expand the applicability of language models in critical domains requiring




Figure 2: CoT Rerailer Pipeline Overview. Our Rerailer pipeline first filters out consistent RPs and passes the fixable inconsistent RPs selected by the Derailment Identification to the Rerailer (blue dashed box). Through multiple iterations of rerailing, the Rerailer mitigates intermediate hallucinated steps along the RP (red dashed box) and produces the final error-free RP to finalize the answer (green dashed box).

efficiency, accuracy, and reliability.

2.2 LLM as Hallucination Verifier

LLMs have shown promise in verifying potential hallucinations and error propagation in complex reasoning tasks. Various approaches have been developed to leverage LLMs for verification, broadly categorized into one-time and step-by-step verification methods. One-time methods, such as Self-Verification (Weng et al., 2023) and Self-Refine (Madaan et al., 2023), assess the entire reasoning chain at once. While efficient, the goal of these approaches is to produce a better final answer and may miss nuanced errors in intermediate steps. In contrast, step-by-step verification methods like Self-Check (Miao et al., 2024) and Deductive Verification (Ling et al., 2023) examine each reasoning step individually using different prompt demonstrations with a single LLM. These approaches offer more precise error detection and tracing of specific errors in the reasoning process, enhancing the overall trustworthiness of the output. However, recent research (Huang et al., 2023) highlighted a significant challenge: LLMs often exhibit overconfidence or inconsistency when evaluating their own outputs, limiting the effectiveness of single-LLM self-checking approaches. To address this, some work (Gou et al., 2024) integrates various tools, such as code interpreters and search engines, to provide a more comprehensive verification process. Instead of relying on external sources, our work takes a novel approach by leveraging a multi-agent system, which has been proven to be superior to

self-verification or resampling methods in improving the factual accuracy of LLM outputs, (Du et al., 2023) in the verification process, leveraging multiple LLMs working collaboratively to verify and generate more precise reasoning steps.

3 Methodology

3.1 Problem Settings

Our focus is on reasoning-based question-answering (QA) tasks. Formally, a QA task is defined as a tuple (Q, C, A) , where Q is a question, C is the context providing necessary background information, and A is the ground-truth answer. The goal for LLMs is to produce a sequence of tokens $T = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$ that accurately answers Q through logically coherent intermediate reasoning steps $S = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m)$, where each step s_i is a subsection of the tokens $(t_{l_i}, t_{r_i}) \subseteq T$. A special case of QA tasks is multiple-choice question-answering (MCQA), where the LLM is provided with a set of predefined answer options $O = (o_1, o_2, \dots, o_k)$ in addition to the question Q and context C . MCQA tasks can be formally defined as a tuple (Q, C, O, A) . The fixed answer format of MCQA makes evaluation more straightforward compared to open-ended QA tasks.

In this work, we primarily focus on MCQA tasks and simple open-ended QA tasks, such as math questions, where the answer format is relatively simple to parse and evaluate. However, the format of these reasoning tasks, coupled with the intrinsic next-token prediction mechanism of LLMs, makes

them susceptible to accumulating errors, thus leading to hallucinated output.

3.2 CoT-Rerailer

Algorithm 1 CoT Rerailer

```

1: Input: Question  $Q$ , Context  $C$ 
2: Output: Refined Reasoning Path  $S_c$ , Final Answer  $A$ 
3: Generate initial reasoning paths  $(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n)$  for  $Q$ 
4: ConsistencyCheck( $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n$ )
5: if not inconsistent then
6:   return  $S_1$ , Answer( $S_1$ )
7: end if
8:  $S_s \leftarrow \text{Judge}(Q, C, S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n)$ 
9: for each step  $s_i$  in  $S_s$  do
10:   $error \leftarrow \text{StepEvaluator}(Q, C, S_s[i])$ 
11:  if error then
12:     $S_s[i] \leftarrow \text{MultiAgentDebate}(Q, C, S_s[i], error)$ 
13:  end if
14: end for
15:  $S_c \leftarrow S_s$ 
16:  $A \leftarrow \text{ReAnswer}(Q, C, S_c)$ 
17: return  $S_c, A$ 

```

To address the critical issues of hallucinations and error accumulation in LLM-generated reasoning, as highlighted in our introduction, we present the "CoT Rerailer" (Fig. 2). This novel approach not only reduces hallucinations but also optimizes computational resources by selectively processing reasoning chains $S = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m)$ that would benefit most from intervention. Our method identifies and corrects the root causes of errors early in the chain S , ensuring each step s_i is logically coherent and factually accurate. This iterative correction of intermediate steps prevents the compounding of errors, maintaining S on a sound and logical track toward the correct answer A .

3.2.1 Derailment Identifier

Building upon the principle of self-consistency introduced by Wang et al. (2023), our analysis begins by detecting potential hallucinations in LLM-generated answers $A = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$. This approach is motivated by recent findings that uncertainty in answer generation strongly indicates hallucination (Zhang et al., 2023a) and the desire to avoid unnecessary computational overhead for questions with consistent reasoning process (RP)




Figure 3: Multi-agent Debates for RP Refinement. Multiple LLM agents (dashed box) engage in debate to correct and improve the reasoning path. The refined RP (green box) leads to a more interpretable and accurate final answer.

while ensuring that questions with inconsistent RP receive appropriate attention.

The Derailment Identifier employs two key components: Consistency Check and Judge, to efficiently filter questions and RP that require more complex processing. For each question Q , we generate a small, fixed number of RPs (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n) . The Consistency Check measures the LLM's ability to generate coherent answers across these iterations. Responses are considered inconsistent if there exist at least two RPs S_j and S_k such that their corresponding final answers a_i and a_j are different, i.e., $a_i \neq a_j$. For consistent answers, we output the result directly, bypassing further processing. For inconsistent RPs, the Judge, an LLM model, evaluates each S_i given the context C and Q . It selects the RP S_s with the least hallucinated intermediate steps s_i , prioritizing coherence and contextual relevance. This selection of the "least incorrect" RP S_s complements the consistency check and serves as an additional safeguard against hallucination.

3.2.2 Rerailment Process

The central motivation behind this process is to improve the quality of the RP for better reasoning. By subjecting the RP to multiple stages of evaluation and refinement, our Rerailment Process is designed to enhance the quality and reliability of the reasoning path (RP), improving both the accuracy of the final answer and the trustworthiness of the reasoning process. This approach, inspired by the advancement of multi-agent systems (Talebirad and

Nadiri, 2023), consists of two key stages: (1) rigorous error identification in intermediate steps, and (2) thorough error correction and RP refinement through multi-agent debates, as detailed presented in Algorithm 1

Step 1: Rigorous Error Identification. We adapted an Intermediate-Step Evaluator, implemented as an LLM agent, examining each step s_i of the selected RP S_s . This evaluator assesses not only the logical consistency and factual accuracy of each step but also its contribution to the overall reasoning quality. By considering only the information presented up to each point in the reasoning chain, the evaluator ensures a step-by-step validation of the RP’s integrity.

Step 2: Comprehensive Error Correction and RP Refinement. When errors are identified by the previous step, we engage a Multi-Agent Debate (MAD) system to address these issues comprehensively. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the MAD process involves multiple LLM agents debating the correct resolution for each identified error. Crucially, this debate focuses not just on fixing factual errors, but on improving the overall quality and coherence of the RP.

Following the MAD process, we generate a new, refined RP S_c . This refined RP undergoes multiple rounds of checking to ensure its validity and coherence. A Re-answer agent then utilizes this corrected RP to produce a final answer that not only reflects the improvements on the final answer made through error correction but also provides a clear, coherent, and trustworthy RP.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental setting

Our study evaluates the CoT Rerailer pipeline using a streamlined experimental framework tailored to diverse knowledge domains. We classify test datasets covering more than 20 categories (e.g., Date Understanding, DisambiguationQA, CollegeMath) from commonly tested QuestionAnswering benchmarks such as MathQA (Amini et al., 2019), GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021), and BigBench (Srivastava et al., 2023) into three broad categories: Commonsense Reasoning (979 questions), Mathematical Reasoning (1049 questions), and Symbolic Reasoning (449 questions). The detailed mapping of subjects to these broad categories is provided in Appendix A.2.1. We use GPT-4, Claude3-sonnet, and

GPT-3.5-turbo, all with temperature of 0.5, for our entire set of experiments. We utilize CoT prompting, SC prompting, and MAD prompting as baselines to compare with the CoT Rerailer. For SC prompting, we adopt a fixed sampling budget of 40 as recommended by the original authors (Wang et al., 2023). For MAD prompting, we include 2 debate agents and 3 rounds of debate (Du et al., 2023). Additional details about hyperparameters and machine settings are provided in Appendix A.2.1. Prompt designs are described in Appendix A.3, and the code and libraries used are available in Appendix A.1.

4.2 Main Results

Pipeline QA Performance: We verify the correction capability of the CoT rerailer through QA performance. Table 1 summarizes the performance of our proposed methods compared to standard Chain-of-Thought prompting, self-consistent CoT, and Multi-agent Debate prompting across different LLM base models, datasets, and categories. Such improvement is also justified in each specific category, which can be referred to in Appendix 7.

Intermediate Error Detection: The core capability of the Rerailer prompting method lies in its ability to track and detect errors in intermediate steps, which is crucial for ensuring accurate error correction and improved QA performance. Fig.4 demonstrates the Rerailer’s effectiveness in identifying and rectifying errors in both basic and advanced math problems. For instance, in a counting problem, the Rerailer corrects a mistake that led to an incorrect final answer in the original reasoning path. Similarly, in a differential equation example, it identifies a fundamental error in the approach and suggests the correct method. These examples showcase the Rerailer’s ability to address cascading errors and hallucinations in the reasoning process. Various additional examples across different problem types can be found in Appendix A.4.

Reasoning Process Comparison: To complement our qualitative analysis with quantitative evaluation, we compare Rerailer with existing step-wise error detection and correction methods, specifically Deductive-verification (De-Ve) (Ling et al., 2024) and Self-Check (Miao et al., 2024). Due to computational constraints, we sampled 290 challenging math questions adapted from GSM8K for this comparison. We conducted a human evaluation study to assess the quality of intermediate reasoning steps. Two domain experts independently rated the coher-

Table 1: The Accuracy of Different Methods Across Main Categories. CoT: Chain-of-Thoughts; SC: Self-Consistency; MAD: Multi-agent Debate

Models	Methods	Commonsense Reasoning	Mathematical Reasoning	Symbolic Reasoning	Overall
Claude-3	CoT	0.748	0.593	0.768	0.686
Claude-3	SC	0.763	0.618	0.784	0.705
Claude-3	MAD	0.747	0.598	0.768	0.688
Claude-3	Rerailer	0.783	0.634	0.793	0.722
GPT-3.5	CoT	0.755	0.561	0.768	0.675
GPT-3.5	SC	0.765	0.584	0.784	0.692
GPT-3.5	MAD	0.755	0.612	0.768	0.697
GPT-3.5	Rerailer	0.768	0.662	0.804	0.730
GPT-4	CoT	0.756	0.604	0.768	0.694
GPT-4	SC	0.766	0.627	0.784	0.711
GPT-4	MAD	0.770	0.624	0.768	0.708
GPT-4	Rerailer	0.787	0.685	0.808	0.748




Figure 4: CoT Rerailer Solving Math Questions. The questions and answers, which were retrieved from the GSM8K and MathQA datasets, are exhibited in the blue box. The red boxes are steps generated via the baseline CoT method and the green boxes are the corrected RP from Rerailer. Mistakes are highlighted in red and corrections are highlighted in green.

ence, relevance, and factual accuracy of the steps generated by each method on a scale of 1-5. As shown in Table 2, Rerailer demonstrates superior performance in both accuracy and intermediate step quality. It achieves the highest accuracy (51.7%) among all methods, showing a notable improvement over De-Ve (48.3%) and Self-Check (50.7%). The results also reveal that Rerailer produces the highest quality intermediate steps, with an average rating of 4.3. This surpasses the ratings of De-Ve (4.0) and Self-Check (3.5), indicating that our method not only improves final answer accuracy but also enhances the overall reasoning process. Details on how we conduct human evaluation with examples can be referred in Appendix B.2

4.3 Ablation Study

Through a series of ablation studies, we assess the contribution of individual components and some design choices within the CoT Rerailer to its overall effectiveness.

Derailment Identifier and Rerailment Process:

The experiments demonstrate the critical roles played by both the Derailment Identifier and the Rerailment Process in the CoT Rerailer pipeline. As shown in Table 3, removing the Derailment Identifier leads to a substantial increase in computational cost (nearly 6x) with only a marginal improvement in accuracy. This result is expected because the Derailment Identifier acts as an efficient filter, selectively choosing reasoning paths

Table 2: Method Comparison on Reasoning Process quality.

Method	Accuracy	Eval Score
CoT	0.417	3.0
De-Ve	0.483	3.7
Self-Check	0.507	3.9
Rerailer	0.517	4.3

Note: Human evaluation scores (1-5) represent the average rating of intermediate step quality by domain experts. CoT: Chain of Thought De-Ve: Deductive Verification.

(RPs) that require refinement. Without it, the model would attempt to refine all RPs, including those that are already satisfactory, leading to unnecessary computations and overfix those already good RP. On the other hand, the absence of the Rerailment Process results in a notable drop in overall accuracy (2%) and a significant degradation in the quality of intermediate reasoning steps. This outcome is anticipated because the Rerailment Process is responsible for verifying and refining the selected RPs, directly contributing to the improvement of reasoning quality. Without this process, errors in the initial reasoning paths would remain uncorrected, propagating through to the final output. These findings demonstrate that the synergistic interaction between the Derailment Identifier and the Rerailment Process is essential for achieving the optimal balance between computational efficiency and reasoning quality in the CoT Rerailer framework.




Figure 5: Correctness of Majority Voting vs. Number of Columns (Samples) Used for Majority Voting in the Derailment Process

NO. of Generated RPs in Derailment: In the Derailment Identification step of our CoT Rerailer pipeline, we generate multiple RPs for each ques-

tion to assess the consistency of the model’s responses in order to distinguish potentially flawed RP. To determine the optimal number of samples, we first followed the practice from the original self-consistency work (Wang et al., 2023) and generated 40 samples for selected questions from our dataset. We then experimented with varying the number of generated samples from 1 to 40 to find the most efficient and adequate number of samples for our pipeline. Fig. 5 presents the accuracy of the Derailment Identification step for each number of samples. We observed that increasing the number of samples generally improved performance, but the rate of change for improvement starts decreasing beyond 4 samples (Wan et al., 2024). Considering the trade-off between computational cost and performance, we chose to generate 4 samples for each question in the Derailment Identification step of our pipeline.

4.4 Analysis

Cost Analysis: Table 4 compares the average API calls and time costs for various methods tested on a selected challenging set of GSM8K questions, also used for human evaluation analysis in Table 2. SC prompting (42.1% accuracy) and De-Ve (48.3% accuracy) are the most computationally intensive, requiring 40 and 340 API calls respectively. MAD prompting (46.2% accuracy) and Self-Check (50.7% accuracy) are more efficient. Our proposed CoT Rerailer achieves the highest accuracy (51.7%) while maintaining relatively low computational costs, with only 5.7 API calls and 126 seconds per question on average. The time per question metric, which accounts for variations in input/output token counts, provides a comprehensive measure of efficiency. This metric shows that Rerailer is substantially faster than SC, MAD, De-Ve, and Self-Check due to the derailment identification process. Given its superior accuracy, Rerailer demonstrates an excellent balance between performance and efficiency, outperforming other methods in the accuracy-efficiency trade-off.

Error Analysis: Despite the advancements, hallucinations were not entirely eliminated. In Fig. 6, we compare the error-correcting ability of SC, MAD, and Rerailer. The upper-left corner of the confusion matrix represents the case where all the methods fail to correct the RP. The main sources of this error type include inaccuracies in the original dataset, lack of background knowledge, and ambiguous questions. For instance, discrepancies between the

Table 3: Ablation Study of Our Model Across Different Components and Categories with GPT-4

Method	Commonsense Reasoning	Mathematical Reasoning	Symbolic Reasoning	Overall	Time (hrs)
Full Pipeline	0.787	0.685	0.808	0.748	86.74
Without Derailment Identifier	0.769	0.656	0.793	0.725	317.88
Without Rerailment Process	0.773	0.643	0.782	0.719	45.41




Figure 6: Confusion matrix for SC, MAD, and Rerailer to compare the error-correcting capabilities.

Table 4: Cost Analysis of Methods on GPT-4 on Average per questions, tested on selected Challenging set of GSM8K question. ACC: Accuracy; s: seconds. SC: Self-Consistency; MAD: Multi-Agent Debate; De-Ve: Deductive Verification. API Calls and Time are calculated as per question.

Method	ACC (%)	API Calls	Time (s)
SC	42.8	40	880
MAD	46.2	6	132
De-Ve	48.3	340	7481
Self-Check	50.7	32	704
Rerailer	51.7	5.7	126

LLM’s answers and the ground-truth responses often highlighted errors in the dataset rather than the LLM’s reasoning. Some questions required external information that was not available to the LLM, leading to incorrect responses. Ambiguous questions also posed challenges in achieving accurate answers without further clarification. In addition, LLM-specific errors, including capturing minor variations in expression, were also observed. In one case, the LLM considered two equivalent equations as different, leading to a false positive hallucination detection. This highlights the need for further refinement in distinguishing genuine

hallucinations from minor variations in expression. Examples are provided in Fig.9-10 in Appendix. Besides, Rerailer demonstrates better correction capability as reflected by the **upper-right corner** of the confusion matrix where the original RP fails to correctly answer the question while the corrected version of Rerailer succeeds.

5 Conclusion

In this study, we demonstrate that the CoT Rerailer framework enhances the accuracy and reliability of large language models in complex reasoning tasks by outperforming existing techniques across various reasoning domains. By efficiently filtering flawed reasoning paths with robust error correction via multi-agent debates, our approach effectively reduces hallucinations and improves the quality of intermediate reasoning steps. This method emphasizes the value of selective intervention and collaborative error correction in enhancing LLM reasoning. The interaction between the Derailment Identifier and Rerailment Process highlights the critical balance between computational efficiency and reasoning quality. We posit that the CoT Rerailer framework will have a broad positive impact, enabling more reliable and trustworthy applications of large language models in complex reasoning tasks.

6 Limitations

Computational Demands on Harder Tasks: Although on average efficiency, the framework requires additional processing power compared to standard methods like CoT given the problem is complex and LLM can't produce consistent reasoning paths, which may limit its applicability in resource-constrained environments in such scenarios.

Knowledge Limitations: As highlighted in our error analysis, the framework's effectiveness is constrained by the knowledge boundaries of the underlying LLM, particularly for questions requiring information beyond its training corpus.

References

- Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Shanchuan Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. [Mathqa: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with operation-based formalisms](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 2357–2367, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anthropic. 2024. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku.
- 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.
- Shizhe Diao, Pengcheng Wang, Yong Lin, and Tong Zhang. 2023. [Active prompting with chain-of-thought for large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2302.12246.
- Yilun Du, Shuang Li, Antonio Torralba, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Igor Mordatch. 2023. Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multi-agent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14325*.
- Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, yelong shen, Yujia Yang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2024. [CRITIC: Large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- 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.
- Jie Huang, Xinyun Chen, Swaroop Mishra, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Adams Wei Yu, Xinying Song, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Large language models cannot self-correct reasoning yet. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01798*.
- Jie Huang, Xinyun Chen, Swaroop Mishra, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Adams Wei Yu, Xinying Song, and Denny Zhou. 2024. [Large language models cannot self-correct reasoning yet](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang (Shane) Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 22199–22213.
- Guohao Li, Hasan Abed Al Kader Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. 2023a. [CAMEL: Communicative agents for "mind" exploration of large language model society](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Junyi Li, Xiaoxue Cheng, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023b. [Halueval: A large-scale hallucination evaluation benchmark for large language models](#).
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yuri Burda, Harrison Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. 2024. [Let's verify step by step](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zhan Ling, Yunhao Fang, Xuanlin Li, Zhiao Huang, Mingu Lee, Roland Memisevic, and Hao Su. 2023. [Deductive verification of chain-of-thought reasoning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.03872.
- Zhan Ling, Yunhao Fang, Xuanlin Li, Zhiao Huang, Mingu Lee, Roland Memisevic, and Hao Su. 2024. Deductive verification of chain-of-thought reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, Shashank Gupta, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Katherine Hermann, Sean Welleck, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, and Peter Clark. 2023. [Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark JF Gales. 2023. [Selfcheckgpt: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08896*.
- Ning Miao, Yee Whye Teh, and Tom Rainforth. 2024. [Selfcheck: Using LLMs to zero-shot check their own step-by-step reasoning](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, 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, Rameesh 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 Ry-

der, 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.

Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training.

Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R. Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, Agnieszka Kluska, Aitor Lewkowycz, Akshat Agarwal, Alethea Power, Alex Ray, Alex Warstadt, Alexander W. Kocurek, Ali Safaya, Ali Tazarv, Alice Xiang, Alicia Parrish, Allen Nie, Aman Hussain, Amanda Askell, Amanda Dsouza, Ambrose Slone, Ameet Rahane, Anantharaman S. Iyer, Anders Andreassen, Andrea Madotto, Andrea Santilli, Andreas Stuhlmüller, Andrew Dai, Andrew La, Andrew Lampinen, Andy Zou, Angela Jiang, Angelica Chen, Anh Vuong, Animesh Gupta, Anna Gottardi, Antonio Norelli, Anu Venkatesh, Arash Gholamidavoodi, Arfa Tabasum, Arul Menezes, Arun Kirubarajan, Asher Mullokandov, Ashish Sabharwal, Austin Herrick, Avia Efrat, Aykut Erdem, Ayla Karakaş, B. Ryan Roberts, Bao Sheng Loe, Barret Zoph, Bartłomiej Bojanowski, Batuhan Özyurt, Behnam Hedayatnia, Behnam Neyshabur, Benjamin Inden, Benno Stein, Berk Ekmekci, Bill Yuchen Lin, Blake Howald, Bryan Orinion, Cameron Diao, Cameron Dour, Catherine Stinson, Cedrick Argueta, César Ferri Ramírez, Chandan Singh, Charles Rathkopf, Chenlin Meng, Chitta Baral, Chiyu Wu, Chris Callison-Burch, Chris Waites, Christian Voigt, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Potts, Cindy Ramirez, Clara E. Rivera, Clemencia Siro, Colin Raffel, Courtney Ashcraft, Cristina Garbacea, Damien Sileo, Dan Garrette, Dan Hendrycks, Dan Kilman, Dan Roth, Daniel Freeman, Daniel Khashabi, Daniel Levy, Daniel Moseguí González, Danielle Perszyk, Danny Hernandez, Danqi Chen, Daphne Ippolito, Dar Gilboa, David Dohan, David Drakard, David Jurgens, Debajyoti Datta,

Deep Ganguli, Denis Emelin, Denis Kleyko, Deniz Yuret, Derek Chen, Derek Tam, Dieuwke Hupkes, Diganta Misra, Dilyar Buzan, Dimitri Coelho Mollo, Diyi Yang, Dong-Ho Lee, Dylan Schrader, Ekaterina Shutova, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Elad Segal, Eleanor Hagerman, Elizabeth Barnes, Elizabeth Donoway, Elie Pavlick, Emanuele Rodola, Emma Lam, Eric Chu, Eric Tang, Erkut Erdem, Ernie Chang, Ethan A. Chi, Ethan Dyer, Ethan Jerzak, Ethan Kim, Eunice Engefu Manyasi, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Fanyue Xia, Fatemeh Siar, Fernando Martínez-Plumed, Francesca Happé, Francois Chollet, Frieda Rong, Gaurav Mishra, Genta Indra Winata, Gerard de Melo, Germán Kruszewski, Giambattista Parascandolo, Giorgio Mariani, Gloria Wang, Gonzalo Jaimovitch-López, Gregor Betz, Guy Gur-Ari, Hana Galijasevic, Hannah Kim, Hannah Rashkin, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Harsh Mehta, Hayden Bogar, Henry Shevlin, Hinrich Schütze, Hiromu Yakura, Hongming Zhang, Hugh Mee Wong, Ian Ng, Isaac Noble, Jaap Jumelet, Jack Geissinger, Jackson Kernion, Jacob Hilton, Jaehoon Lee, Jaime Fernández Fisac, James B. Simon, James Koppel, James Zheng, James Zou, Jan Kocoń, Jana Thompson, Janelle Wingfield, Jared Kaplan, Jarema Radom, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Jason Phang, Jason Wei, Jason Yosinski, Jekaterina Novikova, Jelle Bosscher, Jennifer Marsh, Jeremy Kim, Jeroen Taal, Jesse Engel, Jesujoba Alabi, Jiacheng Xu, Jiaming Song, Jillian Tang, Joan Waweru, John Burden, John Miller, John U. Balis, Jonathan Batchelder, Jonathan Berant, Jörg Froberg, Jos Rozen, Jose Hernandez-Orallo, Joseph Boudeman, Joseph Guerr, Joseph Jones, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, Joshua S. Rule, Joyce Chua, Kamil Kanclerz, Karen Livescu, Karl Krauth, Karthik Gopalakrishnan, Katerina Ignatyeva, Katja Markert, Kaustubh D. Dhole, Kevin Gimpel, Kevin Omondi, Kory Mathewson, Kristen Chifullo, Ksenia Shkaruta, Kumar Shridhar, Kyle McDonell, Kyle Richardson, Laria Reynolds, Leo Gao, Li Zhang, Liam Dugan, Lianhui Qin, Lidia Contreras-Ochando, Louis-Philippe Morency, Luca Moschella, Lucas Lam, Lucy Noble, Ludwig Schmidt, Luheng He, Luis Oliveros Colón, Luke Metz, Lütfi Kerem Şenel, Maarten Bosma, Maarten Sap, Maartje ter Hoeve, Maheen Farooqi, Manaal Faruqui, Mantas Mazeika, Marco Baturan, Marco Marelli, Marco Maru, Maria Jose Ramírez Quintana, Marie Tolkienn, Mario Giulianelli, Martha Lewis, Martin Potthast, Matthew L. Leavitt, Matthias Hagen, Mátyás Schubert, Medina Orduna Baitemirova, Melody Arnaud, Melvin McElrath, Michael A. Yee, Michael Cohen, Michael Gu, Michael Ivanitskiy, Michael Starritt, Michael Strube, Michał Śwędrowski, Michele Bevilacqua, Michihiro Yasunaga, Mihir Kale, Mike Cain, Mimeo Xu, Mirac Suzgun, Mitch Walker, Mo Tiwari, Mohit Bansal, Moin Aminnaseri, Mor Geva, Mozhdah Gheini, Mukund Varma T, Nanyun Peng, Nathan A. Chi, Nayeon Lee, Neta Gur-Ari Krakover, Nicholas Cameron, Nicholas Roberts, Nick Doiron, Nicole Martinez, Nikita Nangia, Niklas Deckers, Niklas Muennighoff, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Niveditha S. Iyer, Noah Constant, Noah Fiedel, Nuan Wen, Oliver Zhang, Omar Agha, Omar Elbaghdadi, Omer Levy, Owain Evans, Pablo Antonio Moreno Casares, Parth Doshi, Pascale Fung, Paul Pu Liang, Paul Vicol, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Peiyuan Liao, Percy Liang, Peter Chang, Peter Eckersley, Phu Mon Htut, Pinyu Hwang, Piotr Miłkowski, Piyush Patil, Pouya Pezeshkpour, Priti Oli, Qiaozhu Mei, Qing Lyu, Qinlang Chen, Rabin Banjade, Rachel Etta Rudolph, Raefer Gabriel, Rahel Habacker, Ramon Risco, Raphaël Millière, Rhythm Garg, Richard Barnes, Rif A. Saurous, Riku Arakawa, Robbe Raymaekers, Robert Frank, Rohan Sikand, Roman Novak, Roman Sitelew, Ronan LeBras, Rosanne Liu, Rowan Jacobs, Rui Zhang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Ryan Chi, Ryan Lee, Ryan Stovall, Ryan Teehan, Rylan Yang, Sahib Singh, Saif M. Mohammad, Sajant Anand, Sam Dillavou, Sam Shleifer, Sam Wiseman, Samuel Gruetter, Samuel R. Bowman, Samuel S. Schoenholz, Sanghyun Han, Sanjeev Kwatra, Sarah A. Rous, Sarik Ghazarian, Sayan Ghosh, Sean Casey, Sebastian Bischoff, Sebastian Gehrmann, Sebastian Schuster, Sepideh Sadeghi, Shadi Hamdan, Sharon Zhou, Shashank Srivastava, Sherry Shi, Shikhar Singh, Shima Asaadi, Shixiang Shane Gu, Shubh Pachchigar, Shubham Toshniwal, Shyam Upadhyay, Shyamolima, Debnath, Siamak Shakeri, Simon Thormeyer, Simone Melzi, Siva Reddy, Sneha Priscilla Makini, Soo-Hwan Lee, Spencer Torene, Sriharsha Hatwar, Stanislas Dehaene, Stefan Divic, Stefano Ermon, Stella Biderman, Stephanie Lin, Stephen Prasad, Steven T. Piantadosi, Stuart M. Shieber, Summer Mishnerghi, Svetlana Kiritchenko, Swaroop Mishra, Tal Linzen, Tal Schuster, Tao Li, Tao Yu, Tariq Ali, Tatsu Hashimoto, Te-Lin Wu, Théo Desbordes, Theodore Rothschild, Thomas Phan, Tianle Wang, Tiberius Nkinyili, Timo Schick, Timofei Kornev, Titus Tunduny, Tobias Gerstenberg, Trenton Chang, Trishala Neeraj, Tushar Khot, Tyler Shultz, Uri Shaham, Vedant Misra, Vera Demberg, Victoria Nyamai, Vikas Raunak, Vinay Ramasesh, Vinay Uday Prabhu, Vishakh Padmakumar, Vivek Srikumar, William Fedus, William Saunders, William Zhang, Wout Vossen, Xiang Ren, Xiaoyu Tong, Xinran Zhao, Xinyi Wu, Xudong Shen, Yadollah Yaghoobzadeh, Yair Lakretz, Yangqiu Song, Yasaman Bahri, Yejin Choi, Yichi Yang, Yiding Hao, Yifu Chen, Yonatan Belinkov, Yu Hou, Yufang Hou, Yuntao Bai, Zachary Seid, Zhuoye Zhao, Zijian Wang, Zijie J. Wang, Zirui Wang, and Ziyi Wu. 2023. [Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2206.04615.

Yashar Talebirad and Amirhossein Nadiri. 2023. [Multi-agent collaboration: Harnessing the power of intelligent llm agents](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.03314.

Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutie 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. 2023a. [Language Models Don't Always Say What They Think: Unfaithful Explanations in Chain-of-Thought Prompting](#).
- Miles Turpin, Julian Michael, Ethan Perez, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2023b. [Language models don't always say what they think: Unfaithful explanations in chain-of-thought prompting](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Guangya Wan, Yuqi Wu, Jie Chen, and Sheng Li. 2024. [Dynamic self-consistency: Leveraging reasoning paths for efficient llm sampling](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.17017*.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023. [Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2203.11171.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Yixuan Weng, Minjun Zhu, Fei Xia, Bin Li, Shizhu He, Shengping Liu, Bin Sun, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2023. [Large language models are better reasoners with self-verification](#). In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Muru Zhang, Ofir Press, William Merrill, Alisa Liu, and Noah A. Smith. 2024. [How language model hallucinations can snowball](#). In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, Longyue Wang, Anh Tuan Luu, Wei Bi, Freda Shi, and Shuming Shi. 2023a. [Siren's song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.01219.
- Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. 2023b. [Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc V Le, and Ed H. Chi. 2023. [Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.

A Appendix

A.1 Package Used and Code

For generating LLMs responses and parsing out answers, we utilize packages "langchain", "langchain_openai", "langchain_anthropic", "langchain_community", and "langchain_core" offered by Langchain². In addition, we use "pandas" for data processing, "matplotlib" for visualization, and "numpy" for basic mathematical manipulation.

Here is the code link for our GitHub (Anonymous): <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/rerailer-0031/Readme.md>

A.2 Experiments Details

In this section, we will include some details that might help readers better understand our work. Note that this might not be comprehensive due to the space and time limit, but we will include what we think is necessary to get a good picture of what we did and what we found in this study.

A.2.1 Experiments Setup

LLM Sources In this study, the gpt models we adopt are from OpenAI "gpt-4" and "gpt-3.5-turbo" models. The claude model is from anthropic 'claude-3-sonnet'.

Data Sources The datasets used in our experiments are derived from a variety of sources, each contributing to the diversity of subjects and complexity of questions analyzed. Below we detail the origin of each subject's data:

- **Big Bench:** This dataset contributes to the *Date Understanding* and *Disambiguation* subjects, providing a focused set of questions that test the model's ability to process and understand dates and time-related queries.
- **MathQA:** The *Math* subject is sourced from the MathQA dataset, which includes a wide range of mathematical problem-solving questions designed to test computational and reasoning skills.

²<https://www.langchain.com/>

- **GSK8K**: Data for the *Challenging Math* subject comes from the GSK8K dataset, known for its complex mathematics questions that require advanced problem-solving capabilities.
- **MMLU (Test Set)**: The Majority of subjects, including *Philosophy, Jurisprudence, International Law, Professional Law, Business Ethics, College Chemistry, College Medicine, College Physics, College Biology, College Mathematics, Abstract Algebra, Formal Logic, Professional Accounting, College Computer Science, Econometrics, and Electrical Engineering*, are derived from the test set of the Massive Multitask Language Understanding (MMLU) dataset. This dataset is notable for its broad coverage of subjects, offering a rigorous testing ground for our models across a wide spectrum of disciplines.

Subjects Descriptions In our experiments, we utilize a diverse range of subjects to evaluate the performance of our models. These subjects are grouped into broader categories to facilitate analysis and understanding. Below is a description of these subjects and their corresponding broader category:

- **Commonsense Reasoning**: Commonsense Reasoning involves areas that require practical knowledge, understanding of real-world situations, and ethical or philosophical reasoning with 979 questions in total.
 - Disambiguation
 - Data Understanding
 - College Medicine
 - College Biology
 - Philosophy
 - Jurisprudence
 - International Law
 - Professional Law
 - Business Ethics
- **Mathematical Reasoning**: Mathematical Reasoning includes all areas directly related to mathematical calculations, statistics, and problem-solving in math with 1049 questions in total.
 - Math
 - Elementary Mathematics,
 - High School Statistics

- Abstract Algebra
- Challenging Math
- Professional Accounting
- College Mathematics

- **Symbolic Reasoning**: Symbolic Reasoning covers areas that rely heavily on formal logic, abstract symbolic manipulation, and scientific principles that involve symbolic representations with 449 questions in total.

- Formal Logic
- College Computer Science
- College Physics
- Electrical Engineering,
- College Chemistry

The categorization is designed to reflect the diversity and scope of the subjects our models are evaluated against, ensuring a comprehensive assessment across a wide array of knowledge domains. To obtain LLM RP for the experiment, we spend roughly \$2000 USD and 250 hrs in total for LLM API usage.

A.2.2 Main Results

In this subsection, we will introduce some detailed information about our experiments.

The provided plots compare the accuracy of different prompting methods, including Self-Consistency, Multi-agent Debate and Rerailer, across subjects (Figure 7).

In Figure 7, we can observe that the Output_Answer consistently outperforms other baseline answer types across all broad categories (Advanced Math, Applied Science, Elementary Math, Law & Philosophy, and Natural Science). This suggests that the Derailment Identification step is effective in identifying and filtering out incorrect answers, leading to improved accuracy. We also observe Multi-step answer has the best performance overall, which is also reflected in the main text.

Overall, these plots highlight the effectiveness of our pipeline in improving the accuracy of the question-answering system across various categories.

We will present our results from our second pipeline using **Confusion Matrices**. A confusion matrix summarizes the performance of a classification model by comparing the predicted labels to the actual labels. In our project, the confusion matrix evaluates the effectiveness of our pipeline in

correcting the answers from the Derailment Identification step.

The confusion matrix consists of four components: True Positive (TP), True Negative (TN), False Negative (FN), and False Positive (FP). TP indicates that both the RP and Rerailer-corrected RP answers are correct. TN means the raw RP answer is incorrect, but the pipeline successfully corrects it. FN indicates that both the raw and corrected RP answers are incorrect, and the pipeline fails to correct the answer. FP means the raw RP answer is correct, but the pipeline introduces an error by modifying it.

We calculate confusion matrices for each broad category and the overall dataset in Figure 6 to analyze the model’s performance within each category and across all categories.

A.3 Prompts and Case Studies

In this section, we included our prompts for each component and their corresponding results. Another hallucination mitigation example of a physics question is shown in Fig. 8.

A.3.1 Raw CoT Generator

In our study, the primary goal was to rerail a hallucinated RP. Hence, we use the basic CoT prompt design with a zero-shot learning approach. Our prompt was defined as follows:

System Message: *You are a professional specialized in {subject}. You need to help me answer the given question. Notice that you need to solve the question step by step and as detailed as possible. Do not jump to the answer directly. If it is a computational question, please provide me with the detailed calculation in your steps, not just say the method! Your intermediate steps and thoughts are critical!*
Human Message: *The question can be found in {question}*

A.3.2 Derailment Identification

The first step of the proposed pipeline consists of a consistency filter with a judge. The consistency filter removed confident responses that LLMs produce similar answers all the time. In the case where LLMs produce inconsistent RPs, we leveraged a Judge agent to determine which RP was most likely to be addressed. Our Judge agent selected the best RP from three candidates and passed the best RP to Rerailer for further mitigation. The Judge agent prompt is defined as follows:

System Message: *”You are a professional specialized in {subject}. A Chain of Thought (COT) is a step-by-step reasoning process used to solve a problem or answer a question. You have been presented with three different RPs below for the question ”{question}”. Please carefully analyze these RPs and provide your assessment on which one is the most logically sound based on the given information and your expertise in the subject.*
Human Message: *”Here are the three Reasoning Paths (RPs) for your analysis:” ”RP 1: {rp1}” ”RP 2: {rp2}” ”RP 3: {rp3}”*

A.3.3 Error Detection Agent

As a critical component of the CoT-Rerailer, the step Evaluator agent checks each intermediate step hallucination. We tried multiple prompts and found that directly asking if the LLM thought the step was "correct" was ambiguous. Hence, in our prompt engineering, we formally defined the term hallucination inspired by []’s definition. Instead of asking for "correctness", we required the LLM to determine if there were any logic mistakes (factuality hallucination) or inconsistency (faithfulness hallucination). The prompt was defined as:

System Message: *You are a professional specialized in {subject}. You need to help me verify my steps when I solve the question. I am currently at step #{current_step}. Before you perform the task, I want you to keep in mind several definitions for my possible mistakes.*

1. Factuality: This type of error emphasizes the discrepancy between generated content and verifiable real-world facts, including factual inconsistency or fabrication. In mathematics, for instance, it may represent the computational error.

2. Faithfulness: This type of error refers to the divergence of my step analysis from the original question or previous steps, as well as consistency within my steps. In mathematics, for instance, it may represent that I understood the question wrongly or my proposed step is inconsistent with my previous step.

Based on my current step response, question, previous steps, and my error definitions, help me verify if any of the mistakes (factuality or faithfulness) occur in my analysis. Notice that skipping a step should not be considered an error as long as the calculation is correct! For instance, $2x+2$ should be the same as $2+2x$. Also, $2x+2+3$ should be the same as $2x+5$ At step 1, since we have no step 0, instead, the factuality and faithfulness check should reflect if I correctly understood the answer. Do not detect any minor hallucinations! In other words, only targeting the mistakes that contain calculation errors or apparent logical flaws or contradict real-world facts! If the provided step acknowledges the mistake, you need to capture it and correct it. If you see any step ends up with 'verified' it means it has been checked without any mistake, so just consider it as correct and do not have to give the verification. Simply say step hallucination is [NO] **Human Message:***Here is my complete thought process {RP} and this is the original question {question}*

A.3.4 Debate Agent

To verify if the proposed correction generated by the step Evaluator agent was truly correct, our Debate Mitigator agents conducted a multi-agent debate. Similar to the Evaluator, it was also necessary to let the debate agent understand the formal definition of hallucination, and the prompt was defined as follows:

System Message: *You are a professional specialized in {subject}. You need to help me verify my steps when I solve the question. I am currently at step #{current_step}.*

1. Factuality: This type of error emphasizes the discrepancy between generated content and verifiable real-world facts, including factual inconsistency or fabrication. In mathematics, for instance, it may represent the computational error.

2. Faithfulness: This type of error refers to the divergence of my step analysis from the original question or previous steps, as well as consistency within my steps. In mathematics, for instance, it may represent that I understood the question wrongly or my proposed step is inconsistent with my previous step.

Other agents helped me identify the error I made in the current step. Your goal is to debate with the other agents and justify if their corrections were correct based on my question, and thought process. Please use Critical Thinking and only capture the significant mistake that will lead to the wrong answer. Errors like different interpretations should be ignored.

Human Message:*Here is my complete thought process {RP} and this is the original question {question}. The full response from the other agents was given as {response}*

A.3.5 Re-answer Agent

Finally, the corrected step along with the previously verified steps were used as the initial thought process to inspire the LLM to regenerate the thought chain. In our experiment, we observed that sometimes only correcting one step was not sufficient to mitigate mistakes since the newly generated RP can also suffer from hallucinations. However, this hallucination becomes more unlikely or contains fewer error since the first few checked steps were certain. The prompt for the re-answer agent was defined as follows:

System Message: *You are a professional specialized in {subject}. Your task is to help me answer the question based on my initial thoughts. I will provide you with several steps of my attempt. Your task is to CONTINUE my thought process and then answer my question step by step. Also, a maximum of 12 steps are allowed and you can assume my initial thoughts had been checked since could be trusted. Remember, your response should based on my initial thoughts!*

Human Message: *Here is my question:{question}. And my initial thought process is given as {RP}*

A.4 Error Analysis Case Study

In our experiment, mainly three types of typical errors occurred with potentially downgrading our performance including wrong ground-truth, lack of background information, and ambiguous questions. The detailed example were show in Fig. 9

B Human Evaluation Details

We conducted a comprehensive human evaluation study to assess the quality of intermediate reasoning steps generated by different methods (CoT, De-Ve, Self-Check, and Rerailer). This section outlines the evaluation process, criteria, and instructions for human annatators.

B.1 Evaluation Process

Each annotator was provided with a set of 50 randomly selected questions from the 290 challenging math questions used in the state-of-the-art comparison. For each question, the evaluator was given the intermediate reasoning steps generated by all four methods (CoT, De-Ve, Self-Check, and Rerailer) in a randomized order to prevent bias. Evaluators were asked to rate each set of intermediate steps on a scale of 1-5 for three criteria: coherence, relevance, and factual accuracy. Evaluators were also encouraged to provide brief qualitative feedback for each evaluation.

B.2 Evaluation Criteria

Evaluators were instructed to consider the following criteria:

1. Coherence (1-5 scale):

- 1: Completely incoherent, steps do not logically follow each other
- 3: Moderately coherent, some logical gaps but generally followable

- 5: Highly coherent, steps flow logically and are easy to follow

2. Relevance (1-5 scale):

- 1: Mostly irrelevant to the problem at hand
- 3: Somewhat relevant, but includes unnecessary or tangential information
- 5: Highly relevant, all steps directly contribute to solving the problem

3. Factual Accuracy (1-5 scale):

- 1: Contains multiple factual errors or misconceptions
- 3: Generally accurate, but with minor errors or imprecisions
- 5: Completely accurate, no detectable errors

B.3 Evaluation Example

Figure 10 shows the Chain-of-Thought (CoT) provided to the annotators. The Right (Teal) Column contains the annotator’s scoring and their qualitative feedback.

Annotator 1:

- **Coherence:** 5/5
- **Relevance:** 5/5
- **Factual Accuracy:** 5/5
- **Qualitative feedback:** Clear, logical, and super easy to follow. Everything builds perfectly to the solution without any fluff. Math checks out too. Solid 5/5.

Annotator 2:

- **Coherence:** 4/5
- **Relevance:** 4/5
- **Factual Accuracy:** 3/5
- **Qualitative feedback:** There is room for improvement. Steps flow okay, but could be clearer on the age calculation part. Doesn’t explain why their answer differs from the ‘ground truth’ — that’s a big miss. Calculations seem right, but that discrepancy is concerning. I’d go with 4/5 for coherence and relevance, 3/5 for accuracy.




Figure 7: Accuracy of different prompting methods across various subjects. The plot shows the accuracy scores for each answer type within each category, as well as overall accuracy lines for comparison. The multi_Step answer, representing the answers using our CoT Rerailer fixed on every calculated step, generally outperforms other answer types across all subjects.

<p>Question: White light is normally incident on a puddle of water (index of refraction 1.33). A thin (500 nm) layer of oil (index of refraction 1.5) floats on the surface of the puddle. Of the following, the most strongly reflected wavelength is?</p> <p>A) 500nm. B) 550nm C) 600nm. D) 650nm.</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>- Ground Truth Answer: C - Plain CoT Answer: D - Rerailer Answer: C</p>	<p>Step 1: Understand that the phenomenon described is thin-film interference, which occurs when light reflects off the two surfaces of a thin film, causing interference. The most strongly reflected wavelength will be the one that undergoes constructive interference.</p>	<p>Step 1: Understand that the phenomenon described is thin-film interference, which occurs when light reflects off the two surfaces of a thin film, causing interference. The most strongly reflected wavelength will be the one that undergoes constructive interference.</p>
	<p>Step 2: Recall that constructive interference occurs when the path difference between the two reflected waves is an integer multiple of the wavelength in the medium, or $(2 * \text{thickness} * n) = m * \lambda$, where m is an integer (for the first order, m=1), thickness is the thickness of the oil layer, n is the index of refraction of the oil, and lambda is the wavelength of light in the oil.</p>	<p>Step 2: Recall that constructive interference occurs when the path difference between the two reflected waves is an integer multiple of the wavelength in the medium, or $(2 * \text{thickness} * n) = m * \lambda$, where m is an integer (for the first order, m=1), thickness is the thickness of the oil layer, n is the index of refraction of the oil, and lambda is the wavelength of light in the oil.</p>
	<p>Step 5: Solve for lambda in oil: $\lambda_{\text{in oil}} = 1500 \text{ nm} / 1.5 = 1000 \text{ nm}$.</p>	<p>Step 5: Apply the formula for higher orders of interference ($m > 0$) to find wavelengths within the visible spectrum. For m=1, the formula becomes $(2 * \text{thickness} * n) = (1 + 1/2) * \lambda$, which simplifies to $(2 * 500 \text{ nm} * 1.5) = 1.5 * \lambda$. This gives $1500 \text{ nm} = 1.5 * \lambda$, so $\lambda = 1000 \text{ nm}$. This wavelength is still outside the visible spectrum.</p>
	<p>Step 6: Since the index of refraction of oil is 1.5, the wavelength in air would be $\lambda_{\text{in air}} = \lambda_{\text{in oil}} / n = 1000 \text{ nm} / 1.5 = 666.67 \text{ nm}$.</p>	<p>Step 6: Continue with m=2, the formula becomes $(2 * \text{thickness} * n) = (2 + 1/2) * \lambda$, which simplifies to $(2 * 500 \text{ nm} * 1.5) = 2.5 * \lambda$. This gives $1500 \text{ nm} = 2.5 * \lambda$, so $\lambda = 600 \text{ nm}$. This wavelength is within the visible spectrum and is a candidate for the most strongly reflected wavelength.</p>
	<p>Step 7: Among the given options, the closest to 666.67 nm is 650 nm, which is option D.</p>	<p>Step 9: Given that no higher orders of m within the visible spectrum and the options provided yield a wavelength that is more strongly reflected than 600 nm, we conclude that 600 nm is the most strongly reflected wavelength within the options given.</p>

Figure 8: CoT Rerailer Solving a Physics Question. The questions and answers, which were retrieved from the MMLU dataset, are exhibited in the blue box. The red boxes are steps generated via the baseline CoT method and the green boxes are the corrected RP from Rerailer. Mistakes are highlighted in red and corrections are highlighted in green.

<p>Question: As of 2018, about what percentage of people from Tunisia say that having an increasing number of people of many different races, ethnic groups and nationalities in their country makes it a better place to live (as opposed to worse or no difference)?</p> <p>A) 24% B) 39% C) 54% D) 69%</p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>- Ground Truth Answer: A - Raw CoT Answer: None - Rerailer Answer: None</p>	<p>Without the ability to access or verify specific survey data from 2018 regarding Tunisian attitudes towards diversity, I cannot provide a direct answer to this question.</p>	<p>To answer this question, we need to rely on specific survey data or reports that have investigated the attitudes of people in Tunisia towards diversity. Since the question is about a specific statistic from 2018, without access to real-time data or the ability to conduct a new survey, the best approach is to refer to reputable sources that have published findings on this topic. These could include international organizations, research institutions, or global surveys that focus on social attitudes and perceptions towards diversity and immigration. Given the lack of direct access to such specific data in this format, we would typically look for reports from entities like Pew Research Center, Gallup, or similar organizations that conduct international surveys on social issues. However, since we cannot perform this search or access new data in real-time, we must acknowledge that answering this question accurately requires specific knowledge or data from such surveys conducted in or around 2018 regarding the attitudes of Tunisian people towards diversity.</p>
---	--	---

Figure 9: Error analysis-Lacking Background Information Global Facts Problem. The questions and answers, which were retrieved from the MMLU dataset, are exhibited in the blue box. The red boxes are steps generated via the baseline CoT method and the green boxes are the corrected CoT from Rerailer.

<p>Question: At 30, Anika is $\frac{4}{3}$ the age of Maddie. What would be their average age in 15 years?</p> <p>Answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ground Truth Answer: 50 - Raw CoT Answer: 41.25 - Rerailer Answer: 41.25 	<p>Step 1: Determine Anika's current age. Since Anika is currently $\frac{4}{3}$ times Maddie's age, we can set up the equation: Anika's age = $(\frac{4}{3}) * \text{Maddie's age}$ Let's denote Maddie's age as M. So, Anika's current age = $(\frac{4}{3}) * M$</p>	<p>Step 1: Determine Anika's current age. Since Anika is currently $\frac{4}{3}$ times Maddie's age, we can set up the equation: Anika's age = $(\frac{4}{3}) * \text{Maddie's age}$ Let's denote Maddie's age as M. So, Anika's current age = $(\frac{4}{3}) * M$</p>
	<p>Step 2: Determine Maddie's current age. Given that Anika is currently 30 years old, we can use the relationship established in step 1 to find Maddie's age. Anika's current age = $(\frac{4}{3}) * \text{Maddie's current age}$ $30 = (\frac{4}{3}) * M$. To find M, we can multiply both sides by $\frac{3}{4}$: $30 * (\frac{3}{4}) = M$ $22.5 = M$ So, Maddie's current age (M) is 22.5 years.</p>	<p>Step 2: Determine Maddie's current age. Given that Anika is currently 30 years old, we can use the relationship established in step 1 to find Maddie's age. Anika's current age = $(\frac{4}{3}) * \text{Maddie's current age}$ $30 = (\frac{4}{3}) * M$. To find M, we can multiply both sides by $\frac{3}{4}$: $30 * (\frac{3}{4}) = M$ $22.5 = M$ So, Maddie's current age (M) is 22.5 years.</p>
	<p>Step 3: Calculate their average age in 15 years. In 15 years, Anika will be $30 + 15 = 45$ years old. And Maddie will be $22.5 + 15 = 37.5$ years old.</p>	<p>Step 3: Calculate their average age in 15 years. In 15 years, Anika will be $30 + 15 = 45$ years old. And Maddie will be $22.5 + 15 = 37.5$ years old.</p>
	<p>Step 4: Find the average of their ages in 15 years. Average age = $(\text{Anika's age in 15 years} + \text{Maddie's age in 15 years}) / 2$ $= (45 + 37.5) / 2$ $= 82.5 / 2$ $= 41.25$ years</p>	<p>Step 4: Find the average of their ages in 15 years. Average age = $(\text{Anika's age in 15 years} + \text{Maddie's age in 15 years}) / 2$ $= (45 + 37.5) / 2$ $= 82.5 / 2$ $= 41.25$ years</p>

Figure 10: Error analysis-Wrong Ground Truth Math Problem. The questions and answers, which were retrieved from the GSM8K dataset, are exhibited in the blue box. The red boxes are steps generated via the baseline CoT method and the green boxes are the corrected RP from Rerailer.