

# Variability Need Not Imply Error: The Case of Adequate but Semantically Distinct Responses

**Evgenia Ilia**  
University of Amsterdam  
e.ilia@uva.nl

**Wilker Aziz**  
University of Amsterdam  
w.aziz@uva.nl

## Abstract

With the broader use of language models (LMs) we need to estimate their ability to respond reliably to prompts (*e.g.*, are generated responses likely to be correct?). Uncertainty quantification tools (notions of confidence and entropy, *i.a.*) can be used to that end (*e.g.*, to reject a response when the model is ‘uncertain’). For example, Kuhn et al. (semantic entropy; 2022b) regard *semantic* variation amongst sampled responses as evidence that the model ‘struggles’ with the prompt and that the LM is likely to err. We argue that semantic variability need not imply error— this being especially intuitive in open-ended settings, where prompts elicit multiple *adequate* but semantically distinct responses. Hence, we propose to annotate sampled responses for their adequacy to the prompt (*e.g.*, using a classifier) and estimate the Probability the model assigns to Adequate Responses (PROBAR), which we then regard as an indicator of the model’s reliability at the instance level. We evaluate PROBAR as a measure of confidence in selective prediction with OPT models (in two QA datasets and in next-word prediction, for English) and find PROBAR to outperform semantic entropy across prompts with varying degrees of ambiguity/open-endedness.

## 1 Introduction

The use of LMs as tools to aid in decision-making evokes the need for techniques that help us determine when they can reliably respond to a prompt (Kuhn et al., 2022b; Lin et al., 2024b; Gruber and Buettner, 2024). Indicators of uncertainty in generation, *e.g.* based on LMs’ predictive distributions (Fomicheva et al., 2020; Aina and Linzen, 2021) or statistics of sampled responses (Ren et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2024b; Manakul et al., 2023; van der Poel et al., 2022), have been shown useful to that end, with LMs exhibiting higher uncertainty when they respond incorrectly. These uncertainty




Figure 1: Bottom: a sampled-based approximation of an LM’s distribution over responses given the question ‘What is a date?’; while the distribution exhibits high entropy, some answers are semantically equivalent. Middle: responses are clustered by meaning; while this representation still exhibits high ‘semantic entropy’ (Kuhn et al., 2022b), probability concentrates on answers to different but plausible interpretations of the question. Top: responses are grouped as a function of their adequacy to the prompt (*i.e.*, wrt any of its plausible interpretations); we regard the probability accumulated by adequate responses (PROBAR) as an expression of confidence and expect it to predict a model’s instance-level performance on both more and less ambiguous/open-ended prompts.

quantifiers enable *selective prediction* (*i.e.*, accepting/rejecting a response depending on the LM’s degree of uncertainty; Kamath et al., 2020; Varshney et al., 2022). For example, entropy (a quantification of the amount of variation in sampled responses) has been shown to (anti-)correlate with generation quality (Fomicheva et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2020) and a good predictor of error (Malinin and Gales, 2021; Xiao and Wang, 2021; Rawte et al., 2023). For short generations, Kuhn et al. (2022b) associate variation in meaning with propensity for error, showing their semantic entropy to outperform entropy’s potential for selective prediction.

In many applications (*e.g.*, question answering, dialogue, story generation), due to factors such as ambiguity, underspecification and differences in perspectives or beliefs (Plank, 2022; Jiang and de Marneffe, 2022; Aroyo and Welty, 2015; Baan et al., 2023), prompts may elicit responses that differ widely while still being arguably adequate. In such cases, which we refer to as ‘open-ended’, the mere presence of semantic variation amongst sampled responses says little, if anything, about an LM’s ability to respond correctly. For a more generally applicable uncertainty quantifier, robust to prompts of varying open-endedness, we argue that rather than semantic similarity amongst sampled responses, we need to reason about whether or not sampled responses are generally *adequate* to the prompt—see Figure 1. We propose to estimate the Probability that an LM assigns to Adequate Responses (PROBAR) and regard that as a notion of confidence in the LM’s ability to respond to a prompt. For that, we design adequacy classifiers to approximately determine the rate at which sampled responses are independently judged to be adequate.

We experiment with three English datasets (Guo et al., 2021; Min et al., 2020; Luke and Christianson, 2018, Abg-COQA, AmbigQA, Provo, resp.) containing prompts of varying open-endedness, and use PROBAR as a measure of confidence in selective prediction with OPT models (Zhang et al., 2022). We compare PROBAR to entropy, semantic entropy and a variant of P(True) (Kadavath et al., 2022). We find PROBAR to outperform them (in terms of AUROC and selective precision vs. coverage), with this being true for both more and less ambiguous/open-ended prompts. For a subset of Abg-COQA, we estimate upperbounds on the performances of semantic entropy and PROBAR by replacing their automated components (clustering algorithm and adequacy classifier, resp.) by human judgement. The Appendix reports extensively on the development of the adequacy classifiers (including human evaluation) as well as on factors such as sample size (for PROBAR estimation), decoding strategy (for selective prediction) and experimental variance. In summary, we contribute a novel uncertainty quantifier that exhibits better performance in selective prediction across prompts of varying open-endedness, addressing a key limitation of the state-of-the-art in this setting.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>We release all code, prompts, generations and human annotated data: <https://github.com/evgeniael/probar>.

## 2 Background

Without loss of generality, we regard an LM as a probabilistic mechanism to generate responses given a prompt. This mechanism is prescribed by two components: a fully-trained neural network (typically, given a prompt and an incomplete response, this NN predicts a probability distribution over candidates for the next token in the response) and a ‘sampling’ algorithm (*i.e.*, a procedure to iteratively draw tokens from next-token distributions and form a complete response; common options include ancestral or unbiased sampling (Bishop and Nasrabadi, 2006), top-k and top-p sampling (Fan et al., 2018; Holtzman et al., 2020), *i.a.*). Given any one prompt  $x$ , these two components induce a conditional distribution over responses, with the relative frequency of a response  $y$  (that is, in a pool of responses obtained by repeated sampling) corresponding, in the limit, to the probability mass  $p(y|x)$  the LM assigns to  $y$  given  $x$ .<sup>2</sup> When we need to choose a single response to stand as ‘the LM’s output’ (*i.e.*, its prediction), given a prompt, we typically introduce a decoding algorithm. A common strategy, which we employ in this paper, is ‘greedy decoding’ (where we form the predicted response by iteratively selecting the most probable next token), other strategies include beam search (Graves, 2012), biased sampling algorithms (*e.g.*, top-k, top-p, *i.a.*) and Bayes risk decoders (Eikema and Aziz, 2022; Bertsch et al., 2023).

If two responses  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  are assigned probabilities such that  $p(y_1|x) < p(y_2|x)$ , we say the LM is less certain about  $y_1$  than it is about  $y_2$ , given  $x$ . It is often useful to express the LM’s state of uncertainty wrt a prompt  $x$ , independently of any one response specifically. One such *uncertainty quantifier* is Shannon entropy:

$$H(Y|X = x) = - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p(y|x) \log p(y|x), \quad (1)$$

where the summation is over the entire (countably infinite) space  $\mathcal{Y}$  of possible responses. For LMs, this quantity can at best be estimated (*e.g.*, via Monte Carlo; MC). Entropy has been used to detect when the LM’s prediction is likely wrong (*i.a.* van der Poel et al., 2022; Rawte et al., 2023; Manakul et al., 2023; Duan et al., 2024), assuming that

<sup>2</sup>If the sampling algorithm is unbiased, this probability is in fact known in closed-form—it is the product of token-level probabilities as assigned by the underlying NN. For the distributions induced by other choices of samplers, this probability is typically available only approximately, via simulation.

		Question: ‘What is the capital of France?’					Question: ‘What is a date?’		
Answer y Paris. <i>Rome.</i> <i>London.</i>	Model A	P(Y x)	P(C x)	P(A x)	Answer y Paris. It’s Paris. <i>London.</i>	Model B	P(Y x)	P(C x)	P(A x)
		0.5	0.5	0.5			0.5	0.9	0.9
		0.4	0.4	0.5			0.4	0.1	0.1
		0.1	0.1			0.1	0.1		
		SE = 0.41		PROBAR = 0.5			SE = 0.14		PROBAR = 0.9
Answer y A fruit. It is a fruit. A romantic appointment. Meeting one romantically.	Model C	P(Y x)	P(C x)	P(A x)	Answer y A fruit. It is a fruit. A dried fruit.	Model D	P(Y x)	P(C x)	P(A x)
		0.2	0.5	1			0.3	1	1
		0.3	0.5				0.3		
		0.2	0.5			0.4			
		0.3							
		SE = 0.3		PROBAR = 1			SE = 0		PROBAR = 1
Answer y A fruit. It is a fruit. <i>Something used in kitchens.</i> <i>A kitchen utensil.</i>	Model E	P(Y x)	P(C x)	P(A x)	Answer y A fruit. </s> <i>It’s&lt;/s&gt;</i>	Model F	P(Y x)	P(C x)	P(A x)
		0.2	0.5	0.5			0.1	0.1	0.1
		0.3	0.5	0.5			0.5	0.9	0.9
		0.2	0.5			0.4			
		0.3							
		SE = 0.3		PROBAR = 0.5			SE = 0.14		PROBAR = 0.1

Figure 2: For each question, we show adequate responses (wrt a plausible interpretation of the prompt) in green and inadequate in red (also *italicised*), bounding boxes highlight semantic clusters (relevant for SE) and adequacy/inadequacy (relevant for PROBAR). For the first prompt, SE makes reasonable predictions (high/low uncertainty for model A/B, resp.) because the question strongly constrains plausible answers for their semantic content. In the second prompt, the ambiguity inherent to ‘date’ allows for plausible answers that convey different meanings. SE makes some poor predictions (e.g., that model C and E are maximally uncertain, obscuring the fact that all answers from C are adequate; that model F is fairly certain, obscuring the fact that the dominant cluster is made of nonsensical responses), while PROBAR makes a reasonable prediction in each case.

higher *surface-form* variation amongst sampled responses is indicative of the model’s inability to process the prompt and, hence, its propensity to make poor predictions. Kuhn et al. (2022b) find this suboptimal, as different surface forms might still convey the same meaning. To compute their *semantic entropy* (SE), they map sampled responses to semantic clusters and estimate entropy over those:

$$SE(Y|X = x) \approx -J^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \log p(c_j|x), \quad (2)$$

where  $c_1, \dots, c_J$  are clusters formed using a model for natural language inference (NLI). In particular, bi-directional entailment between any two sampled responses (each concatenated with the prompt) signals the two responses’ semantic equivalence. For any one cluster  $c_j$ , Kuhn et al. estimate  $p(c_j|x)$  by summing the closed-form probabilities of the unique responses in the cluster, despite the fact that one can only work with a (small) subset of  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Aichberger et al. (2024) propose an improved estimator: the entropy of the empirical distribution over clusters derived from sampled responses (that is,  $-\sum_{c_j} p(c_j|x) \log p(c_j|x)$  with  $p(c_j|x)$  equal the number of responses, incl. repetitions, in cluster  $c_j$  divided by sample size)—we use their SE estimator in this work. In essence, the premise on which SE

is designed and evaluated is that semantic variation signals propensity for error.

### 3 Approach

In open-ended settings, human responses to a prompt may be semantically distinct and yet arguably valid—that can be due to prompt ambiguity or under-specification, due to annotators’ varying perspectives and beliefs, amongst many other factors (e.g. Baan et al., 2023, see section 3). Hence, in this work, we do not regard semantic variation as propensity for error. Figure 2 illustrates for hypothetical QA systems (models A–F), how semantic variation can only be argued to be indicative of error for tasks (or prompts) where the expectation is that only one answer (albeit linguistically expressible in a plethora of ways) is possible. For the first question ( $x =$  ‘What is the capital of France?’), where no data uncertainty (beyond the form of paraphrasing) is expected, SE is successfully indicating how model B is likely more reliable than model A. However, the second ambiguous question ( $x =$  ‘What is a date?’) allows for multiple, semantically distinct answers (due to ambiguities inherent to ‘date’). Here, SE makes model D appear semantically certain (single cluster), while models C and E exhibit complete semantic uncertainty (uniform dis-

tribution over clusters). As it turns out, SE cannot distinguish models C and E, despite only the former having no inadequate responses. On the other hand, model F serves as an example of a pitfall of associating *lack* of semantic variation with correctness: the model is semantically certain, but the dominant cluster is made of nonsensical responses. These examples illustrate how judging responses for their adequacy to the prompt is more informative than assessing their semantic homogeneity: it makes for an expression of confidence that has the potential to work across prompts, whether they admit more or less data uncertainty. Next, we describe our strategy to operationalise this idea.

First, we introduce a judge  $a : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{A_0, A_1\}$  that maps a prompt-response pair to a binary adequacy judgement (adequate  $A_1$  or not adequate  $A_0$ ). A judge can be a human labeller, a purposed-trained classifier or a powerful large language model (‘LLM as a judge’; Li et al., 2024a; Thakur et al., 2024), the latter two serving as an approximation to human labelling.

Then, given an LM and a prompt  $x$ , the probability  $\Pr(a(x, Y) = A_1 | X = x)$  that a response is judged to be adequate  $A_1$ , as induced by the LM and our choice of judge, can be MC-estimated using  $N$  sampled responses  $y_1, \dots, y_N$ :

$$\Pr(a(x, Y) = A_1 | X = x) \approx^{\text{MC}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N [a(x, y_n) = A_1], \quad (3)$$

which is simply the relative frequency of adequate responses amongst the  $N$  samples.<sup>3</sup> This estimate is what we refer to as PROBAR.

## 4 Experiments

Our experiments are designed to establish the merits of PROBAR as an uncertainty quantifier apt to detect which prompts the LM is likely to form correct predictions for, associating low uncertainty (or high confidence) with those, and, conversely, which prompts the LM is likely to form incorrect predictions for, associating high uncertainty (or low confidence) with those.

**Tasks and Datasets.** We use Abg-COQA (Guo et al., 2021), a reading comprehension QA (RCQA) dataset; where a passage is accompanied by one or

<sup>3</sup>The Iverson bracket  $[P]$  evaluates to 1 if the logical predicate  $P$  is True and to 0 otherwise.

more rounds of questions. We separate the observations in this dataset in two portions, one where the last question (in the round) is ambiguous and, given the passage, multiple answers are plausible, and another without ambiguity. This comprises 994 context-ambiguous question pairs (741, 130, 123 in training, development and test sets, resp.) and 253 non-ambiguous prompts (130 and 123 in development and test sets, resp.). We also report experiments on AmbigQA (Min et al., 2020), which is a knowledge based QA (KBQA) dataset. We focus on the 1070 questions labelled as ambiguous from the development set.<sup>4</sup> Finally, we also experiment with next-word prediction (NWP), as a task that portrays high plausible variability. As prompts for this task, we use 100 randomly chosen contexts from Provo Corpus (Luke and Christianson, 2018), a dataset of passage prefixes in English from various sources. Each prefix from the dataset contains, on average, 40 human-labelled next word continuations; which provide us with plausible reference answers for the NWP task.

**Models.** We generate responses from OPT models (Zhang et al., 2022) of varying sizes (2.7B, 6.7B, 13B and 30B). For each prompt (and model size), we obtain the greedy decoding (which stands as the model prediction for the prompt) and we also obtain 10 unbiased samples (for uncertainty quantification). For Abg-COQA, the prompt is comprised of a passage, previous rounds of QA pairs and the ambiguous question. For AmbigQA, the prompt is made of 10-shot question-answer pairs as examples, similar to Kuhn et al. (2022b), followed by the ambiguous question. For both QA datasets, a sampled response is obtained by sampling tokens iteratively until an end-of-sequence token is sampled (or until a maximum length of 150 tokens). For Provo Corpus, the prompt is made of a passage prefix. We follow Ilia and Aziz (2024) and sample a response (*i.e.*, a choice for the next word) by sampling subword tokens iteratively until a complete word is detected. To simulate cases in which the model would not be able to respond to the prompt,<sup>5</sup> we randomly replace each context by a same-length context. The model prompts for all tasks are detailed in Appendix A.1.

<sup>4</sup>We used the version from [https://huggingface.co/datasets/sewon/ambig\\_qa/tree/main/full](https://huggingface.co/datasets/sewon/ambig_qa/tree/main/full), which only contains training and development sets.

<sup>5</sup>We need to simulate those cases since we can expect autoregressive LMs pre-trained on English corpora to perform the NWP task well intrinsically, due to their training objective.

**Metrics.** We evaluate all uncertainty quantifiers for their usefulness in selective prediction (Kamath et al., 2020; Varshney et al., 2022), where, for each prompt, the model’s prediction is accepted or rejected as a function of the uncertainty quantifier (*e.g.*, reject responses generated under more uncertainty than the user tolerates). For the QA tasks, we regard the greedy decoding as the LM’s prediction, as typically done for QA (Kuhn et al., 2022b). For NWP, we choose (at random) one of the sampled responses and regard that as the LM’s prediction. There are different metrics that summarise precision vs. coverage tradeoffs at varying uncertainty thresholds. In Section 5, we report area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC).<sup>6</sup> Higher AUROC is desirable, with the ideal uncertainty quantifier achieving an AUROC score of 1. Additionally, in Appendix B.3, we visualise selective precision (fraction of correct over predicted instances) versus coverage (fractions of predicted over all instances) plots. These evaluation metrics require a notion of correctness by which to criticise the LM’s prediction. In all of our datasets, we have a reference set of plausible answers to which we can compare the LM prediction. For the QA datasets, similar to Lin et al. (2024b), we let gpt3.5-turbo (via the OpenAI API) determine whether the LM prediction is correct: we prompt it to generate true if the prediction is plausible given the question, the passage (if relevant) and the reference answers. For Provo Corpus, we regard the LM prediction as correct if it exactly matches one of the prefix’s reference answers.

**Baselines.** As baselines for comparison, we employ entropy (E), estimated via MC, semantic entropy (SE) estimated following Aichberger et al. (2024), and a variant of P(True) (Kadavath et al., 2022). SE requires a clustering algorithm; we follow the strategy by Kuhn et al. (2022b), using bidirectional entailment. Specifically, for Abg-COQA and AmbigQA, we adopt Deberta-Large (He et al., 2020) as the NLI model. For Provo, instead, we employ an LM, Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407 (Mistral, 2024), to act as an NLI classifier,<sup>7</sup> prompted similarly to the implementation by Farquhar et al. (2024)—details in Appendix A.2. When computing AUROC, we noticed for both E

<sup>6</sup>Interpretable as the rate at which a randomly chosen correct prediction is made under lower uncertainty (or higher confidence) than a randomly chosen incorrect one.


<sup>7</sup>We opt for an LM as NLI models are trained on complete sentences rather than incomplete ones (like passage prefixes).

and SE that the scale of entropy values varies across prompts, as the number of elements in the distributions’ support varies per instance (*i.e.*, the number  $M$  of unique responses for E, and the number  $J$  of clusters for SE), which leads to some misleading AUROC values. We adjust for that by normalising entropy (E or SE) by its theoretical upperbound in each case, and transforming it to a confidence score:  $1 - \frac{H(Y|X=x)}{\log M}$  for E and  $1 - \frac{SE(Y|X=x)}{\log J}$  for SE; these are denoted Norm.E and Norm.SE in plots. We adapt P(True) to prompt for adequacy instead of correctness (details in Appendix A.3); this variant is denoted P(Adequate) in plots.


**PROBAR implementation.** For each task, PROBAR requires an adequacy classifier. For Abg-COQA, we considered two different strategies: (1) approximate adequacy judgements using an NLI model, where the passage is regarded as the premise and an affirmative sentence comprised from the question-response pair is regarded as the hypothesis, and (2) have an LM perform adequacy judgements, with the passage and a question-answer pair provided as context and the LM prompted to generate true if the answer to the question is plausible given the passage, or false if not. For AmbigQA, we prompt an LM to generate true if a response is adequate given the question with respect to the LM’s own training data / parametric knowledge. For NWP, we prompt an LM to generate true if a response is plausible given the context and false otherwise. No adequacy classifier internal to PROBAR has access to reference answers.<sup>8</sup>

**Manual Evaluation.** We perform human evaluation of a number of automated components. In particular, on Abg-COQA, we evaluate clustering algorithms for SE, adequacy classifiers for PROBAR, as well as the LLM component of the evaluation protocol (which assesses the correctness of a selected answer in relation to the available reference answers). We randomly sample 50 context-ambiguous question pairs from the training set of Abg-COQA and manually annotate all responses sampled from OPT-models for their semantic equivalence and adequacy. We use these to characterise upperbounds on the performance we can expect from SE and PROBAR in this setting. We also used the manual adequacy labels to optimise design choices for our classifiers on F1—the best performing classifier

<sup>8</sup>Details about models and prompts in Appendix A.4.



(a) AUROC values for AbgCOQA’s 50 manually annotated contexts. On the left, AUROC is computed using manual correctness annotations for the greedy response; on the right, correctness of the greedy was automated using gpt3.5-turbo.



(b) AUROC values for AbgCOQA’s test set for ambiguous prompts (left), non-ambiguous prompts (middle) and their aggregated set (right); 123, 123 and 246 prompts respectively. Correctness of the greedy was automated using gpt3.5-turbo.

Figure 3: AUROC values for various quantifiers for Abg-COQA.

(which we use across the main experiments) is based on Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407 (Mistral, 2024) (see Appendix A.4, prompt LM-1-Step-Plausible, for all details). For the same 50 context-ambiguous question pairs, we also manually annotate OPT models’ greedy outputs for their correctness. This allows us to evaluate gpt3.5-turbo’s performance in automating correctness decisions when computing AUROC. These labels also allow us to assess the uncertainty quantifiers’ AUROC performance when no errors in the automated components of the evaluation setup occur (measuring *actual* performance of the implemented quantifiers). Last, we labelled generations for 10 contexts from the Provo Corpus in order to assess the performance of PROBAR’s adequacy classifier in NWP. Details on annotations and evaluation results in Appendix A.5 and B.1.

## 5 Results

**Quantifiers’ upperbounds on Abg-COQA.** In Figure 3a, we concentrate on the subset of AbcCOQA for which we obtained manual labels (for semantic clusters in SE, adequacy judgements in PROBAR, and the correctness of greedy responses in the evaluation protocol). In both plots, we observe AUROC values for different uncertainty quan-

tifiers across OPT model sizes, with SE’s and PROBAR’s internal decisions replaced by human judgement. On the left, AUROCs are computed using hand-labelled correctness for the greedy responses, hence we observe results in a setting free of errors in the evaluation protocol. PROBAR (M) and Norm.SE(M) represent the ‘upper-bounds’ for SE and PROBAR, respectively, computed using the manual adequacy and semantic equivalence annotations. PROBAR outperforms all baselines, both its upperbound PROBAR (M) and its practical implementation PROBAR (LM). Beyond the fact that PROBAR (M) surpassed Norm.SE(M) for all OPT models by a large margin, it is noteworthy that PROBAR (LM) surpassed Norm.SE(M).<sup>9</sup> On the right plot of Figure 3a, we see the results for the same subset, but using gpt3.5-turbo to automate the evaluation protocol (*i.e.*, assess correctness of the greedy responses). We can see that errors in evaluation have a greater impact on more informative quantifiers (*i.e.* with higher AUROC values). Those get negatively impacted by misclassifications of some of the plausible decodings they accept with high confidence, while worse uncertainty

<sup>9</sup>In Appendix C.1 we study other choices of decoders for the selected model-generated response used in the AUROC computation, with similar patterns observed.




Figure 4: AUROCs for Provo Corpus (left) and AmbigQA (right) tasks. For Provo Corpus (200 prompts), correctness was assessed via exact matching of a sampled response to human references (AUROC is as an average over 5 runs). For AmbigQA (1070 prompts), correctness of the greedy was assessed by gpt3.5-turbo.

quantifiers, which wrongly abstain from answering, dodge these evaluation errors.

**Quantifiers’ practical performance on AbgCOQA.** We now turn to the test set, with all relevant components automated (semantic clusters in SE, adequacy judgements in PROBAR, and the correctness of greedy responses in the evaluation protocol). Across all settings in Figure 3b (ambiguous prompts, non-ambiguous prompts and their combination), PROBAR outperforms the baselines. In one case, PROBAR, Norm.SE and Norm.E all achieve a similar AUROC score. This can occur when OPT models were rather confident in a single response (which was ultimately also correct); circumstances under which Norm.E and Norm.SE could predict model correctness well. In the non-ambiguous setting, we believe PROBAR’s superior performance can be attributed to its ability to detect ‘confident’ errors (where a model is confident in a response, which is ultimately incorrect). To analyse our results’ variance, we perform a bootstrap analysis in Appendix C.3, where subsets of prompts are repeatedly sampled to compute AUROCs. Moreover, we show the precision-coverage plots in Appendix B.3, that generally paint a similar picture (PROBAR outperforms other quantifiers).

**AmbigQA.** We observe the results for the ambiguous prompts from AmbigQA (Figure 4, right), where PROBAR outperforms other baselines, except for OPT13B. We analyse how well OPT-models model plausible variability to assess whether their similar performance is due to the assessed OPT models inability to capture all plausible answers in their responses. In Appendix Figure 13b, we observe the variation among is largely due to paraphrases (as the histograms of E and SE reveal). This is in contrast to variation observed

in AbgCOQA and Provo Corpus, where variation among semantically distinct responses is more apparent (Appendix Figure 13a and 14).

**Provo Corpus.** In Figure 4 (left), PROBAR outperforms all other quantifiers, robustly informing us when the model can respond to a prompt, despite of the heightened data uncertainty in the NWP task.

## 6 Discussion

We demonstrated how semantic variation need not robustly predict propensity for error. This carries a broader implication: a distribution over responses given a prompt and its basic properties, such as its spread or shape, need not be informative of the correctness of a specific model-generated response. This does not go to say that SE or other metrics based on the same premise are flawed, but their effectiveness is arguably limited to settings (tasks or prompts) where we strongly expect correct responses to differ at most in *how* they convey a single meaning (*i.e.*, paraphrastic variation) and not in *what* meaning they convey—which excludes settings of varying (or unknown) open-endedness. When considering uncertainty metrics to employ, one needs to carefully consider the settings of their problem, task and data. In more open-ended tasks with high data uncertainty, *e.g.* dialogue, open-ended QA, story generation etc., they could consider employing a metric like PROBAR. We demonstrate how PROBAR better informs us whether the model can reliably respond to a prompt, regardless of the prompt’s open-endedness. We also envision potential for finding complementary information in different uncertainty quantifiers. For example, simultaneously high SE and high PROBAR might detect prompts for which the LM models plausible variability well, while simultaneously high SE and

low PROBAR might detect prompts about which the model is rather ignorant. Future work can investigate such relationships. Moreover, PROBAR could power confidence-aware decoding. In Appendix C.4 we take some initial steps in this direction (by regarding one of the responses that was deemed adequate as the chosen LM prediction) to seed future research.

## 7 Related Work

Various methods were proposed to quantify aspects of uncertainty: some based on calibration (Kumar and Sarawagi, 2019; Jiang et al., 2021), some on LMs’ predicted probabilities (Varshney et al., 2023; Bakman et al., 2024; Lin et al., 2024a), and some on the LM’s own uncertainty verbalisation (Kadavath et al., 2022; Mielke et al., 2022).

### Consistency based Uncertainty Estimation.

Another method to assess a model’s uncertainty is based on summarising distributional information from LMs along different ‘consistency’ dimensions. Beyond entropy (Fomicheva et al., 2020; Malinin and Gales, 2021; Xu et al., 2020; Xiao and Wang, 2021; Rawte et al., 2023) and semantic entropy (Kuhn et al., 2022b; Farquhar et al., 2024), other work computes semantic uncertainty with different methods: Aichberger et al. (2024) use importance sampling; Cheng and Vlachos (2024) use similarity-sensitive entropy; Nikitin et al. (2024) use semidefinite unit trace kernels to model semantic similarities; Chen et al. (2024) use the eigenvalues of embeddings of sampled responses and Rabinovich et al. (2023) use the pairwise similarity of embeddings of responses. Scherrer et al. (2024) map sampled responses to semantic actions and Aina and Linzen (2021) map to responses’ interpretations before computing uncertainty metrics. Rather than assessing consistency among responses, Manakul et al. (2023) assess consistency of responses to a specific response, while Chen and Mueller (2024) and Xiong et al. (2023) compute confidence scores using sampling of models’ responses and their confidence scores. Alternatively, rather than repeatedly sampling, responses’ some work perturbs inputs. For instance, Zhao et al. (2024) analyse divergence of responses on rephrased inputs to detect hallucinations, while Tonolini et al. (2024) compute probabilities with a weighted ensemble of rephrased task instructions. Similarly, others compute consistency-based metrics based on responses from paraphrased prompts

(Elazar et al., 2021; Fierro and Søgaard, 2022; Raj et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024b). Beyond sampling outputs from one model, some assess cross-model samples (Zhang et al., 2023, 2024). Other dimensions of consistency investigated include logical (Jang et al., 2022), concept (Sahu et al., 2022) and reasoning path consistency (Wang et al., 2023). PROBAR joins this stream of work; assessing how consistently an LM generates samples deemed as adequate by a task-specific classifier.

**Decomposing Uncertainty** Some work attempts to detect when a model will err by decomposing total uncertainty into aleatoric and epistemic. Gao et al. (2024) quantify those aspects by sampling responses for perturbed inputs; Hou et al. (2023) by ensembling responses with input clarifications and Ling et al. (2024) by sampling responses under different in-context demonstrations. Cole et al. (2023) prompt LMs repetitively to generate interpretations of a question and responses and aggregates into confidence scores, decomposing denotational and epistemic uncertainty. Kuhn et al. (2022a) and Zhang and Choi (2023) detect ambiguous questions to generate clarification questions; targeting uncertainty caused by ambiguity. Yadkori et al. (2024) compute a lower bound on epistemic uncertainty using iterative sampling. Rather than decomposing uncertainty or detecting when an input has high aleatoric uncertainty, PROBAR aims to indicate when a model can reliably respond to a prompt, regardless of potential data uncertainty in the input.

## 8 Conclusion

We demonstrate how semantic variation is not a robust signal for assessing a model’s ability to respond to a prompt in settings where data uncertainty, beyond the form of paraphrasing, is present; particularly relevant to open-ended tasks. We propose PROBAR, an uncertainty quantifier based on the probability the LM generator assigns to the set of responses that are adequate to the prompt; we approximate adequacy judgements using a classifier and use an empirical estimate of the adequacy probability. We demonstrate the efficacy of PROBAR in selective prediction with OPT models in two QA datasets as well as next-word prediction, all exhibiting prompts of varying open-endedness.



## Limitations

Regarding limitations of our study, we have identified the following: PROBAR, as most sampling-based uncertainty quantification methods are generally computationally expensive. However, we believe that the benefits of obtaining useful and reliable uncertainty signals outweigh the computational costs. Nevertheless, we conduct an ablation study in Appendix C.2, where we find that 5 samples would generally be sufficient to obtain results similar to our experiments with 10 samples. Beyond that, future research could investigate whether one could learn to predict PROBAR (similar to how Kossen et al. (2024) predict SE). Furthermore, PROBAR requires a task-specific classifier. Essentially, if one wishes to have an adequacy classifier for tasks different than the ones examined, they would need to construct and evaluate their own (possibly inspired by how we did it). Obviously PROBAR is also highly dependent on the quality of the adequacy classifier—the better the classifier’s performance, the more informative the quantifier will be. This sets as vital that one thoroughly evaluates the adequacy classifier in their setting of interest, given relevant data. That being said, due to limited resources, we only could manually annotate responses to perform a thorough evaluation of the adequacy classifiers from the RCQA task (and a smaller scale evaluation for the NWP task). The classifiers for the KBQA task was not explicitly evaluated for their performance, and we only ‘implicitly’ validate their performance through the improved AUROC performance of PROBAR. At the same time, we only evaluated PROBAR in a setting where only short responses were expected. If one needed to employ an adequacy classifier in a QA setting with longer generations expected, they would need to re-assess the classifier’s performance. At the same time, within our study, adequacy of the response was assessed as a binary decision reflecting whether the response is a plausible answer to the question given a passage (RCQA), the classifier’s training data (KBQA) or a plausible continuation to a context (NWP task). However, within different applications and domains, the notion of adequacy can be as general or as fine-grained as one defines it (e.g., one might consider a response as adequate only if it contains a plausible answer, is grammatically coherent and does not contain toxic text). In this case, they would need to align the training and evaluation of the corresponding

adequacy classifier according to their needs.

## Acknowledgements



This project has received funding by the EU’s Horizon Europe research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 101070631, UTTER).

## References

- Lukas Aichberger, Kajetan Schweighofer, Mykyta Ielanskyi, and Sepp Hochreiter. 2024. Semantically diverse language generation for uncertainty estimation in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04306*.
- Laura Aina and Tal Linzen. 2021. The language model understood the prompt was ambiguous: Probing syntactic uncertainty through generation. In *Proceedings of the Fourth BlackboxNLP Workshop on Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 42–57, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lora Aroyo and Chris Welty. 2015. Truth is a lie: Crowd truth and the seven myths of human annotation. *AI Magazine*, 36(1):15–24.
- Joris Baan, Nico Daheim, Evgenia Ilia, Dennis Ulmer, Haau-Sing Li, Raquel Fernández, Barbara Plank, Rico Sennrich, Chrysoula Zerva, and Wilker Aziz. 2023. Uncertainty in natural language generation: From theory to applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15703*.
- Yavuz Faruk Bakman, Duygu Nur Yaldiz, Baturalp Buyukates, Chenyang Tao, Dimitrios Dimitriadis, and Salman Avestimehr. 2024. MARS: Meaning-aware response scoring for uncertainty estimation in generative LLMs. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7752–7767, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amanda Bertsch, Alex Xie, Graham Neubig, and Matthew Gormley. 2023. It’s MBR all the way down: Modern generation techniques through the lens of minimum Bayes risk. In *Proceedings of the Big Picture Workshop*, pages 108–122, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Christopher M Bishop and Nasser M Nasrabadi. 2006. *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, volume 4. Springer.
- Chao Chen, Kai Liu, Ze Chen, Yi Gu, Yue Wu, Mingyuan Tao, Zhihang Fu, and Jieping Ye. 2024. Inside: LLMs’ internal states retain the power of hallucination detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03744*.

- Jiuhai Chen and Jonas Mueller. 2024. [Quantifying uncertainty in answers from any language model and enhancing their trustworthiness](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5186–5200, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Julius Cheng and Andreas Vlachos. 2024. [Measuring uncertainty in neural machine translation with similarity-sensitive entropy](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2115–2128, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jeremy Cole, Michael Zhang, Dan Gillick, Julian Eisen-schlos, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Jacob Eisenstein. 2023. [Selectively answering ambiguous questions](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 530–543.
- Jinhao Duan, Hao Cheng, Shiqi Wang, Alex Zavalny, Chenan Wang, Renjing Xu, Bhavya Kailkhura, and Kaidi Xu. 2024. [Shifting attention to relevance: Towards the predictive uncertainty quantification of free-form large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5050–5063, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bryan Eikema and Wilker Aziz. 2022. [Sampling-based approximations to minimum Bayes risk decoding for neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10978–10993, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yanai Elazar, Nora Kassner, Shauli Ravfogel, Abhishava Ravichander, Eduard Hovy, Hinrich Schütze, and Yoav Goldberg. 2021. [Measuring and improving consistency in pretrained language models](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1012–1031.
- Angela Fan, Mike Lewis, and Yann Dauphin. 2018. [Hierarchical neural story generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 889–898, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sebastian Farquhar, Jannik Kossen, Lorenz Kuhn, and Yarin Gal. 2024. [Detecting hallucinations in large language models using semantic entropy](#). *Nature*, 630(8017):625–630.
- Constanza Fierro and Anders Søgaard. 2022. [Factual consistency of multilingual pretrained language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 3046–3052, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Marina Fomicheva, Shuo Sun, Lisa Yankovskaya, Frédéric Blain, Francisco Guzmán, Mark Fishel, Nikolaos Aletras, Vishrav Chaudhary, and Lucia Spe-cia. 2020. [Unsupervised quality estimation for neural machine translation](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:539–555.
- Xiang Gao, Jiaxin Zhang, Lalla Mouatadid, and Kamalika Das. 2024. [SPUQ: Perturbation-based uncertainty quantification for large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2336–2346, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Graves. 2012. [Sequence transduction with recurrent neural networks](#). In *ICML Workshop on Representation Learning*, volume abs/1211.3711.
- Sebastian Gregor Gruber and Florian Buettner. 2024. [A bias-variance-covariance decomposition of kernel scores for generative models](#). In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Meiqi Guo, Mingda Zhang, Siva Reddy, and Malihe Alikhani. 2021. [Abg-coqa: Clarifying ambiguity in conversational question answering](#). In *3rd Conference on Automated Knowledge Base Construction*.
- Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2020. [Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03654*.
- Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2020. [The curious case of neural text de-generation](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Bairu Hou, Yujian Liu, Kaizhi Qian, Jacob Andreas, Shiyu Chang, and Yang Zhang. 2023. [Decomposing uncertainty for large language models through input clarification ensembling](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08718*.
- Evgenia Ilia and Wilker Aziz. 2024. [Predict the next word: <humans exhibit uncertainty in this task and language models \\_\\_\\_\\_>](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 234–255, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Myeongjun Jang, Deuk Sin Kwon, and Thomas Lukasiewicz. 2022. [BECEL: Benchmark for consistency evaluation of language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3680–3696, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Nan-Jiang Jiang and Marie-Catherine de Marneffe. 2022. [Investigating reasons for disagreement in natural language inference](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:1357–1374.

- Zhengbao Jiang, Jun Araki, Haibo Ding, and Graham Neubig. 2021. [How can we know when language models know? on the calibration of language models for question answering](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:962–977.
- Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, et al. 2022. Language models (mostly) know what they know. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221*.
- Amita Kamath, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. 2020. [Selective question answering under domain shift](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5684–5696, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jannik Kossen, Jiatong Han, Muhammed Razzak, Lisa Schut, Shreshth Malik, and Yarin Gal. 2024. Semantic entropy probes: Robust and cheap hallucination detection in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15927*.
- Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. 2022a. Clam: Selective clarification for ambiguous questions with generative language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.07769*.
- Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. 2022b. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. In *NeurIPS ML Safety Workshop*.
- Aviral Kumar and Sunita Sarawagi. 2019. Calibration of encoder decoder models for neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00802*.
- Dawei Li, Bohan Jiang, Liangjie Huang, Alimohammad Beigi, Chengshuai Zhao, Zhen Tan, Amrita Bhat-tacharjee, Yuxuan Jiang, Canyu Chen, Tianhao Wu, et al. 2024a. From generation to judgment: Opportunities and challenges of llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.16594*.
- Xiang Lisa Li, Vaishnavi Shrivastava, Siyan Li, Tatsunori Hashimoto, and Percy Liang. 2024b. Benchmarking and improving generator-validator consistency of language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Chin-Yew Lin and Franz Josef Och. 2004. Automatic evaluation of machine translation quality using longest common subsequence and skip-bigram statistics. In *Proceedings of the 42nd annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (ACL-04)*, pages 605–612.
- Zhen Lin, Shubhendu Trivedi, and Jimeng Sun. 2024a. [Contextualized sequence likelihood: Enhanced confidence scores for natural language generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10351–10368, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhen Lin, Shubhendu Trivedi, and Jimeng Sun. 2024b. Generating with confidence: Uncertainty quantification for black-box large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Chen Ling, Xujiang Zhao, Xuchao Zhang, Wei Cheng, Yanchi Liu, Yiyou Sun, Mika Oishi, Takao Osaki, Katsushi Matsuda, Jie Ji, Guangji Bai, Liang Zhao, and Haifeng Chen. 2024. [Uncertainty quantification for in-context learning of large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3357–3370, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Steven G Luke and Kiel Christianson. 2018. The provo corpus: A large eye-tracking corpus with predictability norms. *Behavior research methods*, 50:826–833.
- Andrey Malinin and Mark Gales. 2021. Uncertainty estimation in autoregressive structured prediction. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark Gales. 2023. [SelfCheckGPT: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9004–9017, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sabrina J. Mielke, Arthur Szlam, Emily Dinan, and Y-Lan Boureau. 2022. [Reducing conversational agents’ overconfidence through linguistic calibration](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:857–872.
- Sewon Min, Julian Michael, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [AmbigQA: Answering ambiguous open-domain questions](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 5783–5797, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- AI Mistral. 2024. [Mistral nemo](#).
- Yixin Nie, Adina Williams, Emily Dinan, Mohit Bansal, Jason Weston, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. [Adversarial NLI: A new benchmark for natural language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4885–4901, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexander Nikitin, Jannik Kossen, Yarin Gal, and Pekka Marttinen. 2024. Kernel language entropy: Fine-grained uncertainty quantification for llms from semantic similarities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20003*.
- Barbara Plank. 2022. [The “problem” of human label variation: On ground truth in data, modeling and](#)

- evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10671–10682, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ella Rabinovich, Samuel Ackerman, Orna Raz, Eitan Farchi, and Ateret Anaby Tavor. 2023. [Predicting question-answering performance of large language models through semantic consistency](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Natural Language Generation, Evaluation, and Metrics (GEM)*, pages 138–154, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Harsh Raj, Vipul Gupta, Domenic Rosati, and Subhabrata Majumdar. 2023. Semantic consistency for assuring reliability of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09138*.
- Vipula Rawte, Swagata Chakraborty, Agnibh Pathak, Anubhav Sarkar, S.M Towhidul Islam Tonmoy, Aman Chadha, Amit Sheth, and Amitava Das. 2023. [The troubling emergence of hallucination in large language models - an extensive definition, quantification, and prescriptive remediations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2541–2573, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jie Ren, Jiaming Luo, Yao Zhao, Kundan Krishna, Mohammad Saleh, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, and Peter J Liu. 2022. Out-of-distribution detection and selective generation for conditional language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Pritish Sahu, Michael Cogswell, Yunye Gong, and Ajay Divakaran. 2022. Unpacking large language models with conceptual consistency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15093*.
- Nino Scherrer, Claudia Shi, Amir Feder, and David Blei. 2024. Evaluating the moral beliefs encoded in llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Aman Singh Thakur, Kartik Choudhary, Venkat Srinik Ramayapally, Sankaran Vaidyanathan, and Dieuwke Hupkes. 2024. Judging the judges: Evaluating alignment and vulnerabilities in llms-as-judges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12624*.
- Francesco Tonolini, Nikolaos Aletras, Jordan Massiah, and Gabriella Kazai. 2024. [Bayesian prompt ensembles: Model uncertainty estimation for black-box large language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 12229–12272, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Liam van der Poel, Ryan Cotterell, and Clara Meister. 2022. [Mutual information alleviates hallucinations in abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5956–5965, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Neeraj Varshney, Swaroop Mishra, and Chitta Baral. 2022. [Investigating selective prediction approaches across several tasks in IID, OOD, and adversarial settings](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 1995–2002, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Neeraj Varshney, Wenlin Yao, Hongming Zhang, Jian-shu Chen, and Dong Yu. 2023. A stitch in time saves nine: Detecting and mitigating hallucinations of llms by validating low-confidence generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03987*.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yijun Xiao and William Yang Wang. 2021. [On hallucination and predictive uncertainty in conditional language generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2734–2744, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Miao Xiong, Zhiyuan Hu, Xinyang Lu, Yifei Li, Jie Fu, Junxian He, and Bryan Hooi. 2023. Can llms express their uncertainty? an empirical evaluation of confidence elicitation in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13063*.
- Jiacheng Xu, Shrey Desai, and Greg Durrett. 2020. [Understanding neural abstractive summarization models via uncertainty](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6275–6281, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yasin Abbasi Yadkori, Ilja Kuzborskij, András György, and Csaba Szepesvári. 2024. To believe or not to believe your llm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02543*.
- Adam Yang, Chen Chen, and Konstantinos Pitas. 2024. Just rephrase it! uncertainty estimation in closed-source language models via multiple rephrased queries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13907*.
- Caiqi Zhang, Fangyu Liu, Marco Basaldella, and Nigel Collier. 2024. [LUQ: Long-text uncertainty quantification for LLMs](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5244–5262, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiaxin Zhang, Zhuohang Li, Kamalika Das, Bradley Malin, and Sricharan Kumar. 2023. [SAC<sup>3</sup>: Reliable hallucination detection in black-box language models via semantic-aware cross-check consistency](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 15445–15458, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Michael JQ Zhang and Eunsol Choi. 2023. Clarify when necessary: Resolving ambiguity through interaction with lms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09469*.

Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*.

Yukun Zhao, Lingyong Yan, Weiwei Sun, Guoliang Xing, Chong Meng, Shuaiqiang Wang, Zhicong Cheng, Zhaochun Ren, and Dawei Yin. 2024. **Knowing what LLMs DO NOT know: A simple yet effective self-detection method.** In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7051–7063, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.

## A Experimental details

### A.1 Analysed models’ Prompts

For AmbigQA, we use a 10-shot prompt, with 10 example question-answer pairs from the datasets’ training set:

Question: When did the simpsons first air on television? Answer: April 19, 1987  
 Question: Who played george washington in the john adams series? Answer: David Morse  
 Question: What is the legal age of marriage in usa? Answer: 18 years of age  
 Question: Who starred in barefoot in the park on broadway? Answer: Elizabeth Ashley  
 Question: When did the manhattan project began and end? Answer: Began 1939, end 1946  
 Question: When did the frozen ride open at epcot? Answer: June 21, 2016  
 Question: Name the landforms that form the boundaries of the peninsular plateau? Answer: Aravali Range, Satpura Range, Vindhyan Range  
 Question: When was the last time uga won a national championship? Answer: 1980  
 Question: Who sing play that funky music white boy? Answer: Rob Parissi  
 Question: When was the first airplane used in war? Answer: Bl  e9riot XI  
 Question: <AMBIGUOUS\_QUESTION> Answer:

For Abgcoqa, each datapoint is comprised by a passage, some previous rounds of question-answer pairs and lastly, the ambiguous question, as in the example of Figure 5. Hence, the prompt for each question is constructed as follows:

Context: <PASSAGE>

**Passage:** Angie went to the library with her mother. First she had to turn in the books she was returning at the return desk. They said hello to the man there. He took their books. Then they went into the adult reading room. Angie sat in a brown chair at the table. She made a drawing of her mother. **Her mother found a large red book.** Then they went to the Mystery section. Angie sat in a blue chair. She drew a picture of her brother. Her mother found the book. **It was a green book.** Finally it was time to go to the children’s room. It was Story Hour. Miss Hudson was there to read to all the children. She read a book about friendship...

**Question<sub>i-2</sub>:** What did she draw?

**Answer<sub>i-2</sub>:** Her mother.

**Question<sub>i-1</sub>:** What did her mother find?

**Answer<sub>i-1</sub>:** The book.

**Question<sub>i</sub>:** What colour was it?

**Plausible Answers :** {Red, Green, Do you mean the first book?}

Figure 5: Example of an ambiguous instance from AbgCOQA.

Question: <PREVIOUS\_QUESTION\_1>

Answer: <PREVIOUS\_ANSWER\_1>

Question: <PREVIOUS\_QUESTION\_2>

Answer: <PREVIOUS\_ANSWER\_2>

Question: <AMBIGUOUS\_QUESTION>

Answer:

As these models are pre-trained and tend to continually generate question-answer pairs following a few-shot example, we add to the end-of-sequence tokens, beyond the ‘< EOS >’ token, the tokens corresponding to the words ‘question’, ‘answer’, ‘Question’, ‘Answer’, ‘question:’, ‘answer:’ and ‘.’.

To obtain generations we sampled unbiasedly. From Hugging Face, the relevant parameters are:

do\_sample=True  
 num\_beams=1  
 temperature=1  
 top\_p=1

For the greedy decoding, the parameters are:

do\_sample=False  
 num\_beams=1

### A.2 Semantic equivalence assessment

For computing SE, we need to operationalise an NLI based algorithm, as explained in Section 2.2. For QA experiments, Deberta-Large was used. However, for NWP, the inputs (prefix contexts) were incomplete sentences – which is unlike the training of NLI classifiers such as Deberta-Large. Hence, we prompt a LM, in this case Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407 to act as an NLI classifier. The prompt used for assessing bi-directional entailment is:

You are presented with two strings, String 1 and String 2. Generate True if

String 1 semantically entails String 2 and False otherwise. Only generate True or False. String 1: '<STRING1>' String 2: '<STRING2>'.

### A.3 Adequacy assessment for P(Adeq.)

We adjust Kadavath et al.'s  $P(\text{True})$  to a, relevant in our case,  $P(\text{Adequacy})$ . For that, we prompt the original analysed models (OPT2.7B-30B) as follows:

- **Prompt for RCQA task:**

Context: '<PASSAGE>'

Question: '<QUESTION>'

Here are some brainstormed ideas:  
'<SAMPLED\_RESPONSES>'

Possible answer: <ANSWER>

Is the possible answer:

(A) Plausible

(B) Not Plausible

The possible answer is:

- **Prompt for KBQA task:**

Question: '<QUESTION>'

Here are some brainstormed ideas:  
'<SAMPLED\_RESPONSES>'

Possible answer: <ANSWER>

Is the possible answer:

(A) Plausible

(B) Not Plausible

The possible answer is:

- **Prompt for NWP task:**

Context: '<CONTEXT>'

Here are some brainstormed continuations: <CONTINUATIONS>

Possible continuation: <GREEDY>

Is the possible continuation:

(A) Plausible

(B) Not Plausible

The possible continuation is:

We assess the log-probabilities assigned by the models to the sequences  $P(' (A)' | \text{prompt})$  and  $P(' (B)' | \text{prompt})$ , using the model's output layer's logits, and we normalise to obtain the probability assigned to  $P(' (A)')$ , which is used as a proxy to  $P(\text{Adequate})$ .

### A.4 Adequacy assessment for PROBAR

The function mapping a response to an adequacy assessment is task-specific. Hence, for the different tasks we assessed different prompting techniques and different models.

- **Next word prediction**

1. **Method:** LM as classifier

**Model:** Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407 (referred to as Mis12B)

**Prompt:** You are presented with a piece of text and a continuation. Generate True if the continuation is a plausible continuation to the context and False if it is not a plausible continuation. By plausible, I mean that when concatenating the continuation to the text, the text will remain grammatically correct and comprehensible. Text: '<CONTEXT>' Continuation: '<WORD>' Answer:

- **Knowledge based Question Answering**

1. **Method:** LM as classifier

**Model:** Mistral-Small-Instruct-2409 (referred to as Mis22B)

**Prompt:** You are presented with a question and an answer. Generate True if the answer is a plausible response to the question with respect to your training data and False if not. Only generate True or False. Question: '<QUESTION>' Answer: '<ANSWER>'.

- **Reading Comprehension Question Answering**

1. **Method:** NLI-based classifier

A NLI model is given as a premise the passage and as a hypothesis an affirmative sentence comprised from the question-response pair, generated using a LM. If the entailment probability is higher than the sum of probabilities of neutrality and contradiction, then the response is considered as adequate.

**Model:** DeBERTa-Large (He et al., 2020) and Roberta-large, fine-tuned on a more challenging dataset collected

via an iterative, adversarial human-and-model-in-the-loop procedure (Nie et al., 2020). The former method is referred to as NLI-Easy and the latter as NLI-Hard.

2. **Method:** NLI-based classifier (using a LM for the NLI task)

**Model:** Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 and Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407 (referred to as Mis7B and Mis12B respectively).

**Prompts:**

- (a) *NLI-LM-2*: You are given a premise and a hypothesis. Generate True if the hypothesis is entailed by the premise and False if the hypothesis is not entailed by the premise. Only generate True or False. Premise: '<PASSAGE>' Hypothesis: '<SENTENCE>'
- (b) *NLI-LM-3*: You are given a premise and a hypothesis. Generate Entailment if the hypothesis is entailed by the premise, Contradiction if the hypothesis is contradicted by the premise and Neutral if not possible to determine. Only generate Entailment, Contradiction or Neutral. Premise: '<PASSAGE>' Hypothesis: '<SENTENCE>'

3. **Method:** LM as adequacy classifier

We prompt a LM to act as a classifier, given a document (passage) and a claim (affirmative sentence created from a question response pair from a LM), or the question-answer pair directly.

**Models:** Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407 and Mistral-Small-Instruct-2409, referred to as Mis7B, Mis12B and Mis22B respectively.

**Prompts:**

- (a) *LM-1-Step-Support*: You are presented with a document, a question based on the document and an answer to the question. Generate True if the answer to the question is supported

by the document and False if the answer to the question is not supported by the document. Only generate True or False. Document: '<PASSAGE>' Question: '<QUESTION>' Answer: '<ANSWER>'.

- (b) *LM-1-Step-Plausible*: You are presented with a document, a question based on the document and an answer to the question. Generate True if the answer to the question is plausible given the document and False if the answer to the question is not plausible given the document. Only generate True or False. Document: '<PASSAGE>' Question: '<QUESTION>' Answer: '<ANSWER>'.
- (c) *LM-1-Step-COT*: You are presented with a document, a question based on the document and an answer to the question. Generate True if the answer to the question is plausible given the document and False if the answer to the question is not plausible given the document. Generate your intermediate reasoning steps before generating your final answer. Document: '<PASSAGE>' Question: '<QUESTION>' Answer: '<ANSWER>' Reasoning:
- (d) *LM-2-Steps-Support*: You are presented with a document and a claim. Generate True if the claim is supported by the document and False if the claim is not supported by the document. Only generate True or False. Document: '<PASSAGE>' Claim: '<SENTENCE>'
- (e) *LM-2-Steps-NoContradiction*: You are presented with a document and a claim. Generate True if the claim is not contradicted by the document

and False if the claim is contradicted by the document. Only generate True or False. Document: '<PASSAGE>' Claim: '<SENTENCE>'

- (f) *LM-2-Steps-Support-Few-Shot*: You are presented with a document and a claim. Generate True if the claim is supported by the document and False if the claim is not supported by the document. Only generate True or False, as in the following example: <EXAMPLE>  
Document: <PASSAGE> Claim: '<SENTENCE>' Prediction:

In the cases where an affirmative <SENTENCE> was needed, Mis7b was prompted to generate it given a question-answer pair:

Turn a question-answer pair to a declarative sentence. Only output the sentence and nothing else. Question: '<QUESTION>' Answer: '<ANSWER>'

To obtain a decision from a model's response to the prompt, we do the following: if the lower-cased response contains the string 'true' then we consider the response as adequate; if the lower-cased response contains the string 'false' then we consider the response as non-adequate; if the lower-cased response contains neither the strings 'true' nor 'false', or both of these strings, we dismiss the response when computing PROBAR for the corresponding prompt.

Hugging Face<sup>10</sup> was used to access the models (generators and classifiers). For all experiments A100 GPUs were used, with the exception of OPT30B, for which we used H100 GPUS. The total GPU time for all experiments part of this paper were around 30 hours long.

## A.5 Manual annotations

We randomly sample 50 context-ambiguous question pairs from Abg-COQA's training set and manually annotate for the semantic equivalence and adequacy of the sampled responses and the greedy

response, for all OPT models (2.7B-30B). For adequacy, we annotate using finer-grained notions, as seen in Table 2 (these are also the options given to the annotators when completing the labelling task), which are ultimately mapped to a binary adequacy decision — used as correctness labels during evaluation. For the manual annotations regarding Provo Corpus, we randomly choose a subset of 5 contexts from the original 100 contexts we sampled from the dataset. We annotate the OPT models' generations for the 5 contexts and the corresponding generations for the 5 corrupted contexts as 'Plausible' or 'Not plausible' given the original contexts. Hence, we annotate 100 generations in total (50 from the original and 50 from the corrupted contexts).

The authors of this paper were the ones who undertook the task of annotation. For each assessment, 1 annotator hand labelled each item. Specific instructions given for each task:

**Semantic Equivalence.** 'A passage and a question (given the passage) are provided, which you need to read. Two answers to the question are also provided. You need to decide if these two answers mean the same thing (given the question), or not.'

**Adequacy to the prompt (QA).** 'A passage, a question (given the passage) and some possible answers are provided, which you need to read. You are given 1 possible answer to the prompt. You need to decide whether this answer is adequate/plausible to the prompt ('Match (fully) 1 plausible answer'), with respect to the question, the passage and the possible answers, or not ('Wrong', or 'Inability to answer' — the response explains how the model can not provide an answer, *e.g.* 'I don't know.'). If you think the answer is still plausible given the passage and question, but not included in the possible answers, you might still assign it as plausible, given the available option ('Plausible but not in references'). The same goes for answers that might include more than one (or all) of answers you deem plausible, given the references and your own judgement (options 'Multiple plausible answers found' and 'All plausible answers found'). If you think the question partly includes a correct answer (*e.g.* part of the reference is in the response, or the full reference answer as well as some additional information), you can choose the relevant option ('Match (partly) 1 plausible answer').'

**Adequacy to the prompt (NWP).** 'You are given a context and a plausible continuation. You

<sup>10</sup><https://huggingface.co>



	NLI-Easy				NLI-Hard				NLI-LM-2(Mis7B)			
	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B
Recall	0.3149	0.3381	0.3574	0.3007	0.1933	0.2429	0.2128	0.203	0.6077	0.6142	0.641	0.6203
Precision	0.6786	0.7395	0.7924	0.8163	0.5737	0.6375	0.6944	0.7297	0.6433	0.6482	0.6976	0.7366
Accuracy	0.698	0.672	0.654	0.592	0.656	0.624	0.586	0.536	0.7349	0.6973	0.7008	0.6793
F1	0.4301	0.4641	0.4927	0.4396	0.2892	0.3517	0.3257	0.3176	0.625	0.6308	0.6681	0.6735
	NLI-LM-2(Mis12B)				NLI-LM-3(Mis7B)				LM-1-Step-Support(Mis7B)			
	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B
Recall	0.5635	0.5810	0.6340	0.5902	0.5359	0.4476	0.5617	0.5602	0.7403	0.6844	0.7991	0.7293
Precision	0.5397	0.5951	0.6834	0.7202	0.4619	0.4795	0.6197	0.6898	0.7089	0.7305	0.757	0.7886
Accuracy	0.668	0.658	0.69	0.66	0.606	0.564	0.632	0.632	0.7947	0.7626	0.7851	0.7515
F1	0.5513	0.5880	0.6578	0.6488	0.4961	0.4631	0.5893	0.6183	<b>0.7243</b>	0.7067	<b>0.7775</b>	0.7578
	LM-1-Step-Support(Mis12B)				LM-1-Step-Support(Mis22B)				LM-1-Step-Plausible(Mis7B)			
	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B
Recall	0.6575	0.6429	0.7319	0.7030	0.5580	0.5571	0.6851	0.6466	0.5667	0.5167	0.7845	0.7283
Precision	0.6959	0.7542	0.7818	0.7857	0.7710	0.7748	0.7854	0.8113	0.5484	0.5538	0.7339	0.7751
Accuracy	0.7720	0.7620	0.7780	0.7400	0.7800	0.7460	0.7640	0.7320	0.6707	0.6179	0.7652	0.7414
F1	0.6761	0.6941	0.7560	0.7421	0.6474	0.6482	0.7318	0.7197	0.5574	0.5347	0.7583	0.7510
	LM-1-Step-Plausible(Mis12B)				LM-1-Step-Plausible(Mis22B)				LM-1-Step-COT(Mis12B)			
	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B
Recall	0.7514	0.7143	0.7957	0.7970	0.7127	0.6714	0.7660	0.7331	0.5909	0.6329	0.6070	0.6809
Precision	0.6634	0.7212	0.7276	0.7626	0.7127	0.6980	0.7200	0.7617	0.4643	0.5901	0.5206	0.6272
Accuracy	0.7720	0.7640	0.7640	0.7600	0.7920	0.7400	0.7500	0.7360	0.6057	0.6571	0.5542	0.6181
F1	0.7047	<b>0.7177</b>	0.7602	<b>0.7794</b>	0.7127	0.6845	0.7423	0.7471	0.5200	0.6107	0.5605	0.6530
	LM-2-Steps-FewShot(Mis7B)				LM-2-Steps-Support(Mis7B)				LM-2-Steps-NoContradiction(Mis7B)			
	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B	OPT2.7B	OPT6.7B	OPT13B	OPT30B
Recall	0.5865	0.6328	0.6271	0.5961	0.6358	0.6231	0.6888	0.6328	0.6348	0.6390	0.7130	0.6513
Precision	0.6213	0.6359	0.6682	0.7451	0.6321	0.6683	0.6981	0.7500	0.5947	0.6190	0.6612	0.7203
Accuracy	0.7148	0.6912	0.6797	0.6791	0.7402	0.7113	0.7175	0.6973	0.7131	0.6834	0.6951	0.6821
F1	0.6034	0.6343	0.6471	0.6623	0.6340	0.6450	0.6935	0.6864	0.6141	0.6288	0.6861	0.6841

Table 1: Performance of various adequacy classifiers on the manual adequacy annotations from the random 50 contexts chosen from AbgCOQA.

Fine-grained label	Binary decision
Inability to answer	Incorrect
Wrong	Incorrect
Match (fully) 1 plausible answer	Correct
Match (partly) 1 plausible answer	Correct
Multiple plausible answers found	Correct
All plausible answers found	Correct
Plausible but not in references	Correct

Table 2: Fine-grained correctness labels and their associate binary correctness assigned when computing evaluation metrics.

need to decide whether this continuation is plausible or not, given the context. By plausible, we mean that when appending the continuation to the context, the new piece of text created remains sensible, comprehensible and grammatically correct.’

## B Results

### B.1 Evaluating adequacy classifiers

The manual annotations are used to evaluate the performance of the various classifiers used. For each analysed model (OPT2.7B-30B), we have annotations for each sampled response for all contexts we annotated (50x10 = 500 annotations, for each

	Adequacy Classifier Performance		
	Original	Corrupt	Total
<b>Recall</b>	0.936	1	0.958
<b>Precision</b>	0.936	0.556	0.75
<b>Accuracy</b>	0.88	0.6	0.74
<b>F1</b>	0.936	0.714	0.841

Table 3: Performance of adequacy classifier for Provo Corpus based on the manually annotated continuations given the original contexts, corrupted contexts and their aggregation.

model). We compare the predictions from the various classifiers discussed in Appendix A.4 to the manual annotations. Various performance statistics (accuracy, precision, recall and F1-score) are measured. We decide on which classifier to employ for experiments based on F1-score. The two best performing models are LM-1-Step-Support-Mis7B and LM-1-Step-Plausible-Mis12B, with the former achieving the best performance for OPT2.7B and OPT13B and the latter achieving the best performance for OPT6.7B and OPT30B; we employ the latter in our experiments. Similar results can be seen in Table 3 for the adequacy classifier for the NWP task (given the manual annotations discussed in Appendix A.5).

## B.2 Evaluating AUROC correctness decision

When computing AUROC, the correctness decision for the greedy response needs to be automated. We assess various ways to achieve this. Kuhn et al. (2022b) uses Rouge-L score (Lin and Och, 2004) between the model’s response and a reference. If this value surpasses a threshold (set by Kuhn et al. to 0.3), then the response is considered correct (or otherwise, adequate). However, during our analysis, we conclude that the performance of this heuristic can be rather impactful on the AUROC values. If the heuristic misclassifies a response’s correctness, a more informative confidence metric’s AUROC will be negatively impacted to a higher extent than a less informative metric. For this reason, we find it important to evaluate the various heuristics for assessing a response’s correctness and evaluating their performance. For this purpose, we exploit the manual annotations for the adequacy of the greedy response as gold-labels, which we compare against the automated correctness/adequacy decision from different methods (for each analysed model OPT2.7B-30B, we have 50 annotations for the adequacy of the greedy). We assess Kuhn et al. automated correctness and we also assess different LMs as a judge, similar to Lin et al. (2024b). We employ Mistral-Small-Instruct-2409 and gpt3.5-turbo, referred to as Mis22B and ChatGPT). The prompt includes the passage (if relevant), the question, the reference responses and the ‘proposed’ response (*i.e.* the greedy response). Find below the exact prompts:

**Prompt for AbgCOQA.** You are presented with a document, a question based on the document, some acceptable answers and a proposed answer. Generate True if the proposed answer is a plausible answer to the question given the document and False if not. By plausible, I mean that the answer might be conveying the same meaning as one of the acceptable answers (even if it contains more or less information, as long as they have the same meaning), or, even if not similar to one of the acceptable answers, the answer can still be supported by the document.

Document: ‘<PASSAGE>  
 Question: ‘<AMBIGUOUS\_QUESTION>  
 Acceptable Answers: ‘<REFERENCES>  
 Proposed Answer: ‘<GREEDY>’.

	RougeL	Mis22B	ChatGPT
<b>OPT2.7B</b>			
<b>Recall</b>	0.767	0.7667	0.9
<b>Precision</b>	0.885	0.821	0.844
<b>Accuracy</b>	0.8	0.76	0.84
<b>F1</b>	0.821	0.793	<b>0.871</b>
<b>OPT6.7B</b>			
<b>Recall</b>	0.694	0.75	0.861
<b>Precision</b>	0.893	0.931	0.912
<b>Accuracy</b>	0.72	0.78	0.84
<b>F1</b>	0.781	0.831	<b>0.886</b>
<b>OPT13B</b>			
<b>Recall</b>	0.730	0.838	0.946
<b>Precision</b>	0.931	0.886	0.921
<b>Accuracy</b>	0.76	0.8	0.9
<b>F1</b>	0.812	0.861	<b>0.933</b>
<b>OPT30B</b>			
<b>Recall</b>	0.706	0.824	0.882
<b>Precision</b>	0.923	0.903	0.909
<b>Accuracy</b>	0.76	0.82	0.86
<b>F1</b>	0.8	0.862	<b>0.896</b>

Table 4: Performance of various automated correctness decision methods: RougeL(response, reference) > 0.3 (RougeL), Mis22B as a judge and ChatGPT as a judge. ChatGPT outperforms other methods as per F1 (and other metrics), and is thus employed as the correctness criterion for QA experiments.

**Prompt for AmbigQA.** You are presented with a question, some acceptable answers and a proposed answer. Generate True if the proposed answer is a plausible answer to the question given your training data and False if not. By plausible, I mean that the answer might be conveying the same meaning as one of the acceptable answers (even if it contains more or less information, as long as they have the same meaning), or, even if not similar to one of the acceptable answers, the answer can still be supported by your training data.

Question: ‘<AMBIGUOUS\_QUESTION>  
 Acceptable Answers: ‘<REFERENCES>  
 Proposed Answer: ‘<GREEDY>’.

The results of this evaluation for AbgCOQA can be found in Table 4. Based on F1, we decide to employ ChatGPT as a judge as the automated correctness criterion for the QA tasks, as it outperforms other methods in our analysis by a large margin.




Figure 6: Coverage vs ‘Precision’ for different uncertainty indicators, across OPT models (for manually annotated contexts).




Figure 7: Coverage vs ‘Precision’ for different uncertainty indicators, across OPT models (for ambiguous contexts from AbgCOQA’s test set).




Figure 8: Coverage vs ‘Precision’ for different uncertainty indicators, across OPT models (for non-ambiguous contexts from AbgCOQA’s test set).




Figure 9: Coverage vs ‘Precision’ for different uncertainty indicators, across OPT models (for mixed contexts from AbgCOQA’s test set).




Figure 10: Coverage vs ‘Precision’ for different uncertainty indicators, across OPT models (for ambiguous contexts from AbgCOQA’s development set).




Figure 11: Coverage vs ‘Precision’ for different uncertainty indicators, across OPT models (for non-ambiguous contexts from AbgCOQA’s development set).




Figure 12: Coverage vs ‘Precision’ for different uncertainty indicators, across OPT models (for mixed contexts from AbgCOQA’s development set).

### B.3 Risk vs Coverage plots

Beyond the use of AUROC as an evaluation metric, we also plot the Selective Coverage vs Precision plots, another selective prediction setting in which one can assess the informativeness of a metric. The resulting plots can be found in Figure 6-12. Across almost all settings, PROBAR outperforms other quantifiers.

### B.4 Additional Analysis

We also demonstrate in Figure 15 the AUROC results for Abg-COQA’s development set. For all models except OPT13B, PROBAR outperforms or performs on par with other baselines.

Additionally, to get a grasp of the plausible variability we can expect for each dataset, we plot E and SE values (non-normalised) across prompts, for different models. In Figure 13b, we observe how despite variation among unique responses, the variation is among paraphrases (as the histograms of E and SE reveal). This is in contrast to variation observed in AbgCOQA and Provo Corpus, where variation among semantically distinct responses seems to exist (Figure 13a and 14).


## C Ablations

### C.1 Sampled instead of greedy response for AUROC computation

We assessed whether SE and PROBAR are useful metrics for informing a user whether the greedy response is likely to be correct. We aim to assess whether similar trends hold when assessing how useful our metrics are when informing the user about the correctness of a sampled response (unbiasedly). We repeat our analysis on the 50 contexts for which we obtained the manual annotations and report the average AUROC over 5 runs (*i.e.* over 5 different sampled responses, for which we sample from the already 10 sampled responses per context) for various uncertainty metrics. The results can be observed in Figure 16; the AUROCs shown are an average over 5 runs, while for the correctness of the sample we use the manual adequacy assessments we have annotated). We observe a similar trend to when the greedy response is used for the AUROC computation.

### C.2 Number of samples for PROBAR

Sampling-based confidence methods can be expensive. In the case of Probar, the quality of the classifier’s predictions can obviously affect the informa-



(a) E and SE histograms across AbgCOQA’s ambigu- (b) E and SE histograms across AmbigQA’s prompts, (c) E and SE histograms across AmbigQA’s prompts, (d) E and SE histograms across AmbigQA’s prompts, for different models. for different models.

Figure 13: Entropy (E) and Semantic Entropy (SE), non-normalised for two datasets of ambiguous prompts.




Figure 14: Entropy and Semantic Entropy histograms across Provo Corpus prompts, for different models.

tiveness of the metric overall. We speculate that a higher number of samples, will make PROBAR’s performance more robust to the misclassifications

of the adequacy classifier it relies on. We conduct a controlled experiment, where we subsample  $k$  samples from the 10 samples available to us for each context and compute PROBAR, for the 50 manually annotated contexts. The results can be seen in Figure 17: we observe how the performance of PROBAR improves as the number of samples grow. However, we can achieve reasonably similar performance to the original 10 samples using 5 samples or more.

### C.3 AUROC variance

We assess how PROBAR’s performance varies (in terms of AUROC), depending on which prompts of the assessed set of prompts was used. We repeatedly subsample a subset of the contexts and compute AUROCs for SE, PROBAR and other quantifiers, which we present in Figure 18.

### C.4 PROBAR for decoding

In our thus far analysis, PROBAR was employed as a metric that can inform the users about the model’s reliability when responding to a prompt. We consider whether it could also be exploited for ‘confidence-informed’ decoding. As such, we conduct an experiment (using the subset of contexts




Figure 15: AUROC values for AbgCOQA’s development set on ambiguous prompts (left), unambiguous prompts (middle) and their aggregation (right), where correctness of the greedy was assessed by gpt3.5-turbo as a judge. It concerns 130,130 and 260 prompts respectively.




Figure 16: Average AUROC values (over 5 sampled responses) for various uncertainty indicators for the models analysed. They regard the 50 contexts that were manually annotated, and for the correctness of the sample, the manual annotation is used.




Figure 17: Probar’s AUROC vs sample size (average of 5 runs). The faded-out lines show the AUROC values for the original 10 samples.

we have manually annotated). For these, we assess precision of the greedy decoding (number of greedy decodings assessed as correct by manual annotations divided by number of greedy decodings). Regarding the PROBAR-aware decoding, for each prompt, we randomly sample one of the responses deemed as adequate by PROBAR’s automated classifier and assess its manual correctness. If no samples were deemed as adequate by PROBAR’s classifier, we abstain from generating. Precision is assessed again (number of sampled decodings assessed as correct by manual annotations divided by number of sampled decodings). Results can be seen in Table 5; for the PROBAR-aware decoding performance, precision is an average over 10 runs (as there is randomness in the process). Although in one setting precision worsened (OPT13B), we observe some encouraging results, that could pave the path for future research in this direction.

	Precision on decoding	
	Greedy	Probar-aware
<b>OPT2.7B</b>	0.60	<b>0.63</b>
<b>OPT6.7B</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.72</b>
<b>OPT13B</b>	<b>0.74</b>	0.67
<b>OPT30B</b>	0.68	<b>0.74</b>

Table 5: Precision of Greedy vs Probar-aware decodings for prompts from different models, on the manually annotated subset of contexts. For Probar-aware results, the precision over 10 runs is shown.






Figure 18: AUROC values (and their mean) for 50 subsets of 50, 50, 100 (from top to bottom) for various models and quantifiers, for AbgCOQA's test set.




Figure 19: AUROC values (and their mean) for 50 subsets of 50, 50 and 100 (from top to bottom) for various models and quantifiers.




Figure 20: AUROC values (and their mean) for 50 subsets of 500 prompts for various models and quantifiers, for AmbigQA.