

# Influences on LLM Calibration: A Study of Response Agreement, Loss Functions, and Prompt Styles

Yuxi Xia<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Pedro Henrique Luz de Araujo<sup>1,2</sup>, Klim Zaporozjets<sup>3</sup>,  
Benjamin Roth<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Computer Science, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria,

<sup>2</sup>UniVie Doctoral School Computer Science, Vienna, Austria

<sup>3</sup>Department of Computer Science, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

<sup>4</sup>Faculty of Philological and Cultural Studies, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

\*yuxi.xia@univie.ac.at

## Abstract

Calibration, the alignment between model confidence and prediction accuracy, is critical for the reliable deployment of large language models (LLMs). Existing works neglect to measure the generalization of their methods to other prompt styles and different sizes of LLMs. To address this, we define a controlled experimental setting covering 12 LLMs and four prompt styles. We additionally investigate if incorporating the response agreement of multiple LLMs and an appropriate loss function can improve calibration performance. Concretely, we build Calib-n, a novel framework that trains an auxiliary model for confidence estimation that aggregates responses from multiple LLMs to capture inter-model agreement. To optimize calibration, we integrate focal and AUC surrogate losses alongside binary cross-entropy. Experiments across four datasets demonstrate that both response agreement and focal loss improve calibration from baselines. We find that few-shot prompts are the most effective for auxiliary model-based methods, and auxiliary models demonstrate robust calibration performance across accuracy variations, outperforming LLMs' internal probabilities and verbalized confidences. These insights deepen the understanding of influence factors in LLM calibration, supporting their reliable deployment in diverse applications.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Improving the calibration of Large Language Models (LLMs), i.e., aligning the model's confidence with the accuracy of its predictions, can maintain their reliability, usability, and ethical deployment in domains like medicine, law, and education (Guo et al., 2017a; Jiang et al., 2021; Geng et al., 2024). As LLMs are increasingly integrated into decision-making processes, poor calibration can amplify

risks of misinformation, propagate biases, and foster over-reliance among users (Raji et al., 2020).

Recent studies (Ni et al., 2024) indicate that LLMs struggle to accurately express their internal confidence in natural language, particularly in the form of verbalized confidence (Tian et al., 2023). Liu et al. (2024) addresses this issue by training a linear layer to adjust the hidden states of the LLM's final layer for confidence prediction, but this approach only applies to LLMs with accessible weights. In contrast, Ulmer et al. (2024) introduces an auxiliary model for confidence estimation using only the generations of the target LLM but is constrained by its evaluation on just two LLMs and two prompt styles. These narrow experimental setups limit the generalization of their findings.

Our study tackles this limitation by comprehensively examining the generalization of different methods over 12 LLMs and four prompt styles. Additionally, we investigate the influence of diverse factors on the calibration of LLMs, which includes response agreements among LLMs, three loss functions, and four prompt styles. Concretely, we introduce **Calib-n** (illustrated in Fig. 1), a novel framework aggregating responses from multiple LLMs ( $n$  indicates the number of LLMs) to train a single auxiliary model for confidence estimation. Calib-n captures inter-model agreement, mitigating overfitting and reducing overconfidence associated with individual LLMs for calibration (Kim et al., 2023). Except for standard binary cross-entropy (BCE) loss, we incorporate focal (FL) (Lin et al., 2020) and AUC surrogate (AUC) (Yuan et al., 2021) loss functions that are effective for improving the calibration of non-transformer type of neural networks (Mukhoti et al., 2020; Moon et al., 2020). Finally, we systematically study the effects of prompt styles, testing four diverse prompt types: Verbalized (Tian et al., 2023), Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022), Zero-shot, and Few-shot prompts.

Our experiments span four open-ended ques-

<sup>1</sup>Code and data will be released upon acceptance




Figure 1: Overview of calibration training of Calib- $n$  ( $n$  indicates the number of LLMs that provide responses). We consider the effect of different **prompt styles** on calibration and design four diverse prompts to query  $n$  target LLMs to provide answers to a question.  $n$  joint strings of the question with each answer presenting the **response agreement** of LLMs are passed to the auxiliary model to generate probabilities for each answer. The auxiliary model is optimized with three **loss functions** respectively on the correctness of the LLM answers. Brier score (one of four metrics) is used to evaluate the calibration performance of the auxiliary model.

tion answering datasets and 12 LLMs, including seven small models (2–9B parameters) and five large models (27–72B parameters) from five distinct model families. The results indicate that no single method consistently outperforms all others across the various models, datasets, and prompt configurations. Yet, after aggregating the results and counting the number of overall wins for each method, we uncover new insights regarding the calibration factors of the analyzed settings:

- **Response Agreement:** By leveraging inter-model response agreement, Calib- $n$  outperforms the state-of-the-art baselines.
- **Loss Functions:** FL loss improves calibration compared to BCE and AUC losses, demonstrating its effectiveness for both Calib-1 (i.e., using responses from one LLM) and Calib- $n$ . Calib-1 trained with FL yields the best results.
- **Prompt Style:** We find that the effectiveness of methods is highly influenced by the prompt styles, with few-shot prompts proving to be the most beneficial for training auxiliary models.
- **Accuracy-Calibration Correlation:** With accuracy variances caused by different dataset complexities, prompt styles and models, we find that auxiliary models maintain robust calibration performance across accuracy changes, in contrast to the fluctuating calibration of

LLMs that rely on internal probabilities and verbalized confidences.

Our findings underscore the importance of reexamining calibration strategies for LLMs, suggesting the use of response agreement, focal loss and few-shot prompts to improve the calibration of LLMs.

## 2 Related Work

**Calibration** The concept of calibration of neural networks was introduced by Guo et al. (2017b). Lin et al. (2022) show that GPT-3 can learn to express uncertainty about its own answers without the use of logits. Later, Tian et al. (2023) demonstrate that verbalized confidence is generally better calibrated than the conditional probabilities w.r.t the consistency of the LLMs. However, Zhang et al. (2024) show that LLM probabilities and verbalized confidence tend to overly concentrate within a fixed range. Similarly, Ni et al. (2024) analyze and compare probabilistic and verbalized perceptions of the knowledge boundaries of LLM, highlighting their challenges in confidence estimation. To address these issues, Liu et al. (2024) train a linear layer to adjust the last layer’s hidden states of LLMs for confidence generation. Ulmer et al. (2024) propose a method to estimate LLM confidence based only on textual input and output. However, none of these works perform a comprehensive analysis of **different influence factors in LLM calibration**. These factors can be loss functions, response agreement and prompt styles. Mukhoti et al. (2020) prove that

focal loss (Lin et al., 2020) can improve the calibration of neural networks. AUC surrogate loss (Yuan et al., 2021) and correctness ranking loss (Moon et al., 2020) calibrate models by adjusting the ranking of logits to ensure positive samples are ranked higher than negative samples. Kim et al. (2023) suggest combining the predictions from multiple models (response agreement) can mitigate overfitting and reduce overconfidence for calibration. Min et al. (2022); Wang et al. (2023); Chen et al. (2024) showcase that LLMs output is highly dependent on the prompt and different prompt styles can significantly influence the performance of LLMs. Our work comprehensively studies the influence of response agreement, three loss functions, and four prompt styles with 12 LLMs on four open-ended question answering datasets.

### 3 Methodology

Fig. 1 demonstrates our framework, which includes four prompt styles, assessment of the correctness of LLM generation, and calibration training of auxiliary models for confidence estimation and calibration evaluation for these models.

#### 3.1 Prompt Styles

Prompt styles significantly impact LLMs’ performance (Chen et al., 2024). Liu et al. (2024) use Few-shot prompts to query LLM answers for calibration experiments. Tian et al. (2023) employ verbalized prompts to elicit probability estimates from LLMs regarding their responses. Ulmer et al. (2024) evaluate their methods on both CoT and verbalized prompts. However, these studies either evaluate their methods against baselines using inconsistent prompt styles or fail to provide a comprehensive comparison across diverse prompt styles. For example, Liu et al. (2024) use verbalized prompts to generate verbalized probabilities as a baseline, but apply few-shot prompts to their method, which ignores the potential influence of prompts in calibration evaluation. Our work comprehensively studies the impact of prompt styles in LLM calibration and employs the most commonly used prompts: Verbalized (Verb.), Zero-shot, CoT, and Few-shot prompts. The detailed prompts are shown in Appendix A.1. Given a question  $q$  with one of the prompts, we process the answers generated by  $n$  target LLMs with regular expression-based text processing.

#### 3.2 Correctness of LLM Generation

We employ a Judge model  $\mathcal{J}$ , Prometheus-8x7b-v2.0, to assess the correctness of generated answers w.r.t target answers. We selected this model because it is open-source and its judgments have been shown to strongly correlate with those of human evaluators and large proprietary models (Kim et al., 2024). Given an input question  $q$ , a target answer  $y$ , and a generated answer  $a_i$  by the  $i$ -th target LLM  $\mathcal{M}_i$ ,  $\mathcal{J}$  is prompted to provide a binary correctness score  $c_i$  that reflects the semantical equivalence between  $a_i$  and  $y$ . The specific prompt is shown in Appendix A.2.

$$c_i = \mathcal{J}(a_i \stackrel{\text{semantic}}{=} y | q, y, a_i), c_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad (1)$$

#### 3.3 Response Agreements of Multiple LLMs

Different from previous work (Liu et al., 2024; Ulmer et al., 2024; Tian et al., 2023) that estimate confidence using the information from a single target LLM, Calib-n leverages the responses from  $n$  target LLMs to train an auxiliary model for estimating jointly the confidence for each LLM. This setting is inspired by Kim et al. (2023) which suggests that combining predictions can mitigate overfitting and reduce overconfidence inherent to individual models for confidence estimation. By having access to the responses of  $n$  LLMs, the auxiliary model can infer cases of low consensus among models, signaling increased uncertainty. We verify the effectiveness of this setting by comprehensively comparing the results of using the generations produced by one LLM (**Calib-1**) to using the generations from multiple LLMs (**Calib-n**).

The auxiliary model,  $f(\cdot)$ , is composed of a transformer backbone (bert-base-uncased (Devlin et al., 2018)), a classification head ( $768 \rightarrow n$ ) and a sigmoid activation function, which outputs probabilities  $P$  for LLM answers  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ . The input for  $f(\cdot)$  is  $n$  joint strings of  $q$  with each answer (e.g.,  $q[\text{SEP}]a_i$ ), denoted as  $\{q + a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ .

$$P = f(\{q + a_i\}_{i=1}^n) = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^n, p_i \in [0, 1] \quad (2)$$

**Training objective.** The goal is to optimize the predicted probability to align with the correctness of the input answer. Give  $k$  questions, we minimize the averaged BCE loss of each LLM answer:

$$\mathcal{L}_{BCE} = -\frac{1}{k \cdot n} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^n \left( c_i^{(j)} \log(p_i^{(j)}) + (1 - c_i^{(j)}) \log(1 - p_i^{(j)}) \right) \quad (3)$$

**Evaluation.** A target LLM  $\mathcal{M}_i$  achieves a low calibration Brier score if  $p_i$  accurately reflects the reliability of  $a_i$ , which is the correctness  $c_i$ . Specifically, for all  $k$  generated answers of  $\mathcal{M}_i$  regarding  $k$  questions, the Brier score (Brier, 1950) of  $\mathcal{M}_i$  average squared error between all predicted probabilities and correctness of these answers:

$$\text{Brier}(\mathcal{M}_i) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k (p_i^{(j)} - c_i^{(j)})^2 \quad (4)$$

Following Tian et al. (2023), we also evaluate all methods with three other metrics (details in Section 4.3).

### 3.4 Loss Functions

To further improve the calibration, we experiment with focal and AUC losses in addition to BCE loss.

**Focal loss (FL)** (Lin et al., 2020; Mukhoti et al., 2020) focuses on hard-to-classify examples, reducing the weight of correctly classified samples and encouraging the model to focus on predictions with high BCE loss. This loss is commonly used in imbalanced datasets but can benefit calibration since it emphasizes predictions with a large discrepancy between confidence and correctness. The equation is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FL}} = -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \left( \alpha (1 - e^{-\mathcal{L}_{\text{BCE}_j}})^{\gamma} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{BCE}_j} \right) \quad (5)$$

Where  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{BCE}_j}$  is the BCE loss of the data sample  $j$ . We use the default setting from Lin et al. (2020) to set  $\alpha = 0.25$  and  $\gamma = 2.0$ .

**AUC Surrogate loss (AUC)** (Yuan et al., 2021) uses a logistic loss to maximize the differences between true and false answers’ scores (logits  $x$  generated by the classification head). The equation is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{AUC}} = \frac{1}{|T| \cdot |F|} \sum_{t \in T} \sum_{f \in F} \sigma(x_f - x_t) \quad (6)$$

Where  $T$  and  $F$  are the indexes set for all true and false answers respectively.  $\sigma$  stands for sigmoid function.

In the end, we propose the following methods combining different techniques and verify their effectiveness with comprehensive experiments across different models, datasets and prompts.

**(BCE)/(FL)/(AUC)Calib-1:** calibration training using the generations from one target LLM and optimizing with BCE/FL/AUC loss function.

**(BCE)/(FL)/(AUC)Calib-n:** calibration training using the generations from  $n$  target LLM and optimizing with BCE/FL/AUC loss function.

**(BCE)/(FL)/(AUC)Calib-n+PS:** Platt Scaling (PS) (Platt, 1999) (explained in Section 4.4) rescales the probabilities of test data by learning on the probabilities of validation data. Those probabilities are generated by corresponding Calib-n models.

## 4 Experiments

To comprehensively compare confidence estimation methods, we include diverse datasets, LLMs, and state-of-the-art baselines in our experimental setting.

### 4.1 Datasets

We cover four open-ended question-answering datasets: TriviaQA (Joshi et al., 2017), SciQ (Johannes Welbl, 2017), WikiQA (Yang et al., 2015), and NQ (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019). We adopt the setting from Liu et al. (2024), where 2k/1k samples are selected as training/test data for TriviaQA, SciQ, and NQ, and 1040/293 for WikiQA.

### 4.2 Models

We include 12 models from five families: Llama (Grattafiori et al., 2024; Touvron et al., 2023), Phi (Abdin et al., 2024), Gemma (Team et al., 2024), Qwen (Yang et al., 2024), and Mixtral (Jiang et al., 2024).<sup>2</sup> In our analyses, we cluster the models based on their number of parameters:

**Small models (2-9B parameters):** Llama-2-7b-chat-hf (referred as Llama2-7b), Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct (Llama3.1-8b), Llama-3-8B-Instruct (Llama3-8b), Phi-3-small-128k-instruct (Phi3-7b), Phi-3.5-mini-instruct (Phi3-4b), gemma-2-2b-it (Gemma2-2b), gemma-2-9b-it (Gemma2-9b).

**Large models (27-72B parameters):** Qwen2-72B-Instruct (Qwen2-72b), Llama-3-70B-Instruct (Llama3-72b), Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct (Llama3.1-70b), Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1 (Mixtral-8x7b), gemma-2-27b-it (Gemma2-27b).

Calib-n models are trained with all LLMs inside the same group and provide confidence scores for each model in that group.

### 4.3 Evaluation Metrics

We report four metrics for calibration evaluation:

<sup>2</sup>All models are available at <https://huggingface.co/models>.

**ECE:** The expected calibration error (Guo et al., 2017b) is computed by partitioning the predictions into 10 bins based on their confidence and then taking the weighted (by the number of samples in a bin) average of the squared difference between bin average accuracy and confidence.

**ECE-t:** The temperature-scaled expected calibration error (Tian et al., 2023) finds a single temperature scaling parameter  $\beta$  that minimizes the negative log-likelihood between model confidences and answer correctness. Then,  $\beta$  is used to scale the confidences before the ECE is computed.

**Brier:** The Brier Score (Brier, 1950) is the average squared error between predictions’ confidence and correctness (see Eq. 4).

**AUC:** The area under the curve (AUC) of selective accuracy and coverage (Geifman and El-Yaniv, 2017). Let coverage be the fraction of all test samples with a confidence lower than some threshold  $t, 0 \leq t \leq 1$ . The accuracy-coverage curve plots the coverage against the accuracy (of covered samples) for all threshold values.

**Aggregate analysis.** We aggregate the performance of different confidence estimation methods by counting their number of **wins**: given each metric above, we count the number of times a method outperforms the others in all possible combinations of prompt style, dataset, and model.

#### 4.4 Baseline Methods

We compare Calib-\* with standard baselines and the state-of-the-art confidence estimation methods:

**LLM Probabilities (LLM Prob.):** The conditional sequence probability  $P_\theta(y|x)$  of an answer  $y$  given an input  $x$ , according to the model parametrized by  $\theta$ .

**LLM Prob. + Platt scaling (PS):** This method applies Platt scaling (Platt, 1999) to the previous baseline. That is, two scalars  $a, b \in \mathcal{R}$  are used to scale the original LLM probability  $p$ :  $p_{ps} = \sigma(ap + b)$ , where  $\sigma$  is the sigmoid function. We obtain parameters  $a$  and  $b$  by minimizing the mean-squared error between model confidences and answer correctness.

**Verbalized confidences (Verbalized %) (Tian et al., 2023):** The probability of correctness expressed in models’ (text) responses given the Verb. prompts.

**APRICOT (Ulmer et al., 2024):** A recent method for calibrating LLMs. It consists of clustering related questions and measuring the per-cluster




Figure 2: Comparison of Calib-1 and Calib-n methods based on the number of wins across different loss functions for calibrating small (left) and large (right) LLMs.

accuracies given answers from a target LLM. Then the cluster accuracies are used as the references to train an auxiliary transformer model that outputs confidence values for the target LLM.

## 5 Results and Analysis

The detailed results (Table 1-8) indicate that no single method consistently outperforms all others across various models, datasets, and prompt configurations. Therefore, we first present the aggregated results, which summarize all the results, followed by a more detailed discussion.

### 5.1 Aggregated Result

**What is the best loss function for improving calibration?** In Fig. 2, we compare the performance of Calib-1 and Calib-n when optimizing with different loss functions. We observe that **FL loss wins in most settings**, followed by BCE loss. Additionally, we notice that BCE loss outperforms the FL loss when applied in the Calib-n method for large models.

**What is the best overall method?** Fig. 3a and 3b present the winning comparison results of (BCE)Calib-\* and (FL)Calib-\* methods against baseline methods respectively. The results demonstrate that Calib-\* methods gain more wins than baselines in both sub-figures. Verbalized confidences get the lowest number of wins. Applying Platt Scaling can further improve the calibration performance of LLM probabilities but this technique is not generalizable to enhance the calibration of Calib-n. Fig. 3a shows that (BCE)Calib-n gains the highest wins against the baseline methods. While (FL)Calib-1 accrues more wins in Fig. 3b. To identify the best method, we present Fig. 3c to compare the performance among our Calib-\*




Figure 3: The winning comparison results of different methods and prompts: 3a and 3b sub-figures present the superior results of Calib-\* methods using BCE and FL loss respectively when against baselines. 3c shows the comparison results among all Calib-\* methods, demonstrating that (FL)Calib-1 achieves the best overall performance. 3d compares the winning result among all prompt styles and shows that using few-shot prompts is the most beneficial.




Figure 4: The correlation between accuracies achieved by different configurations (i.e., prompts, models, datasets) and corresponding ECE scores evaluated on different methods. The line of Verbalized % is not continuous because it only applies to Verb. prompts and thus has fewer accuracy points than other methods. The result indicates that Calib-\* and APRICOT are robust to accuracy variations. Different methods achieve the lowest ECE scores in different accuracy ranges.

methods, demonstrating that **(FL)Calib-1 exhibits the best overall performance.**

**Which prompt style is most effective?** The differences in prompt styles are well-known for their impact on the performance of LLMs. Fig. 3d showcases that prompt styles can also impact calibration performance. The results indicate that **few-shot is the most beneficial prompt** contributing to the highest wins among all other prompt styles.

**Which calibration methods maintain robustness to accuracy variations?** Previous work (Zhang et al., 2024) reveals that confidence esti-

mation methods like LLM probabilities and Verbalized confidence excessively concentrate on a fixed range (tend to be overconfident) and remain unchanged regardless of the dataset’s complexity. To analyze this issue, we test all the confidence estimation methods with different datasets, prompts, and models. Each setting combination (e.g., using Zero-shot prompts to test the TriviaQA dataset on Gemma2-27b model) can result in one single accuracy value and multiple ECE scores—one for each confidence estimation method. We sort the accuracy values from all setting combinations and analyze the correlation between the accuracies and ECE scores. The results are presented in Fig. 4. We observe that ECE scores of LLM probabilities, LLM Prob.+PS, Verbalized confidences and (BCE)Calib-n+PS are highly correlated with accuracies, i.e., the ECE scores decrease when the accuracies get higher which verified the findings of Zhang et al. (2024). **APRICOT, Calib-1 and Calib-n are robust to the accuracy changes**, the ECE scores of these methods remain relatively stable across different accuracies. Verbalized confidence consistently shows the lowest performance across all accuracy levels.

**What is the best method for different accuracy levels?** The optimal goal of current state-of-the-art confidence estimation methods should not only focus on achieving a low calibration error at a narrow accuracy range but also analyze the performance of the method across different accuracy levels. We perform this analysis in Fig. 4. We observe that (FL)Calib-1 performs the best in low accuracy ranges up to 50%, and Calib-n+PS achieves the lowest ECE scores for accuracies between 50% and 70%. LLM Prob.+PS works the best for high accuracy (>70%) settings mainly be-

Method	Verb.				Zero-shot				CoT				Few-shot				
	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier ↓	AUC↑	ECE ↓	ECE-t↓	Brier ↓	AUC↑	ECE ↓	ECE-t↓	Brier ↓	AUC↑	ECE ↓	ECE-t↓	Brier ↓	AUC↑	
Gemma2-27b	LLM Prob.	0.445	0.249	0.417	0.704	0.447	0.255	0.419	0.713	0.395	0.268	0.392	0.671	0.235	0.184	0.308	0.584
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.282	0.052	0.293	0.690	0.276	0.064	0.288	0.713	0.226	0.059	0.283	0.672	0.133	0.011	0.264	0.584
	Verbalized %	0.512	0.187	0.471	0.685	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.111	0.094	0.228	0.607	0.110	0.115	0.232	0.627	0.087	0.077	0.226	0.678	0.092	0.090	0.235	0.678
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.066	0.068	0.220	0.596	0.064	0.066	0.223	0.590	0.046	0.045	0.224	0.666	0.146	0.147	0.232	0.717
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.069	0.066	0.212	0.648	0.056	0.041	0.216	0.651	0.095	0.081	0.226	0.695	0.088	0.067	0.220	0.713
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.202	0.062	0.255	0.637	0.198	0.046	0.257	0.651	0.170	0.076	0.255	0.695	0.103	0.122	0.241	0.713
	(FL)Calib-1	0.038	0.038	0.215	0.597	0.056	0.058	0.219	0.607	0.051	0.049	0.228	0.650	0.123	0.123	0.227	0.717
	(FL)Calib-n	0.083	0.083	0.217	0.642	0.070	0.057	0.219	0.645	0.084	0.083	0.226	0.692	0.085	0.080	0.220	0.710
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.203	0.057	0.254	0.642	0.191	0.056	0.255	0.645	0.167	0.079	0.254	0.692	0.101	0.120	0.241	0.710
Llama3-70b	LLM Prob.	0.445	0.302	0.430	0.712	0.458	0.259	0.426	0.747	0.412	0.251	0.416	0.612	0.336	0.117	0.364	0.532
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.355	0.113	0.350	0.703	0.266	0.132	0.291	0.747	0.224	0.023	0.289	0.612	0.224	0.009	0.298	0.532
	Verbalized %	0.406	0.084	0.380	0.698	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.137	0.130	0.255	0.596	0.111	0.116	0.239	0.635	0.114	0.117	0.244	0.656	0.106	0.068	0.236	0.683
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.075	0.071	0.231	0.610	0.066	0.067	0.225	0.641	0.066	0.045	0.232	0.662	0.119	0.121	0.232	0.709
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.058	0.062	0.223	0.644	0.040	0.025	0.215	0.670	0.096	0.088	0.229	0.690	0.061	0.062	0.213	0.730
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.171	0.038	0.255	0.632	0.179	0.050	0.256	0.670	0.163	0.081	0.256	0.690	0.134	0.107	0.238	0.730
	(FL)Calib-1	0.079	0.065	0.228	0.625	0.080	0.080	0.229	0.630	0.057	0.037	0.234	0.647	0.105	0.111	0.225	0.713
	(FL)Calib-n	0.080	0.093	0.228	0.638	0.040	0.022	0.215	0.675	0.096	0.095	0.231	0.686	0.066	0.058	0.216	0.725
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.182	0.046	0.259	0.638	0.176	0.060	0.254	0.675	0.168	0.070	0.258	0.686	0.134	0.110	0.240	0.725
Llama3.1-70b	LLM Prob.	0.301	0.231	0.326	0.704	0.308	0.237	0.326	0.722	0.274	0.221	0.330	0.619	0.172	0.098	0.266	0.640
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.254	0.116	0.293	0.690	0.236	0.066	0.279	0.722	0.195	0.023	0.275	0.619	0.135	0.064	0.258	0.640
	Verbalized %	0.435	0.122	0.405	0.711	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.120	0.115	0.248	0.621	0.080	0.078	0.239	0.635	0.083	0.080	0.230	0.688	0.097	0.075	0.234	0.687
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.130	0.123	0.249	0.602	0.089	0.088	0.244	0.580	0.073	0.058	0.211	0.733	0.105	0.102	0.221	0.726
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.062	0.055	0.224	0.656	0.058	0.047	0.230	0.637	0.049	0.054	0.211	0.730	0.081	0.080	0.217	0.719
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.157	0.015	0.258	0.606	0.143	0.078	0.254	0.637	0.138	0.121	0.246	0.730	0.084	0.099	0.237	0.719
	(FL)Calib-1	0.041	0.034	0.223	0.660	0.047	0.046	0.236	0.596	0.060	0.050	0.206	0.742	0.074	0.075	0.216	0.724
	(FL)Calib-n	0.077	0.079	0.227	0.657	0.055	0.049	0.229	0.643	0.055	0.053	0.210	0.732	0.068	0.072	0.217	0.714
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.169	0.051	0.257	0.657	0.147	0.060	0.255	0.643	0.142	0.117	0.248	0.732	0.092	0.104	0.238	0.714
Qwen2-72b	LLM Prob.	0.470	0.321	0.455	0.692	0.483	0.280	0.450	0.734	0.380	0.276	0.393	0.620	0.220	0.092	0.280	0.645
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.259	0.120	0.289	0.745	0.270	0.057	0.292	0.734	0.202	0.021	0.282	0.620	0.203	0.085	0.281	0.645
	Verbalized %	0.433	0.065	0.404	0.734	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.114	0.113	0.241	0.614	0.096	0.085	0.227	0.647	0.113	0.112	0.247	0.641	0.086	0.078	0.230	0.694
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.038	0.039	0.230	0.586	0.027	0.029	0.217	0.638	0.092	0.092	0.234	0.668	0.115	0.117	0.229	0.714
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.063	0.064	0.225	0.635	0.046	0.020	0.215	0.664	0.083	0.084	0.231	0.682	0.076	0.078	0.222	0.712
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.166	0.039	0.255	0.625	0.185	0.047	0.256	0.664	0.137	0.084	0.252	0.682	0.117	0.091	0.244	0.712
	(FL)Calib-1	0.051	0.050	0.231	0.595	0.031	0.020	0.219	0.627	0.077	0.084	0.230	0.671	0.089	0.087	0.223	0.712
	(FL)Calib-n	0.095	0.095	0.233	0.622	0.051	0.040	0.217	0.664	0.083	0.086	0.230	0.683	0.071	0.074	0.221	0.712
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.183	0.032	0.261	0.622	0.188	0.048	0.257	0.664	0.135	0.083	0.251	0.683	0.116	0.090	0.244	0.712
Mixtral-8x7b	LLM Prob.	0.513	0.269	0.479	0.703	0.412	0.155	0.401	0.637	0.452	0.270	0.447	0.627	0.369	0.075	0.380	0.574
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.264	0.015	0.292	0.653	0.233	0.066	0.290	0.637	0.245	0.013	0.305	0.627	0.141	0.001	0.267	0.574
	Verbalized %	0.472	0.167	0.447	0.655	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.124	0.120	0.247	0.602	0.092	0.088	0.239	0.646	0.115	0.113	0.252	0.620	0.161	0.070	0.263	0.640
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.040	0.031	0.224	0.605	0.037	0.037	0.225	0.658	0.082	0.083	0.249	0.607	0.145	0.097	0.269	0.618
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.082	0.061	0.227	0.619	0.032	0.021	0.229	0.634	0.064	0.068	0.241	0.631	0.085	0.085	0.230	0.686
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.188	0.022	0.260	0.610	0.143	0.070	0.255	0.634	0.116	0.060	0.254	0.631	0.101	0.078	0.244	0.686
	(FL)Calib-1	0.031	0.025	0.226	0.580	0.033	0.035	0.224	0.662	0.077	0.046	0.247	0.598	0.121	0.098	0.262	0.619
	(FL)Calib-n	0.093	0.083	0.231	0.618	0.024	0.025	0.227	0.643	0.078	0.076	0.242	0.631	0.072	0.077	0.230	0.682
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.183	0.034	0.256	0.618	0.147	0.074	0.255	0.643	0.129	0.054	0.257	0.631	0.104	0.068	0.244	0.682

Table 1: Test performance of our methods (Calib-\*) and baseline methods on NQ dataset using four different prompts (Verb., Zero-shot, CoT, Few-shot). Calib-n is trained with the responses of all LLMs in the table. Only Verb. prompt asks the LLM to provide a probability for a given answer and thus have the results for Verbalized % performance. We color the text with a scale normalized by the values gap in each column, with darker shades indicating better performance. The results of the other three datasets and seven models are shown in Appendix A.7.

cause LLM probabilities are usually overconfident.

## 5.2 Detailed Fraction Results

Table 1 presents the test results of our methods and baselines on the NQ dataset when evaluated on five large-size LLMs. We analyze the performance of all methods across prompts, models, and

evaluation metrics. The results reveal that the effectiveness of methods is highly influenced by the prompt styles and models. However, our proposed methods (Calib-\*) achieve better calibration than baselines on most prompts and models.

**Across Methods:** LLM probabilities and Verbalized confidence show poor performance, exhibit-




Figure 5: Reliability diagrams for our different methods using 10 bins each for Llama3.1-70b on NQ. The color and the percentage number within each bar present the proportion of total data samples contained in each bin. More figures of other models and datasets are shown in Appendix A.6.

ing high ECE, ECE-t, and Brier scores across all prompts. Adding Platt Scaling (LLM Prob.+PS) improves calibration but is still outperformed by our proposed Calib-\* methods. Among baselines, APRICOT performs better than Verbalized confidence, although it does not achieve the best results in most settings. Across all evaluation metrics, our Calib-\* methods outperform others. For example, (BCE)Calib-n achieves the lowest ECE and Brier scores, particularly with the CoT and few-shot prompts, e.g., ECE of 0.049 on Llama3.1-70b. PS only helps decrease the ECE-t scores but can not enhance overall performance, this is because PS is similar to ECE-t which is a posthoc method for scaling probabilities. **Across Prompts:** Calibration quality improves with few-shot and CoT prompts compared to the verb. and zero-shot prompts. For instance, (BCE)Calib-1 achieves an ECE-t of 0.045 with the CoT prompts compared to 0.068 with the verb. prompts on Gemma2-27b. **Across Models:** Larger models (e.g., Qwen2-72b and Llama3.1-70b) generally exhibit better calibration when using Calib-\* methods, reflecting their better alignment with calibration techniques. For instance, (FL)Calib-n+PS achieves an ECE of 0.071 on Qwen2-72b compared to 0.095 on smaller models like Mixtral-8x7b.

**Reliability diagrams analysis.** Fig. 5 shows that PS produces a narrow range of confidence scores, indicating limited diversity in the emitted confidence levels. LLM probabilities and Ver-

balized confidence often exhibit overconfidence, even when applied to datasets with low accuracy (<40%, reported in Fig. 8 in Appendix). In contrast, our Calib-\* methods show a more conservative approach, aligning their confidence levels more closely with the true accuracy of the model, reflecting improved calibration and reliability.

## 6 Conclusion

Previous studies (Ulmer et al., 2024; Tian et al., 2023) have assessed calibration methods within limited settings, overlooking their generalization across diverse model sizes and prompt styles. This study addresses this limitation by conducting experiments on 12 LLMs with parameters ranging from 2B-72B and four prompt styles. We also comprehensively analyze the influence of response agreement and loss functions in LLM calibration. Experimental results show that both response agreement and FL loss enhance calibration from baselines, with (FL)Calib-1 achieving the best performance. We also find that few-shot prompts improve LLM accuracy and calibration, and auxiliary-based methods show robust performance across diverse settings—maintaining stable calibration regardless of accuracy levels. These findings highlight the effectiveness of various calibration strategies and encourage future methods to re-evaluate the importance of our explored factors for achieving reliable confidence estimation.



## 7 Limitations

Although our work covers a wide range of factors, there are potentially more factors worth exploring. For example, we analyze a wide range of prompt types, including Few-shot and Chain-of-Thought, the influence of fine-grained prompt variations or automatically generated prompts remains unexplored. The interplay between prompt engineering and calibration could warrant deeper investigation.

Our study focuses on calibration performance metrics like ECE, ECE-t, and Brier scores. While these metrics are widely used, they may not fully capture all aspects of calibration quality, such as user-perceived confidence or task-specific utility.

Existing works use various ways of determining the accuracy of LLM generations. For instance, some works (Tian et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024) use LLMs as a Judge, other works (Ulmer et al., 2024; Xiong et al., 2024) use certain metrics such as extract match or ROUGE score. While the optimal solution is underexplored, we choose the more commonly used and cost-efficient method.

Future work can address these limitations by testing broader LLMs and tasks, automating prompt optimization, and developing hybrid approaches that adapt to varying accuracy levels and application constraints.

## 8 Acknowledgments

This research has been funded by the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF)[10.47379/VRG19008] "Knowledge infused Deep Learning for Natural Language Processing".

## References

Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Hany Awadalla, Ahmed Awadallah, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Jianmin Bao, Harkirat Behl, Alon Benhaim, Misha Bilenko, Johan Bjorck, Sébastien Bubeck, Martin Cai, Qin Cai, Vishrav Chaudhary, Dong Chen, Dongdong Chen, Weizhu Chen, Yen-Chun Chen, Yi-Ling Chen, Hao Cheng, Parul Chopra, Xiyang Dai, Matthew Dixon, Ronen Eldan, Victor Fragoso, Jianfeng Gao, Mei Gao, Min Gao, Amit Garg, Allie Del Giorno, Abhishek Goswami, Suriya Gunasekar, Emman Haider, Junheng Hao, Russell J. Hewett, Wenxiang Hu, Jamie Huynh, Dan Iter, Sam Ade Jacobs, Mojan Javaheripi, Xin Jin, Nikos Karampatziakis, Piero Kauffmann, Mahoud Khademi, Dongwoo Kim, Young Jin Kim, Lev Kurilenko, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi

Li, Yunsheng Li, Chen Liang, Lars Liden, Xihui Lin, Zeqi Lin, Ce Liu, Liyuan Liu, Mengchen Liu, Weishung Liu, Xiaodong Liu, Chong Luo, Piyush Madan, Ali Mahmoudzadeh, David Majercak, Matt Mazzola, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Arindam Mitra, Hardik Modi, Anh Nguyen, Brandon Norick, Barun Patra, Daniel Perez-Becker, Thomas Portet, Reid Pryzant, Heyang Qin, Marko Radmilac, Liliang Ren, Gustavo de Rosa, Corby Rosset, Sambudha Roy, Olatunji Ruwase, Olli Saarikivi, Amin Saied, Adil Salim, Michael Santacrose, Shital Shah, Ning Shang, Hiteshi Sharma, Yelong Shen, Swadheen Shukla, Xia Song, Masahiro Tanaka, Andrea Tupini, Praneetha Vaddamanu, Chunyu Wang, Guanhua Wang, Lijuan Wang, Shuohang Wang, Xin Wang, Yu Wang, Rachel Ward, Wen Wen, Philipp Witte, Haiping Wu, Xiaoxia Wu, Michael Wyatt, Bin Xiao, Can Xu, Jiahang Xu, Weijian Xu, Jilong Xue, Sonali Yadav, Fan Yang, Jianwei Yang, Yifan Yang, Ziyi Yang, Donghan Yu, Lu Yuan, Chenruidong Zhang, Cyril Zhang, Jianwan Zhang, Li Lyna Zhang, Yi Zhang, Yue Zhang, Yunan Zhang, and Xiren Zhou. 2024. [Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.14219.

Glenn W. Brier. 1950. [Verification of forecasts expressed in terms of probability](#). *Monthly Weather Review*, 78(1):1 – 3.

Banghao Chen, Zhaofeng Zhang, Nicolas Langrené, and Shengxin Zhu. 2024. [Unleashing the potential of prompt engineering in large language models: a comprehensive review](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.14735.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. [BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). *CoRR*, abs/1810.04805.

Yonatan Geifman and Ran El-Yaniv. 2017. [Selective classification for deep neural networks](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.

Jiahui Geng, Fengyu Cai, Yuxia Wang, Heinz Koepl, Preslav Nakov, and Iryna Gurevych. 2024. A survey of confidence estimation and calibration in 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 6577–6595.

Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong,

Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Alonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, Danny Wyatt, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Govind Thattai, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Milon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jack Zhang, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Jun-teng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Karthik Prasad, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhalla, Kushal Lakhotia, Lauren Rantala-Yearly, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Pasupuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Maria Tsimpoukelli, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kam-bador, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Ning Zhang, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Çelebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Prajjwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan, Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohan Maheswari, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shaoliang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Rapparthi, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stephane Collot, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Tarek Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gouget, Virginie Do, Vish Vogeti, Vitor Albiero, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyan Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xide Xia, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuwei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie Delpierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papakipos, Aaditya Singh, Aayushi Srivastava, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld,

Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Amos Teo, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Dong, Annie Franco, Anuj Goyal, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Bharambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhardi, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence, Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Ce Liu, Changhan Wang, Changkyu Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Cynthia Gao, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymer, Daniel Li, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovich, Didem Foss, Dingkang Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn, Emily Wood, Eric-Tuan Le, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun, Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Filippos Kokkinos, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Swee, Gil Halpern, Grant Herman, Grigory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hakan Inan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Hongyuan Zhan, Ibrahim Damlaj, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Ilias Leontiadis, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Janice Lam, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul, Jessica Zhong, Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Kartikay Khandelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kiran Jagadeesh, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian Khabsa, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Miao Liu, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Hermoso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Munish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Egebo, Nicolas Usunier, Nikhil Mehta, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pavan Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr

- Dollar, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratanchandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Rangaprabhu Parthasarathy, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Russ Howes, Ruty Rinott, Sachin Mehta, Sachin Siby, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Mahajan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lindsay, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shishir Patil, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agarwal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Summer Deng, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury, Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Koehler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaocheng Tang, Xiaojian Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yaniv Kleinman, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yu Zhao, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yunlu Li, Yuzi He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosnbrick, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, Zhiwei Zhao, and Zhiyu Ma. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. 2017a. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML'17*, page 1321–1330. JMLR.org.
- Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. 2017b. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L el io Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th eophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth ee Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2024. [Mixtral of experts](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.04088.
- 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.
- Matt Gardner Johannes Welbl, Nelson F. Liu. 2017. Crowdsourcing multiple choice science questions. *arXiv:1707.06209v1*.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611.
- Jaeyoung Kim, Dongbin Na, Sungchul Choi, and Sungbin Lim. 2023. [Bag of tricks for in-distribution calibration of pretrained transformers](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2023*, pages 551–563, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Seungone Kim, Juyoung Suk, Shayne Longpre, Bill Yuchen Lin, Jamin Shin, Sean Welleck, Graham Neubig, Moontae Lee, Kyungjae Lee, and Minjoon Seo. 2024. [Prometheus 2: An open source language model specialized in evaluating other language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.01535.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, et al. 2019. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:453–466.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022. Teaching models to express their uncertainty in words. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Doll ar. 2020. [Focal loss for dense object detection](#). *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 42(2):318–327.
- Xin Liu, Muhammad Khalifa, and Lu Wang. 2024. [Litcab: Lightweight language model calibration over short- and long-form responses](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. ICLR.
- Sewon Min, Xinxu Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work? In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11048–11064.
- Jooyoung Moon, Jihyo Kim, Younghak Shin, and Sangheum Hwang. 2020. [Confidence-aware learning for deep neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7034–7044. PMLR.
- Jishnu Mukhoti, Viveka Kulharia, Amartya Sanyal, Stuart Golodetz, Philip Torr, and Puneet Dokania. 2020. Calibrating deep neural networks using focal loss. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15288–15299.

- Shiyu Ni, Keping Bi, Lulu Yu, and Jiafeng Guo. 2024. [Are large language models more honest in their probabilistic or verbalized confidence?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.09773.
- John Platt. 1999. Probabilistic outputs for support vector machines and comparisons to regularized likelihood methods. *Advances in Large Margin Classifiers*, 10(3):61–74.
- Inioluwa Deborah Raji, Andrew Smart, Rebecca N White, Margaret Mitchell, Timnit Gebru, Ben Hutchinson, Jamila Smith-Loud, Daniel Theron, and Parker Barnes. 2020. Closing the ai accountability gap: Defining an end-to-end framework for internal algorithmic auditing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pages 33–44.
- Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, Johan Ferret, Peter Liu, Pouya Tafti, Abe Friesen, Michelle Casbon, Sabela Ramos, Ravin Kumar, Charline Le Lan, Sammy Jerome, Anton Tsitsulin, Nino Vieillard, Piotr Stanczyk, Sertan Girgin, Nikola Momchev, Matt Hoffman, Shantanu Thakoor, Jean-Bastien Grill, Behnam Neyshabur, Olivier Bachem, Alanna Walton, Aliaksei Severyn, Alicia Parrish, Aliya Ahmad, Allen Hutchison, Alvin Abdagic, Amanda Carl, Amy Shen, Andy Brock, Andy Coenen, Anthony Laforge, Antonia Paterson, Ben Bastian, Bilal Piot, Bo Wu, Brandon Royal, Charlie Chen, Chintu Kumar, Chris Perry, Chris Welty, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Danila Sinopalnikov, David Weinberger, Dimple Vijaykumar, Dominika Rogozińska, Dustin Herbison, Elisa Bandy, Emma Wang, Eric Noland, Erica Moreira, Evan Senter, Evgenii Eltyshv, Francesco Visin, Gabriel Rasskin, Gary Wei, Glenn Cameron, Gus Martins, Hadi Hashemi, Hanna Klimczak-Plucińska, Harleen Batra, Harsh Dhand, Ivan Nardini, Jacinda Mein, Jack Zhou, James Svensson, Jeff Stanway, Jetha Chan, Jin Peng Zhou, Joana Carrasqueira, Joana Iljazi, Jocelyn Becker, Joe Fernandez, Joost van Amersfoort, Josh Gordon, Josh Lipschultz, Josh Newlan, Ju yeong Ji, Kareem Mohamed, Kartikeya Badola, Kat Black, Katie Millican, Keelin McDonnell, Kelvin Nguyen, Kiranbir Sodhia, Kish Greene, Lars Lowe Sjoesund, Lauren Usui, Laurent Sifre, Lena Heuermann, Leticia Lago, Lilly McNealus, Livio Baldini Soares, Logan Kilpatrick, Lucas Dixon, Luciano Martins, Machel Reid, Manvinder Singh, Mark Iverson, Martin Görner, Mat Velloso, Mateo Wirth, Matt Davidow, Matt Miller, Matthew Rahtz, Matthew Watson, Meg Risdal, Mehran Kazemi, Michael Moynihan, Ming Zhang, Minsuk Kahng, Minwoo Park, Mofi Rahman, Mohit Khatwani, Natalie Dao, Nenshad Bardoliwalla, Nesh Devanathan, Neta Dumai, Nilay Chauhan, Oscar Wahltinez, Pankil Botarda, Parker Barnes, Paul Barham, Paul Michel, Pengchong Jin, Petko Georgiev, Phil Culliton, Pradeep Kuppala, Ramona Comanescu, Ramona Merhej, Reena Jana, Reza Ardeshir Rokni, Rishabh Agarwal, Ryan Mullins, Samaneh Saadat, Sara Mc Carthy, Sarah Cogan, Sarah Perrin, Sébastien M. R. Arnold, Sebastian Krause, Shengyang Dai, Shruti Garg, Shruti Sheth, Sue Ronstrom, Susan Chan, Timothy Jordan, Ting Yu, Tom Eccles, Tom Hennigan, Tomas Kocisky, Tulsee Doshi, Vihan Jain, Vikas Yadav, Vilobh Meshram, Vishal Dharmadhikari, Warren Barkley, Wei Wei, Wenming Ye, Woohyun Han, Woosuk Kwon, Xiang Xu, Zhe Shen, Zhitao Gong, Zichuan Wei, Victor Cotruta, Phoebe Kirk, Anand Rao, Minh Giang, Ludovic Peran, Tris Warkentin, Eli Collins, Joelle Barral, Zoubin Ghahramani, Raia Hadsell, D. Sculley, Jeanine Banks, Anca Dragan, Slav Petrov, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Clement Farabet, Elena Buchatskaya, Sebastian Borgeaud, Noah Fiedel, Armand Joulin, Kathleen Kenealy, Robert Dadashi, and Alek Andreev. 2024. [Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.00118.
- Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Allan Zhou, Archit Sharma, Rafael Rafailov, Huaxiu Yao, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher Manning. 2023. [Just ask for calibration: Strategies for eliciting calibrated confidence scores from language models fine-tuned with human feedback.](#) In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5433–5442, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Dennis Ulmer, Martin Gubri, Hwaran Lee, Sangdoon Yun, and Seong Oh. 2024. [Calibrating large language models using their generations only.](#) In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15440–15459, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lean Wang, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Hao Zhou,

- Fandong Meng, Jie Zhou, and Xu Sun. 2023. Label words are anchors: An information flow perspective for understanding in-context learning. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9840–9855.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Miao Xiong, Zhiyuan Hu, Xinyang Lu, Yifei Li, Jie Fu, Junxian He, and Bryan Hooi. 2024. [Can llms express their uncertainty? an empirical evaluation of confidence elicitation in llms](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.13063.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jianxin Yang, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Xuejing Liu, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhifang Guo, and Zhihao Fan. 2024. [Qwen2 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.10671.
- Yi Yang, Wen-tau Yih, and Christopher Meek. 2015. [WikiQA: A challenge dataset for open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2013–2018, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhuoning Yuan, Yan Yan, Milan Sonka, and Tianbao Yang. 2021. Large-scale robust deep auc maximization: A new surrogate loss and empirical studies on medical image classification. In *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 3020–3029.
- Min Zhang, Jianfeng He, Taoran Ji, and Chang-Tien Lu. 2024. [Don't go to extremes: Revealing the excessive sensitivity and calibration limitations of LLMs in implicit hate speech detection](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12073–12086, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Prompts for target LLM

#### A.1.1 Verb. prompt

Provide your best guess and the probability that it is correct (0.0 to 1.0) for the following question. Give ONLY the guess and probability, no other words or explanation. For example: \n\n Guess: <most likely guess, as short as possible; not a complete sentence, just the guess!>\n "Probability: <the probability between 0.0 and 1.0 that your guess is correct, without any extra commentary whatsoever; just the probability!>\n\n The question is: [Question]

#### A.1.2 Zero-shot prompt

Provide your best guess for the following question. Give ONLY the guess, no other words or explanations, as short as possible; not a complete sentence, just the guess! \n\n The question is: [Question]

#### A.1.3 CoT prompt

Briefly answer the following question by thinking step by step. Give the final answer (start with 'Answer: ' ) with minimal words at the end. \n\n The question is: [Question]

#### A.1.4 Few-shot prompt

user: [Question 1] assistant: [Target 1]  
user: [Question 2] assistant: [Target 2]  
...  
user: [Question 6] assistant: [Target 6]  
user: [Question] assistant:

### A.2 Prompt for Judge

Task Description: \n An instruction (might include an Input inside it), a response to evaluate, a reference answer that gets a score of 1, and a score rubric representing a evaluation criteria are given.

1. Write detailed feedback that assesses the quality of the response strictly based on the given score rubric, not evaluating in general.

2. After writing feedback, write a score that is an integer between 0 and 1. You should refer to the score rubric.

3. The output format should look as follows: "Feedback: (write a feedback for criteria) [RESULT] (an integer number between 0 and 1)"

4. Please do not generate any other opening, closing, and explanations.

The instruction to evaluate:[Question]

Response to evaluate: [LLM Answer]

Reference Answer (Score 1): [Target]

Score Rubrics:\n Score 0: the response and reference answer to the instruction are not semantically equivalent.\n Score 1: the response and reference answer to the instruction are semantically equivalent.

Feedback:

### A.3 Technical Details

After a grid search of hyperparameters, we trained our auxiliary models (BERT-base, 110M parameters) using a learning rate of  $1e-5$  and a batch size of 16 for five epochs. All experiments, including LLM inferences, are performed on a maximum of 2 NVIDIA H100 GPUs. The training time for one epoch of 2k samples is around 200 seconds on one GPU, this time can be different depends on the dataset size and number of joint LLMs in training.

### A.4 Aggregated Results Across Different Configurations

Fig. 6 shows the calibration performances of different methods across different configurations such as prompt styles, model sizes and datasets. We observe that the best method is highly dependent on these factors.

**Prompt specific performance.** The first row of Fig. 6 presents the prompt specific performance for different methods. We observe that Calib-n always




Figure 6: Performance Comparison results of different methods against baselines across three setting configurations (prompt styles, model sizes and datasets).

outperforms Calib-1 across different prompt styles when both are optimized with BCE loss. When FL loss is applied, Calib-n only outperforms Calib-1 in few-shot prompts. We hypothesize that the longer LLM answers generated with few-shot prompts usually lead to higher response agreement and thus enhance the performance of Calib-n.

**Model size specific performance.** The second row of Fig. 6 presents the model-size specific performance for different methods. We find that Calib-n outperforms Calib-1 on large-size models. However, (FL)Calib-1 performs better for small-size models. We also observe that the best method is model size dependent.

**Dataset specific performance.** The second row of Fig. 6 presents the dataset specific performance for different methods. (BCE)Calib-n consistently achieves better performances than (BCE)Calib-1 over all datasets. In contrast, (FL)Calib-1 always outperform (FL)Calib-n.

## A.5 Accuracy Statistics of LLMs

We present Fig. 7 and 8 to demonstrate the accuracy performance of LLMs across different prompts and datasets. Large size models typically yield better performance than small size models. Few shot prompts improve the performance more than other

prompt styles. Most LLMs achieve their highest accuracy on the Sciq dataset, while the NQ dataset proves to be the most challenging.

## A.6 Reliability Diagrams

Similar to Fig. 5, Fig. 9-11 show the reliability diagrams of other three datasets for Llama3.1-70 with Verb. prompts. We find that for high accuracy (>50%) datasets (TriviaQA and Sciq), Calib-\* using BCE and FL loss is less conservative and more likely to predict high confidence.

## A.7 Detailed Results of LLM Calibration

Similar to Table 1, Table 2-8 show the rest of the detailed calibration results of different methods.




Figure 7: Model performance ranking across different datasets, performance is averaged over four prompt styles.




Figure 8: Model performance across different prompts and datasets




Figure 9: Reliability diagrams for Llama3.1-70b on TriviaQA with Verb. prompts.






Figure 10: Reliability diagrams for Llama3.1-70b on SciQ with Verb. prompts.




Figure 11: Reliability diagrams for Llama3.1-70b on WikiQA with Verb. prompts.

Method	Verb.				Zero-shot				CoT				Few-shot				
	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	
Llama2-7b	LLM Prob.	0.437	0.239	0.401	0.737	0.296	0.170	0.291	0.746	0.314	0.180	0.324	0.693	0.419	0.042	0.400	0.643
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.256	0.065	0.299	0.613	0.246	0.092	0.266	0.746	0.165	0.113	0.261	0.708	0.249	0.054	0.295	0.643
	Verblized %	0.395	0.049	0.384	0.618	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.140	0.087	0.236	0.685	0.146	0.109	0.232	0.658	0.141	0.122	0.253	0.673	0.118	0.073	0.232	0.667
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.179	0.180	0.267	0.636	0.163	0.165	0.257	0.620	0.239	0.238	0.302	0.599	0.328	0.201	0.326	0.693
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.259	0.250	0.308	0.610	0.256	0.256	0.298	0.635	0.226	0.222	0.298	0.634	0.251	0.202	0.286	0.717
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.092	0.036	0.227	0.664	0.117	0.045	0.234	0.612	0.089	0.080	0.252	0.617	0.116	0.093	0.228	0.679
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.124	0.091	0.240	0.637	0.102	0.085	0.225	0.632	0.098	0.076	0.245	0.654	0.093	0.081	0.216	0.705
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.134	0.032	0.246	0.629	0.178	0.037	0.249	0.632	0.099	0.056	0.246	0.654	0.162	0.065	0.242	0.705
	(FL)Calib-1	0.073	0.041	0.227	0.652	0.084	0.051	0.223	0.606	0.091	0.086	0.254	0.602	0.086	0.078	0.221	0.683
	(FL)Calib-n	0.121	0.093	0.243	0.617	0.098	0.079	0.226	0.620	0.093	0.065	0.241	0.662	0.098	0.080	0.216	0.702
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.138	0.034	0.249	0.617	0.156	0.030	0.243	0.620	0.105	0.068	0.245	0.662	0.164	0.067	0.241	0.702
Llama3-8b	LLM Prob.	0.274	0.165	0.277	0.751	0.336	0.222	0.325	0.739	0.246	0.181	0.296	0.638	0.251	0.048	0.286	0.691
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.192	0.037	0.279	0.623	0.188	0.129	0.264	0.739	0.130	0.058	0.254	0.638	0.160	0.073	0.264	0.691
	Verblized %	0.385	0.089	0.381	0.642	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.172	0.089	0.259	0.663	0.152	0.140	0.257	0.661	0.169	0.127	0.263	0.657	0.131	0.073	0.240	0.701
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.248	0.235	0.302	0.636	0.277	0.254	0.316	0.609	0.250	0.229	0.308	0.591	0.198	0.153	0.251	0.727
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.239	0.176	0.288	0.665	0.248	0.206	0.304	0.629	0.220	0.223	0.289	0.635	0.257	0.208	0.275	0.757
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.123	0.098	0.252	0.637	0.124	0.086	0.256	0.626	0.127	0.083	0.264	0.606	0.095	0.068	0.217	0.738
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.168	0.070	0.256	0.676	0.148	0.073	0.261	0.649	0.140	0.079	0.260	0.647	0.060	0.049	0.209	0.741
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.100	0.051	0.243	0.635	0.088	0.052	0.244	0.649	0.068	0.048	0.237	0.647	0.100	0.111	0.233	0.741
	(FL)Calib-1	0.090	0.076	0.238	0.660	0.112	0.098	0.252	0.626	0.102	0.081	0.258	0.603	0.075	0.047	0.212	0.740
	(FL)Calib-n	0.165	0.070	0.268	0.618	0.149	0.075	0.260	0.640	0.135	0.058	0.255	0.655	0.052	0.049	0.208	0.743
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.094	0.034	0.245	0.618	0.080	0.048	0.243	0.640	0.071	0.054	0.237	0.655	0.108	0.109	0.232	0.743
Llama3-1-8b	LLM Prob.	0.255	0.129	0.256	0.786	0.167	0.127	0.234	0.750	0.298	0.154	0.315	0.685	0.107	0.037	0.204	0.774
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.223	0.050	0.286	0.610	0.169	0.140	0.237	0.810	0.209	0.053	0.277	0.685	0.158	0.117	0.238	0.775
	Verblized %	0.440	0.175	0.429	0.604	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.154	0.122	0.245	0.661	0.126	0.066	0.226	0.725	0.115	0.061	0.207	0.771	0.119	0.089	0.232	0.703
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.251	0.251	0.292	0.687	0.256	0.260	0.291	0.699	0.236	0.166	0.245	0.789	0.126	0.137	0.201	0.778
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.203	0.189	0.258	0.705	0.215	0.186	0.268	0.706	0.190	0.165	0.240	0.733	0.255	0.203	0.255	0.780
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.107	0.083	0.220	0.692	0.121	0.134	0.237	0.703	0.083	0.057	0.178	0.806	0.062	0.067	0.187	0.777
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.126	0.069	0.226	0.704	0.127	0.063	0.232	0.723	0.074	0.042	0.197	0.779	0.041	0.038	0.185	0.783
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.146	0.060	0.244	0.643	0.119	0.122	0.238	0.723	0.176	0.140	0.234	0.779	0.135	0.155	0.224	0.783
	(FL)Calib-1	0.096	0.089	0.217	0.686	0.088	0.112	0.225	0.708	0.065	0.047	0.180	0.796	0.055	0.052	0.189	0.772
	(FL)Calib-n	0.117	0.070	0.238	0.640	0.122	0.077	0.231	0.720	0.084	0.053	0.193	0.790	0.042	0.032	0.186	0.780
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.148	0.057	0.244	0.640	0.116	0.117	0.240	0.720	0.178	0.157	0.234	0.790	0.137	0.152	0.224	0.780
Gemma2-2b	LLM Prob.	0.185	0.114	0.209	0.801	0.195	0.111	0.211	0.822	0.142	0.107	0.222	0.751	0.209	0.225	0.303	0.620
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.272	0.025	0.286	0.635	0.244	0.140	0.253	0.822	0.203	0.099	0.250	0.751	0.155	0.025	0.260	0.620
	Verblized %	0.526	0.099	0.493	0.667	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.150	0.073	0.221	0.691	0.143	0.129	0.236	0.658	0.148	0.097	0.232	0.685	0.145	0.093	0.247	0.671
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.189	0.203	0.268	0.637	0.208	0.208	0.273	0.633	0.206	0.216	0.280	0.654	0.291	0.205	0.317	0.677
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.240	0.251	0.296	0.644	0.269	0.270	0.311	0.637	0.251	0.234	0.303	0.672	0.394	0.303	0.393	0.690
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.120	0.081	0.221	0.635	0.103	0.070	0.226	0.639	0.114	0.046	0.226	0.671	0.092	0.101	0.233	0.665
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.094	0.099	0.213	0.653	0.104	0.094	0.227	0.629	0.073	0.074	0.213	0.687	0.128	0.106	0.240	0.685
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.184	0.052	0.242	0.651	0.185	0.037	0.253	0.629	0.176	0.081	0.249	0.687	0.163	0.066	0.257	0.685
	(FL)Calib-1	0.049	0.027	0.203	0.658	0.068	0.049	0.219	0.637	0.067	0.035	0.216	0.680	0.084	0.090	0.238	0.645
	(FL)Calib-n	0.088	0.072	0.211	0.644	0.098	0.096	0.227	0.621	0.065	0.062	0.209	0.697	0.129	0.105	0.240	0.683
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.195	0.055	0.246	0.644	0.178	0.033	0.248	0.621	0.160	0.082	0.244	0.697	0.162	0.067	0.257	0.683
Gemma2-9b	LLM Prob.	0.244	0.180	0.265	0.767	0.276	0.207	0.289	0.762	0.217	0.165	0.269	0.688	0.176	0.177	0.260	0.589
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.126	0.042	0.260	0.679	0.177	0.119	0.258	0.762	0.120	0.072	0.245	0.689	0.042	0.039	0.225	0.589
	Verblized %	0.406	0.118	0.395	0.697	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.168	0.106	0.264	0.675	0.183	0.144	0.279	0.633	0.179	0.142	0.271	0.655	0.164	0.111	0.246	0.661
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.248	0.210	0.310	0.590	0.247	0.228	0.304	0.603	0.238	0.239	0.298	0.604	0.160	0.164	0.240	0.670
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.284	0.193	0.327	0.604	0.266	0.205	0.315	0.617	0.218	0.225	0.289	0.635	0.266	0.229	0.283	0.685
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.146	0.106	0.268	0.606	0.101	0.097	0.258	0.598	0.090	0.053	0.249	0.613	0.099	0.087	0.225	0.652
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.230	0.078	0.304	0.609	0.176	0.088	0.279	0.618	0.145	0.080	0.260	0.648	0.068	0.078	0.218	0.679
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.048	0.039	0.241	0.625	0.069	0.038	0.243	0.618	0.056	0.054	0.237	0.648	0.035	0.037	0.218	0.679
	(FL)Calib-1	0.126	0.102	0.264	0.600	0.102	0.103	0.258	0.602	0.090	0.074	0.251	0.621	0.098	0.073	0.224	0.657
	(FL)Calib-n	0.224	0.061	0.299	0.609	0.175	0.082	0.279	0.610	0.141	0.061	0.256	0.653	0.070	0.079	0.218	0.678
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.039	0.039	0.243	0.609	0.082	0.043	0.244	0.610	0.067	0.048	0.238	0.653	0.034	0.034	0.218	0.678
Phi3-4b	LLM Prob.	0.331	0.140	0.287	0.832	0.321	0.137	0.277	0.832	0.301	0.155	0.289	0.776	0.135	0.041	0.233	0.674
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.273	0.051	0.266	0.801	0.232	0.177	0.266	0.832	0.223	0.135	0.267	0.776	0.212	0.040	0.272	0.674
	Verblized %	0.472	0.066	0.437	0.753	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.139	0.068	0.205	0.728	0.125	0.114	0.226	0.712	0.164	0.116	0.249	0.674	0.			

Method	Verb.				Zero-shot				CoT				Few-shot				
	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	
Gemma2-27b	LLM Prob.	0.294	0.251	0.308	0.700	0.315	0.227	0.312	0.729	0.257	0.254	0.307	0.593	0.136	0.173	0.226	0.563
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.100	0.016	0.249	0.679	0.144	0.091	0.250	0.729	0.087	0.018	0.242	0.594	0.013	0.020	0.200	0.563
	Verblized %	0.347	0.122	0.345	0.689	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.195	0.168	0.288	0.605	0.183	0.152	0.277	0.622	0.175	0.133	0.268	0.639	0.096	0.095	0.209	0.637
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.243	0.209	0.302	0.596	0.217	0.204	0.295	0.588	0.242	0.203	0.298	0.587	0.171	0.152	0.241	0.630
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.304	0.219	0.337	0.589	0.284	0.220	0.321	0.604	0.261	0.213	0.310	0.585	0.217	0.211	0.241	0.626
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.135	0.104	0.262	0.625	0.107	0.109	0.259	0.594	0.097	0.081	0.252	0.591	0.098	0.085	0.207	0.621
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.163	0.114	0.270	0.598	0.120	0.098	0.257	0.603	0.102	0.097	0.250	0.591	0.107	0.101	0.212	0.605
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.018	0.029	0.240	0.594	0.055	0.033	0.244	0.603	0.022	0.007	0.236	0.591	0.048	0.012	0.201	0.605
	(FL)Calib-1	0.118	0.059	0.254	0.621	0.111	0.093	0.258	0.593	0.080	0.049	0.240	0.589	0.095	0.053	0.206	0.614
	(FL)Calib-n	0.162	0.122	0.275	0.593	0.105	0.077	0.250	0.623	0.109	0.097	0.251	0.594	0.121	0.109	0.216	0.601
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.031	0.015	0.240	0.593	0.042	0.042	0.242	0.623	0.013	0.012	0.235	0.594	0.051	0.016	0.201	0.601	
Llama3-70b	LLM Prob.	0.308	0.278	0.324	0.659	0.308	0.295	0.327	0.649	0.254	0.230	0.289	0.569	0.149	0.095	0.227	0.601
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.109	0.091	0.239	0.665	0.098	0.040	0.241	0.649	0.048	0.002	0.225	0.569	0.028	0.029	0.207	0.601
	Verblized %	0.282	0.069	0.298	0.673	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.178	0.150	0.278	0.589	0.176	0.134	0.279	0.593	0.184	0.124	0.267	0.610	0.118	0.094	0.213	0.677
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.244	0.219	0.306	0.575	0.209	0.172	0.285	0.611	0.210	0.179	0.286	0.577	0.145	0.154	0.210	0.680
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.314	0.210	0.344	0.578	0.283	0.190	0.318	0.611	0.282	0.227	0.311	0.570	0.147	0.149	0.204	0.706
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.113	0.084	0.252	0.595	0.114	0.101	0.252	0.614	0.137	0.098	0.254	0.559	0.081	0.062	0.194	0.697
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.176	0.124	0.277	0.590	0.148	0.087	0.262	0.608	0.121	0.107	0.247	0.578	0.123	0.072	0.209	0.693
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.021	0.001	0.234	0.596	0.030	0.029	0.233	0.608	0.023	0.036	0.223	0.578	0.101	0.077	0.202	0.693
	(FL)Calib-1	0.098	0.104	0.257	0.571	0.123	0.088	0.254	0.609	0.124	0.099	0.255	0.573	0.095	0.062	0.199	0.687
	(FL)Calib-n	0.180	0.126	0.282	0.584	0.138	0.061	0.253	0.625	0.136	0.092	0.251	0.578	0.139	0.063	0.214	0.692
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.012	0.010	0.234	0.584	0.039	0.042	0.232	0.625	0.028	0.031	0.223	0.578	0.108	0.073	0.203	0.692	
Llama3.1-70b	LLM Prob.	0.203	0.215	0.271	0.659	0.212	0.234	0.267	0.670	0.168	0.150	0.254	0.619	0.065	0.064	0.172	0.716
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.163	0.096	0.262	0.657	0.073	0.046	0.225	0.670	0.039	0.048	0.224	0.619	0.105	0.087	0.188	0.716
	Verblized %	0.306	0.131	0.311	0.661	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.149	0.123	0.261	0.611	0.164	0.134	0.266	0.605	0.161	0.109	0.244	0.653	0.087	0.082	0.183	0.692
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.206	0.195	0.278	0.609	0.216	0.201	0.283	0.587	0.219	0.188	0.272	0.596	0.113	0.120	0.177	0.714
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.310	0.225	0.340	0.585	0.294	0.223	0.327	0.586	0.269	0.229	0.307	0.572	0.157	0.162	0.195	0.725
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.066	0.067	0.244	0.583	0.070	0.053	0.236	0.592	0.047	0.027	0.225	0.620	0.072	0.072	0.179	0.710
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.172	0.129	0.274	0.590	0.147	0.106	0.266	0.583	0.100	0.094	0.245	0.591	0.068	0.065	0.178	0.715
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.010	0.011	0.237	0.584	0.031	0.001	0.233	0.583	0.004	0.004	0.228	0.591	0.115	0.096	0.191	0.715
	(FL)Calib-1	0.055	0.064	0.241	0.602	0.092	0.090	0.248	0.580	0.048	0.033	0.225	0.624	0.042	0.053	0.181	0.708
	(FL)Calib-n	0.177	0.125	0.278	0.586	0.135	0.092	0.261	0.592	0.110	0.083	0.246	0.603	0.067	0.063	0.181	0.714
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.001	0.001	0.236	0.586	0.024	0.006	0.232	0.592	0.022	0.014	0.227	0.603	0.126	0.098	0.192	0.714	
Qwen2-72b	LLM Prob.	0.305	0.253	0.316	0.708	0.341	0.261	0.340	0.697	0.228	0.222	0.282	0.603	0.074	0.062	0.207	0.661
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.116	0.053	0.242	0.682	0.137	0.056	0.253	0.697	0.068	0.046	0.231	0.603	0.067	0.053	0.209	0.661
	Verblized %	0.314	0.077	0.317	0.684	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.194	0.156	0.281	0.602	0.176	0.136	0.279	0.615	0.145	0.134	0.251	0.632	0.095	0.090	0.218	0.632
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.224	0.203	0.292	0.591	0.172	0.170	0.271	0.579	0.168	0.174	0.260	0.605	0.146	0.175	0.222	0.672
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.293	0.234	0.334	0.584	0.274	0.220	0.316	0.605	0.260	0.231	0.303	0.586	0.154	0.168	0.216	0.691
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.099	0.080	0.249	0.594	0.062	0.015	0.238	0.625	0.045	0.025	0.225	0.627	0.094	0.077	0.208	0.674
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.150	0.130	0.269	0.592	0.112	0.096	0.257	0.607	0.091	0.087	0.242	0.597	0.120	0.060	0.216	0.680
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.031	0.014	0.238	0.595	0.034	0.034	0.240	0.607	0.014	0.013	0.229	0.597	0.088	0.059	0.208	0.680
	(FL)Calib-1	0.120	0.092	0.259	0.584	0.069	0.015	0.239	0.619	0.060	0.020	0.228	0.625	0.101	0.070	0.210	0.676
	(FL)Calib-n	0.158	0.130	0.273	0.591	0.096	0.079	0.249	0.622	0.104	0.095	0.248	0.588	0.136	0.083	0.222	0.678
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.011	0.007	0.238	0.591	0.048	0.056	0.239	0.622	0.013	0.016	0.230	0.588	0.080	0.059	0.209	0.678	
Mixtral-8x7b	LLM Prob.	0.342	0.273	0.342	0.683	0.280	0.212	0.303	0.654	0.296	0.246	0.315	0.585	0.194	0.085	0.276	0.535
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.088	0.015	0.244	0.607	0.142	0.075	0.252	0.655	0.075	0.015	0.234	0.585	0.131	0.004	0.257	0.535
	Verblized %	0.318	0.052	0.324	0.624	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.215	0.166	0.300	0.584	0.153	0.153	0.261	0.603	0.149	0.132	0.262	0.606	0.242	0.141	0.319	0.531
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.215	0.210	0.290	0.581	0.157	0.144	0.253	0.647	0.142	0.146	0.255	0.583	0.105	0.117	0.257	0.560
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.305	0.263	0.341	0.565	0.291	0.292	0.327	0.552	0.192	0.196	0.274	0.573	0.184	0.192	0.271	0.597
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.093	0.079	0.253	0.582	0.061	0.057	0.226	0.658	0.057	0.051	0.232	0.588	0.172	0.052	0.271	0.567
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.154	0.142	0.270	0.580	0.121	0.134	0.260	0.561	0.085	0.055	0.239	0.576	0.143	0.064	0.256	0.594
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.018	0.011	0.239	0.587	0.037	0.042	0.238	0.561	0.026	0.021	0.228	0.576	0.015	0.020	0.236	0.594
	(FL)Calib-1	0.071	0.044	0.243	0.580	0.068	0.062	0.227	0.660	0.054	0.024	0.230	0.593	0.165	0.054	0.271	0.555
	(FL)Calib-n	0.169	0.160	0.279	0.568	0.106	0.110	0.254	0.572	0.099	0.043	0.239	0.603	0.151	0.070	0.260	0.589
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.025	0.014	0.240	0.568	0.007	0.010	0.236	0.572	0.045	0.020	0.228	0.603	0.023	0.018	0.237	0.589	

Table 3: Test results of large-size models on TriviaQA dataset.

Method	Verb.				Zero-shot				CoT				Few-shot				
	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	
Llama2-7b	LLM Prob.	0.323	0.196	0.329	0.712	0.238	0.152	0.270	0.735	0.240	0.147	0.286	0.661	0.398	0.045	0.394	0.604
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.313	0.012	0.341	0.599	0.234	0.093	0.268	0.736	0.164	0.087	0.253	0.722	0.203	0.022	0.282	0.606
	Verblized %	0.369	0.026	0.375	0.616	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.130	0.118	0.259	0.630	0.118	0.108	0.231	0.666	0.120	0.125	0.244	0.675	0.121	0.088	0.237	0.682
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.216	0.216	0.284	0.619	0.255	0.255	0.297	0.652	0.222	0.162	0.275	0.654	0.207	0.207	0.259	0.728
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.304	0.308	0.340	0.654	0.297	0.294	0.324	0.674	0.228	0.224	0.283	0.679	0.215	0.205	0.256	0.735
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.065	0.063	0.242	0.624	0.081	0.080	0.222	0.673	0.088	0.085	0.233	0.659	0.073	0.071	0.216	0.718
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.170	0.132	0.259	0.661	0.189	0.139	0.260	0.689	0.136	0.104	0.238	0.694	0.106	0.104	0.214	0.735
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.126	0.032	0.256	0.615	0.194	0.066	0.257	0.689	0.140	0.089	0.253	0.694	0.153	0.092	0.242	0.735
	(FL)Calib-1	0.040	0.012	0.236	0.636	0.069	0.067	0.222	0.661	0.057	0.080	0.229	0.660	0.086	0.048	0.218	0.710
(FL)Calib-n	0.198	0.173	0.278	0.617	0.184	0.131	0.257	0.689	0.126	0.107	0.235	0.689	0.094	0.092	0.211	0.734	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.136	0.039	0.259	0.617	0.203	0.065	0.261	0.689	0.123	0.084	0.251	0.689	0.165	0.097	0.240	0.734	
Llama3-8b	LLM Prob.	0.162	0.108	0.229	0.752	0.232	0.172	0.265	0.737	0.201	0.182	0.277	0.603	0.165	0.045	0.255	0.612
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.177	0.057	0.277	0.621	0.136	0.104	0.246	0.737	0.074	0.028	0.236	0.603	0.095	0.042	0.243	0.612
	Verblized %	0.321	0.070	0.340	0.626	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.185	0.187	0.286	0.587	0.146	0.146	0.259	0.636	0.163	0.147	0.254	0.639	0.115	0.111	0.225	0.691
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.233	0.229	0.288	0.646	0.224	0.223	0.290	0.615	0.201	0.201	0.269	0.634	0.212	0.211	0.245	0.730
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.257	0.256	0.290	0.697	0.280	0.276	0.315	0.654	0.224	0.218	0.270	0.650	0.202	0.208	0.238	0.753
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.118	0.120	0.239	0.673	0.111	0.094	0.252	0.616	0.094	0.097	0.233	0.638	0.106	0.103	0.211	0.733
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.122	0.126	0.233	0.704	0.147	0.147	0.255	0.660	0.112	0.098	0.229	0.669	0.088	0.088	0.201	0.752
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.110	0.022	0.256	0.600	0.091	0.042	0.246	0.660	0.081	0.067	0.227	0.669	0.103	0.115	0.214	0.752
	(FL)Calib-1	0.112	0.105	0.237	0.676	0.094	0.088	0.249	0.610	0.075	0.079	0.230	0.644	0.089	0.084	0.207	0.731
(FL)Calib-n	0.203	0.213	0.289	0.598	0.136	0.135	0.251	0.661	0.091	0.087	0.226	0.658	0.075	0.071	0.199	0.750	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.094	0.029	0.253	0.598	0.087	0.050	0.245	0.661	0.045	0.061	0.227	0.658	0.104	0.117	0.215	0.750	
Llama3.1-8b	LLM Prob.	0.145	0.103	0.223	0.762	0.086	0.072	0.235	0.682	0.263	0.157	0.302	0.674	0.070	0.031	0.212	0.689
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.252	0.098	0.308	0.588	0.180	0.147	0.229	0.803	0.186	0.085	0.269	0.674	0.100	0.049	0.222	0.689
	Verblized %	0.415	0.184	0.413	0.587	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.182	0.179	0.273	0.590	0.108	0.103	0.216	0.734	0.092	0.084	0.224	0.721	0.101	0.082	0.202	0.738
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.251	0.211	0.276	0.729	0.240	0.221	0.268	0.753	0.233	0.197	0.253	0.761	0.180	0.178	0.214	0.740
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.223	0.224	0.258	0.755	0.200	0.193	0.243	0.782	0.223	0.182	0.251	0.763	0.192	0.193	0.224	0.758
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.084	0.106	0.199	0.770	0.118	0.133	0.207	0.771	0.089	0.091	0.196	0.781	0.082	0.090	0.192	0.744
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.118	0.116	0.206	0.758	0.117	0.104	0.198	0.788	0.106	0.073	0.192	0.793	0.081	0.082	0.192	0.756
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.173	0.008	0.263	0.587	0.166	0.121	0.243	0.788	0.126	0.158	0.236	0.793	0.115	0.127	0.206	0.756
	(FL)Calib-1	0.068	0.091	0.198	0.757	0.093	0.101	0.202	0.759	0.074	0.077	0.192	0.774	0.061	0.069	0.190	0.741
(FL)Calib-n	0.240	0.245	0.295	0.584	0.119	0.103	0.196	0.787	0.110	0.074	0.197	0.780	0.075	0.068	0.191	0.755	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.166	0.017	0.261	0.584	0.155	0.126	0.240	0.787	0.151	0.150	0.235	0.780	0.110	0.117	0.207	0.755	
Gemini2-2b	LLM Prob.	0.060	0.065	0.196	0.774	0.069	0.067	0.192	0.791	0.104	0.097	0.236	0.691	0.141	0.145	0.260	0.633
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.179	0.001	0.279	0.586	0.156	0.151	0.229	0.791	0.083	0.080	0.237	0.691	0.060	0.033	0.238	0.633
	Verblized %	0.424	0.108	0.420	0.629	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.158	0.172	0.277	0.602	0.164	0.159	0.266	0.632	0.150	0.153	0.261	0.641	0.110	0.105	0.228	0.704
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.183	0.184	0.270	0.631	0.221	0.218	0.292	0.604	0.161	0.161	0.259	0.654	0.225	0.225	0.266	0.708
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.277	0.282	0.319	0.662	0.300	0.294	0.331	0.630	0.236	0.229	0.293	0.674	0.258	0.258	0.282	0.716
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.061	0.070	0.240	0.635	0.109	0.110	0.255	0.604	0.076	0.073	0.235	0.659	0.129	0.134	0.225	0.716
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.142	0.124	0.247	0.680	0.167	0.167	0.265	0.640	0.119	0.100	0.240	0.687	0.122	0.109	0.224	0.723
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.143	0.041	0.261	0.630	0.131	0.021	0.257	0.640	0.098	0.073	0.245	0.687	0.111	0.099	0.233	0.723
	(FL)Calib-1	0.024	0.036	0.235	0.637	0.113	0.109	0.256	0.613	0.066	0.066	0.236	0.653	0.092	0.088	0.215	0.716
(FL)Calib-n	0.177	0.175	0.271	0.627	0.173	0.169	0.265	0.640	0.103	0.074	0.235	0.682	0.111	0.096	0.221	0.720	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.137	0.034	0.260	0.627	0.099	0.013	0.251	0.640	0.094	0.081	0.245	0.682	0.102	0.107	0.232	0.720	
Gemini2-9b	LLM Prob.	0.164	0.165	0.242	0.655	0.163	0.146	0.227	0.722	0.138	0.120	0.215	0.669	0.097	0.093	0.195	0.614
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.056	0.023	0.220	0.675	0.098	0.075	0.214	0.722	0.064	0.059	0.202	0.669	0.053	0.013	0.187	0.614
	Verblized %	0.269	0.101	0.276	0.698	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.153	0.149	0.250	0.590	0.141	0.135	0.248	0.607	0.145	0.144	0.231	0.642	0.096	0.087	0.179	0.693
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.119	0.132	0.241	0.596	0.119	0.123	0.244	0.620	0.200	0.175	0.245	0.648	0.186	0.167	0.214	0.690
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.262	0.229	0.296	0.620	0.282	0.248	0.312	0.618	0.176	0.172	0.226	0.672	0.170	0.175	0.191	0.726
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.078	0.044	0.223	0.590	0.083	0.063	0.233	0.598	0.057	0.052	0.200	0.659	0.091	0.081	0.173	0.700
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.116	0.115	0.244	0.637	0.142	0.137	0.247	0.631	0.060	0.062	0.193	0.688	0.059	0.061	0.165	0.732
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.041	0.036	0.218	0.615	0.016	0.020	0.222	0.631	0.082	0.077	0.200	0.688	0.108	0.086	0.177	0.732
	(FL)Calib-1	0.037	0.032	0.218	0.597	0.060	0.044	0.224	0.617	0.039	0.033	0.200	0.651	0.068	0.058	0.170	0.698
(FL)Calib-n	0.142	0.131	0.258	0.611	0.126	0.137	0.245	0.634	0.055	0.050	0.195	0.678	0.056	0.052	0.165	0.728	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.030	0.023	0.217	0.611	0.029	0.030	0.221	0.634	0.091	0.077	0.203	0.678	0.113	0.080	0.178	0.728	
Phi3-4b	LLM Prob.	0.187	0.121	0.226	0.796	0.186	0.121	0.225	0.785	0.142	0.119	0.220	0.720	0.039	0.020	0.225	0.624
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.154	0.092	0.201	0.835	0.150	0.138	0.226	0.785	0.104	0.054	0.216	0.720	0.022	0.051	0.230	0.624
	Verblized %	0.322	0.034	0.324	0.703	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.064	0.059	0.204	0.755	0.143	0.132	0.247	0.672	0.127	0.133	0.238	0.643	0.			

Method	Verb.				Zero-shot				CoT				Few-shot				
	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	
Gemma2-27b	LLM Prob.	0.193	0.181	0.236	0.705	0.204	0.179	0.229	0.713	0.161	0.158	0.227	0.630	0.080	0.088	0.172	0.616
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.077	0.038	0.216	0.658	0.068	0.081	0.199	0.713	0.028	0.035	0.199	0.630	0.080	0.026	0.170	0.616
	Verblized Prob.	0.224	0.071	0.247	0.685	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.140	0.139	0.239	0.594	0.165	0.163	0.236	0.595	0.111	0.111	0.215	0.618	0.092	0.097	0.171	0.621
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.127	0.137	0.245	0.606	0.118	0.152	0.254	0.589	0.122	0.122	0.212	0.624	0.147	0.140	0.181	0.683
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.201	0.188	0.275	0.598	0.231	0.207	0.289	0.583	0.217	0.207	0.250	0.637	0.168	0.150	0.193	0.684
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.101	0.099	0.223	0.598	0.098	0.098	0.221	0.571	0.059	0.059	0.200	0.621	0.065	0.045	0.157	0.675
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.095	0.103	0.222	0.585	0.113	0.114	0.224	0.577	0.065	0.060	0.197	0.643	0.052	0.037	0.153	0.673
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.021	0.024	0.213	0.578	0.026	0.023	0.208	0.577	0.054	0.061	0.199	0.643	0.092	0.060	0.162	0.673
	(FL)Calib-1	0.081	0.077	0.219	0.599	0.066	0.075	0.214	0.594	0.058	0.059	0.199	0.625	0.038	0.037	0.155	0.662
	(FL)Calib-n	0.064	0.073	0.216	0.597	0.094	0.098	0.221	0.576	0.061	0.063	0.195	0.649	0.040	0.041	0.155	0.664
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.041	0.042	0.211	0.597	0.020	0.017	0.208	0.576	0.058	0.063	0.199	0.649	0.092	0.060	0.163	0.664
Llama3-70b	LLM Prob.	0.172	0.177	0.251	0.626	0.212	0.223	0.261	0.660	0.182	0.168	0.233	0.664	0.062	0.042	0.184	0.571
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.104	0.018	0.219	0.680	0.044	0.020	0.219	0.661	0.033	0.050	0.204	0.664	0.048	0.000	0.182	0.571
	Verblized Prob.	0.203	0.021	0.244	0.685	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.155	0.156	0.250	0.580	0.139	0.142	0.244	0.614	0.108	0.112	0.215	0.630	0.105	0.084	0.181	0.715
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.156	0.168	0.254	0.575	0.144	0.151	0.254	0.599	0.170	0.177	0.223	0.655	0.172	0.092	0.214	0.738
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.203	0.188	0.271	0.610	0.243	0.227	0.295	0.602	0.237	0.228	0.253	0.645	0.209	0.100	0.227	0.766
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.094	0.087	0.232	0.536	0.122	0.120	0.243	0.563	0.073	0.066	0.201	0.654	0.057	0.064	0.163	0.738
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.081	0.091	0.224	0.612	0.123	0.122	0.236	0.601	0.074	0.071	0.199	0.660	0.038	0.031	0.158	0.744
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.036	0.016	0.219	0.593	0.041	0.017	0.222	0.601	0.068	0.077	0.202	0.660	0.113	0.081	0.173	0.744
	(FL)Calib-1	0.052	0.051	0.225	0.557	0.079	0.071	0.226	0.615	0.055	0.053	0.198	0.655	0.049	0.021	0.159	0.739
	(FL)Calib-n	0.067	0.073	0.220	0.613	0.110	0.115	0.233	0.598	0.072	0.067	0.197	0.665	0.062	0.021	0.162	0.741
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.047	0.022	0.218	0.613	0.037	0.014	0.223	0.598	0.060	0.083	0.201	0.665	0.132	0.081	0.176	0.741
Llama3.1-70b	LLM Prob.	0.133	0.119	0.220	0.688	0.120	0.101	0.205	0.704	0.125	0.119	0.213	0.671	0.062	0.047	0.154	0.692
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.054	0.009	0.212	0.698	0.078	0.063	0.199	0.705	0.073	0.070	0.202	0.671	0.105	0.058	0.165	0.692
	Verblized Prob.	0.231	0.066	0.246	0.709	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.136	0.129	0.236	0.636	0.146	0.147	0.239	0.574	0.134	0.132	0.215	0.644	0.076	0.070	0.160	0.700
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.113	0.118	0.231	0.650	0.167	0.093	0.253	0.622	0.157	0.112	0.246	0.658	0.138	0.117	0.178	0.732
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.179	0.144	0.250	0.664	0.232	0.189	0.289	0.605	0.209	0.203	0.245	0.681	0.188	0.131	0.206	0.740
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.037	0.039	0.212	0.602	0.082	0.081	0.214	0.617	0.098	0.095	0.199	0.674	0.041	0.040	0.145	0.751
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.054	0.061	0.204	0.666	0.089	0.089	0.221	0.597	0.056	0.057	0.193	0.691	0.038	0.042	0.146	0.745
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.023	0.038	0.213	0.619	0.033	0.036	0.211	0.597	0.079	0.087	0.202	0.691	0.129	0.103	0.161	0.745
	(FL)Calib-1	0.036	0.035	0.206	0.636	0.057	0.064	0.213	0.624	0.079	0.092	0.198	0.666	0.023	0.017	0.144	0.738
	(FL)Calib-n	0.027	0.040	0.200	0.669	0.079	0.082	0.220	0.592	0.065	0.053	0.193	0.690	0.036	0.038	0.147	0.742
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.051	0.070	0.210	0.669	0.040	0.029	0.212	0.592	0.078	0.085	0.202	0.690	0.133	0.099	0.163	0.742
Qwen2-72b	LLM Prob.	0.177	0.167	0.231	0.666	0.231	0.185	0.254	0.743	0.191	0.172	0.242	0.623	0.093	0.021	0.166	0.687
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.065	0.117	0.205	0.697	0.056	0.056	0.216	0.743	0.037	0.052	0.207	0.623	0.120	0.045	0.176	0.687
	Verblized Prob.	0.211	0.051	0.232	0.715	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.145	0.146	0.227	0.623	0.149	0.150	0.241	0.607	0.125	0.121	0.222	0.613	0.094	0.102	0.184	0.653
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.189	0.163	0.255	0.616	0.156	0.153	0.244	0.601	0.139	0.163	0.216	0.665	0.210	0.131	0.237	0.721
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.187	0.172	0.267	0.638	0.230	0.220	0.290	0.608	0.223	0.199	0.246	0.688	0.209	0.119	0.234	0.750
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.068	0.079	0.208	0.620	0.101	0.100	0.233	0.596	0.088	0.097	0.200	0.680	0.077	0.060	0.160	0.717
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.043	0.057	0.203	0.638	0.114	0.102	0.232	0.610	0.063	0.072	0.194	0.687	0.052	0.035	0.151	0.750
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.035	0.035	0.207	0.604	0.058	0.011	0.221	0.610	0.079	0.076	0.202	0.687	0.114	0.092	0.165	0.750
	(FL)Calib-1	0.054	0.055	0.205	0.625	0.065	0.061	0.226	0.584	0.074	0.072	0.197	0.679	0.062	0.045	0.162	0.715
	(FL)Calib-n	0.051	0.053	0.205	0.623	0.099	0.093	0.229	0.611	0.053	0.062	0.194	0.683	0.061	0.025	0.152	0.746
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.046	0.048	0.206	0.623	0.050	0.012	0.221	0.611	0.070	0.088	0.202	0.683	0.126	0.095	0.167	0.746
Mixtral-8x7b	LLM Prob.	0.261	0.216	0.286	0.675	0.204	0.163	0.256	0.660	0.258	0.214	0.289	0.582	0.097	0.071	0.209	0.528
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.058	0.024	0.228	0.603	0.052	0.024	0.223	0.660	0.066	0.005	0.225	0.582	0.011	0.001	0.199	0.528
	Verblized Prob.	0.273	0.059	0.288	0.611	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.157	0.152	0.254	0.609	0.120	0.117	0.230	0.640	0.098	0.101	0.218	0.661	0.101	0.095	0.211	0.605
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.206	0.231	0.263	0.631	0.183	0.188	0.237	0.687	0.175	0.156	0.240	0.677	0.343	0.097	0.339	0.636
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.199	0.182	0.277	0.634	0.177	0.157	0.266	0.654	0.276	0.098	0.297	0.636	0.273	0.136	0.295	0.698
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.071	0.078	0.224	0.633	0.079	0.087	0.211	0.678	0.079	0.085	0.213	0.671	0.087	0.083	0.196	0.654
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.053	0.059	0.220	0.647	0.060	0.041	0.219	0.632	0.014	0.016	0.207	0.660	0.053	0.053	0.184	0.701
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.050	0.008	0.226	0.609	0.036	0.014	0.221	0.632	0.061	0.053	0.215	0.660	0.094	0.070	0.192	0.701
	(FL)Calib-1	0.072	0.091	0.224	0.642	0.043	0.043	0.205	0.684	0.051	0.067	0.210	0.669	0.075	0.056	0.194	0.676
	(FL)Calib-n	0.042	0.042	0.221	0.631	0.038	0.029	0.217	0.631	0.032	0.020	0.208	0.657	0.049	0.044	0.187	0.696
	(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.051	0.004	0.224	0.631	0.033	0.012	0.221	0.631	0.052	0.060	0.215	0.657	0.095	0.066	0.194	0.696

Table 5: Test results of large-size models on Sciq dataset.

Method	Verb.				Zero-shot				CoT				Few-shot				
	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	
Llama2-7b	LLM Prob.	0.426	0.207	0.392	0.692	0.369	0.140	0.301	0.751	0.248	0.153	0.291	0.620	0.409	0.117	0.402	0.578
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.269	0.039	0.274	0.720	0.344	0.069	0.264	0.752	0.155	0.090	0.248	0.716	0.265	0.044	0.306	0.581
	Verblized Prob.	0.432	0.047	0.398	0.666	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.180	0.117	0.256	0.590	0.139	0.070	0.169	0.693	0.153	0.117	0.262	0.634	0.145	0.075	0.231	0.688
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.216	0.227	0.283	0.534	0.178	0.145	0.212	0.641	0.233	0.190	0.274	0.651	0.273	0.121	0.297	0.663
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.233	0.243	0.298	0.615	0.245	0.204	0.251	0.653	0.186	0.171	0.266	0.651	0.226	0.233	0.267	0.730
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.158	0.100	0.252	0.565	0.086	0.029	0.157	0.677	0.147	0.061	0.249	0.648	0.146	0.057	0.242	0.646
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.112	0.089	0.229	0.616	0.034	0.022	0.146	0.697	0.128	0.058	0.233	0.684	0.068	0.050	0.216	0.693
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.133	0.015	0.239	0.588	0.246	0.068	0.214	0.697	0.049	0.120	0.242	0.684	0.126	0.107	0.242	0.693
	(FL)Calib-1	0.113	0.072	0.237	0.574	0.058	0.025	0.152	0.674	0.133	0.081	0.236	0.649	0.073	0.024	0.230	0.648
(FL)Calib-n	0.109	0.089	0.232	0.589	0.040	0.038	0.148	0.686	0.141	0.090	0.229	0.696	0.086	0.054	0.213	0.704	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.143	0.022	0.242	0.589	0.256	0.049	0.219	0.686	0.046	0.151	0.241	0.696	0.121	0.125	0.241	0.704	
Llama3-8b	LLM Prob.	0.344	0.125	0.290	0.795	0.422	0.196	0.359	0.756	0.357	0.182	0.355	0.667	0.271	0.121	0.326	0.529
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.305	0.134	0.288	0.664	0.316	0.083	0.271	0.756	0.191	0.053	0.271	0.667	0.184	0.009	0.283	0.529
	Verblized Prob.	0.494	0.089	0.436	0.694	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.150	0.089	0.210	0.639	0.106	0.112	0.185	0.649	0.156	0.151	0.258	0.598	0.148	0.060	0.229	0.739
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.133	0.136	0.210	0.693	0.142	0.123	0.210	0.634	0.138	0.123	0.257	0.602	0.238	0.060	0.261	0.756
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.104	0.106	0.194	0.721	0.161	0.178	0.235	0.654	0.252	0.253	0.305	0.570	0.177	0.166	0.215	0.809
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.126	0.053	0.190	0.692	0.097	0.050	0.179	0.675	0.028	0.022	0.240	0.586	0.149	0.085	0.228	0.748
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.101	0.035	0.182	0.710	0.082	0.059	0.177	0.641	0.044	0.064	0.231	0.641	0.108	0.076	0.214	0.762
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.195	0.065	0.221	0.627	0.226	0.018	0.225	0.641	0.124	0.060	0.253	0.641	0.144	0.148	0.237	0.762
	(FL)Calib-1	0.074	0.063	0.184	0.691	0.068	0.054	0.176	0.622	0.019	0.011	0.240	0.578	0.132	0.090	0.241	0.667
(FL)Calib-n	0.085	0.050	0.185	0.661	0.038	0.055	0.171	0.665	0.032	0.038	0.227	0.656	0.110	0.067	0.213	0.766	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.214	0.072	0.225	0.661	0.231	0.031	0.233	0.665	0.134	0.075	0.254	0.656	0.144	0.165	0.237	0.766	
Llama3.1-8b	LLM Prob.	0.306	0.119	0.244	0.788	0.176	0.148	0.246	0.704	0.276	0.159	0.319	0.617	0.183	0.096	0.273	0.594
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.344	0.029	0.276	0.638	0.234	0.079	0.253	0.733	0.189	0.019	0.271	0.617	0.166	0.010	0.269	0.594
	Verblized Prob.	0.629	0.143	0.560	0.676	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.098	0.053	0.148	0.756	0.148	0.061	0.218	0.691	0.123	0.089	0.234	0.683	0.151	0.088	0.259	0.652
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.209	0.129	0.206	0.727	0.212	0.159	0.254	0.679	0.298	0.127	0.315	0.672	0.027	0.062	0.244	0.588
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.182	0.142	0.191	0.760	0.170	0.186	0.255	0.685	0.294	0.287	0.329	0.546	0.262	0.255	0.282	0.700
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.047	0.037	0.135	0.760	0.106	0.063	0.210	0.681	0.076	0.031	0.217	0.710	0.135	0.054	0.265	0.584
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.054	0.050	0.133	0.769	0.115	0.041	0.215	0.660	0.075	0.034	0.222	0.685	0.104	0.047	0.244	0.654
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.255	0.052	0.212	0.676	0.167	0.039	0.233	0.660	0.102	0.090	0.244	0.685	0.052	0.091	0.242	0.654
	(FL)Calib-1	0.030	0.040	0.134	0.766	0.062	0.034	0.203	0.681	0.064	0.026	0.218	0.702	0.096	0.032	0.252	0.593
(FL)Calib-n	0.046	0.049	0.143	0.674	0.086	0.050	0.211	0.645	0.119	0.061	0.223	0.672	0.112	0.052	0.241	0.664	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.264	0.051	0.218	0.674	0.163	0.024	0.236	0.645	0.134	0.078	0.252	0.672	0.087	0.088	0.243	0.664	
Gemini2-2b	LLM Prob.	0.204	0.089	0.203	0.769	0.210	0.092	0.196	0.825	0.184	0.141	0.261	0.667	0.107	0.090	0.225	0.665
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.309	0.025	0.272	0.625	0.277	0.125	0.249	0.825	0.208	0.047	0.264	0.667	0.189	0.056	0.252	0.665
	Verblized Prob.	0.623	0.155	0.571	0.622	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.163	0.073	0.193	0.665	0.124	0.107	0.201	0.663	0.191	0.141	0.262	0.552	0.133	0.092	0.240	0.676
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.309	0.122	0.281	0.603	0.333	0.050	0.290	0.698	0.192	0.093	0.273	0.573	0.280	0.158	0.289	0.718
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.248	0.243	0.285	0.598	0.218	0.197	0.267	0.647	0.274	0.249	0.326	0.555	0.234	0.261	0.288	0.711
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.094	0.033	0.184	0.613	0.108	0.059	0.192	0.685	0.096	0.041	0.234	0.560	0.118	0.043	0.236	0.678
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.082	0.071	0.175	0.643	0.072	0.048	0.187	0.680	0.064	0.077	0.230	0.581	0.049	0.055	0.219	0.691
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.217	0.004	0.223	0.639	0.209	0.074	0.228	0.680	0.178	0.008	0.262	0.581	0.152	0.115	0.252	0.691
	(FL)Calib-1	0.051	0.031	0.175	0.623	0.074	0.047	0.188	0.683	0.050	0.048	0.229	0.573	0.104	0.048	0.233	0.679
(FL)Calib-n	0.063	0.036	0.174	0.656	0.043	0.049	0.184	0.669	0.054	0.060	0.228	0.595	0.062	0.068	0.219	0.688	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.227	0.011	0.227	0.656	0.207	0.067	0.230	0.669	0.184	0.003	0.264	0.595	0.129	0.113	0.249	0.688	
Gemini2-9b	LLM Prob.	0.316	0.203	0.308	0.753	0.338	0.162	0.303	0.799	0.275	0.182	0.303	0.674	0.177	0.166	0.268	0.618
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.221	0.022	0.271	0.739	0.238	0.113	0.258	0.799	0.121	0.083	0.254	0.676	0.121	0.056	0.249	0.618
	Verblized Prob.	0.531	0.147	0.490	0.732	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.186	0.085	0.243	0.672	0.114	0.054	0.209	0.703	0.190	0.122	0.282	0.593	0.145	0.119	0.249	0.654
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.131	0.120	0.246	0.638	0.152	0.119	0.234	0.701	0.124	0.118	0.262	0.549	0.199	0.145	0.265	0.684
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.106	0.110	0.220	0.691	0.179	0.187	0.247	0.696	0.245	0.249	0.317	0.509	0.236	0.247	0.271	0.703
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.159	0.055	0.231	0.674	0.123	0.032	0.216	0.693	0.116	0.024	0.262	0.563	0.079	0.075	0.224	0.701
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.176	0.042	0.230	0.714	0.145	0.024	0.224	0.690	0.128	0.059	0.264	0.565	0.132	0.087	0.235	0.689
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.150	0.081	0.229	0.691	0.118	0.004	0.230	0.690	0.033	0.018	0.249	0.565	0.072	0.092	0.234	0.689
	(FL)Calib-1	0.122	0.066	0.222	0.677	0.092	0.048	0.214	0.676	0.096	0.025	0.255	0.575	0.094	0.055	0.220	0.702
(FL)Calib-n	0.161	0.057	0.224	0.712	0.114	0.032	0.216	0.690	0.119	0.042	0.260	0.573	0.137	0.077	0.234	0.693	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.170	0.065	0.230	0.712	0.140	0.022	0.233	0.690	0.038	0.028	0.249	0.573	0.090	0.088	0.235	0.693	
Phi3-4b	LLM Prob.	0.374	0.187	0.332	0.742	0.245	0.123	0.253	0.760	0.209	0.100	0.249	0.739	0.181	0.084	0.243	0.665
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.310	0.054	0.279	0.768	0.192	0.117	0.257	0.760	0.170	0.096	0.257	0.739	0.223	0.086	0.277	0.665
	Verblized Prob.	0.546	0.088	0.489	0.749	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.135	0.095	0.195	0.631	0.141	0.076	0.238	0.675	0.133	0.135	0.258	0.609	0.			

Method	Verb.				Zero-shot				CoT				Few-shot				
	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	
Gemma2-27b	LLM Prob.	0.423	0.258	0.382	0.775	0.448	0.259	0.410	0.730	0.359	0.222	0.356	0.654	0.158	0.164	0.226	0.501
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.285	0.101	0.284	0.712	0.234	0.078	0.261	0.730	0.160	0.095	0.261	0.656	0.057	0.065	0.204	0.501
	Verblized Prob.	0.578	0.132	0.519	0.752	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.114	0.070	0.186	0.749	0.127	0.071	0.201	0.734	0.152	0.095	0.244	0.679	0.109	0.103	0.216	0.619
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.171	0.157	0.240	0.650	0.104	0.112	0.217	0.709	0.098	0.108	0.236	0.692	0.075	0.063	0.204	0.621
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.170	0.157	0.230	0.705	0.085	0.086	0.192	0.752	0.200	0.169	0.261	0.640	0.093	0.124	0.205	0.615
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.099	0.039	0.191	0.725	0.129	0.038	0.204	0.735	0.132	0.059	0.230	0.719	0.052	0.052	0.186	0.660
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.042	0.052	0.182	0.718	0.102	0.052	0.187	0.778	0.084	0.086	0.230	0.650	0.092	0.026	0.198	0.618
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.174	0.131	0.228	0.721	0.193	0.120	0.226	0.778	0.109	0.090	0.250	0.650	0.066	0.050	0.201	0.618
	(FL)Calib-1	0.070	0.041	0.192	0.689	0.103	0.074	0.197	0.745	0.105	0.067	0.227	0.715	0.040	0.028	0.185	0.669
	(FL)Calib-n	0.064	0.049	0.183	0.715	0.095	0.069	0.186	0.780	0.114	0.098	0.224	0.674	0.102	0.043	0.203	0.612
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.184	0.104	0.231	0.715	0.189	0.133	0.226	0.780	0.094	0.112	0.246	0.674	0.122	0.052	0.206	0.612	
Llama3-70b	LLM Prob.	0.359	0.245	0.353	0.727	0.424	0.234	0.385	0.752	0.319	0.239	0.351	0.582	0.125	0.111	0.230	0.512
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.207	0.136	0.278	0.673	0.219	0.071	0.263	0.752	0.091	0.008	0.254	0.582	0.024	0.043	0.214	0.512
	Verblized Prob.	0.439	0.098	0.415	0.686	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.181	0.077	0.234	0.700	0.151	0.081	0.207	0.744	0.174	0.099	0.274	0.614	0.125	0.114	0.239	0.620
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.127	0.133	0.245	0.650	0.111	0.114	0.228	0.690	0.121	0.119	0.251	0.628	0.087	0.057	0.199	0.699
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.156	0.158	0.242	0.679	0.122	0.124	0.216	0.719	0.181	0.115	0.264	0.638	0.123	0.120	0.212	0.669
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.165	0.069	0.244	0.669	0.131	0.041	0.213	0.729	0.147	0.095	0.261	0.626	0.042	0.030	0.201	0.666
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.123	0.095	0.221	0.717	0.108	0.024	0.201	0.746	0.125	0.055	0.244	0.668	0.072	0.036	0.200	0.670
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.140	0.125	0.237	0.672	0.179	0.098	0.229	0.746	0.029	0.048	0.241	0.668	0.039	0.075	0.211	0.670
	(FL)Calib-1	0.147	0.069	0.241	0.667	0.095	0.054	0.206	0.729	0.132	0.072	0.255	0.632	0.045	0.019	0.202	0.662
	(FL)Calib-n	0.109	0.049	0.219	0.715	0.097	0.034	0.202	0.737	0.111	0.049	0.240	0.675	0.081	0.016	0.208	0.631
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.155	0.135	0.236	0.715	0.176	0.076	0.230	0.737	0.019	0.068	0.241	0.675	0.032	0.077	0.211	0.631	
Llama3.1-70b	LLM Prob.	0.174	0.179	0.250	0.729	0.229	0.182	0.273	0.706	0.156	0.177	0.260	0.634	0.085	0.074	0.194	0.570
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.168	0.023	0.269	0.687	0.152	0.073	0.250	0.706	0.037	0.063	0.237	0.634	0.078	0.004	0.191	0.570
	Verblized Prob.	0.453	0.130	0.432	0.708	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.135	0.103	0.228	0.718	0.195	0.131	0.277	0.619	0.162	0.108	0.264	0.644	0.142	0.120	0.204	0.589
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.093	0.092	0.227	0.695	0.098	0.098	0.242	0.622	0.209	0.203	0.270	0.573	0.148	0.152	0.223	0.566
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.150	0.151	0.234	0.704	0.154	0.151	0.247	0.657	0.278	0.228	0.316	0.532	0.111	0.126	0.197	0.598
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.140	0.054	0.236	0.694	0.159	0.041	0.253	0.644	0.150	0.077	0.266	0.582	0.064	0.062	0.193	0.565
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.130	0.033	0.228	0.716	0.155	0.049	0.241	0.690	0.144	0.092	0.270	0.584	0.085	0.033	0.194	0.576
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.122	0.072	0.239	0.685	0.132	0.089	0.237	0.690	0.027	0.059	0.244	0.584	0.087	0.000	0.194	0.576
	(FL)Calib-1	0.117	0.070	0.234	0.689	0.123	0.009	0.249	0.612	0.142	0.037	0.261	0.587	0.073	0.068	0.193	0.574
	(FL)Calib-n	0.120	0.050	0.228	0.712	0.141	0.057	0.243	0.668	0.145	0.120	0.265	0.598	0.090	0.051	0.198	0.575
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.123	0.105	0.239	0.712	0.110	0.067	0.240	0.668	0.015	0.057	0.243	0.598	0.091	0.000	0.194	0.575	
Qwen2-72b	LLM Prob.	0.403	0.249	0.389	0.693	0.500	0.235	0.459	0.750	0.301	0.246	0.345	0.542	0.127	0.133	0.225	0.551
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.196	0.100	0.272	0.716	0.227	0.032	0.273	0.749	0.079	0.002	0.253	0.542	0.049	0.037	0.209	0.551
	Verblized Prob.	0.480	0.042	0.449	0.745	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.159	0.120	0.251	0.645	0.118	0.096	0.226	0.665	0.169	0.135	0.267	0.628	0.070	0.070	0.215	0.581
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.185	0.169	0.283	0.563	0.139	0.145	0.248	0.615	0.102	0.110	0.250	0.612	0.066	0.101	0.208	0.608
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.270	0.279	0.318	0.557	0.194	0.201	0.264	0.638	0.172	0.152	0.271	0.629	0.126	0.160	0.218	0.635
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.108	0.044	0.247	0.564	0.118	0.029	0.235	0.631	0.103	0.081	0.248	0.627	0.065	0.063	0.207	0.592
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.106	0.092	0.249	0.593	0.095	0.061	0.226	0.648	0.118	0.056	0.243	0.662	0.062	0.025	0.199	0.635
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.098	0.023	0.246	0.586	0.119	0.078	0.237	0.648	0.047	0.046	0.240	0.662	0.042	0.082	0.206	0.635
	(FL)Calib-1	0.068	0.056	0.244	0.553	0.072	0.042	0.226	0.631	0.095	0.043	0.248	0.621	0.069	0.064	0.211	0.581
	(FL)Calib-n	0.105	0.091	0.246	0.593	0.082	0.074	0.228	0.636	0.107	0.088	0.238	0.669	0.069	0.020	0.200	0.628
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.119	0.027	0.251	0.593	0.124	0.061	0.239	0.636	0.063	0.067	0.240	0.669	0.040	0.069	0.205	0.628	
Mixtral-8x7b	LLM Prob.	0.306	0.264	0.340	0.590	0.297	0.137	0.317	0.664	0.268	0.195	0.295	0.614	0.222	0.093	0.286	0.529
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.099	0.036	0.254	0.574	0.113	0.091	0.255	0.664	0.061	0.018	0.227	0.614	0.078	0.039	0.243	0.529
	Verblized Prob.	0.327	0.151	0.336	0.615	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.123	0.107	0.258	0.617	0.165	0.126	0.274	0.584	0.080	0.085	0.228	0.612	0.106	0.084	0.242	0.617
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.187	0.187	0.284	0.522	0.098	0.113	0.258	0.588	0.049	0.030	0.220	0.609	0.030	0.028	0.220	0.665
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.252	0.252	0.301	0.546	0.254	0.228	0.304	0.561	0.173	0.191	0.274	0.484	0.221	0.165	0.269	0.639
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.119	0.032	0.263	0.520	0.099	0.038	0.257	0.576	0.046	0.037	0.214	0.638	0.054	0.047	0.221	0.666
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.170	0.076	0.278	0.567	0.106	0.101	0.267	0.552	0.121	0.104	0.253	0.533	0.068	0.017	0.229	0.636
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.015	0.022	0.247	0.516	0.038	0.002	0.249	0.552	0.048	0.014	0.229	0.533	0.060	0.052	0.233	0.636
	(FL)Calib-1	0.110	0.014	0.257	0.551	0.088	0.042	0.257	0.561	0.013	0.014	0.217	0.613	0.064	0.055	0.219	0.683
	(FL)Calib-n	0.163	0.078	0.275	0.566	0.096	0.087	0.264	0.552	0.115	0.150	0.248	0.554	0.061	0.055	0.226	0.645
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.024	0.025	0.244	0.566	0.045	0.007	0.249	0.552	0.040	0.006	0.228	0.554	0.030	0.077	0.232	0.645	

Table 7: Test results of large-size models on WikiQA dataset.

Method	Verb.				Zero-shot				CoT				Few-shot				
	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	ECE↓	ECE-t↓	Brier↓	AUC↑	
Llama2-7b	LLM Prob.	0.554	0.248	0.480	0.700	0.436	0.182	0.356	0.719	0.488	0.182	0.445	0.647	0.543	0.047	0.477	0.628
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.513	0.020	0.420	0.640	0.397	0.032	0.283	0.721	0.328	0.050	0.297	0.680	0.333	0.002	0.297	0.628
	Verblized Prob.	0.549	0.056	0.467	0.638	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.066	0.066	0.155	0.655	0.050	0.055	0.123	0.712	0.086	0.076	0.200	0.646	0.071	0.044	0.180	0.681
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.212	0.221	0.258	0.643	0.176	0.178	0.208	0.649	0.223	0.211	0.271	0.654	0.193	0.193	0.240	0.686
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.266	0.249	0.284	0.676	0.248	0.228	0.257	0.680	0.290	0.235	0.319	0.651	0.200	0.197	0.231	0.722
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.043	0.050	0.156	0.651	0.047	0.049	0.128	0.670	0.052	0.060	0.191	0.657	0.093	0.060	0.181	0.687
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.052	0.052	0.156	0.675	0.048	0.041	0.131	0.714	0.076	0.072	0.197	0.657	0.060	0.057	0.172	0.727
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.278	0.048	0.232	0.667	0.305	0.013	0.221	0.714	0.233	0.037	0.246	0.657	0.229	0.062	0.227	0.727
	(FL)Calib-1	0.026	0.039	0.153	0.653	0.060	0.038	0.130	0.660	0.050	0.049	0.190	0.655	0.061	0.043	0.176	0.691
(FL)Calib-n	0.051	0.049	0.156	0.663	0.068	0.037	0.133	0.710	0.048	0.048	0.193	0.644	0.060	0.054	0.170	0.730	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.270	0.050	0.228	0.663	0.307	0.022	0.223	0.710	0.227	0.021	0.245	0.644	0.228	0.052	0.228	0.730	
Llama3-8b	LLM Prob.	0.398	0.150	0.328	0.755	0.435	0.199	0.366	0.737	0.415	0.211	0.392	0.653	0.408	0.046	0.380	0.639
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.353	0.042	0.280	0.712	0.378	0.059	0.298	0.737	0.290	0.051	0.298	0.653	0.318	0.011	0.322	0.639
	Verblized Prob.	0.517	0.084	0.437	0.686	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.065	0.055	0.156	0.689	0.075	0.072	0.169	0.639	0.073	0.081	0.220	0.641	0.089	0.059	0.213	0.682
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.191	0.199	0.236	0.656	0.145	0.146	0.201	0.619	0.306	0.120	0.304	0.679	0.213	0.220	0.274	0.706
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.222	0.232	0.253	0.676	0.218	0.227	0.264	0.654	0.280	0.273	0.323	0.671	0.233	0.233	0.267	0.734
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.044	0.043	0.158	0.642	0.076	0.073	0.169	0.638	0.014	0.013	0.211	0.647	0.093	0.084	0.206	0.702
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.055	0.056	0.156	0.680	0.056	0.055	0.164	0.668	0.067	0.064	0.209	0.683	0.081	0.074	0.197	0.733
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.260	0.055	0.224	0.683	0.257	0.063	0.228	0.668	0.196	0.076	0.250	0.683	0.184	0.110	0.240	0.733
	(FL)Calib-1	0.049	0.035	0.159	0.628	0.073	0.068	0.173	0.605	0.029	0.022	0.213	0.639	0.064	0.065	0.202	0.702
(FL)Calib-n	0.039	0.037	0.153	0.682	0.046	0.046	0.163	0.664	0.053	0.049	0.210	0.666	0.061	0.061	0.194	0.738	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.262	0.059	0.226	0.682	0.269	0.054	0.234	0.664	0.193	0.075	0.252	0.666	0.183	0.117	0.240	0.738	
Llama3.1-8b	LLM Prob.	0.335	0.104	0.255	0.808	0.303	0.146	0.272	0.737	0.428	0.182	0.395	0.630	0.278	0.029	0.277	0.716
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.363	0.038	0.279	0.621	0.340	0.068	0.280	0.747	0.320	0.050	0.306	0.630	0.283	0.059	0.296	0.716
	Verblized Prob.	0.597	0.132	0.518	0.684	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.068	0.067	0.143	0.646	0.074	0.078	0.175	0.674	0.071	0.055	0.194	0.699	0.071	0.026	0.200	0.732
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.168	0.189	0.221	0.681	0.215	0.226	0.266	0.607	0.401	0.218	0.355	0.712	0.175	0.166	0.224	0.760
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.228	0.224	0.247	0.692	0.242	0.248	0.282	0.641	0.276	0.259	0.306	0.675	0.212	0.207	0.242	0.775
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.054	0.056	0.137	0.695	0.060	0.050	0.174	0.640	0.075	0.071	0.190	0.719	0.080	0.056	0.196	0.751
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.043	0.040	0.136	0.704	0.047	0.044	0.168	0.683	0.056	0.051	0.186	0.729	0.064	0.055	0.184	0.777
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.282	0.019	0.218	0.636	0.238	0.043	0.229	0.683	0.221	0.086	0.244	0.729	0.193	0.138	0.238	0.777
	(FL)Calib-1	0.044	0.034	0.137	0.692	0.040	0.042	0.174	0.629	0.058	0.057	0.187	0.715	0.055	0.029	0.190	0.757
(FL)Calib-n	0.063	0.063	0.143	0.632	0.043	0.042	0.167	0.684	0.038	0.034	0.183	0.728	0.053	0.050	0.184	0.769	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.286	0.030	0.221	0.632	0.256	0.044	0.238	0.684	0.210	0.106	0.241	0.728	0.196	0.133	0.236	0.769	
Gemma2-2b	LLM Prob.	0.279	0.124	0.229	0.758	0.290	0.130	0.244	0.755	0.261	0.152	0.260	0.701	0.240	0.134	0.256	0.646
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.382	0.013	0.273	0.705	0.367	0.049	0.270	0.756	0.318	0.052	0.266	0.701	0.301	0.026	0.265	0.646
	Verblized Prob.	0.628	0.099	0.551	0.700	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.056	0.039	0.127	0.694	0.059	0.048	0.142	0.693	0.086	0.042	0.171	0.687	0.071	0.021	0.156	0.755
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.215	0.156	0.208	0.716	0.185	0.174	0.220	0.666	0.225	0.199	0.263	0.642	0.167	0.183	0.219	0.763
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.269	0.211	0.269	0.714	0.254	0.224	0.269	0.692	0.289	0.259	0.312	0.663	0.267	0.241	0.267	0.785
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.043	0.032	0.127	0.683	0.065	0.060	0.146	0.650	0.054	0.032	0.171	0.643	0.071	0.030	0.156	0.765
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.054	0.041	0.130	0.688	0.050	0.043	0.144	0.705	0.072	0.068	0.174	0.688	0.096	0.069	0.166	0.782
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.309	0.015	0.222	0.679	0.293	0.041	0.227	0.705	0.259	0.065	0.235	0.688	0.265	0.094	0.234	0.782
	(FL)Calib-1	0.025	0.034	0.126	0.665	0.040	0.036	0.145	0.645	0.026	0.027	0.169	0.639	0.032	0.033	0.154	0.761
(FL)Calib-n	0.053	0.037	0.130	0.688	0.064	0.033	0.143	0.708	0.044	0.045	0.169	0.682	0.089	0.056	0.163	0.776	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.312	0.019	0.223	0.688	0.294	0.052	0.228	0.708	0.272	0.068	0.244	0.682	0.273	0.102	0.240	0.776	
Gemma2-9b	LLM Prob.	0.390	0.230	0.368	0.716	0.396	0.201	0.355	0.746	0.374	0.232	0.377	0.641	0.298	0.207	0.341	0.594
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.306	0.095	0.289	0.696	0.309	0.100	0.285	0.746	0.243	0.046	0.284	0.641	0.213	0.029	0.284	0.594
	Verblized Prob.	0.547	0.196	0.496	0.695	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.096	0.099	0.210	0.626	0.084	0.073	0.206	0.646	0.097	0.088	0.234	0.638	0.077	0.076	0.226	0.689
	(AUC)Calib-1	0.210	0.218	0.279	0.594	0.192	0.203	0.265	0.604	0.227	0.223	0.299	0.621	0.240	0.236	0.287	0.727
	(AUC)Calib-n	0.256	0.257	0.287	0.642	0.219	0.230	0.275	0.649	0.270	0.268	0.311	0.662	0.273	0.272	0.296	0.740
	(BCE)Calib-1	0.098	0.087	0.206	0.597	0.048	0.040	0.203	0.616	0.053	0.061	0.223	0.637	0.122	0.120	0.224	0.722
	(BCE)Calib-n	0.108	0.075	0.209	0.629	0.093	0.040	0.201	0.674	0.092	0.064	0.224	0.667	0.067	0.072	0.208	0.742
	(BCE)Calib-n+PS	0.178	0.035	0.230	0.631	0.180	0.064	0.231	0.674	0.155	0.052	0.247	0.667	0.148	0.107	0.246	0.742
	(FL)Calib-1	0.057	0.064	0.203	0.604	0.046	0.042	0.204	0.599	0.024	0.024	0.223	0.634	0.108	0.097	0.221	0.718
(FL)Calib-n	0.091	0.063	0.206	0.621	0.066	0.051	0.196	0.677	0.083	0.044	0.224	0.655	0.067	0.082	0.210	0.736	
(FL)Calib-n+PS	0.182	0.030	0.232	0.621	0.199	0.071	0.239	0.677	0.157	0.048	0.249	0.655	0.152	0.096	0.248	0.736	
Phi3-4b	LLM Prob.	0.467	0.145	0.367	0.788	0.436	0.143	0.337	0.767	0.385	0.143	0.319	0.734	0.306	0.026	0.244	0.714
	LLM Prob.+PS	0.389	0.017	0.279	0.768	0.400	0.061	0.292	0.767	0.368	0.059	0.296	0.734	0.378	0.077	0.303	0.714
	Verblized Prob.	0.593	0.077	0.505	0.751	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	APRICOT	0.068	0.038	0.131	0.722	0.066	0.040	0.133	0.758	0.061	0.059	0.162	0.718	0.			