

---

# Reinforcing Thinking through Reasoning-Enhanced Reward Models

---

Diji Yang<sup>\*1</sup> Linda Zeng<sup>\*2</sup> Kezhen Chen<sup>3</sup> Yi Zhang<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) exhibit great potential in complex multi-step reasoning through inference-time thinking but still struggle with deciding when to stop thinking due to limited self-awareness about their knowledge boundaries. While human preference alignment has shown extraordinary opportunities, expensive labeling challenges adherence to scaling law. Language model self-critique, as an alternative to using human-labeled reasoning data, is questioned with its inherited biases. This work addresses these challenges by distilling the LLM’s own reasoning processes into synthetic behavioral data, eliminating the need for manual labeling of intermediate steps. Building on this concept, we propose **Distillation-Reinforcement-Reasoning (DRR)**, a three-step framework that leverages the LLM’s inherent behaviors as external feedback by first generating behavioral data using the Reasoner (LLM) to reflect its reasoning capabilities, then training a lightweight discriminative reward model (DM) on behavioral data, and finally deploying the DM at inference time to assist the Reasoner’s decision-making. Experiments on multiple benchmarks show that the DRR framework outperforms self-critique approaches without relying on additional complex data annotation. Benefiting from lightweight design, ease of replication, and adaptability, DRR is applicable to a wide range of LLM-centric tasks.

## 1. Introduction

Generative Large Language Models (LLMs) have achieved remarkable success in various natural language processing tasks, demonstrating impressive capabilities in understanding and generating human-like text (Ouyang et al., 2022; OpenAI, 2023; Dubey et al., 2024). Despite their successes,

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution <sup>1</sup>University of California, Santa Cruz <sup>2</sup>The Harker School <sup>3</sup>Meta, work done as external collaboration. Correspondence to: Yi Zhang <yiz@ucsc.edu>.

enabling LLMs to perform complex multi-step reasoning effectively remains a significant challenge (Mirzadeh et al., 2024). In tasks that require reasoning over multiple steps, such as complex problem-solving or logical inference, early attempts tried to make LLM mimic the multiple steps of prolonged thinking that humans perform when faced with difficult problems in inference time (OpenAI, 2024; Yang et al., 2024b). However, LLMs often struggle with deciding “when to stop” due to limited self-awareness of knowledge. They may provide incomplete solutions, over-extended reasoning, or fail to produce a final answer when appropriate.

Traditional approaches to improving self-awareness in multi-step reasoning in LLMs primarily rely on *outcome supervision*, where models are trained to produce the correct final answer (Lightman et al., 2023). While this method helps align the models’ outputs with expected results, it does not necessarily enhance the reasoning process itself. Recent research suggests that *process supervision*, which involves supervising the intermediate reasoning steps, can lead to better performance in multi-step reasoning tasks (OpenAI, 2024; Lightman et al., 2023; Kumar et al., 2024). On the downside, process supervision requires midterm labels for each reasoning step, which are expensive and time-consuming to obtain, limiting the scalability of this approach. Another line of research involves self-critique mechanisms, enabling models to assess and refine their outputs by leveraging their pre-trained knowledge or by estimating confidence scores (Pan et al., 2023). However, these strategies have limitations due to the models’ inherent biases and tendencies towards hallucinations (Stechly et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023; Stechly et al., 2024). Additionally, methods that rely on accessing internal model states are impractical for closed-source LLMs, restricting their applicability.

In this paper, we propose a novel framework that addresses the “when to stop” problem to equip pretrained LLMs with enhanced multi-step thinking capabilities. Inspired by ethological practices—which analyze observable behaviors without inferring unmeasurable internal states (TINBERGEN, 1963)—our method leverages the outputs generated by LLMs to enhance knowledge awareness of the system’s knowledge boundaries. Specifically, our approach empowers the LLM with a multi-step self-correction mechanism through an in-context reinforcement learning process (Monea et al., 2024), which reinforces reasoning behav-

iors dynamically during inference without altering model parameters. This mechanism relies on feedback in the form of verbal reward (Shinn et al., 2024), providing linguistic evaluations of the reasoning process while preserving the original model’s integrity. Instead of relying on expensive midterm labels or accessing the internal representations of the large model, we train an external Discriminative Model (DM) to evaluate the outputs of the LLM at each reasoning step. The DM provides midterm verbal rewards by assessing whether the LLM’s current output is acceptable or if further reasoning is required, thereby informing the decision to continue or terminate the reasoning process. By continuously evaluating these outputs, the framework reinforces effective thinking behaviors in the LLM, creating a feedback loop analogous to reinforcing thinking in behaviorism, where feedback guides the system to improve reasoning and decision-making over time. Each interaction between the LLM and the DM constitutes a step towards system-level self-correction, with the DM guiding the LLM on when to terminate the iterative process.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce a novel DRR framework that addresses the “when to stop” problem in LLMs, enabling them to decide whether to continue reasoning, provide a final answer, or abstain during inference-time thinking. This framework leverages reinforcing thinking principles to establish a continuous feedback mechanism that enhances the model’s reasoning and decision-making capabilities.
- We define a scalable Reasoning Process Distillation algorithm that generates reasoning-rich synthetic behavioral data from existing QA datasets. This algorithm eliminates the need for manual labeling of intermediate steps and facilitates the training of effective discriminative reward models.
- We will release all codebase, checkpoints, and generated data <sup>1</sup>, which are shown to be beneficial for both open-source and closed-source LLMs across various tasks, to facilitate future research on the thinking ability of generative models.

## 2. Related Work

Recently, an emerging field in AI is to allow (large language) models to learn and enhance the reasoning process through reinforcement learning (RL) (Ouyang et al., 2022; Lightman et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024a;b) in contrast to traditional outcome supervision only. While RL-based methods, with or without parameter changes (verbal RL (Shinn

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/dyang39/DRR>

Q: What is a good database to use to search for formal articles related to Natural Language Processing?

A1: IEEE Xplore Digital Library

R1: Building upon the need for a comprehensive and authoritative source for scholarly articles in the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP), the IEEE Xplore Digital Library stands out as a highly suitable database. It hosts a wide array of peer-reviewed articles, conference proceedings, and standards largely focused on engineering, computer science, and technology, including in-depth research on NLP. Additionally, IEEE Xplore is known for its high-quality content supported by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, a leading organization in technological innovation, making it a reliable source for current research and trends in NLP. This makes it particularly valuable for those seeking to explore the intersection of NLP with other cutting-edge technologies. ENV: The previous response was insufficient; explore a new line of reasoning to approach a better answer, building on past information if useful.

A2: The Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL) Anthology.

R2: The ACL Anthology is a specialized repository maintained by the Association for Computational Linguistics, focusing exclusively on scholarly papers in the field of computational linguistics and natural language processing. It provides free access to all papers published by the ACL and its associated conferences and workshops, making it a comprehensive resource for finding formal articles and cutting-edge research in NLP.

ENV: The response is sufficient. Stop generating further outputs.

Figure 1. Inference time thinking example with multi-round Answer (A) and Rationale (R) generation. With the help of verbal feedback (ENV), the LLM refines its previous answers by applying different reasoning chains.

et al., 2024)), may not match the efficiency of supervised learning in rapidly aligning input-output pairs, they offer significant advantages once models acquire basic language understanding and reasoning capabilities through pretraining. Specifically, RL enables exploration with weaker outcome supervision, often surpassing training data patterns in solving complex problems (Kumar et al., 2024). Noteworthy achievements in this domain include AlphaGo (Silver et al., 2016), which mastered the game of Go, and the recent OpenAI-o1 (OpenAI, 2024), which has demonstrated proficiency in general generative tasks. Nonetheless, systems that engage in these complex reasoning processes require the ability to determine when to end the reasoning process and generate a final response (Yang et al., 2024b). This decision-making relies heavily on the system’s self-awareness or self-criticism (Pan et al., 2023). Existing research on system-level self-criticism can be categorized into two approaches: feedback generated by the LLM itself (LLM Self-critics) and feedback provided by additional components within the AI system (External Feedback) <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>In this work, while we explicitly distinguish between LLM self-critics and External Feedback, we note that from the system’s perspective, all critic and feedback—whether from the LLM or external modules—remains internal to the AI system.

**LLM Self-critics** LLM self-critics mechanisms empower language models to assess and refine their own outputs (Kadavath et al., 2022; Yao et al., 2022; Asai et al., 2023; Amayuelas et al., 2023). There are two predominant strategies for LLMs to self-present their feedback (Pan et al., 2023). A straightforward approach leverages the model’s pre-trained knowledge to critique and enhance its responses (Wang et al., 2023a; Weng et al., 2023; Madaan et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2023b; Yin et al., 2023). While this method utilizes the model’s inherent capabilities, it may not be able to reliably identify its own errors due to its inherent biases and tendencies to hallucinations (Stechly et al., 2023). The second approach involves using confidence scores or uncertainty estimates to evaluate the quality of the model’s outputs (Xie et al., 2024; Farquhar et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2023). This strategy typically requires manually crafted criteria, which can be labor-intensive and lack a theoretical foundation for optimal configuration, thereby limiting its reliability and generalizability (Pan et al., 2023). Moreover, the need to access the internal state of the model closes off the opportunity for its application to good-performing closed-source LLM APIs such as ChatGPT and Gemini.

Inspired by the fact that Ethologists draw conclusions about animals through observable behavior and avoid making assumptions about internal states that can hardly be directly measured (TINBERGEN, 1963), our approach emphasizes the analysis of real observable behavior (i.e., the outputs of LLM) rather than defining internal states (e.g., confidence thresholds).

**External Feedback** Recent studies have shown that external modules can provide meaningful feedback during the generation process of LLMs, thereby enhancing system performance (Gou et al., 2024). These modules encompass a diverse range of variations, including tools like Code Interpreters (Chen et al., 2023a), Search Engines (Trivedi et al., 2023), and other specialized software (Kim et al., 2024), as well as carefully designed rules (Yao et al., 2024). MemPrompt (Madaan et al., 2022) predefines a dictionary of possible LLM outputs and their corresponding scores to offer feedback at inference time, similar to our analysis of LLM behavior. While these approaches effectively respond to LLM behavior across various benchmarks, however, these non-deep learning tools tend to limit the flexibility of the system.

On the other hand, since RLHF (Ouyang et al., 2022), using external deep learning models as a reward provider has also been widely studied recently (Bai et al., 2022; Glaese et al., 2022). These works focus on using the feedback provided by the reward model to fine-tune the LLM instead of directly participating in the generation at inference time. Consequently, these resource-intensive approaches require

large amounts of high-quality labeled data to train the reward models and substantial computational resources to perform LLM tuning.

In contrast, our training only involved a small classifier fine-tuning on the LLM’s behavioral data. This data can be easily generated from any raw data with only the required initial input and final output, which are typically available for most datasets.

**Hallucination Detection** Hallucination detection has emerged as a pivotal task in the era of large language models, aiming to differentiate between hallucinated and accurate content using binary classification (Ji et al., 2023). While our work does not specifically focus on hallucination detection, it shares certain methodological similarities with one prominent approach in that field: training hallucination classifiers to detect hallucinations based on the model’s internal states, such as hidden layer representations (Azaria & Mitchell, 2023; Su et al., 2024). However, this method requires direct access to the model’s internal workings, making it unsuitable for closed-source systems. A recent approach, ReID (Chen et al., 2023b), utilizes hallucination data from LLMs and designs complex training objectives to align a hallucination detector with human evaluation metrics. Inspired by this line of research, our approach circumvents the complexities of human alignment and intricate training designs. Instead, we rely entirely on behavioral data from model outputs, which allows our DM to serve as a hallucination detector/to prevent hallucinations. More importantly, since our focus extends beyond mere hallucination detection, our system considers this as a mid-step signal and analyzes how this signal can be used to further optimize the reasoning chains of LLMs, thereby improving the overall performance in general natural language generation tasks.

### 3. Approach

In this section, we introduce our main framework for enhancing LLM inference time reasoning. As shown in Figure 2, it consists of three steps: behavioral data generation via Reasoning Process Distillation, where LLM reasoning patterns are collected as training data (Section 3.1); training of the Discriminative Model (DM), where the DM learns to assess LLM behavior (Section 3.2); and system deployment for inference, during which the LLM and the DM interact over multiple iterations in order to produce a final answer or abstention (Section 3.3).

#### 3.1. Reasoning Process Distillation

Algorithm 1 depicts our semi-supervised Reasoning Process Distillation algorithm for data collection to support the Discriminative Model (DM) training. This algorithm simulates the Reasoner LLM’s inference-time behavior across




Figure 2. Overview of the three-step Distillation-Reinforcement-Reasoning (DRR) pipeline.

multiple reasoning iterations using raw training data. For each question  $Q$ , the Reasoner  $\mathcal{R}$  generates an answer  $A'$  alongside its rationale  $r$ . A binary verdict label is assigned to indicate whether the DM should accept or reject the response, depending on whether  $A'$  matches the ground-truth answer  $A$ . For all incorrect answers, it is re-prompted with the question  $Q$  and past history (i.e., context  $C$ ) to explore alternative reasoning paths. This iterative process continues until the Reasoner generates the correct answer  $A$ , signaling that the DM should accept the response and stop further reasoning. If no accurate response is generated after a predefined number of iterations, the process terminates to avoid an infinity loop. As the result, the generated data reflects a diverse range of LLM behaviors the DM may encounter across various turns during inference, allowing the DM to directly learn the unconscious reasoning patterns that LLM tends to generate when leading to a correct or incorrect answer. By making use of LLM’s natural behaviors with its environment, this generation method streamlines the feedback collection process, relying solely on the input and ground-truth output from existing datasets, which are typically available for most datasets.

### 3.2. Discriminative Model Training

Given a question, its past context, and an LLM-generated answer with rationale, the goal of the DM is to predict whether the new answer should be accepted or rejected. In other words, the DM acts as a binary classification model, and its training on a distribution over  $(x, y)$  is alignment between the input tuple  $x_i = \{Q, C, A', r\}$  and the label  $y \in \{\text{Accept}, \text{Reject}\}$ . Through observing both the LLM’s previous responses and its new rationale, which may include corrections to past reasoning or further explorations

into internal knowledge, the DM learns to be both a coach, supervising the LLM’s behavior across multiple iterations, and a judge, determining the reliability of its final response. This enables the DM to determine if the LLM’s response is influenced by hallucinations and when it should stop.

Specifically, the DM predicts logits  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , representing unnormalized probabilities for the two classes. To account for the higher cost of false-positive errors (i.e., Accepting an incorrect answer), the weight  $w_1$  for class `Accept` is set higher than  $w_0$ , the weight for class `Reject`. The weighting design encourages DM to adopt stricter acceptance criteria, prioritizing the reliability of the final decision and reducing the likelihood of harmful false-positive predictions (see Section 6 for details). The training objective is to minimize a weighted cross-entropy loss as shown in Equation 1, where  $P(y|x; \theta)$  is the predicted probability of the class  $y$ , and  $w_y$  represents class-specific weights.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DM}}(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [w_y \log P(y | x; \theta)] \quad (1)$$

By utilizing the behavioral data described in Section 3.1, the DM is exposed to diverse scenarios reflective of inference-time conditions. This approach eliminates the reliance on external reward signals, commonly collected through human feedback, as the DM inherently models these features by learning directly from the dataset.

### 3.3. Inference

At inference, the system features an iterative line of exchanges between the Reasoner (LLM) and the Discriminative Model (DM). While the LLM aims to answer the initial question, the DM assesses LLM reasoning and provides feedback signals by accepting or rejecting its responses.

**Algorithm 1** Reasoning Process Distillation Algorithm

---

```

1: Notation:
2:  $\mathcal{R}$ : Reasoner LLM
3:  $Q$ : Question
4:  $A$ : Ground-truth Answer
5:  $C$ : Context (initialized as empty)
6:  $r$ : Rationale
7:  $A'$ : LLM-generated answer
8: for each data point do
9:    $C \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
10:  while true do
11:     $(A', r) \leftarrow \mathcal{R}(Q, C)$ 
12:    if  $A' = A$  then
13:      Record  $\{Q, C, A', r\}$  with verdict Accept
14:      break {Exit the while loop}
15:    else
16:      Record  $\{Q, C, A', r\}$  with verdict Reject
17:    end if
18:     $C \leftarrow C \cup \{A', r\}$ 
19:    if maximum turns reached then
20:      break {Exit the while loop}
21:    end if
22:  end while
23: end for

```

---

Similar to the data generation process in Section 3.1, the LLM generates answers and rationales across multiple reasoning iterations. Unlike in training, where responses are compared to ground-truth answers, inference uses the trained DM to assess the quality of responses in real time. The DM predicts accept or reject verdicts based on the question, context, answer, and rationale, guiding the system toward a reliable final response. This feedback mechanism enables the system to operate without requiring ground-truth comparisons during inference. In general, this architecture offers flexibility by supporting adaptive reasoning iterations. The DM dynamically decides whether further exploration is necessary based on the behavioral data it was trained on. This allows the system to efficiently balance between preventing over-extended reasoning and addressing incomplete or incorrect responses. This adaptability mirrors human problem-solving, where some answers are instinctively clear while others demand deeper reasoning.

## 4. Experiment

### 4.1. Environment Setup

**Tasks and Datasets** We evaluate our approach on two critical reasoning tasks: commonsense reasoning and knowledge-intensive reasoning. Commonsense reasoning tests the ability to navigate general, intuitive, everyday scenarios, while knowledge-intensive tasks entail the appli-

cation of specialized factual knowledge to solve complex problems. These tasks embody essential real-world challenges that LLMs must address to demonstrate practical utility and adaptability. Specifically, we use CommonsenseQA (Talmor et al., 2019) and WinoGrande (Sakaguchi et al., 2020) for commonsense reasoning, and OpenBookQA (Mihaylov et al., 2018) and PIQA (Bisk et al., 2020) for knowledge-intensive reasoning. We use the QA pairs from the training sets to generate mid-step behavioral data for DM training. Due to the label availability, we evaluate the released test set for OpenBookQA and the validation sets for all other datasets. Notably, our method offers a scalable and cost-effective solution, leveraging the training of a lightweight classifier rather than the computationally expensive re-training of large generative models. Besides, our method does not require any optimization for individual datasets; that is, for all experiments (except the ablation study), we train one classifier for all four datasets. As a result, our method can be expanded to and efficiently deployed across a diverse range of reasoning tasks.

**Evaluation** In addition to using accuracy as an evaluation metric, we contend that standard evaluation question-answering metrics may not adequately capture user satisfaction, as incorrect or misleading answers are often more disappointing than no answer at all. We advocate for an alternative utility function, formula score (FS) (Davis, 1967), inspired by scoring systems used in mathematical competitions (Mathematical Association of America, 2024), which assign negative scores to incorrect answers and no penalties for abstentions. This metric better reflects the objectives of a trustworthy QA system, emphasizing the importance of correct reasoning and appropriate decision-making on when to provide a final answer. Specifically, a correct answer earns 1 point, an incorrect answer results in a 1-point deduction, and choosing not to answer yields 0 points. The earned points percentage over all points will be the final score. We evaluate our system using both standard accuracy and formula score, allowing for a more balanced measure of the reliability of QA systems, particularly in cases where avoiding incorrect answers is critical.

Additionally, we report the critic-decision accuracy (Acc(D)), which measures the accuracy of a system’s decisions to give an answer or abstain (i.e. how well it decides to abstain or not). For DRR, this refers to the DM accuracy at the last reasoning turn before an answer is given and is calculated by comparing the DM’s accept or reject prediction to the accuracy of the LLM answer. For zero-shot methods, this refers to the percentage of LLM’s successful answers and abstentions, when the answer it would have given had it not abstained is wrong.

Table 1. Results on four question answering datasets using trainable Llama3 and API-accessed GPT-4 as Reasoner. Each method is evaluated by Accuracy (ACC) and Formula Score (FS). The Overall (Combined) results aggregate all data points across datasets into one unified set for holistic evaluation. Methods marked with \* indicate results reported by prior works<sup>3</sup>.

		Commonsense				Knowledge Intensive				Overall		
		CommonSenseQA		WinoGrande		OpenBookQA		PIQA		Combined		
		Acc	FS	Acc	FS	Acc	FS	Acc	FS	Acc	FS	
Trainable	ZS	Self-Talk (Llama3)*	70.60	-	-	-	72.20	-	77.20	-	-	-
		Llama3 (CoT)	73.46	46.93	58.96	17.91	70.00	40.00	78.13	56.26	72.52	48.53
		Llama3 (Abstain)	73.14	46.27	59.27	18.85	70.20	40.40	66.27	32.54	66.51	35.63
	Learned	Crystal (Llama3)*	75.10	-	-	-	72.60	-	78.20	-	-	-
		Llama3 (SFT-LoRA)	77.23	54.46	76.40	52.80	80.60	61.20	81.99	63.98	79.75	60.85
		DRR (Llama3)	<b>82.31</b>	<b>65.52</b>	<b>77.03</b>	<b>54.06</b>	<b>81.20</b>	<b>63.00</b>	<b>83.62</b>	<b>67.30</b>	<b>81.78</b>	<b>65.46</b>
API	GPT4 (CoT)	83.54	67.08	74.59	49.17	<b>91.20</b>	82.40	91.08	82.15	86.13	65.47	
	GPT4 (Abstain)	82.56	65.11	74.43	48.86	85.60	71.20	85.40	70.80	82.56	59.25	
	GPT4 (Self-Critic)	74.61	49.22	77.03	54.06	88.80	77.60	88.68	77.37	83.43	60.47	
	DRR (GPT4)	<b>86.24</b>	<b>74.45</b>	<b>79.48</b>	<b>59.19</b>	<b>91.20</b>	<b>82.80</b>	<b>91.51</b>	<b>82.92</b>	<b>87.91</b>	<b>69.44</b>	

**Baseline methods** We first include two good-performing system-level self-critic baselines. Self-Talk (Shwartz et al., 2020), as one of the pioneering works leveraging model self-awareness (for information seeking) in zero-shot setting, has recently been enhanced with the support of LLM (Llama3) and updated prompting methods, establishing it as a strong baseline (Molfese et al., 2024). Crystal (Liu et al., 2023) tunes the model for self-feedback ability via reinforcement learning and achieves decent performance. While the original work uses T5 as the Reasoner backbone, we report results from a recent Llama3 reproduction (Molfese et al., 2024) to ensure model consistency in comparisons.

In addition, we evaluate our system against three widely used methods: Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting, self-critic (GPT-4), and supervised fine-tuning (Llama3). For the CoT baseline, we evaluate the LLM using two separate experimental setups to optimize for accuracy and formula score. As shown in Table 1, Llama3 used a common QA prompt to optimize the accuracy, while Llama3 (Abstain) includes an abstain (Wen et al., 2024) option to tailor to the formula score. In contrast, our system includes abstentions by treating any instances where the DM consistently rejects responses until the maximum number of attempts is reached as an abstain action. To compare against standard LLM self-critique, we built a prompt-based self-reasoning baseline following the implementation by Huang et al. (2023). This evaluates the LLM’s self-awareness to refine its responses without external feedback. We also conduct a supervised fine-tuning baseline to enable a more direct and fair comparison to our approach. Unlike the previous two zero-shot or few-shot baselines, this method fine-tunes the LLM using the same amount of training data as our method. To match the trained parameters used in our system, we ap-

ply Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2021) for parameter-efficient fine-tuning. This baseline highlights the comparison between standard fine-tuning approach and our method.

## 4.2. Implementation Details

**Model Choice** Following the naming convention in Figure 2, we use Llama3-8b (Dubey et al., 2024) and GPT-4 as the LLM, and we finetune the Flan-T5-783M (Chung et al., 2024) as the Discriminative Model. Our choice of LLMs reflects both open-sourced and closed-source models to demonstrate the flexibility of our system. While the DM can take on any classifier architecture, we choose the widely used Flan-T5 to balance performance and model size on this binary classification task. Rather than evaluating the factual accuracy of information, the DM focuses on recognizing patterns in the LLM’s responses that indicate hallucinations or errors in reasoning.

**Fine-tuning Details** The DM is fine-tuned on generated behavioral data for all datasets from the first reasoning process distillation step of DRR. Each reasoning turn for a question is treated as a single data point, and all turns for the same question are kept together within the training or validation set to prevent knowledge leakage. The DM is fine-tuned using the Adam optimizer with the loss function described in Equation 1. All experiments were conducted on two NVIDIA A6000 GPUs. The data preparation process, all training hyperparameters, and the prompt configurations

<sup>3</sup>The original works use models different from Llama3. For a fair comparison, we report the performance from recent reproduction (Molfese et al., 2024). Due to limited access to the prediction file, the FS becomes unavailable as well as the Overall score.




Figure 3. Critic-decision accuracy (Acc(D)) for Abstain, Self-Critic, and DRR settings using Llama3 and GPT-4 as Reasoner.

are detailed in Appendices A and B.

**Maximum Turns** While our ideal system could run for any number of necessary reasoning turns, our experiments are constrained by time and computational resources, and after a large number of iterations, there is a higher possibility of an infinite state where the LLM never generates a correct answer. Consequently, we set a maximum number of turns of four for generation and five for inference, after which wrong answers are counted as abstention during inference.

## 5. Results and Analysis

The experiment results are reported in Table 1. Compared to zero-shot CoT baselines, our system demonstrates consistent improvements in both accuracy and formula score across all data sets for both Llama3 and GPT4, successfully empowering the LLM to self-correct and achieve more accurate answers by facilitating an iterative reasoning process. Furthermore, the relative increases in formula scores are significantly greater than the increases in accuracy, highlighting our system’s ability to mitigate undesirable responses through deciding abstentions. In comparison, the abstain zero-shot consistently decreases performance, indicating LLMs do not know by themselves when to give an abstention. Performance improvements are more apparent in commonsense reasoning tasks, such as WinoGrande, than in knowledge-intensive reasoning tasks. Knowledge-intensive tasks often require factual knowledge, making LLMs more prone to guessing the same answer or becoming stuck after multiple iterations. This contrast demonstrates how our method excels in domains that benefit more directly from iterative reasoning.

For open-source models, such as Llama3, our system achieves significant relative improvements over supervised fine-tuning (SFT-LoRA), providing a lightweight, interpretable, and widely applicable alternative. Unlike super-

vised fine-tuning, which offers limited scope (with no reasoning chain) for further enhancements in complex scenarios, our approach generates a mid-step thinking path that enables greater interpretability and potential for future improvements. Additionally, our method is applicable beyond open-source models, as demonstrated by its success with GPT-4, highlighting its adaptability to improve inference-time performance for API-accessed models across diverse settings without additional training. For closed-source models, such as GPT-4, our system outperforms self-critic baselines in all datasets in both accuracy and formula score, demonstrating the benefits of multi-turn reasoning using external feedback. This is particularly important in scenarios where additional training is infeasible, such as with closed-source API-accessed models. Furthermore, most self-critic scores decrease from zero-shot CoT, aligning with findings by Huang et al. (2023) on the limitations of LLM self-awareness.

**Critic Decision Accuracy** Figure 3 illustrates the critic-decision accuracy of DRR compared to Abstain and Self-Critic baselines, demonstrating the DM’s positive impact at inference time decision-making. As previously discussed, the critic’s decision-making ability is inherently tied to the model’s self-awareness of its knowledge boundaries. Using Llama3 as the Reasoner, DRR achieves an average accuracy of 81.43% across four datasets, significantly surpassing the Abstain baseline at 67.22%. For the GPT-4, while both (82.00%) and Self-Critic (82.28%) baselines exhibit much stronger capability on Acc(D) than Llama3-Abstain, DRR achieves the highest average accuracy at 87.48%, consistently outperforming both baselines across all datasets. By achieving better Acc(D) compared to the baselines where the LLM makes decisions independently, the use of the DM facilitates more accurate answers and meaningful abstentions during inference-time reasoning.

## 6. Discussion

**Qualitative Examples** Figure 4 displays various examples of the common behavior of our system at inference time. The first example shows optimal behavior, where the LLM responds incorrectly and with disjoint reasoning in its rationale on the first turn, the DM identifies this hallucination and rejects the response, and the LLM retries on the second turn, adequately correcting its answer and rationale, leading to an accepted correct answer. We also observe this behavior occurring flexibly across often more than two turns. The second example shows our system’s ability to mitigate cases where LLM can never reach a correct answer. The DM consistently rejects faulty responses, where the LLM answer does not match an otherwise correct rationale (Turn 1), where the rationale contradicts itself (Turn 2), or where the rationales do not directly answer the question (subsequent

Question: You'll find a landing at the top of what? Choices: [0: 'ocean', 1: 'apartment building', 2: 'stairwell', 3: 'airport', 4: 'room']. Answer: 3 (Incorrect) Rationale: A landing is a platform or a flat area at the top of a <b>staircase</b> , and it is typically found at the top of an <b>airport</b> , where planes land. Reject ✖ Wrong Answer! Try again.	Question: What do you need to wear when hiking? Choices: [0: 'cast iron stomach', 1: 'physical exertion', 2: 'shin splints', 3: 'adventure', 4: 'fatigue']. Answer: 3 (Incorrect) Rationale: <b>Shin splints</b> are a common injury that can occur when hiking, especially if you are not... Reject ✖ Wrong Answer! Try again.	Question: If a person loses his job and is low on money, he will have to start cutting back on how much food he consumes or he'd run out, otherwise known as... Choices: [0: 'destroying', 1: 'conserving', 2: 'losing', 3: 'squandering']. Answer: 1 (Correct) Rationale: The correct answer is "conserving" because the person is <b>reducing their consumption</b> of food to make it last longer... Reject ✖ Wrong Answer! Try again.
Answer: 2 (Correct) Rationale: A landing can also refer to a platform or a flat area at the top of a <b>staircase</b> , which is typically found at the top of a <b>stairwell</b> , providing a safe and stable surface for people to step onto. Accept ✔ Correct	Answer: 4 (Incorrect) Rationale: The question asks what you need to wear when hiking, not what you need to avoid or be aware of. Fatigue is a common <b>experience</b> when... Reject ✖ Wrong Answer! Try again.	Answer: 3 (Incorrect) Rationale: The phrase "or he'd run out" implies a sense of scarcity and urgency, suggesting that the person is <b>not just reducing</b> their consumption, but is at risk of exhausting their resources. Reject ✖ Wrong Answer! Try again.
	Answer: 1 (Incorrect) Rationale: ...physical exertion is <b>not something you wear</b> . However, it is a crucial aspect of hiking... Reject ✖ Wrong Answer! Try again.	Answer: 1 (Correct) Rationale: Instead of focusing on the connotation of "squandering", I'm considering the literal meaning of the phrase "cutting back". It implies a <b>reduction or decrease</b> in the amount of food consumed. In this context, " <b>conserving</b> " refers to the <b>act of reducing</b> . Accept ✔ Correct
	Answer: 0 (Incorrect) Rationale: "cast iron stomach" is a <b>metaphorical</b> ... Reject ✖ Wrong Answer! Try again.	
	Answer: 0 (Incorrect) Rationale: "cast iron stomach" is <b>not just</b> a metap... Reject ✖ Abstention	

Figure 4. Examples on CommonsenseQA and OpenBookQA with Llama3. *Left*: successful correction and acceptance; *Center*: continued rejection leading to abstention; *Right*: false rejection followed by successful acceptance.

turns), until the maximum turns is reached, leading to an abstention. This also highlights the importance of insights provided into abstention offered by the formula score introduced in Section 4.1. While these abstentions are counted as incorrect answers for the accuracy score, they mitigate the negative effects measured by the formula score. The third example shows the DM incorrectly rejecting an answer at the first turn and then correcting itself and accepting the correct answer at a later turn. This demonstrates another pattern of our system’s capability to mitigate errors as it has the ability to correct itself both on the LLM and on the DM side. In fact, it can make the LLM reconsider its initial response and be more sure about the next time around, as shown by the more logical and well-explained rationale at the later turn. Furthermore, this shows the less weight put on DM’s false negatives, making them less costly to system performance.

**Generative vs. Discriminative** Our system relies on a lightweight Discriminative Model (DM) to identify faulty reasoning steps rather than having a single generative model handle both answer production and error detection. We argue that discriminative decisions, such as binary classification of correctness, can be less complex than unrestricted text generation. The DM only needs to learn whether the LLM’s intermediate output is acceptable or flawed, rather

than produce the entire answer. In practice, as illustrated in Figure 4, spotting a hallucinated statement or a gap in reasoning is often more straightforward than generating a complete solution from scratch.

This observation aligns with findings in adversarial training for image generation: the discriminator in Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) is frequently able to surpass the generator to the point of near-perfect classification, sometimes leading to mode collapse (Goodfellow et al., 2014; Arjovsky et al., 2017). Although our setting differs from image generation, this pattern suggests that a specialized classifier can outpace a generative model in identifying errors. Recent self-critique approaches have also drawn attention to how generative and discriminative strengths differ. For instance, Jiang et al. (2024) note that LLMs do not necessarily excel at discriminative tasks (such as self-correction) unless they are explicitly trained for them. In a similar vein, our DM focuses on binary classification, freeing the LLM to concentrate on generative functions.

In addition, smaller discriminative models provide practical advantages. They typically require fewer parameters and can be retrained quickly without modifying the main LLM. For example, Tyen et al. (2023) suggests that if an LLM can identify where its own errors occur, it can correct them. They use a similar strategy of training a small classifier to



detect errors in LLM outputs. Building on these findings, our work pairs the LLM’s strengths in generative reasoning with the DM’s specialized discriminative ability, resulting in an efficient self-correction framework. By doing so, we reduce the training burden on the LLM, simplify the classification task for the DM, and demonstrate improved overall performance in multi-step reasoning tasks.

**The Impact of False Positive** False positives, where the DM incorrectly accepts a wrong LLM answer, are more costly compared to DM rejections in our system because acceptances immediately end the reasoning process and provide no opportunity for future correction. On the other hand, false negatives, which are rejections of correct answers, proceed to another round of reasoning, where the DM or the LLM can correct its behavior (i.e., the third example in Figure 4). Motivated by the idea that the DM should be more cautious in choosing to accept an answer than to reject one, we introduce weighted training to the DM training (detailed in Section 3.2) and test it in an ablation study (displayed in Table 2).

## 7. Ablation study

This section investigates two critical design factors for the Discriminative Model (DM): label weighting and model size. The results, shown in Table 2, reveal how these factors impact system performance.

Table 2. Ablation Studies on OpenBookQA: Performance Comparison of Flan-Large, Flan-XL, and Weighted Training for DM training. All experiments use Llama3 as the Reasoner, with the DM being trained on OpenBookQA only.

Model/Setting	Acc	FS	Acc(D)
<b>Ablation Study 1: Weighted Training</b>			
DRR (Flan-T5-Large)	75.20	51.00	71.40
+Weighted Training	77.40	55.60	78.20
<b>Ablation Study 2: DM Size</b>			
DRR (Flan-T5-Large)	75.20	51.00	71.40
+ Flan-T5-XL	80.00	66.60	86.60

**Weighted Training** As discussed in Section 6, false-positive errors incur the highest cost. To mitigate this, following equation 1, the DM training applies label weights  $w_{y_i}$  that favor rejecting incorrect answers over mistakenly accepting them. Specifically, this study compares a 3:1 ratio (Reject to Accept) with the unweighted 1:1 setting. Results in Table 2 show that weighted training offers a slight but consistent improvement in all evaluated metrics.

**DM Size** Flan-T5-Large-783M was selected for its strong performance in preliminary tests. Table 2 compares this baseline with a larger DM, Flan-T5-XL-2.85B, on the OpenBookQA dataset using Llama3. While the larger model can offer an additional performance boost, the smaller DM achieves competent results, making billion-scale parameters less essential in many practical scenarios.

## 8. Conclusion

This work addresses the pressing challenge of diminishing fresh training data for large language models, which need ever-increasing high-quality inputs to refine their advanced capabilities. We proposed Distillation-Reinforcement-Reasoning (DRR), a framework that enhances LLM’s inference-time reasoning via in-context reinforcement learning supervised by a small discriminative model, which is trained from synthetic data generated from the LLM through a novel reasoning process distillation algorithm. Empirical results on multiple standard QA benchmarks demonstrate the effectiveness of this framework over self-critique approaches. We expect this low-cost and scalable solution to provide a practical path for large language models to continue improving complex reasoning abilities in accordance with scaling laws.

## References

- Amayuelas, A., Pan, L., Chen, W., and Wang, W. Knowledge of knowledge: Exploring known-unknowns uncertainty with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13712*, 2023.
- Arjovsky, M., Chintala, S., and Bottou, L. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pp. 214–223, 2017.
- Asai, A., Wu, Z., Wang, Y., Sil, A., and Hajishirzi, H. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Azaria, A. and Mitchell, T. The internal state of an llm knows when it’s lying. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 967–976, 2023.
- Bai, Y., Jones, A., Ndousse, K., Askell, A., Chen, A., Das-Sarma, N., Drain, D., Fort, S., Ganguli, D., Henighan, T., et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022.
- Bisk, Y., Zellers, R., Gao, J., Choi, Y., et al. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In

- Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pp. 7432–7439, 2020.
- Chen, C., Liu, K., Chen, Z., Gu, Y., Wu, Y., Tao, M., Fu, Z., and Ye, J. Inside: LLMs’ internal states retain the power of hallucination detection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Chen, X., Lin, M., Schärli, N., and Zhou, D. Teaching large language models to self-debug. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023a.
- Chen, Y., Fu, Q., Yuan, Y., Wen, Z., Fan, G., Liu, D., Zhang, D., Li, Z., and Xiao, Y. Hallucination detection: Robustly discerning reliable answers in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pp. 245–255, 2023b.
- Chung, H. W., Hou, L., Longpre, S., Zoph, B., Tay, Y., Fedus, W., Li, Y., Wang, X., Dehghani, M., Brahma, S., et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(70):1–53, 2024.
- Davis, F. B. A note on the correction for chance success. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 35(3):42–47, 1967.
- Dubey, A., Jauhri, A., Pandey, A., Kadian, A., Al-Dahle, A., Letman, A., Mathur, A., Schelten, A., Yang, A., Fan, A., et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- Farquhar, S., Kossen, J., Kuhn, L., and Gal, Y. Detecting hallucinations in large language models using semantic entropy. *Nature*, 630(8017):625–630, 2024.
- Glaese, A., McAleese, N., Trębacz, M., Aslanides, J., Firoiu, V., Ewalds, T., Rauh, M., Weidinger, L., Chadwick, M., Thacker, P., et al. Improving alignment of dialogue agents via targeted human judgements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14375*, 2022.
- Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., and Bengio, Y. Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- Gou, Z., Shao, Z., Gong, Y., Yang, Y., Duan, N., Chen, W., et al. Critic: Large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Hu, E. J., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., Chen, W., et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Huang, J., Chen, X., Mishra, S., Zheng, H. S., Yu, A. W., Song, X., and Zhou, D. Large language models cannot self-correct reasoning yet. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Ji, Z., Lee, N., Frieske, R., Yu, T., Su, D., Xu, Y., Ishii, E., Bang, Y. J., Madotto, A., and Fung, P. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38, 2023.
- Jiang, D., Zhang, J., Weller, O., Weir, N., Van Durme, B., and Khashabi, D. Self-[in] correct: LLMs struggle with refining self-generated responses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04298*, 2024.
- Kadavath, S., Conerly, T., Askell, A., Henighan, T., Drain, D., Perez, E., Schiefer, N., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., DasSarma, N., Tran-Johnson, E., et al. Language models (mostly) know what they know. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221*, 2022.
- Kim, G., Baldi, P., and McAleer, S. Language models can solve computer tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Kumar, A., Zhuang, V., Agarwal, R., Su, Y., Co-Reyes, J. D., Singh, A., Baumli, K., Iqbal, S., Bishop, C., Roelofs, R., et al. Training language models to self-correct via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12917*, 2024.
- Lightman, H., Kosaraju, V., Burda, Y., Edwards, H., Baker, B., Lee, T., Leike, J., Schulman, J., Sutskever, I., and Cobbe, K. Let’s verify step by step. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Liu, J., Pasunuru, R., Hajishirzi, H., Choi, Y., and Celikyilmaz, A. Crystal: Introspective reasoners reinforced with self-feedback. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 11557–11572, 2023.
- Madaan, A., Tandon, N., Clark, P., and Yang, Y. Memory-assisted prompt editing to improve gpt-3 after deployment. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 2833–2861, 2022.
- Madaan, A., Tandon, N., Gupta, P., Hallinan, S., Gao, L., Wiegrefe, S., Alon, U., Dziri, N., Prabhumoye, S., Yang, Y., et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Mathematical Association of America. Amc 10, 2024. URL [https://artofproblemsolving.com/wiki/index.php/AMC\\_10](https://artofproblemsolving.com/wiki/index.php/AMC_10). Accessed: 2024-10.

- Mihaylov, T., Clark, P., Khot, T., and Sabharwal, A. Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 2381–2391, 2018.
- Mirzadeh, I., Alizadeh, K., Shahrokhi, H., Tuzel, O., Bengio, S., and Farajtabar, M. Gsm-symbolic: Understanding the limitations of mathematical reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05229*, 2024.
- Molfese, F., Conia, S., Orlando, R., and Navigli, R. Zebra: Zero-shot example-based retrieval augmentation for commonsense question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 22429–22444, 2024.
- Monea, G., Bosselut, A., Brantley, K., and Artzi, Y. Llms are in-context reinforcement learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05362*, 2024.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- OpenAI. Openai o1, September 2024. URL <https://openai.com/index/learning-to-reason-with-llms/>.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- Pan, L., Saxon, M., Xu, W., Nathani, D., Wang, X., and Wang, W. Y. Automatically correcting large language models: Surveying the landscape of diverse self-correction strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03188*, 2023.
- Sakaguchi, K., Le Bras, R., Bhagavatula, C., and Choi, Y. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pp. 8732–8740, 2020.
- Shinn, N., Cassano, F., Gopinath, A., Narasimhan, K., and Yao, S. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Shwartz, V., West, P., Bras, R. L., Bhagavatula, C., and Choi, Y. Unsupervised commonsense question answering with self-talk. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05483*, 2020.
- Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C. J., Guez, A., Sifre, L., Van Den Driessche, G., Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Panneershelvam, V., Lanctot, M., et al. Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *nature*, 529(7587):484–489, 2016.
- Stechly, K., Marquez, M., and Kambhampati, S. Gpt-4 doesn’t know it’s wrong: An analysis of iterative prompting for reasoning problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12397*, 2023.
- Stechly, K., Valmeekam, K., and Kambhampati, S. On the self-verification limitations of large language models on reasoning and planning tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08115*, 2024.
- Su, W., Wang, C., Ai, Q., Hu, Y., Wu, Z., Zhou, Y., and Liu, Y. Unsupervised real-time hallucination detection based on the internal states of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06448*, 2024.
- Talmor, A., Herzig, J., Lourie, N., and Berant, J. Commonsenseqa: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 4149–4158, 2019.
- TINBERGEN, N. On aims and methods of ethology. *Zeitschrift für tierpsychologie*, 20(4):410–433, 1963.
- Trivedi, H., Balasubramanian, N., Khot, T., and Sabharwal, A. Interleaving retrieval with chain-of-thought reasoning for knowledge-intensive multi-step questions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 10014–10037, 2023.
- Tyen, G., Mansoor, H., Chen, P., Mak, T., and Cărbune, V. Llms cannot find reasoning errors, but can correct them! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08516*, 2023.
- Wang, X., Wei, J., Schuurmans, D., Le, Q. V., Chi, E. H., Narang, S., Chowdhery, A., and Zhou, D. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023a.
- Wang, Y., Kordi, Y., Mishra, S., Liu, A., Smith, N. A., Khashabi, D., and Hajishirzi, H. Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 13484–13508, 2023b.
- Wen, B., Yao, J., Feng, S., Xu, C., Tsvetkov, Y., Howe, B., and Wang, L. L. Know your limits: A survey of abstention in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.18418*, 2024.
- Weng, Y., Zhu, M., Xia, F., Li, B., He, S., Liu, S., Sun, B., Liu, K., and Zhao, J. Large language models are better reasoners with self-verification. In *The 2023 Conference*

on *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023.

Xie, Y., Kawaguchi, K., Zhao, Y., Zhao, J. X., Kan, M.-Y., He, J., and Xie, M. Self-evaluation guided beam search for reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

Yang, D., Chen, K., Rao, J., Guo, X., Zhang, Y., Yang, J., and Zhang, Y. Tackling vision language tasks through learning inner monologues. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pp. 19350–19358, 2024a.

Yang, D., Rao, J., Chen, K., Guo, X., Zhang, Y., Yang, J., and Zhang, Y. Im-rag: Multi-round retrieval-augmented generation through learning inner monologues. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pp. 730–740, 2024b.

Yao, S., Zhao, J., Yu, D., Du, N., Shafran, I., Narasimhan, K. R., and Cao, Y. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

Yao, S., Yu, D., Zhao, J., Shafran, I., Griffiths, T., Cao, Y., and Narasimhan, K. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

Yin, Z., Sun, Q., Guo, Q., Wu, J., Qiu, X., and Huang, X.-J. Do large language models know what they don't know? In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pp. 8653–8665, 2023.

Zhang, T., Qiu, L., Guo, Q., Deng, C., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Z., Zhou, C., Wang, X., and Fu, L. Enhancing uncertainty-based hallucination detection with stronger focus. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023.

## A. DM Training Data Preparation and Hyperparameters

Table 3. DM training and development dataset sizes, including a breakdown of each of the six question-answering datasets, using Llama3 and GPT-4 as the Reasoner.

Dataset	Train		Dev	
	Llama3	GPT-4	Llama3	GPT-4
CommonSenseQA	11416	11124	2855	2783
Winograndel	10969	10529	2744	2668
PIQA	7785	3654	1950	911
OpenBookQA	5496	4909	1365	1230
<b>Joint</b>	<b>35666</b>	<b>30216</b>	<b>8914</b>	<b>7592</b>

To prepare the raw generated data in Section 3.1 for DM training, we down-sample data points with `Reject` label while keeping all `Accept` data points constant for each dataset. We observe that generated data naturally consists of more rejections than acceptances of LLM answers because the condition for generation to continue is a reject label. As a result, examples of rejections are present in many turns for a question (e.g., an answer is repeatedly rejected), but acceptances are only present in the final turn. When down-sampling, we directly remove data points without keeping data points of different turns of conversations with the same original question (same ID) together. This is because the past history of answers provided in the task content of data points already shows the full context and does not require all turns to be in the training data. Then, for each dataset, we randomly split the generated data into a train and dev set for DM training using an 80/20 split, keeping data points of different turns with the same ID together to avoid data leakage. Last, we concatenate the prepared train sets and the dev sets of each dataset together. Table 3 displays the dataset sizes of the train and dev sets for Llama3 and GPT-4 experiments, including the sizes for each dataset. Table 4 displays an example DM input and output before tokenization. We map `Accept` labels to 1, `Reject` labels to 0, and include a basic instruction to the DM. We fine-tune Flan-T5 with an Adam optimizer ( $\eta = 3e^{-5}$ ,  $\lambda = 1e^{-4}$ ) with 500 warmup steps.

Input	Output
Instruction: Predict if the following answer to the question and context should be accepted, 1, or rejected, 0, based on the rationale. Question: When eating everything on the tasting menu , what does one tend to feel? Choices: [0: 'full stomach', 1: 'getting full', 2: 'gaining weight', 3: 'sick', 4: 'satisfaction']. Previous LLM Response: Answer: 4 Rationale: The phrase "tasting menu" implies a culinary experience where one is sampling a variety of dishes, often in small portions. As a result, one tends to feel satisfied, rather than full, getting full, gaining weight, or sick , as the portions are typically designed to be manageable and enjoyable. Wrong answer! Try again. Answer: 1 Rationale: When eating everything on the tasting menu, one tends to feel "getting full" because each dish is a new and exciting experience, and the palate is constantly being stimulated. The variety of flavors, textures, and presentation can lead to a sense of anticipation and excitement with each new course, making it difficult to feel completely full, but rather, one is constantly adjusting to the next culinary delight.	1

Table 4. Sample DM input and output from OpenBookQA, where the response is accepted at the second turn.

## B. Prompts

**Zero-Shot Baselines** For zero-shot baselines, we designed three types of prompts: (a) *Standard QA Prompt*: a straightforward question-answering prompt; (b) *Abstain QA Prompt*: an extended prompt allowing the model to abstain from answering if none of the options are correct; and (c) *Self-Critic Prompt*: a prompt adapted from Huang et al. (2023) where the model critiques its own response and iteratively improves it. Zero-shot predictions are generated by evaluating the first turn of our system, ignoring DM outputs. Abstain zero-shot predictions are run separately. Note that the self-critic prompt directly from Huang et al. (2023) may produce discrepancies, such as self-critic scores being lower than zero-shot scores using our system prompts.

**DRR Prompt Settings** DRR employs two distinct prompt strategies. **Version 1** uses a direct instruction-based approach. The first turn uses the *Standard QA Prompt* as a system prefix, mimicking zero-shot performance. Subsequent turns replace the standard QA prompt with a *Exploration Prompt*, instructing the LLM to explore new reasoning paths based on feedback such as "Wrong Answer! Try again.". Temperature settings are 0.1 (Top-P 0.9) for the first turn to ensure consistent zero-shot responses and 0.6 (Top-P 0.7) for later turns to increase diversity. **Version 2** adopts a gradual prompting strategy. All turns use the *Standard QA Prompt* as a system prefix. The appended context includes an environment message that emphasizes gradual improvement and encourages exploring new reasoning paths without explicitly labeling past answers as wrong. Temperature settings are 0.6 (Top-P 0.9) for all turns. For a given experiment, the same strategy is used for both the generation and inference steps. **Version 1** is used for Llama models, while **Version 2** is applied to GPT models.

**Prompt Examples** Examples of each prompt are displayed as following.

### Standard QA Prompt (Llama3 Zero-Shot, Temperature = 0.1):

```
You are a knowledgeable question-answering assistant, specializing in multiple
choice questions. Based on the question and the list of choices provided,
select the best answer. Carefully evaluate each option before deciding.
Provide your choice (e.g., 0, 1, 2, etc) along with a brief explanation
of your reasoning.
```

```
Respond only with the following format, nothing else:
```

```
Answer: [Provide the answer here]
```

```
Rationale: [Provide the rationale here]
```

```
Do not include any additional text, headers, or explanations outside this format.
```

### Standard QA Prompt (GPT-4 Zero-Shot, Temperature = 0.6):

```
You are a highly knowledgeable assistant skilled in multi-step reasoning for multiple-choice
Respond only with the following format, nothing else:
```

```
Answer: [Provide the answer here]
```

```
Rationale: [Provide the rationale here]
```

```
Do not include any additional text, headers, or explanations outside this format.
```

### Abstain QA Prompt (Llama3/GPT-4 Zero-Shot, Temperature = 0.1):

```
You are a highly knowledgeable assistant skilled in multi-step reasoning for multiple-choice
Respond only with the following format, nothing else:
```

```
Answer: [Provide answer here or 'none of the above']
```

```
Rationale: [Provide the rationale here]
```

```
Do not include any additional text, headers, or explanations outside this format.
```

### Self-Critic QA Prompt (GPT-4 Self-Critic, Temperature = 0):

```
Q: ... Choices: ...
```

Explain your reasoning. You must choose only one option from above. Your final answer should be

...

Review your previous answer and find problems with your answer.

...

Based on the problems you found, improve your answer. You must choose only one option from above.

**Exploration Prompt for *Version 1* (Llama3 DRR, Temperature = 0.6, Top-P = 0.7):**

You are an expert assistant specializing in multiple-choice questions, dedicated to exploring multiple ways of thinking to provide accurate answers. Below, you will see an LLM's previous answer, including the choice it selected and its reasoning, followed by the feedback: 'Wrong answer! Try again.'

Your task is to **think outside the box** and use a **completely different line of reasoning** to approach the question. Carefully reassess each option, explore alternative interpretations, and **avoid repeating the same ideas**. Focus on providing fresh insights and explain your reasoning in a distinct way.

Respond only with the following format, nothing else:

Answer: [Provide answer here or 'none of the above']

Rationale: [Provide the rationale here]

Do not include any additional text, headers, or explanations outside this format.

**Appended Environment Message to Context (*Version 1*) (Llama3 DRR):**

Previous LLM Answer: Answer:...

Rationale:...

Wrong Answer! Try again.

**Appended Environment Message to Context (*Version 2*) (GPT-4 DRR):**

LLM Answer 1:...

Rationale 1:...

Env: The previous response was insufficient; explore a new line of reasoning to approach a more accurate answer.