
Rethinking Uncertainty Estimation in Natural Language Generation

Lukas Aichberger ^{*1} Kajetan Schweighofer ^{*1} Sepp Hochreiter ^{1,2}

¹ ELLIS Unit Linz and LIT AI Lab, Institute for Machine Learning,
Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria

² NXAI GmbH, Linz, Austria

* Joint first authors

{aichberger, schweighofer, hochreit}@ml.jku.at

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly employed in real-world applications, driving the need to evaluate the trustworthiness of their generated text. To this end, reliable uncertainty estimation is essential. Since current LLMs generate text autoregressively through a stochastic process, the same prompt can lead to varying outputs. Consequently, leading uncertainty estimation methods generate and analyze multiple output sequences to determine the LLM’s uncertainty. However, generating output sequences is computationally expensive, making these methods impractical at scale. In this work, we inspect the theoretical foundations of the leading methods and explore new directions to enhance their computational efficiency. Building on the framework of proper scoring rules, we find that the negative log-likelihood of the most likely output sequence constitutes a theoretically grounded uncertainty measure. To approximate this alternative measure, we propose G-NLL, which has the advantage of being obtained using only a single output sequence generated by greedy decoding. This makes uncertainty estimation more efficient and straightforward, while preserving theoretical rigor. Empirical results demonstrate that G-NLL achieves state-of-the-art performance across various LLMs and tasks. Our work lays the foundation for efficient and reliable uncertainty estimation in natural language generation, challenging the necessity of more computationally involved methods currently leading the field.

1 Introduction

Despite the advancements in Natural Language Generation (NLG), determining the trustworthiness of generated text remains challenging. To address this, it is crucial to reliably assess the level of uncertainty a language model has regarding its generated text. Although uncertainty estimates do not guarantee factual correctness, particularly when the generated text is based on consistent but inaccurate training data, they remain a reliable indicator of errors at present [Farquhar et al., 2024].

Assessing predictive uncertainty in language models is inherently difficult due to their stochastic and autoregressive nature. For a given input sequence, language models predict next token probabilities, based on which a specific token is selected and appended to the sequence. This stochastic process is repeated for each new token until an end-of-sequence token is reached. Selecting different tokens at specific steps during this autoregressive generation leads to varying output sequences for the same input sequence. Consequently, the space of possible output sequences is vast and computationally intractable to explore exhaustively [Sutskever et al., 2014, Vaswani et al., 2017]. Nevertheless, leading uncertainty estimation methods predominantly rely on the probability distribution over all possible output sequences [Kuhn et al., 2023, Duan et al., 2024, Farquhar et al., 2024].

To approximate this probability distribution, output sequences have to be generated and analyzed. However, due to the large number of parameters in language models, predicting each additional token is computationally expensive [Radford et al., 2018, Dubey et al., 2024]. Thus, practical approaches only sample a small fraction of possible output sequences [Malinin and Gales, 2021, Kadavath et al., 2022]. Moreover, even after having generated multiple likely output sequences, it remains unclear whether they indicate high uncertainty. Sampled output sequences that differ from one another do not necessarily indicate that the language model is uncertain about the semantics. These output sequences may be syntactically or lexically distinct while remaining semantically equivalent. Leading uncertainty measures address this by analyzing the semantics with separate language inference models [Kuhn et al., 2023, Aichberger et al., 2024, Farquhar et al., 2024]. While these measures improve the performance of the uncertainty estimates, they further add complexity and computational overhead. These factors make current uncertainty estimation methods impractical at scale, hindering their widespread adoption in real-world applications.

Efficient uncertainty estimation methods are needed to ensure language model trustworthiness without imposing excessive computational demands. To address this need, we introduce G-NLL, an uncertainty measure that can be reliably estimated from a single output sequence. We theoretically motivate our measure by building on insights from the framework of proper scoring rules [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007] that has recently been investigated for uncertainty estimation in the standard classification setting [Kotelevskii and Panov, 2024, Hofman et al., 2024]. Specifically, we extend their insights on proper scoring rules for uncertainty estimation to NLG and explore the zero-one score as an alternative to the prevalent logarithmic score. The resulting uncertainty measure is straightforward: it simply is the negative log-likelihood of the most likely output sequence, estimated using greedy decoding. By eliminating the need to generate and semantically analyze multiple output sequences, G-NLL significantly reduces computational costs and algorithmic complexity.

Noteworthy, some recent works have considered the sequence likelihood for uncertainty estimation in NLG [Fadeeva et al., 2023, Bakman et al., 2024, Yaldiz et al., 2024, Fadeeva et al., 2024, Vazhentsev et al., 2024, Plaut et al., 2024, Abbasi-Yadkori et al., 2024]. However, these works introduce the approach as heuristic without providing a theoretical justification, and, thus, often utilize arbitrary output sequences rather than focusing explicitly on obtaining the most likely one. Furthermore, many prominent works on uncertainty estimation in NLG entirely overlook using the sequence likelihood as a baseline for comparison [Kuhn et al., 2023, Duan et al., 2024, Manakul et al., 2023, Farquhar et al., 2024]. To close this gap, our work derives the maximum sequence likelihood as a proper uncertainty measure, and proposes an efficient approximation, which we denote as G-NLL.

Our experiments on question-answering tasks demonstrate that G-NLL matches and even exceeds the performance of current state-of-the-art uncertainty estimation measures across various model classes, model sizes, model stages, tasks, datasets, and evaluation metrics. While maintaining theoretical rigor, our measure offers an effective and more efficient solution for uncertainty estimation in NLG. G-NLL serves not only as a strong baseline for future methods but also as a highly practical solution for widespread adoption in real-world applications.

Our main contributions are:

- We propose the negative log-likelihood of the most likely output sequence as an alternative uncertainty measure in NLG and introduce G-NLL, an efficient approximation using greedy decoding.
- We provide a rigorous theoretical foundation for this alternative measure, building upon established principles in uncertainty estimation theory and proper scoring rules.
- We conduct extensive experiments showing that G-NLL is both efficient and reliable, matching or outperforming state-of-the-art methods while significantly reducing computational costs.

2 Predictive Uncertainty in NLG

To introduce predictive uncertainty in NLG, we start by providing the necessary background on language models and their use in NLG. In Sec. 2.1 we then elaborate on the framework of proper scoring rules and draw the connections to measuring predictive uncertainty in NLG. In Sec. 2.2, we discuss how established uncertainty measures can be interpreted within this framework, specifically by assuming the logarithmic score. Finally, we introduce the maximum sequence probability and its approximation G-NLL in Sec. 2.3 by considering the zero-one score instead.

Preliminaries. We assume a fixed training dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{s_i\}_{i=1}^N$ consisting of ordered tokens $s_t \in \mathcal{V}$, with \mathcal{V} being a given vocabulary. Each token at step t is assumed to be sampled according to the predictive distribution $p(s_t | s_{<t}, w^*)$, conditioned on the sequence of preceding tokens $s_{<t}$ and the true (but unknown) language model parameters w^* . We assume that the given model class can theoretically represent the true predictive distribution, a common and usually necessary assumption [Hüllermeier and Waegeman, 2021]. How likely language model parameters \tilde{w} match w^* is given by the posterior distribution $p(\tilde{w} | \mathcal{D}) = p(\mathcal{D} | \tilde{w})p(\tilde{w})/p(\mathcal{D})$.

The input to a given language model parameterized by w is a sequence $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_M)$ and the output is a sequence $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_T) \in \mathcal{Y}_T$, with $x, y \in \mathcal{V}$ and \mathcal{Y}_T being the set of all possible output sequences with sequence length T . The likelihood of a token $y_t \in \mathbf{y}$ being generated by the language model is conditioned on both the input sequence and all previously generated tokens, denoted as $p(y_t | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<t}, w)$. The likelihood of output sequences $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_T$ being generated by the language model is then the product of the individual token probabilities, denoted as $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, w) = \prod_{t=1}^T p(y_t | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<t}, w)$ [Sutskever et al., 2014], while the heuristic length-normalized variant is $\bar{p}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, w) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log p(y_t | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<t}, w) \right\}$ [Malinin and Gales, 2021].

Computing the likelihood of a specific output sequence \mathbf{y}' being generated by the language model parameterized by w is straightforward. The language model directly provides the token likelihoods for a given input sequence. However, determining the full probability distribution over all possible output sequences is considerably more challenging, since \mathcal{Y}_T scales exponentially with the sequence length T . The computational complexity of evaluating all possible sequences grows as $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{V}|^T)$. Since modern language models even exceed a vocabulary size $|\mathcal{V}|$ of one hundred thousand tokens, this distribution becomes intractable to compute, even for relatively short maximal sequence lengths T [Dubey et al., 2024].

2.1 Proper Scoring Rules and the Relation to Uncertainty Measures in NLG

We next give an introduction to proper scoring rules and discuss how they give rise to uncertainty measures. For more details, in the standard classification setting, we refer to Hofman et al. [2024], Kotelevskii and Panov [2024]. Proper scoring rules are a class of functions that evaluate the quality of probabilistic predictions by assigning a numerical score based on the predictive distribution and the actual observations [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007]. In particular, a proper scoring rule is an extended real-valued function $S : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$, such that $S(p, \cdot)$ is \mathcal{P} -quasi-integrable over a convex class of probability measures \mathcal{P} . In the context of uncertainty estimation in NLG, the general notion of proper scoring rules assigns a numerical score to how well an observed output sequence \mathbf{y}' aligns with the predictive distribution of the true model $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, w^*)$, denoted as

$$S(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, w^*), \mathbf{y}') . \quad (1)$$

To obtain concrete uncertainty measures, we need to make two specific assumptions [Schweighofer et al., 2024]. First, we have to define the predictive distribution used to sample output sequences. Following Aichberger et al. [2024], we assume that we use a single, given “off-the-shelf” language model with parameters w to sample output sequences $\mathbf{y}' \sim p(\mathbf{y}' | \mathbf{x}, w)$. This assumption is implicitly employed by other works as well [Kuhn et al., 2023, Fadeeva et al., 2024] and is intuitively reasonable, as our primary concern is the uncertainty of outputs from a specific language model. Thus, we consider the expected score over possible output sequences under the predictive distribution of the given language model

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}' \sim p(\mathbf{y}' | \mathbf{x}, w)} [S(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, w^*), \mathbf{y}')] , \quad (2)$$

quantifying how well the predictive distribution of the given language model aligns with the true predictive distribution, capturing predictive uncertainty. Second, we have to define how the true model is being approximated. We consider a Bayesian approximation of the true model, i.e. consider each possible language model \tilde{w} according to its posterior probability $p(\tilde{w} | \mathcal{D})$ [Schweighofer et al., 2023b,a]. Thus, we perform a posterior expectation over the expected score:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w} \sim p(\tilde{w} | \mathcal{D})} [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}' \sim p(\mathbf{y}' | \mathbf{x}, w)} [S(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \tilde{w}), \mathbf{y}')]] . \quad (3)$$

The resulting Eq. (3) can be additively decomposed into an entropy term and a divergence term [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007, Kull and Flach, 2015]:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w} \sim p(\tilde{w}|\mathcal{D})} [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}' \sim p(\mathbf{y}'|\mathbf{x}, \tilde{w})} [\mathbb{S}(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \tilde{w}), \mathbf{y}')]]}_{\text{expected score}} \tag{4} \\
&= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}' \sim p(\mathbf{y}'|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})} [\mathbb{S}(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}), \mathbf{y}')] }_{\text{entropy term}} \\
&+ \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w} \sim p(\tilde{w}|\mathcal{D})} [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y}' \sim p(\mathbf{y}'|\mathbf{x}, \tilde{w})} [\mathbb{S}(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \tilde{w}), \mathbf{y}')] - \mathbb{S}(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}), \mathbf{y}')]]}_{\text{divergence term}} .
\end{aligned}$$

The expected score over possible output sequences \mathbf{y}' and language models \tilde{w} captures the *total* uncertainty of the given language model. The entropy term reflects *aleatoric* uncertainty, which quantifies the inherent stochasticity of generating output sequences with a given language model [Aichberger et al., 2024]. The divergence term reflects *epistemic* uncertainty, which quantifies the uncertainty due to lack of knowledge about the true language model parameters, arising from limited data or model capacity [Houlsby et al., 2011, Gal, 2016, Malinin, 2019, Hüllermeier and Waegeman, 2021]. Finally, we have not yet specified the proper scoring rule \mathbb{S} , which we will do in the following sections to derive the concrete measures of uncertainty.

2.2 Established Uncertainty Measures in NLG based on the Logarithmic Score

The logarithmic score is typically assumed implicitly in both standard classification [Houlsby et al., 2011, Gal, 2016] and NLG settings [Malinin and Gales, 2021, Kuhn et al., 2023] to derive uncertainty measures. This is due to the grounding of the resulting measures in principles of information theory [Lahlou et al., 2023, Gruber and Buettner, 2023, Hofman et al., 2024, Kotelevskii and Panov, 2024]. In the context of NLG, the logarithmic score considers the negative log-likelihood of a generated output sequence \mathbf{y}' :

$$\mathbb{S}_{\log}(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \cdot), \mathbf{y}') = -\log p(\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}' | \mathbf{x}, \cdot) . \tag{5}$$

Substituting the logarithmic score into Eq. (4) results in the cross-entropy $\text{CE}(\cdot; \cdot)$ between the output sequence distribution of the given language model and that of every possible language model according to their posterior probability $p(\tilde{w} | \mathcal{D})$ [Aichberger et al., 2024]:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w} \sim p(\tilde{w}|\mathcal{D})} [\text{CE}(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}); p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \tilde{w}))]}_{\text{total}} \tag{6} \\
&= \underbrace{\mathbb{H}(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}))}_{\text{aleatoric}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{w} \sim p(\tilde{w}|\mathcal{D})} [\text{KL}(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) \| p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \tilde{w}))]}_{\text{epistemic}} .
\end{aligned}$$

The epistemic uncertainty is a posterior expectation of the Kullback-Leibler divergence $\text{KL}(\cdot \| \cdot)$ between the output sequence distribution of the given model and that of all possible models. This requires considering every possible model parametrization. Since modern language models have billions of parameters [Radford et al., 2018, Zhang et al., 2022, Touvron et al., 2023, Zuo et al., 2024, Dubey et al., 2024], the epistemic uncertainty is particularly challenging to estimate.

Current work usually solely considers the aleatoric uncertainty, captured by the Shannon entropy $\mathbb{H}(\cdot)$ of the output sequence distribution of the given language model [Kuhn et al., 2023, Aichberger et al., 2024, Farquhar et al., 2024]. Computing the output sequence distribution still requires considering the whole set of possible output sequences \mathcal{Y}_T . Thus, the primary objective of uncertainty estimation based on the logarithmic score is to closely approximate this output sequence distribution.

Predictive Entropy. The aleatoric uncertainty under a given language model is the entropy of the output sequence distribution, commonly referred to as Predictive Entropy (PE) [Malinin and Gales, 2021]. Intuitively, high PE implies that the language model is likely to generate different output sequences from the same input sequence, indicating high uncertainty of the language model. PE usually is estimated via Monte Carlo (MC) sampling [Malinin and Gales, 2021]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{H}(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{y} \sim p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})} [-\log p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})] \tag{7} \\
&\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N -\log p(\mathbf{y}^n | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) , \quad \mathbf{y}^n \sim p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) .
\end{aligned}$$

Semantic Entropy. Semantic Entropy (SE) [Kuhn et al., 2023, Farquhar et al., 2024] builds on the fact that output sequences may be different on a token level but equivalent on a semantics level. In such cases, the PE can be misleading, as it reflects high uncertainty even when different output sequences have the same semantic meaning. PE also captures the uncertainty of the language model in expressing the semantically same statement, which is often not the focus of uncertainty estimation in NLG. Thus, instead of the entropy of the output sequence distribution, the entropy of the semantic cluster distribution is considered, denoted as $p(c | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) = \sum_{\mathcal{Y}} p(c | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}) p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$. The probability of an output sequence belonging to a semantic cluster is usually approximated with a separate natural language inference model. SE thus measures uncertainty about the semantics of output sequences and is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} H(p(c | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})) &= \mathbb{E}_{c \sim p(c | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})} [-\log p(c | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})] \\ &\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N -\log p(c^n | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}), \quad c^n \sim p(c | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Each of these uncertainty measures based on the logarithmic score considers the distribution over all possible output sequences $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$, which is defined over the entire set of possible output sequences \mathcal{Y}_T . Approximating this distribution requires sampling multiple output sequences from \mathcal{Y}_T , which is computationally expensive. In the following, we eliminate this requirement by considering an alternative proper scoring rule.

2.3 New Uncertainty Measures in NLG based on the Zero-One Score

We propose to measure predictive uncertainty in NLG using measures based on the zero-one score instead of the logarithmic score. Although it has been considered in the standard classification setting [Hofman et al., 2024, Kotelevskii and Panov, 2024], to the best of our knowledge, the zero-one score has not yet been considered as a proper scoring rule for deriving uncertainty measures in NLG. The zero-one score considers the predictive distribution for the most likely output sequence:

$$S_{0,1}(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \cdot), \mathbf{y}') = \begin{cases} 1 - p(\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}' | \mathbf{x}, \cdot) & \text{if } \mathbf{y}' = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \cdot), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Substituting the zero-one score into Eq. (4) results in the total uncertainty being the expected confidence of the given language model about the most likely output sequences generated by every possible language model according to their posterior probability $p(\tilde{\mathbf{w}} | \mathcal{D})$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \sim p(\tilde{\mathbf{w}} | \mathcal{D})} [1 - p(\mathbf{y} = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^* | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})]}_{\text{total}} \\ &= \underbrace{1 - p(\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^* | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})}_{\text{aleatoric}} + \underbrace{p(\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^* | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \sim p(\tilde{\mathbf{w}} | \mathcal{D})} [p(\mathbf{y} = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^* | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})]}_{\text{epistemic}}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with $\mathbf{y}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{y}} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{w}})$. Similar to Eq. (6), the epistemic uncertainty is a posterior expectation that remains challenging to estimate. However, we again focus on the aleatoric uncertainty, which solely considers the likelihood of the most likely output sequence under the given language model.

While aleatoric uncertainty derived from the logarithmic score requires approximating the entire output sequence distribution by sampling multiple sequences (see Eq. (7) and Eq. (8)), the one derived from the zero-one score solely requires approximating the most likely output sequence under the given language model. This distinction is crucial, as approximating the most likely output sequence aligns directly with standard inference techniques widely used in language models. We propose to approximate the measure using the greedily decoded output sequence under the given language model. For numerical stability, we consider the negative log-likelihood of this output sequence, which is proportional to the measure of aleatoric uncertainty in Eq. (10):

$$\text{G-NLL} := - \sum_{t=1}^T \log \left(\max_{y_t} p(y_t | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{<t}, \mathbf{w}) \right) \approx - \underbrace{\max_{\mathbf{y}} \log p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})}_{\propto 1 - p(\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^* | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})} \quad (11)$$

Our proposed uncertainty measure challenges the prevailing reliance on multi-sequence sampling and semantic clustering to estimate uncertainty in NLG. By solely relying on the output sequences generated with greedy decoding, our approach significantly reduces computational overhead while maintaining theoretical rigor through its foundation in proper scoring rules. While uncertainty measures based on the logarithmic score could theoretically excel if the full distribution over output sequences $p(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$ were accessible, as in standard classification tasks, this distribution is intractable for NLG tasks due to their stochastic and autoregressive nature. As a result, sampling-based methods often yield crude approximations, constrained by computational costs and sampling variability. In contrast, G-NLL offers a principled alternative while eliminating the need for extensive sampling, making our method highly practical and straightforward.

3 Related Work

In the previous section, we discussed uncertainty estimation measures based on the logarithmic score. Beyond these, there is a body of work that extends the concept of Semantic Entropy [Kuhn et al., 2023, Farquhar et al., 2024], for instance by either improving the semantic clustering [Nikitin et al., 2024, Qiu and Miikkulainen, 2024], improving the sampling of output sequences [Aichberger et al., 2024], or directly approximating the measure from hidden states of the language model [Kossen et al., 2024, Chen et al., 2024]. Also, there is a body of work that builds upon the concept of Predictive Entropy [Malinin and Gales, 2021], for instance by considering a weighting factor for individual token and sequence likelihoods to account for the importance on a semantic level [Duan et al., 2024, Bakman et al., 2024, Yaldiz et al., 2024].

There are also works that use the likelihood of a single output sequence as a heuristic baseline. For instance, Fadeeva et al. [2023], Fadeeva et al. [2024], and Vazhentsev et al. [2024] consider the most likely output sequence in their experiments. Bakman et al. [2024] and the follow-up work by Yaldiz et al. [2024] consider the sequence likelihood as part of their uncertainty estimation method. Abbasi-Yadkori et al. [2024] use greedy decoded sequence likelihood as a baseline. Plaut et al. [2024] show that maximum softmax probabilities predict correctness in question-answering. Ren et al. [2023] use perplexity as a baseline for OOD detection, stating that it alone is ill-suited for this task. Zhang et al. [2024] use likelihood ratio between pre-trained and fine-tuned language models for OOD detection, claiming that this ratio achieves high performance.

Furthermore, there is work on uncertainty estimation in NLG that is not grounded in proper scoring rules. For instance, several approaches leverage the language model itself to directly predict uncertainty, whether through numerical estimates or verbal explanations [Mielke et al., 2022, Lin et al., 2022, Kadavath et al., 2022, Cohen et al., 2023a, Ganguli et al., 2023, Ren et al., 2023, Tian et al., 2023]. Cohen et al. [2023b] employ cross-examination, where one language model generates an output sequence and another model acts as an examiner to assess uncertainty. Zhou et al. [2023] explore the behavior of language models when expressing their uncertainty, providing insights into how models articulate confidence in their predictions. Also, Manakul et al. [2023] propose using sampled output sequences as input for another language model to assess uncertainty, offering a unique perspective on sequence evaluation. Additionally, Xiao et al. [2022] provide an empirical analysis of how factors such as model architecture and training data influence uncertainty estimates. Finally, conformal prediction [Quach et al., 2024] offers another approach by calibrating a stopping rule for output sequence generation.

4 Experiments

We aligned the evaluation of uncertainty estimation methods with related work by focusing on free-form question-answering tasks [Kuhn et al., 2023, Duan et al., 2024, Bakman et al., 2024, Nikitin et al., 2024, Aichberger et al., 2024, Kossen et al., 2024]. While Farquhar et al. [2024] additionally concerns experiments with paragraph-length generations, their approach involves breaking down the entire paragraph into factual claims and reconstructing corresponding questions. Since the performance is expected to correlate with the performance on free-form question answering, we decided to focus specifically on free-form question answering tasks for a more direct assessment and less ambiguity in the evaluation.

Table 1: Average AUROC across TriviaQA, SVAMP, and NQ datasets, using uncertainty estimates of different measures to distinguish between correct and incorrect answers. Varying model architectures (*transformer*, *state-space*), model sizes (*7B*, *8B*, *70B*), and model stages (*PT*, *IT*) are considered for generating answers. The reference answer is generated using *greedy decoding*, either as a whole sentence (*long*) or a short phrase (*short*). The reference answer’s correctness is assessed by checking if the F1 score of the commonly used SQuAD metric exceeds 0.5 (*F1*) or if the LLM-as-a-judge considers it as correct (*LLM*). Predictive Entropy (*PE*), length-normalized Predictive Entropy (*LN-PE*), Semantic Entropy (*SE*), length-normalized Semantic Entropy (*LN-SE*), and discrete Semantic Entropy (*D-SE*) use 10 output sequences to assign an uncertainty estimate, each generated via multinomial sampling. G-NLL solely uses the reference answer to assign an uncertainty estimate.

		Uncertainty measure based score			Logarithmic					Zero-One
	Model	Gen.	Metric	PE	LN-PE	SE	LN-SE	D-SE	G-NLL	
Transformer	8B	PT	short	F1	.776	.795	.775	.793	<u>.804</u>	.824
			long	LLM	.698	.714	.690	.706	<u>.719</u>	.726
		IT	short	LLM	.562	.555	.545	.553	<u>.600</u>	.649
			short	F1	.772	.801	.805	<u>.814</u>	.806	.838
			short	LLM	.676	.697	.704	<u>.709</u>	.694	.722
			long	LLM	.551	.548	.599	.601	<u>.609</u>	.615
	70B	PT	short	F1	.775	.790	.793	<u>.803</u>	.791	.820
			long	LLM	.693	.709	.718	<u>.722</u>	.715	.723
		IT	long	LLM	.552	.534	.558	.569	<u>.571</u>	.649
			short	F1	.748	.781	.790	.799	.783	.792
			short	LLM	.681	.698	.703	.709	.699	.699
			long	LLM	.555	.557	.568	.595	.600	.562
State-Space	7B	PT	short	F1	.811	.815	.809	.822	<u>.828</u>	.843
			long	LLM	.705	.711	.701	.711	<u>.716</u>	.728
		IT	short	LLM	.567	.597	.574	.611	.624	.612
	8B	PT	short	F1	.793	.814	.797	.816	<u>.829</u>	.838
			long	LLM	.690	.701	.689	.699	<u>.711</u>	.719
		IT	long	LLM	.588	.587	.597	.618	.629	.615

Datasets. We evaluated uncertainty estimation methods on three different datasets. We used the over 3,000 test instances from *TriviaQA* [Joshi et al., 2017] concerning trivia questions, the over 300 test instances from *SVAMP* [Patel et al., 2021] concerning elementary-level math problems, and the over 3,600 test instances from *NQ-Open* [Lee et al., 2019] to assess natural questions aggregated from Google Search. Each dataset was utilized for two distinct tasks: (1) generating concise answers in the form of short phrases, and (2) producing more detailed answers in the form of full sentences, following the evaluation procedure in Farquhar et al. [2024]. The resulting six tasks span a broad range of scenarios, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of different uncertainty estimation methods.

Models. We conducted our evaluations on six distinct language models across different architectures, sizes, and training stages. Specifically, we used the transformer model series *Llama-3.1* [Dubey et al., 2024] and the state-space model series *Falcon Mamba* [Gu and Dao, 2024, Zuo et al., 2024], representing two prominent language modeling paradigms. To assess the effect of training stage model scale on uncertainty estimation in NLG, we considered pre-trained (*PT*) and instruction-tuned (*IT*) language models with 7, 8, and 70 billion parameters, together covering a wide spectrum of model characteristics.

Baselines. We compare our method against the commonly used uncertainty measures based on the logarithmic score as of Eq. (7) and Eq. (8). These include Predictive Entropy (*PE*), length-normalized Predictive Entropy (*LN-PE*) [Malinin and Gales, 2021], Semantic Entropy (*SE*), length-normalized Semantic Entropy (*LN-SE*), and Discrete Semantic Entropy (*D-SE*) [Kuhn et al., 2023, Farquhar et al., 2024]. For a given output sequence \mathbf{y}' , the length-normalized variants consider $\bar{p}(\mathbf{y}' | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$ instead of $p(\mathbf{y}' | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$ to compute the uncertainty estimates. The discrete variant of Semantic




Figure 1: Quality of estimators for synthetic predictive distributions $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$ with $|\mathcal{V}| = 20$ and $T = 4$. The predictive entropy $H(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}))$ is estimated as in Eq. (7) using multinomial sampling (MS) with different temperatures (τ). The maximum sequence likelihood $\max_{\mathbf{y}} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$ is estimated by the maximum over N samples obtained by beam search ($N = 1$ represents greedy decoding) or MS with different τ . Statistics are obtained by sampling different $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$. (a) Lines show average, shades denote one standard deviation. (b) Lines show median, shades denote 5% to 95% quantile.

Entropy entirely disregards the output sequence likelihood and only considers the proportion of output sequences that belong to the same semantic cluster [Farquhar et al., 2024].

Evaluation. Effective uncertainty measures should accurately reflect the reliability of answers generated by the language model. Higher uncertainty more likely leads to incorrect generations. Thus, to evaluate the performance of an uncertainty estimator, we assess how well it correlates with the correctness of the language model’s answers; correct answers should be assigned a lower uncertainty estimator than incorrect answers. To determine whether an answer is correct, it has to be compared to the respective ground truth answer. To do so, we check if the F1 score of the commonly used SQuAD metric exceeds 0.5 [Rajpurkar et al., 2016]. Although there are some limitations to using such a simple metric, it has relatively small errors in standard data sets and, therefore, remains widely used in practice. However, this metric is only applicable for short-phrase generations that align with the ground truth answer. Therefore, we additionally employ Llama-3.1 with 70 billion parameters [Dubey et al., 2024] as an LLM-as-a-judge to assess the correctness of both short-phrase and full-sentence generations. To measure the correlation between the incorrectness of answers and the respective uncertainty estimates, we use the Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (AUROC). Higher AUROC values indicate better performance of the uncertainty estimator, as it reflects a stronger alignment between the correctness of the language model’s answers and their respective uncertainty estimates. Overall, this evaluation process follows established methodologies for assessing the performance of uncertainty measures in NLG [Kuhn et al., 2023, Duan et al., 2024, Farquhar et al., 2024, Nikitin et al., 2024, Aichberger et al., 2024, Kossen et al., 2024].

Analysis of results. Tab. 1 summarizes the performance of uncertainty measures across six different language models and six different tasks. In most cases, G-NLL demonstrates superior performance, outperforming current state-of-the-art uncertainty measures, particularly in tasks that involve generating short phrases. This suggests that our measure is highly effective when focusing on the essential part of the output sequence that contains the actual answer to a question. In practical scenarios, the reliability of the specific answer is often more relevant than the uncertainty of the entire generated sentence. Thus, our measure provides targeted and computationally efficient uncertainty estimates, delivering enhanced performance where it is most critical, especially in real-world applications. Detailed results for individual datasets and additional evaluations can be found in Apx. C.

4.1 Quality of Estimators

Synthetic setting. We conjectured that uncertainty measures based on the zero-one score are better aligned with estimation using standard decoding strategies in NLG. Therefore, we conduct a synthetic experiment, where we sample predictive distributions $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$ with smaller vocabulary sizes and shorter sequence lengths, while preserving the distributional characteristics typical of language models. This approach allows us to obtain ground truths for both $H(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}))$ and $\max_{\mathbf{y}} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$, which become intractable with larger vocabulary sizes and sequence lengths. Using this synthetic

setup, we aim to evaluate how the quality of estimators improves with the number of samples. Fig. 1a summarizes the results for estimating the entropy, derived from the logarithmic score. The results show that low sample sizes lead to high estimator variance. Similarly, Fig. 1b summarizes the results for estimating the maximum sequence likelihood, derived from the zero-one score. The results indicate that, while multinomial sampling (MS) also exhibits higher variance with fewer samples, heuristics such as beam search and even greedy decoding provide accurate estimates of the maximum sequence probability with negligible variance. Details on the sampling procedure of the predictive distributions as well as additional experiments are provided in Apx. B. This synthetic experiment suggests that MS is ineffective at estimating $\max_{\mathbf{y}} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$, whereas greedy decoding, as we propose in Eq. (11), performs well and might further improve by using beam search with larger width. We further investigate this in the following ablation with a real language model on the TriviaQA dataset.

Real-world setting. We further examine the empirical performance of using output sequences generated by various decoding methods as approximations of the most likely output sequence for estimating uncertainty in NLG. Specifically, we generate output sequences using multinomial sampling (MS) with different temperatures τ , greedy decoding, and beam search (BS) with different beam sizes. Each of the generated output sequences is then used for the uncertainty estimate, following the same evaluation process as the main results in Tab. 1. Notably, the baselines are unaffected by these output sequences, as they rely on sequences generated using their optimal hyperparameter settings. Figure 2 shows that while MS significantly degrades the performance of the zero-one score base uncertainty measure, greedy decoding achieves high performance, comparable to beam search, reinforcing its validity as an effective approximation of the most likely output sequence.




Figure 2: Average AUROC over TriviaQA instances, using the Llama-3.1-8B model to generate short phrase answers. The ten output sequences for the baselines are generated with their best hyperparameter setting. The one output sequence for NLL is generated with a specific decoding method.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced an alternative uncertainty measure: the negative log-likelihood of the most likely output sequence under a given language model. This measure is motivated by the general notion of proper scoring rules, utilizing the zero-one score as an alternative to the prevalent logarithmic score. Unlike previous measures, it does not require sampling multiple output sequences but can be efficiently approximated using G-NLL through a single output sequence generated via greedy decoding. The experiments demonstrate that it largely outperforms previous measures that entail considerably higher computational costs and algorithmic complexity.

Although G-NLL effectively captures uncertainty, it currently does not account for the semantics of the generated output sequence. Future work should explore extensions that incorporate semantic meaning to further enhance the uncertainty estimator while preserving its computational efficiency. Moreover, measures based on proper scoring rules rely on heuristics, such as length normalization, to address variations in sequence lengths [Malinin and Gales, 2021, Duan et al., 2024, Bakman et al., 2024, Yaldiz et al., 2024]. Investigating theoretically grounded methods to handle these varying generation characteristics represents another promising direction for future work.

While there remain opportunities for refinement, our proposed measure provides a solid foundation for efficient and reliable uncertainty estimation in NLG. It paves the way for efficient methods that build upon single output sequences. Given its simplicity and minimal computational overhead, G-NLL serves as a robust baseline for the development of new uncertainty measures. Moreover, it represents a significant step toward delivering reliable uncertainty estimates that can be effectively applied to real-world applications at scale.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge EuroHPC Joint Undertaking for awarding us access to Karolina at IT4Innovations, Czech Republic. The ELLIS Unit Linz, the LIT AI Lab, the Institute for Machine Learning, are supported by the Federal State Upper Austria. We thank the projects Medical Cognitive Computing Center (MC3), INCONTROL-RL (FFG-881064), PRIMAL (FFG-873979), S3AI (FFG-872172), DL for GranularFlow (FFG-871302), EPILEPSIA (FFG-892171), AIRI FG 9-N (FWF-36284, FWF-36235), AI4GreenHeatingGrids (FFG- 899943), INTEGRATE (FFG-892418), ELISE (H2020-ICT-2019-3 ID: 951847), Stars4Waters (HORIZON-CL6-2021-CLIMATE-01-01). We thank NXAI GmbH, Audi.JKU Deep Learning Center, TGW LOGISTICS GROUP GMBH, Silicon Austria Labs (SAL), FILL Gesellschaft mbH, Anyline GmbH, Google, ZF Friedrichshafen AG, Robert Bosch GmbH, UCB Biopharma SRL, Merck Healthcare KGaA, Verbund AG, GLS (Univ. Waterloo), Software Competence Center Hagenberg GmbH, Borealis AG, TÜV Austria, Frauscher Sensonic, TRUMPF and the NVIDIA Corporation.

References

- Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori, Ilya Kuzborskij, András György, and Csaba Szepesvari. To believe or not to believe your LLM: Iterativeprompting for estimating epistemic uncertainty. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- Lukas Aichberger, Kajetan Schweighofer, Mykyta Ielanskyi, and Sepp Hochreiter. Semantically diverse language generation for uncertainty estimation in language models. *arXiv*, 2406.04306, 2024.
- Yavuz Faruk Bakman, Duygu Nur Yaldiz, Baturalp Buyukates, Chenyang Tao, Dimitrios Dimitriadis, and Salman Avestimehr. MARS: Meaning-aware response scoring for uncertainty estimation in generative LLMs. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7752–7767. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024.
- Chao Chen, Kai Liu, Ze Chen, Yi Gu, Yue Wu, Mingyuan Tao, Zhihang Fu, and Jieping Ye. INSIDE: LLMs’ internal states retain the power of hallucination detection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Roi Cohen, Mor Geva, Jonathan Berant, and Amir Globerson. Crawling the internal knowledge-base of language models. In Andreas Vlachos and Isabelle Augenstein, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EAACL 2023*, pages 1856–1869. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023a.
- Roi Cohen, May Hamri, Mor Geva, and Amir Globerson. LM vs LM: Detecting factual errors via cross examination. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12621–12640. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023b.
- Jinhao Duan, Hao Cheng, Shiqi Wang, Alex Zavalny, Chenan Wang, Renjing Xu, Bhavya Kailkhura, and Kaidi Xu. Shifting attention to relevance: Towards the predictive uncertainty quantification of free-form large language models. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5050–5063, 2024.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, and Aurelien Rodriguez et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv*, 2407.21783, 2024.
- 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. LM-polygraph: Uncertainty estimation for language models. In Yansong Feng and Els Lefever, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical*

- Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 446–461. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- Ekaterina Fadeeva, Aleksandr Rubashevskii, Artem Shelmanov, Sergey Petrakov, Haonan Li, Hamdy Mubarak, Evgenii Tsymbalov, Gleb Kuzmin, Alexander Panchenko, Timothy Baldwin, Preslav Nakov, and Maxim Panov. Fact-checking the output of large language models via token-level uncertainty quantification. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 9367–9385. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024.
- Sebastian Farquhar, Jannik Kossen, Lorenz Kuhn, and Yarin Gal. Detecting hallucinations in large language models using semantic entropy. *Nature*, 630(8017):625–630, 2024.
- Yarin Gal. *Uncertainty in deep learning*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2016.
- Deep Ganguli, Amanda Askell, Nicholas Schiefer, Thomas I. Liao, Kamilė Lukošiuūtė, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Catherine Olsson, Danny Hernandez, Dawn Drain, Dustin Li, Eli Tran-Johnson, Ethan Perez, Jackson Kernion, Jamie Kerr, Jared Mueller, Joshua Landau, Kamal Ndousse, Karina Nguyen, Liane Lovitt, Michael Sellitto, Nelson Elhage, Noemi Mercado, Nova DasSarma, Oliver Rausch, Robert Lasenby, Robin Larson, Sam Ringer, Sandipan Kundu, Saurav Kadavath, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Sheer El Showk, Tamera Lanham, Timothy Telleen-Lawton, Tom Henighan, Tristan Hume, Yuntao Bai, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Ben Mann, Dario Amodei, Nicholas Joseph, Sam McCandlish, Tom Brown, Christopher Olah, Jack Clark, Samuel R. Bowman, and Jared Kaplan. The capacity for moral self-correction in large language models. *arXiv*, 2302.07459, 2023.
- Tilmann Gneiting and Adrian E Raftery. Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 102(477):359–378, 2007.
- Sebastian Gruber and Florian Buettner. Uncertainty estimates of predictions via a general bias-variance decomposition. In Francisco Ruiz, Jennifer Dy, and Jan-Willem van de Meent, editors, *Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 206, pages 11331–11354. PMLR, 2023.
- Albert Gu and Tri Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024.
- Paul Hofman, Yusuf Sale, and Eyke Hüllermeier. Quantifying aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty with proper scoring rules. *arXiv*, 2404.12215, 2024.
- Neil Houlsby, Ferenc Huszár, Zoubin Ghahramani, and Máté Lengyel. Bayesian active learning for classification and preference learning. *arXiv*, 1112.5745, 2011.
- Eyke Hüllermeier and Willem Waegeman. Aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in machine learning: An introduction to concepts and methods. *Machine Learning*, 110:457–506, 2021.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S. Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2017.
- Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, Scott Johnston, Sheer El-Showk, Andy Jones, Nelson Elhage, Tristan Hume, Anna Chen, Yuntao Bai, Sam Bowman, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Danny Hernandez, Josh Jacobson, Jackson Kernion, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Sam Ringer, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, and Jared Kaplan. Language models (mostly) know what they know. *arXiv*, 2207.05221, 2022.
- Jannik Kossen, Jiatong Han, Muhammed Razzak, Lisa Schut, Shreshth Malik, and Yarin Gal. Semantic entropy probes: Robust and cheap hallucination detection in llms. *arXiv*, 2406.15927, 2024.

- Nikita Kotelevskii and Maxim Panov. Predictive uncertainty quantification via risk decompositions for strictly proper scoring rules. *arXiv*, 2402.10727, 2024.
- Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Meelis Kull and Peter Flach. Novel decompositions of proper scoring rules for classification: Score adjustment as precursor to calibration. In Annalisa Appice, Pedro Pereira Rodrigues, Vítor Santos Costa, Carlos Soares, João Gama, and Alípio Jorge, editors, *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 68–85. Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- Salem Lahlou, Moksh Jain, Hadi Nekoei, Victor I Butoi, Paul Bertin, Jarrid Rector-Brooks, Maksym Korablyov, and Yoshua Bengio. DEUP: Direct epistemic uncertainty prediction. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856.
- Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. Latent retrieval for weakly supervised open domain question answering. In Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez, editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6086–6096. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. Teaching models to express their uncertainty in words. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. ISSN 2835-8856.
- Andrey Malinin. *Uncertainty estimation in deep learning with application to spoken language assessment*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2019.
- Andrey Malinin and Mark Gales. Uncertainty estimation in autoregressive structured prediction. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark Gales. SelfCheckGPT: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9004–9017. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- Sabrina J. Mielke, Arthur Szlam, Emily Dinan, and Y-Lan Boureau. Reducing conversational agents’ overconfidence through linguistic calibration. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:857–872, 2022.
- Alexander V Nikitin, Jannik Kossen, Yarin Gal, and Pekka Marttinen. Kernel language entropy: Fine-grained uncertainty quantification for LLMs from semantic similarities. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- Arkil Patel, Satwik Bhattamishra, and Navin Goyal. Are NLP models really able to solve simple math word problems? In Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2080–2094. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021.
- Benjamin Plaut, Nguyen X. Khanh, and Tu Trinh. Probabilities of chat llms are miscalibrated but still predict correctness on multiple-choice q&a. *arXiv*, 2402.13213, 2024.
- Xin Qiu and Risto Miikkulainen. Semantic density: Uncertainty quantification for large language models through confidence measurement in semantic space. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- Victor Quach, Adam Fisch, Tal Schuster, Adam Yala, Jae Ho Sohn, Tommi S. Jaakkola, and Regina Barzilay. Conformal language modeling. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2018.

- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In Jian Su, Kevin Duh, and Xavier Carreras, editors, *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2383–2392. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2016.
- Jie Ren, Yao Zhao, Tu Vu, Peter J. Liu, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Self-evaluation improves selective generation in large language models. *arXiv*, 2312.09300, 2023.
- Kajetan Schweighofer, Lukas Aichberger, Mykyta Ielanskyi, and Sepp Hochreiter. Introducing an improved information-theoretic measure of predictive uncertainty. *arXiv*, 2311.08309, 2023a.
- Kajetan Schweighofer, Lukas Aichberger, Mykyta Ielanskyi, Günter Klambauer, and Sepp Hochreiter. Quantification of uncertainty with adversarial models. In A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 19446–19484. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023b.
- Kajetan Schweighofer, Lukas Aichberger, Mykyta Ielanskyi, and Sepp Hochreiter. On information-theoretic measures of predictive uncertainty. *arXiv*, 2410.10786, 2024.
- Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V Le. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. In Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014.
- Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Allan Zhou, Archit Sharma, Rafael Rafailov, Huaxiu Yao, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher Manning. Just ask for calibration: Strategies for eliciting calibrated confidence scores from language models fine-tuned with human feedback. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5433–5442. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv*, 2307.09288, 2023.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, 2017.
- Artem Vazhentsev, Ekaterina Fadeeva, Rui Xing, Alexander Panchenko, Preslav Nakov, Timothy Baldwin, Maxim Panov, and Artem Shelmanov. Unconditional truthfulness: Learning conditional dependency for uncertainty quantification of large language models. *arXiv*, 2408.10692, 2024.
- Yuxin Xiao, Paul Pu Liang, Umang Bhatt, Willie Neiswanger, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Louis-Philippe Morency. Uncertainty quantification with pre-trained language models: A large-scale empirical analysis. In Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 7273–7284. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022.
- Duygu Nur Yaldiz, Yavuz Faruk Bakman, Baturalp Buyukates, Chenyang Tao, Anil Ramakrishna, Dimitrios Dimitriadis, Jieyu Zhao, and Salman Avestimehr. Do not design, learn: A trainable scoring function for uncertainty estimation in generative llms. *arXiv*, 2406.11278, 2024.

- Andi Zhang, Tim Z. Xiao, Weiyang Liu, Robert Bamler, and Damon Wischik. Your finetuned large language model is already a powerful out-of-distribution detector. *arXiv*, 2404.08679, 2024.
- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Myle Ott, Sam Shleifer, Kurt Shuster, Daniel Simig, Punit Singh Koura, Anjali Sridhar, Tianlu Wang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv*, 2205.01068, 2022.
- Kaitlyn Zhou, Dan Jurafsky, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Navigating the grey area: How expressions of uncertainty and overconfidence affect language models. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5506–5524. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- Jingwei Zuo, Maksim Velikanov, Dhia Eddine Rhaiem, Ilyas Chahed, Younes Belkada, Guillaume Kunsch, and Hakim Hacid. Falcon mamba: The first competitive attention-free 7b language model. *arXiv*, 2410.05355, 2024.

A Ethics and Reproducibility Statement

We acknowledge that language models can generate biased or harmful content if not properly managed. While our uncertainty estimation method enhances reliability, we encourage the responsible use of our approach in conjunction with bias mitigation and content moderation techniques.

We have made concerted efforts to ensure the reproducibility of our results. We report the raw average scores across held-out test datasets without standard error, as the distributional characteristics are more reflective of the models and datasets selected than the uncertainty estimation method itself. Theoretical derivations are provided in Sec. 2. All datasets are publicly available, and standard benchmarks are utilized to facilitate replication.

B Comparison of Estimators

In this section we want to empirically investigate the performance of estimators for the predictive entropy $H(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}))$ (Eq. (7)) and the maximum sequence likelihood $\max_{\mathbf{y}} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$ (Eq. (11)) in a controlled setting. Therefore, we consider a synthetic experiment with the following setup. We are given a space of possible outcomes \mathcal{V} with $|\mathcal{V}| = \{20, 100\}$. The task is to predict a sequence $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_T) \in \mathcal{Y}_T$ where $y \in \mathcal{V}$ and T is 2, 3, or 4. Predictive distributions $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$ are not represented by a neural network, but randomly sampled (but fixed in the experiment presented in the appendix) according to a Dirichlet distribution $\text{Dir}(\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{|\mathcal{V}|}\})$. The alpha parameters of the Dirichlet distribution are specified to yield typical predictive distributions as encountered in language models that follow a Zipf distribution. For $|\mathcal{V}| = 20$ we have $\alpha_{1,2} = 10$ and $\alpha_{3-20} = 0.2$. For $|\mathcal{V}| = 100$ we have $\alpha_{1,2} = 10$, $\alpha_{3-6} = 1$ and $\alpha_{7-100} = 0.2$. Note that the order of alpha values is randomly shuffled before drawing each predictive distribution. Representative predictive distributions sampled from this Dirichlet distribution are shown in Fig. 3a and Fig. 3b.

The experiments investigate the quality of the estimators depending on the number of samples $\{\mathbf{y}_n\}_{n=1}^N$. This is possible because it is possible to calculate the ground truth values for both the entropy and the maximum sequence likelihood for this small synthetic example by exhaustive enumeration. We average over 1,000 runs, meaning that new sets of samples $\{\mathbf{y}_n\}_{n=1}^N$ are drawn to calculate the respective estimators. As beam search is deterministic, it does not vary in this experimental setting, compared to Fig. 1b in the main paper, where we investigated the quality of estimators for different $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$.

Entropy estimation. The results are shown in Fig. 4. We observe that the variance of estimators increases for larger vocabulary sizes $|\mathcal{V}|$ and sequence lengths T . Furthermore, lower temperatures decrease the variance of the estimator at the cost of introducing bias.

Maximum sequence likelihood. The results are shown in Fig. 5. We observe that low-temperature multinomial sampling and beam search find the maximum sequence log-likelihood with a low number of samples with high probability. Greedy decoding (beam width = 1) finds the maximum for all experimental settings except one, where it takes a beam width of 2 to find it.




Figure 3: Exemplary predictive distributions $p(y_t | \mathbf{y}_{<t}, \mathbf{x})$ for different vocabulary sizes (widths).




Figure 4: **Estimator of Predictive Entropy.** Results for different vocabulary sizes (width) and sequence lengths (depth). We estimate the entropy $H(p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}))$ using N Monte-Carlo samples (c.f. Eq. (7)). Lines denote the average over runs, while shades denote one standard deviation. We compare multinomial sampling (MS) for two commonly used temperatures. The experiments show that the decreased temperature leads to lower variance, but introduces bias.




Figure 5: **Estimator of maximum sequence likelihood.** Results for different vocabulary sizes (width) and sequence lengths (depth). We estimate $\max_{\mathbf{y}} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$ using the maximum over N sampled obtained by beam search ($N = 1$ is greedy decoding) or multinomial sampling (MS) with different temperatures. Lines denote the median, shades signify the possible values between the 5 and 95 percent quantile. Beam search is deterministic for any given distribution $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$. Even with a very low number of samples, low-temperature multinomial sampling (MS) and beam search are able to find the maximum with high probability.

Table 2: **Average AUROC** across TriviaQA, SVAMP, and NQ datasets, using uncertainty estimates of different measures as a score to distinguish between correct and incorrect answers. Varying model architectures (*transformer*, *state-space*), model sizes (*7B*, *8B*, *70B*), and model stages (*PT*, *IT*) are considered for generating answers. The reference answer is generated using **beam search with 5 beams**, either as a whole sentence (*long*) or a short phrase (*short*). The correctness of the reference answer is assessed by checking if the F1 score of the commonly used SQuAD metric exceeds 0.5 (*F1*) or the Llama-3.1-70B model considers it as correct (*LLM*). Predictive Entropy (*PE*), length-normalized Predictive Entropy (*LN-PE*), Semantic Entropy (*SE*), length-normalized Semantic Entropy (*LN-SE*), and discrete Semantic Entropy (*D-SE*) use 10 output sequences to assign an uncertainty estimate, each generated via multinomial sampling. G-NLL solely uses the reference answer to assign an uncertainty estimate.

Uncertainty measure based score			Logarithmic					Zero-One		
Model	Gen.	Metric	PE	LN-PE	SE	LN-SE	D-SE	G-NLL		
Transformer	8B	short	F1	.775	.791	.765	.787	.799	.822	
		PT	short	LLM	.700	.712	.686	.704	.713	.726
		long	LLM	.556	.540	.493	.520	.578	.591	
	IT	short	F1	.778	.808	.805	.819	.811	.845	
		PT	short	LLM	.682	.704	.706	.713	.698	.729
		long	LLM	.535	.520	.584	.585	.586	.559	
	70B	PT	short	F1	.788	.799	.796	.812	.798	.833
			short	LLM	.700	.717	.719	.727	.718	.725
			long	LLM	.540	.552	.489	.531	.552	.608
		IT	short	F1	.756	.786	.796	.806	.788	.800
			short	LLM	.680	.697	.701	.707	.695	.707
			long	LLM	.534	.533	.544	.569	.574	.534
State-Space	PT	short	F1	.814	.818	.806	.823	.825	.846	
		short	LLM	.703	.709	.699	.711	.712	.719	
		long	LLM	.570	.595	.550	.609	.602	.563	
	IT	short	F1	.799	.815	.794	.817	.828	.845	
		short	LLM	.699	.713	.694	.709	.720	.730	
		long	LLM	.574	.575	.582	.621	.607	.577	

C Detailed Results

In this section, we provide detailed results to complement the main results presented in Tab. 1.

The main results used greedy decoding (beam search of size 1) to estimate the maximum sequence likelihood (zero-one score based measure) and 10 samples to estimate entropies (logarithmic score based measures). For each dataset, we performed a hyperparameter search on held-out instances to determine the best-performing temperature $\tau \in \{0.5, 1.0, 1.5\}$ for sampling output sequences used for the logarithmic score based measures.

We look into how much the maximum sequence likelihood benefits from additional samples by increasing the beam with to 5. The results are given in Tab. 2, showing that our measure continues to improve for a larger number of beams, thus better estimates of the maximum sequence likelihood. Furthermore, we provide detailed results for individual datasets in Tab. 3, complimenting the results presented in the main paper (c.f. Tab. 1).

The AUROC is considered as a primary performance measure throughout the paper. We additionally consider the average rejection accuracy, i.e. the accuracy of model predictions when allowing to reject a certain budget of predictions based on the uncertainty estimate. Thus, predictions are only evaluated for the 80% most certain predictions. Results are given in Tab. 4, again with greedy decoding for our measure based on the zero-one score. The results show, that our measure is very competitive across all settings, despite its simplicity and efficiency.

Table 3: **Average AUROC** of individual datasets, using uncertainty estimates of different measures as a score to distinguish between correct and incorrect answers.

<i>Uncertainty measure based score</i>				<i>Logarithmic</i>					<i>Zero-One</i>		
<i>D</i>	<i>Model</i>	<i>Gen.</i>	<i>Metric</i>	<i>PE</i>	<i>LN-PE</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>LN-SE</i>	<i>D-SE</i>	<i>G-NLL</i>		
TriviaQA	Transformer	8B	short	F1	.758	.778	.788	.798	.787	.810	
			PT	short	LLM	.675	.694	.703	.704	.682	.722
			long	LLM	.592	.604	.640	.631	.650	.704	
		IT	short	F1	.735	.768	.790	.800	.777	.809	
			short	LLM	.660	.684	.708	.710	.680	.716	
			long	LLM	.603	.627	.678	.672	.670	.670	
	70B	short	F1	.707	.730	.741	.743	.702	.744		
		PT	short	LLM	.650	.660	.696	.695	.656	.698	
		long	LLM	.538	.533	.625	.574	.563	.692		
		short	F1	.698	.714	.722	.726	.688	.722		
		IT	short	LLM	.663	.675	.685	.679	.633	.701	
		long	LLM	.530	.553	.564	.571	.564	.543		
	State-Space	7B	short	F1	.786	.793	.812	.818	.810	.832	
			PT	short	LLM	.687	.697	.712	.714	.695	.724
			long	LLM	.597	.653	.675	.680	.689	.705	
		short	F1	.780	.799	.810	.819	.811	.827		
		PT	short	LLM	.696	.701	.714	.717	.703	.730	
		long	LLM	.645	.654	.688	.698	.692	.694		
SVAMP	Transformer	8B	short	F1	.847	.867	.865	.870	.868	.885	
			PT	short	LLM	.779	.788	.753	.772	.791	.772
			long	LLM	.575	.563	.519	.534	.601	.669	
		short	F1	.879	.903	.914	.912	.887	.931		
		IT	short	LLM	.706	.725	.736	.731	.701	.753	
		long	LLM	.556	.524	.590	.608	.631	.662		
	70B	short	F1	.892	.906	.925	.929	.923	.936		
		PT	short	LLM	.794	.817	.814	.815	.819	.799	
		long	LLM	.578	.554	.553	.579	.571	.665		
		short	F1	.830	.895	.915	.922	.915	.909		
		IT	short	LLM	.703	.744	.734	.748	.762	.713	
		long	LLM	.601	.577	.613	.649	.663	.597		
	State-Space	7B	short	F1	.882	.893	.874	.883	.889	.914	
			PT	short	LLM	.752	.757	.730	.738	.757	.776
			long	LLM	.536	.585	.534	.602	.612	.579	
		short	F1	.843	.891	.854	.876	.892	.905		
		IT	short	LLM	.706	.730	.704	.709	.737	.744	
		long	LLM	.577	.586	.578	.616	.639	.613		
NQ	Transformer	8B	short	F1	.725	.739	.673	.710	.758	.776	
			PT	short	LLM	.639	.661	.615	.641	.683	.683
			long	LLM	.517	.498	.478	.495	.550	.573	
		short	F1	.702	.732	.711	.731	.756	.774		
		IT	short	LLM	.662	.682	.669	.685	.700	.697	
		long	LLM	.494	.491	.530	.524	.527	.514		
	70B	short	F1	.727	.733	.711	.737	.748	.779		
		PT	short	LLM	.634	.649	.642	.657	.671	.672	
		long	LLM	.538	.514	.494	.553	.580	.589		
		short	F1	.718	.734	.734	.748	.746	.743		
		IT	short	LLM	.676	.674	.689	.698	.702	.681	
		long	LLM	.535	.540	.526	.566	.574	.545		
	State-Space	7B	short	F1	.766	.758	.741	.765	.785	.782	
			PT	short	LLM	.675	.680	.661	.681	.697	.683
			long	LLM	.567	.553	.512	.551	.572	.554	
		short	F1	.755	.751	.727	.754	.783	.781		
		IT	short	LLM	.669	.672	.648	.671	.692	.683	
		long	LLM	.541	.521	.526	.541	.554	.537		

Table 4: **Average Rejection Accuracy (80%)** across TriviaQA, SVAMP and NQ datasets, using uncertainty estimates of different measures as a score to distinguish between correct and incorrect answers. The reference answer is generated using greedy decoding, with the correctness being assessed by checking if the F1 score of the commonly used SQuAD metric exceeds 0.5 (*F1*), the pre-trained Llama-3.1-70B model considers it as correct (*LLM*), or the instruction-tuned Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct model considers it as correct (*LLM-Instruct*).

<i>Uncertainty measure based score</i>			<i>Logarithmic</i>					<i>Zero-One</i>		
Model	Gen.	Metric	PE	LN-PE	SE	LN-SE	D-SE	G-NLL		
Transformer	8b	short	F1	.661	<u>.672</u>	.651	.643	.655	.681	
		PT	LLM	.774	.782	.767	.766	.765	.778	
			LLM-Instruct	.704	<u>.721</u>	.693	.688	.702	.723	
		long	LLM	.596	.590	<u>.598</u>	.592	.590	.619	
			LLM-Instruct	.667	<u>.684</u>	.632	.643	.644	.686	
		IT	short	F1	.668	.684	.680	.673	.687	.702
	LLM		LLM	.775	<u>.781</u>	.779	.775	.778	.788	
			LLM-Instruct	.723	.742	.732	.726	<u>.743</u>	.751	
	long		LLM	.628	.630	.651	.644	.653	.652	
			LLM-Instruct	.713	.724	.705	.713	<u>.727</u>	.734	
	70b		PT	short	F1	.818	.827	.822	.827	<u>.829</u>
		LLM		LLM	.844	<u>.852</u>	.846	.847	.851	.855
				LLM-Instruct	.867	.875	.876	.881	.885	.881
		long	LLM	.704	.699	<u>.719</u>	.707	.705	.724	
			LLM-Instruct	LLM-Instruct	.789	<u>.795</u>	.776	.781	.788	.812
				F1	.795	.813	.814	.809	<u>.819</u>	.823
	IT	short	LLM	.836	.842	.842	.837	<u>.844</u>	.845	
		LLM-Instruct	LLM-Instruct	.850	.867	.866	.865	.874	.870	
LLM			.706	.706	.712	.715	.721	.715		
long	LLM-Instruct	LLM-Instruct	.855	.850	.827	.842	.861	.851		
		F1	<u>.598</u>	.596	.585	.579	.583	.612		
	State-Space	PT	short	LLM	.729	<u>.737</u>	.723	.721	.733	.742
LLM-Instruct			LLM-Instruct	.638	<u>.640</u>	.626	.621	.632	.651	
			LLM	.613	.627	.612	.624	.620	.623	
long		LLM-Instruct	LLM-Instruct	.606	.611	.601	.611	<u>.618</u>	.633	
			F1	.592	<u>.603</u>	.588	.581	.589	.615	
		IT	short	LLM	.737	<u>.742</u>	.730	.726	.740	.744
LLM-Instruct	LLM-Instruct		.632	<u>.646</u>	.625	.619	.637	.653		
	LLM		.611	.617	.618	.612	.625	.625		
long	LLM-Instruct	.643	.652	.628	.628	<u>.654</u>	.658			