

Enhancing Hallucination Detection through Noise Injection

Litian Liu¹ Reza Pourreza¹ Sunny Panchal¹ Apratim Bhattacharyya¹ Yao Qin² Roland Memisevic¹

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are prone to generating plausible yet incorrect responses, known as hallucinations. Effectively detecting hallucinations is therefore crucial for the safe deployment of LLMs. Recent research has linked hallucinations to model uncertainty, suggesting that hallucinations can be detected by measuring dispersion over answer distributions obtained from a set of samples drawn from a model. While drawing from the distribution over tokens defined by the model is a natural way to obtain samples, in this work, we argue that it is sub-optimal for the purpose of detecting hallucinations. We show that detection can be improved significantly by taking into account model uncertainty in the Bayesian sense. To this end, we propose a very simple and efficient approach that perturbs an appropriate subset of model parameters, or equivalently hidden unit activations, during sampling. We demonstrate its effectiveness across a wide range of datasets and model architectures.

1. Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have made significant advancements in recent years (Achiam et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023). However, despite the strides, LLMs sometimes generate plausible yet incorrect responses – a phenomenon known as hallucination (Ji et al., 2023; Kuhn et al., 2023a). To ensure the safe deployment of LLMs, effective detection of hallucination is essential, and has gained significant attention in recent years (Malinin & Gales, 2020; Lin et al., 2022; 2023; Kuhn et al., 2023a; Chen et al., 2024). Many research efforts focus on detecting hallucinations by assessing uncertainty across samples drawn from the model. For example, Malinin & Gales (2020) propose leveraging predictive uncertainty for hallucination detection. Similarly, Lin et al.

¹Qualcomm AI Research ²UC Santa Barbara. Correspondence to: Litian Liu <litiliu@qti.qualcomm.com>, Roland Memisevic <rmemisev@qti.qualcomm.com>.




Figure 1. Prior work relies solely on prediction layer sampling for hallucination detection, capturing mainly aleatoric uncertainty. We introduce noise injection to perturb intermediate representations. Combining noise injection with prediction layer sampling, our approach captures both epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty.

(2022) and Lin et al. (2023) propose semantic consistency and quantify lexical similarity across samples. The core principle underlying this line of work is simple: the greater the observed uncertainty associated with a prediction, the higher the likelihood of hallucination.

Since a language model defines the probability distribution over the next tokens, an obvious way to generate samples is to repeatedly draw from the conditional distribution over tokens given the context so far. This way of sampling stays faithful to the probability distribution defined by the model (up to any deviations from the training temperature), and it makes sense when the goal is to generate multiple answers, say, to a given prompt.

However, in the case of hallucination detection, the purpose of sampling is *not* to generate multiple different alternatives as answers to a given prompt. Instead, it is to estimate the coherence of a model’s responses to the prompt, via a kind of “sensitivity analysis” that makes it possible to assess the likelihood of a given prompt to elicit a hallucination in a model. A distribution of responses that is coherent under perturbations is considered as evidence for the model know-




Figure 2. Effect of Intermediate Layer Noise on Hallucination Detection. (a) *Standalone Effect.* Noise injection induces epistemic uncertainty, where the LLM shows greater uncertainty for hallucinations (grey) than non-hallucinations (blue), as reflected by larger answer entropy (Equation 4). (b) *Combined Effect.* Combining noise injection with prediction layer sampling (b Right) improves hallucination/non-hallucination separation compared to using sampling alone (b Left), enhancing detection effectiveness. This highlights the importance of combining epistemic uncertainty with aleatoric uncertainty captured by sampling for hallucination detection. Evaluation on GSM8K dataset with Llama-2-7B-chat model across 10 samples.

ing the correct response for a given prompt and, accordingly, for an answer generated by the model to be considered truthful.

More formally, sampling from the model using next-token prediction can be considered as a way to capture uncertainty in the data distribution, whereas to detect hallucinations, we are also interested in the model uncertainty, which is the result of training on a finite training set. The distinction between these two types of uncertainty has been studied formally by Osband (2016), who refers to the first (data uncertainty) as *aleatoric* and the latter (model uncertainty) as *epistemic*.

This distinction is also reflected in a Bayesian perspective, where uncertainty over the model parameters reflects the epistemic and the model’s output distribution the aleatoric uncertainty. However, a full Bayesian treatment is challenging for LLMs, which contain billions of parameters and are trained on datasets containing billions, and sometimes trillions, of tokens (Hou et al., 2024). In this work, we devise a novel, simple but effective *training-free* approach to obtain a surrogate distribution over models that are plausible given the training data, using pre-trained model weights as a starting point. Our approach is illustrated in Figure 1.

To approximate the distribution over plausible models, we consider random perturbations of the parameters of a pre-trained model, which, as we show, is equivalent to perturbing hidden unit activations in some layers of the LLM for an appropriately chosen subset of parameters. Conveniently, the hidden activations also tend to capture the more abstract and high-level representations of a given phrase or “thought”. This differentiates them from the output logits, which represent meaning at a much lower, syntactic level, potentially making stability of hidden activations a better candidate to assess a model’s faithfulness to the prompt in the context of detecting hallucinations.

Concretely, our surrogate distribution is uniformly distributed and centered at the pre-trained parameter weights of the hidden units and whose variance is defined by a single hyper-parameter. This allows models in the surrogate distribution to explain the training data well, while possessing sufficiently high coverage of plausible models in order to capture key aspects of the additional model uncertainty. This is illustrated in Figure 2, where we show the uncertainty associated with a prediction in the case of a hallucination, highlighting the effectiveness of jointly capturing epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty in a Bayesian framework.

In this work, we show how our insight gives rise to a novel, simple and efficient, yet effective approach to incorporate model uncertainty into hallucination detection, and we demonstrate its effectiveness empirically across a wide range of datasets and model architectures (Gemma-2B-it, Phi-3-mini-4k-instruct, Mistral-7B-Instruct, Llama-2-7B-chat, and Llama-2-13B-chat.).

2. Problem Statement

Prior work (Malinin & Gales, 2020; Lin et al., 2022; 2023; Kuhn et al., 2023a; Chen et al., 2024) connects hallucination detection to model uncertainty estimation. Given an uncertainty metric $E(\cdot)$, detecting whether the model is hallucinating for a given input context x can be formulated as a binary classification problem:

$$D(x) = \begin{cases} \text{Non-Hallucination} & \text{if } E(\mathcal{Y}) < \tau \\ \text{Hallucination} & \text{if } E(\mathcal{Y}) \geq \tau \end{cases}, \quad (1)$$

where τ is threshold and $\mathcal{Y} = \{y^1, y^2, \dots, y^K\}$ denotes K samples given the input. A higher level of uncertainty indicates hallucination.

For reasoning tasks, we introduce an uncertainty metric

Table 1. Example of Answer Entropy Computation on GSM8K dataset. For each response, the answer string is marked in **bold**, with the remaining text representing the reasoning part. We estimate uncertainty by counting the occurrence of each answer string. In this example, with $K = 3$ samples, $E_{answer}(\mathcal{Y}) = -0.67 \times \log 0.67 - 0.33 \times \log 0.33$.

Responses for “A robe takes 2 bolts of blue fiber and half that much white fiber. How many bolts in total does it take? ”	Answer	Answer Frequency
Half of 2 bolts of white fiber is $2/2 = 1$ bolt. So, it takes $2 + 1 = 3$ bolts in total. The answer is 3.	3	67%
2 bolts of blue fiber and half that much white fiber is $2 + \text{half of } 2 = 2 + 1 = 3$ bolts. The answer is 3.	3	
2 bolts of blue fiber and half that much white fiber is $2 \times 2 = 4$ bolts of blue fiber. The answer is 4	4	33%

focused on the answer space, as detailed in Section 3.1. This metric targets the final answer rather than intermediate tokens, making it particularly well-suited for reasoning tasks with lengthy intermediate rationales.

To compute the uncertainty associated with a certain generation, we propose to use both aleatoric (observation) and epistemic (model) uncertainty. To capture model uncertainty, instead of considering a single LLM, we consider the distribution of plausible models given the training data D . Using the classic Bayesian formulation, we can express the distribution over token y_t given prompt x , previous tokens $y_{<t}$, and the training data D , as the expectation

$$p(y_t | y_{<t}, x, D) = \int p(y_t | y_{<t}, x, \omega) p(\omega | D) d\omega, \quad (2)$$

where ω denotes model parameters and $p(\omega | D)$ the posterior over parameters given the training data.

Since $p(\omega | D)$ is not directly accessible in practice, it is a common practice to replace it in the integral with a surrogate distribution $q(\omega)$. One way to estimate $q(\omega)$ is to minimize the KL divergence between $q(\omega)$ and the true posterior $p(\omega | D)$ using a variational lower bound on the Bayesian evidence (MacKay, 2003; Gal & Ghahramani, 2016b). However, since LLMs are very expensive to train, Bayesian treatment of LLMs for hallucination detection has remained illusive (Hou et al., 2024). In this work, instead of training from scratch to estimate $q(\omega)$, we suggest using pre-trained models as an initial estimate for the surrogate distribution $q(\omega)$. Concretely, we define $q(\omega)$ as,

$$q(\mathbf{w}) = \prod_{i \notin \mathcal{S}} \delta(w_i - \bar{w}_i) \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{U}(w_i | \bar{w}_i, \bar{w}_i + \alpha), \quad (3)$$

where w_i represents the i^{th} parameter of the model, \bar{w}_i is the value of w_i as stored in the pre-trained checkpoint. For parameters in \mathcal{S} , we perturb according to a uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$ centered near the respective pre-trained parameters, with α the magnitude of the perturbation. For parameters not in \mathcal{S} , we fix them at their checkpoint values,

effectively applying a Dirac delta distribution $\delta(\cdot)$ centered at the pre-trained. Our choice of $q(\omega)$ is inspired by Kendall & Gal (2017), illustrating that as the volume of training data increases, the estimated distribution parameters become narrowly concentrated. In LLMs, we expect this effect to be amplified due to their massive data scale.

In Section 3, we exemplify the effectiveness of this Bayesian view with a simple approach. Restricting \mathcal{S} to the bias terms in the MLP blocks allows us to equivalently implement the approximation by injecting noise into the MLP layer activation, i.e., to the activation h_i^l of the i^{th} neuron. Through extensive experiments in Section 4, we show that even this lightweight “noise injection” approach can already greatly enhance hallucination detection accuracy. We further show in Appendix B that perturbing the bias has a similar effect as perturbing the weights. And we demonstrate the general effectiveness of this Bayesian perspective in Appendix C with an alternative example that perturbs a different set of model parameters.

3. Uncertainty and Hallucination Detection

In this section, we conduct a case study to investigate the effectiveness of the surrogate model distribution $q(\omega)$ described above, in capturing epistemic uncertainty. We first hypothesize and validate that, when sampling under the model distribution $q(\omega)$ (Equation (2)), responses exhibit greater variability when the model hallucinates. We then observe that such epistemic uncertainty has a complementary effect when compared to aleatoric uncertainty for hallucination detection. Overall, combining epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty yields the best performance.

3.1. Case Study Setup

We perform an initial case study using the GSM8K dataset (Cobbe et al., 2021). Section 4 demonstrates that our algorithm also generalizes to knowledge-based question-and-answer tasks.

Table 2. **Case Study: Effectiveness of Noise Injection for Enhancing Hallucination Detection.** With the same aleatoric uncertainty fixed by sampling temperature, noise injection (first row) introduces epistemic uncertainty, improving detection effectiveness over no noise (second row), as shown by a higher AUROC. Such improvement is achieved without degrading model accuracy. Evaluation on GSM8K dataset with Llama-2-7B-chat model across 10 samples.

	AUROC	ACC
Answer Entropy w/ T = 0.5, no noise	71.56	23.64
Answer Entropy w/ T = 0.5, noise ~ U(0, 0.05)	76.14	24.09

In this study, we use the GSM8K test set, containing 1319 questions, along with in-context learning examples from Wei et al. (2022). The dataset consists of mathematical question-response pairs $\{x, y\}$, where each response includes both the reasoning and the answer: $y = [r, a]$. As shown in Table 1, following in-context learning examples, an LLM can produce coherent yet incorrect answers—i.e., hallucinations—highlighting the need for effective hallucination detection in such reasoning tasks.

For effective hallucination detection through uncertainty estimation, we need to design an effective uncertainty metric as described in Equation (1). As illustrated in Table 1, reasoning chains can be extensive, although the final answer holds greater importance. Consequently, assigning equal weight to all tokens during uncertainty estimation may be suboptimal. To address this, we estimate uncertainty by counting the number of occurrences of each answer string and introduce the metric of *Answer Entropy*:

$$\mathcal{H}_{ans}(\mathcal{Y}) = - \sum_j p(a_j) \log p(a_j) \quad (4)$$

where $p(a_j)$ is the empirical probability of each unique answer a_j over the K final answers $\{a^1, a^2, \dots, a^K\}$ extracted from K responses $\mathcal{Y} = \{\hat{y}^1, \hat{y}^2, \dots, \hat{y}^K\}$. An example of the answer entropy computation is provided in Table 1.

In the following, we focus on the Llama-2-7B-chat model (Touvron et al., 2023). Experiments with additional datasets, uncertainty metrics, and models are discussed in Section 4.

3.2. Hallucination Detection Under Epistemic Uncertainty

We capture epistemic uncertainty through noise injection and examine model hallucination behavior under it. Specifically, we inject uniform noise sampled from $\mathcal{U}(0, 0.07)$ to perturb the MLP activations of layers 20 – 32 of the transformer. This approximately modifies the MLP bias of the model and thus effectively samples a model $\hat{\omega}$ from our surrogate distribution $q(\omega)$. To isolate this effect, we set the prediction layer sampling temperature to zero and decode greedily to eliminate aleatoric uncertainty from sampling.




Figure 3. **Complementary Effect of Epistemic Uncertainty and Aleatoric Uncertainty.** The x-axis presents answer entropy (Equation 4) with prediction layer sampling only, which mainly captures aleatoric uncertainty. The y-axis presents answer entropy under intermediate layer noise injection only, which mainly captures epistemic uncertainty. A Pearson correlation of 0.58 indicates a complementary relationship between the two types of uncertainty.

We generate $K = 10$ samples for each question and compute answer entropy following Equation (4). We classify model hallucination on a question level; model responses to a question are considered as hallucinating if the majority of the $K = 10$ generated answers are incorrect, and as non-hallucinating otherwise. In Figure 2 (left), we compare answer entropy between hallucinating and non-hallucinating cases by overlaying the histograms of the two groups. We observe that with the model stochastically sampled from $q(\omega)$, responses exhibit greater variability when hallucinating (grey), as evidenced by higher entropy values. This shows the effectiveness of using noise injection for capturing epistemic uncertainty and thus detecting hallucinations.

3.3. Complementary Effect of Aleatoric and Epistemic Uncertainty

We now examine the interplay between aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty and their impact on model performance.

Epistemic Uncertainty: We evaluate model performance with noise sampled from $\mathcal{U}(0, 0.07)$ and sampling temperature set to zero as in Section 3.2.

Aleatoric Uncertainty: We evaluate model performance with temperature $T = 0.5$ and without noise injection. This inference scheme leverages the aleatoric uncertainty as captured by the original model.

For each setup, we assess answer entropy across $K = 10$ samples for each question following Equation (4). In the scatter plot in Figure 3, we display each question of the GSM8K test set as a point, with the x-value representing answer entropy under aleatoric uncertainty, and the y-value representing the same under epistemic uncertainty. The plot shows that model performance under the two types of uncertainty is only weakly correlated, with a Pearson correlation of 0.58. This suggests that there is a positive but complementary relationship. We further validate the complementarity in Section 4.3.

3.4. Algorithm: Noise Injection for Hallucination Detection

To capture both epistemic uncertainty and aleatoric uncertainty, as suggested by Section 3.3, we incorporate noise injection alongside prediction layer sampling and propose our Noise Enhanced Hallucination Detection algorithm. The algorithm is described in detail in Algorithm 1.

First, to capture epistemic uncertainty, we inject noise to MLP activations, which effectively samples a model from our model distribution $\hat{\omega} \sim q(\omega)$ (see Equation (3)) as in Section 3.2. Second, to capture aleatoric uncertainty, we sample from the temperature-adjusted categorical distribution $p(y_t | y_{<t}, x, \hat{\omega})$. Repeating the sampling process effectively draws samples from,

$$\int p(y_t | y_{<t}, x, \omega) q(\omega) d\omega. \quad (5)$$

To detect hallucinations, we compute the answer entropy over the K generated samples and apply a threshold.

Empirical Validation. In Table 2, we validate the effectiveness of our scheme under the case study setup. We perturb the MLP activation of layers 20 to 32 with additive uniform noise of magnitude $\alpha = 0.07$, sampled from $\mathcal{U}(0, 0.07)$, and evaluate over $K = 10$ samples. In practice, the noise magnitude can be selected based on the validation set, and we present an ablation study on different noise magnitudes in Section 4.3. Following Malinin & Gales (2020); Lin et al. (2022; 2023); Kuhn et al. (2023a); Chen et al. (2024), we assess the effectiveness of hallucination detection using the threshold-free metric, the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC), where a higher value indicates better detection performance. As shown in Table 2,

Algorithm 1 Noise Enhanced Hallucination Detection

input Input context: x , number of samples: K , surrogate model distribution: $q(\omega)$ (built from noise magnitude α , perturbed layers L_1 to L_2), model dimension d , temperature: T , uncertainty metric: $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$.

output Hallucination detection score: $s(x)$

- 1: **for** $k = 1$ to K **do**
- 2: // Sample model from $\hat{\omega} \sim q(\omega)$ //
- 3: Sample noise: $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{U}(0, \alpha)^d$
- 4: **for** each token $\hat{y}_t^k \in \hat{\mathcal{Y}}^k$ **do**
- 5: **for** each layer l **do**
- 6: Compute h^l using the potentially perturbed prior layer representations.
- 7: **if** $l \in [L_1, L_2]$ **then**
- 8: Perturb the MLP activations: $\hat{h}^l = h^l + \epsilon$.
- 9: **end if**
- 10: **end for**
- 11: // Sample tokens from model $\hat{\omega}$ //
- 12: Sample token $\hat{y}_t^k \sim p(y_t | y_{<t}, x, \hat{\omega})$ with temperature T .
- 13: **end for**
- 14: **end for**

return Hallucination detection score $s(x) = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{Y})$, where $\mathcal{Y} = \{y^1, y^2, \dots, y^K\}$

our scheme effectively detects hallucination instances with AUROC value > 50 .

We further compare our approach with previously proposed schemes that solely rely on prediction layer sampling without noise injection and thus do not capture epistemic uncertainty. The setup without noise injection follows Section 3.3. As shown in Table 2, our approach significantly improves detection effectiveness and achieves a higher AUROC value. The improvement is also visualized in Figure 2 (b), where noise injection increases the separation and reduces the overlap in the histograms from left to right.

Finally, we evaluate model accuracy on the GSM8K dataset. To this end, we use majority voting based on the generated samples. Like before, we compare the aleatoric and epistemic settings. As shown in Table 2, taking into account epistemic uncertainty improves hallucination detection performance without degrading model accuracy.

Overall, our case study strongly supports our hypothesis regarding the relative importance of taking into account epistemic uncertainty when generating samples.

4. Experiments

In this section, we move beyond the case study and extensively validate the effectiveness of our algorithm across different datasets and model architectures. Further, we conduct

Table 3. **Intermediate Layers Noise Injection Enhances Hallucination Detection across Models and Datasets.** The gain shows the benefits of epistemic uncertainty alongside aleatoric uncertainty. Answer entropy over $K = 10$ samples is used for hallucination detection. Detection AUROC is reported with mean and 95% confidence intervals. Higher mean values indicate better performance.

	GSM8K	CSQA	TriviaQA
Gemma-2B-it	51.36 +/- 0.79	58.97 +/- 0.47	68.65 +/- 0.13
Gemma-2B-it w/ Noise	57.11 +/- 0.67	61.71 +/- 0.37	69.38 +/- 0.11
Phi-3-mini-4k-instruct (3.8B)	65.86 +/- 0.58	75.05 +/- 0.41	82.00 +/- 0.09
Phi-3-mini-4k-instruct w/ Noise	72.51 +/- 0.53	76.60 +/- 0.53	82.02 +/- 0.06
Mistral-7B-Instruct	78.06 +/- 0.30	72.96 +/- 0.45	77.59 +/- 0.08
Mistral-7B-Instruct w/ Noise	81.26 +/- 0.37	75.01 +/- 0.42	79.42 +/- 0.06
Llama-2-7B-chat	71.56 +/- 0.51	70.59 +/- 0.36	74.03 +/- 0.09
Llama-2-7B-chat w/ Noise	76.14 +/- 0.52	71.56 +/- 0.36	75.05 +/- 0.08
Llama-2-13B-chat	77.20 +/- 0.33	67.55 +/- 1.02	73.39 +/- 0.09
Llama-2-13B-chat w/ Noise	79.25 +/- 0.32	69.10 +/- 0.94	75.10 +/- 0.07

a comprehensive ablation study to understand the effects of varying the number of samples, noise injection layers, noise magnitude, sampling temperature, and uncertainty metrics.

4.1. Main Result

In Table 3, we validate the effectiveness of noise injection for enhancing hallucination detection.

Dataset: Beyond the mathematical reasoning task GSM8K, we also test on CSQA (Talmor et al., 2019), which assesses commonsense world knowledge in a multiple-choice format, and TriviaQA (Joshi et al., 2017), which evaluates factual question answering. For CSQA, we test on the validation set with 1,221 questions and prompt the model using 7-shot chain-of-thought exemplars for in-context learning, following Wei et al. (2022). For TriviaQA, we test the `rc.nocontext` validation subset with 9,960 unique questions, designed for free-form, context-free question-answering. To evaluate TriviaQA, we prompt the model with 10 in-context learning examples from the corresponding training set following Kuhn et al. (2023a). Overall, our datasets cover different topics, formats (free-form vs. multiple choice), and prompting styles (with or without chain-of-thought). For more details, see Section A.1.

Model: We evaluate a diverse range of LLMs across various sizes, including Gemma-2B-it (Team et al., 2024), Phi-3-mini-4k-instruct (2.8B) (Abdin et al., 2024), Mistral-7B-Instruct (Jiang et al., 2023), Llama-2-7B-chat, and Llama-2-13B-chat.

Setup: Following Section 3.1, we inject random uniform noise sampled from $\mathcal{U}(0, \alpha)$ into the MLP layer activation of upper layers. Since our performance is not sensitive to specific layers (Section 4.4), we inject noise into roughly

the top third of the layers (see Appendix A.2 for exact layer ranges). For the noise magnitude α , we select from [0.01, 0.03, 0.05, 0.07, 0.09, 0.11] based on validation sets, as detailed in A.3. The temperature is fixed at $T = 0.5$, and answer entropy over $K = 10$ samples is used for hallucination detection.

For each setup, we bootstrap $K = 10$ samples 25 times from a total of 40 samples and report the mean AUROC with its 95% confidence interval.

Performance: Looking at Table 3, we observe that taking into account epistemic uncertainty consistently improves hallucination detection, as indicated by higher AUROC scores. The improvement is more pronounced on GSM8K and CSQA than on TriviaQA. This may be because GSM8K and CSQA involve chain-of-thought reasoning, where the model is called across multiple steps so that uncertainty accumulates. This is unlike TriviaQA, which relies on directly short answers. Nonetheless, noise injection remains effective on TriviaQA. Notably, on TriviaQA with `Phi-3-mini-4k-instruct`, the baseline AUROC is already the highest across the board, suggesting performance saturation, which limits the impact of noise.

4.2. Ablation of Number of Samples

So far, we have presented results based on $K = 10$ samples in Section 3 and Section 4.1. We now extend this study to explore the effect of noise injection across different numbers of samples. In Figure 4, we present the hallucination detection AUROC (left) and model accuracy (right) on GSM8K for $K = 1$ to $K = 20$. The rest of the setup follows Section 3.1. For each K , we report the mean and 95% interval across 25 bootstraps of K samples from a total of 40 samples. As shown in Figure 4, both hallucination




Figure 4. Noise Injection Enhances Hallucination Detection Across Different Number of Samples. Evaluation under $T = 0.5$ for GSM8K datasets on Llama-2-7B-chat model across 1 - 20 samples. With noise magnitude $\alpha = 0$, only aleatoric uncertainty [A] is captured; with $\alpha = 0.07$, both aleatoric [A] and epistemic [E] uncertainty are captured. Hallucination detection AUROC (Left) and model accuracy (Right) reported; higher values are better. Mean and 95% confidence intervals are shown.

detection AUROC and model accuracy on GSM8K improve with an increasing number of samples. Notably, noise injection to capture epistemic uncertainty consistently enhances the effectiveness of hallucination detection across different numbers of samples without degrading model accuracy. In practice, the number of samples can be adjusted based on the computational budget and accuracy requirements. Nevertheless, our experiments demonstrate that noise injection improves hallucination detection effectiveness, regardless of the specific number of samples.

4.3. Ablation of Temperature and Noise Magnitude

In Table 4, we explore the effectiveness of our algorithm under varying temperatures and noise magnitude. The experimental setup follows Section 3.1. As shown in Table 4, while the optimal noise magnitude varies with temperature, moderate noise injection generally enhances hallucination detection. Further, the table highlights the complementary effects of epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty. As temperature increases from $T = 0.8$ to 1.0 without noise injection, hallucination detection AUROC plateaus, revealing the limits of modeling aleatoric uncertainty alone. However, injecting noise at $T = 0.8$ improves performance by capturing both epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty.

4.4. Ablation on Noise Injection Layers

We now investigate the effect of noise injection across different layers. We perform ablation experiments on LLaMA-2-7B-chat, which consists of 32 layers in total. In addition to injecting noise in the upper layers (20-32), we also experiment with noise injection in the middle (10-20) and lower (0-10) layers. In Table 5, we report the hallucination detection AUROC with noise injected on different layers. The noise magnitude is set to $\{0.05, 0.01, 0.01\}$ for upper layers, middle layers, and lower layers, respec-

tively, each achieving the optimal performance across noise injection level $\{0.01, 0.03, 0.05, 0.07, 0.09\}$ for the corresponding layers. As expected, lower layers require smaller magnitudes due to their lower tolerance for error propagation. From Table 5, we observe that noise injection across different layers yields similar detection effectiveness, with all setups improving performance compared to the baseline where no noise is injected. This suggests our algorithm is robust to the layer of choice and highlights the overall effectiveness of introducing epistemic uncertainty.

4.5. Ablation on Uncertainty Metric

Here, we investigate the impact of noise injection on hallucination detection using alternative uncertainty metrics $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$. We consider predictive entropy (entropy normalized for sequence length) (Malinin & Gales, 2020), lexical similarity (based on Rouge-L scores) (Lin et al., 2022; 2023), and semantic entropy (which clusters similar generated texts before calculating entropy) (Kuhn et al., 2023b).

Among the datasets analyzed, TriviaQA stands out as the most suitable for evaluating the specified metrics. The multiple-choice format of CSQA does not lend itself well to Rouge-L measurement. Similarly, the numerical answers in GSM8K are incompatible with the clustering required for Semantic Entropy analysis. In contrast, the short, free-form answers in TriviaQA make it an ideal candidate for all the metrics under consideration.

In Table 6, we present the AUROC metric for Predictive Entropy, Lexical Similarity, and Semantic Entropy on TriviaQA, evaluated at a temperature of $T = 0.5$ and noise magnitudes of $\{0, 0.09\}$. The data show that all uncertainty metrics improve with noise injection, demonstrating our algorithm’s robustness to metric selection.

Table 4. Noise injection at varying magnitudes improves hallucination detection across temperatures AUROC values for different temperature-noise magnitude combinations are color-coded, with darker shades indicating better performance. Temperature adjustment only reaches a plateau, indicating the limit of aleatoric uncertainty, while noise injection further improves performance, showing the complementary effect of epistemic uncertainty. Evaluation on GSM8K dataset with Llama-2-7B-chat model across 10 samples.

	No Noise	Noise $\sim U(0, 0.01)$	Noise $\sim U(0, 0.03)$	Noise $\sim U(0, 0.05)$	Noise $\sim U(0, 0.07)$	Noise $\sim U(0, 0.09)$
T=0.2	66.09	68.49	69.90	70.35	72.50	73.96
T=0.5	71.56	75.71	72.73	74.06	76.14	75.24
T=0.8	72.43	77.56	77.22	77.67	78.78	79.03
T=1.0	72.34	77.12	77.68	78.34	78.14	78.22

Table 5. Noise injection across different layers consistently enhances hallucination detection. AUROC is reported, with higher values indicating better performance. Evaluation on CSQA dataset with Llama-2-7B-chat model across 10 samples.

	AUROC
No Noise	67.55
Lower Layer Noise	70.03
Middle Layer Noise	69.68
Upper Layer Noise	69.10

Table 6. Noise Injection Enhances Hallucination Detection under Predictive Entropy, Lexical Similarity, and Semantic Entropy. Evaluation on TriviaQA dataset with Llama-2-7B-chat model across 10 samples.

	$\epsilon = 0$	$\epsilon \sim U(0, 0.09)$
Predictive Entropy	79.28	79.92
Lexical Similarity	77.40	78.90
Semantic Entropy	75.70	77.21

5. Related Work

Bayesian Neural Networks. Standard neural networks typically learn only a single point estimate, neglecting epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty. Bayesian methods (MacKay, 1992; Neal, 2012) learn a posterior distribution over models to capture epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty, but at a high computational cost. Gal & Ghahramani (2016b) addressed this issue using variational inference with a Bernoulli approximation of the weight distribution, subsequently extended to CNNs by Gal & Ghahramani (2016a). In case of LLMs, Hou et al. (2024) contend that Bayesian methods are not compatible with LLMs due to computational costs and thus aim to quantify epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty using clarification questions. Here, we deal with the challenge posed by computational costs with a novel Bayesian training-free approach using noise injection.

Hallucination Detection. Several recent works have demonstrated a strong correlation between model uncertainty and the likelihood of hallucination. Measures of model uncertainty include the entropy of answer (Malinin & Gales, 2021), semantic (Kuhn et al., 2023a; Chen et al., 2024; Farquhar et al., 2024), predictive (Xiao & Wang, 2021), and lexical (Lin et al., 2022; 2023) distributions. These methods rely on a diverse set of model samples generated by temperature-based sampling, which primarily captures aleatoric uncertainty. Our work is complementary to these approaches and introduces epistemic uncertainty.

In addition to entropy-based estimates, intermediate model activations have been shown to provide insights into model confidence. Chuang et al. (2023) demonstrates that the divergence in activations between correct and incorrect tokens increases across layers, with contrasted activations growing sharper for correct tokens. Additionally, Li et al. (2024) shows that hidden embeddings encode an LLM’s sense of “truthfulness”, which may be steered along a vector of truth through test-time intervention. Self-reported confidence as explored by Manakul et al. (2023) and Kadavath et al. (2022) is a promising direction but requires the model to be well-calibrated and can be sensitive to distribution shifts.

6. Conclusion

This work addresses the important issue of hallucination detection for the safe deployment of LLMs. We have established a link between hallucinations and epistemic uncertainty, noting that existing methods primarily focus on aleatoric uncertainty through next-token sampling. Our investigation shows that the often overlooked epistemic uncertainty can be complementary, and that taking epistemic uncertainty into account when generating samples can therefore greatly benefit hallucination detection and also model accuracy. We show that we can efficiently capture epistemic uncertainty efficiently in a training-free paradigm is pos-

sible in approximation by simply perturbing hidden unit activations during the generation of samples. Extensive experiments validate the effectiveness of our approach, demonstrating its potential to improve the reliability of LLMs.

Impact Statement

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of Machine Learning. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none of which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

References

- Abdin, M., Aneja, J., Awadalla, H., Awadallah, A., Awan, A. A., Bach, N., Bahree, A., Bakhtiari, A., Bao, J., Behl, H., et al. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219*, 2024.
- Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Chen, C., Liu, K., Chen, Z., Gu, Y., Wu, Y., Tao, M., Fu, Z., and Ye, J. INSIDE: LLMs’ internal states retain the power of hallucination detection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Zj12nzlQbz>.
- Chuang, Y.-S., Xie, Y., Luo, H., Kim, Y., Glass, J. R., and He, P. Dola: Decoding by contrasting layers improves factuality in large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Cobbe, K., Kosaraju, V., Bavarian, M., Chen, M., Jun, H., Kaiser, L., Plappert, M., Tworek, J., Hilton, J., Nakano, R., et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- Farquhar, S., Kossen, J., Kuhn, L., and Gal, Y. Detecting hallucinations in large language models using semantic entropy. *Nature*, 630(8017):625–630, 2024.
- Gal, Y. and Ghahramani, Z. Bayesian convolutional neural networks with Bernoulli approximate variational inference. In *ICLR workshop track*, 2016a.
- Gal, Y. and Ghahramani, Z. Dropout as a bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning. In *ICML*, 2016b.
- Hou, B., Liu, Y., Qian, K., Andreas, J., Chang, S., and Zhang, Y. Decomposing uncertainty for large language models through input clarification ensembling. In *ICML*, 2024.
- Ji, Z., Lee, N., Frieske, R., Yu, T., Su, D., Xu, Y., Ishii, E., Bang, Y. J., Madotto, A., and Fung, P. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38, 2023.
- Jiang, A. Q., Sablayrolles, A., Mensch, A., Bamford, C., Chaplot, D. S., Casas, D. d. l., Bressand, F., Lengyel, G., Lample, G., Saulnier, L., et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- Joshi, M., Choi, E., Weld, D. S., and Zettlemoyer, L. 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)*, pp. 1601–1611, 2017.
- Kadavath, S., Conerly, T., Askell, A., Henighan, T., Drain, D., Perez, E., Schiefer, N., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., DasSarma, N., Tran-Johnson, E., et al. Language models (mostly) know what they know. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05221*, 2022.
- Kendall, A. and Gal, Y. What uncertainties do we need in bayesian deep learning for computer vision? In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- Kuhn, L., Gal, Y., and Farquhar, S. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VD-AYtP0dve>.
- Kuhn, L., Gal, Y., and Farquhar, S. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023b. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VD-AYtP0dve>.
- Li, K., Patel, O., Viégas, F., Pfister, H., and Wattenberg, M. Inference-time intervention: Eliciting truthful answers from a language model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Lin, Z., Liu, J. Z., and Shang, J. Towards collaborative neural-symbolic graph semantic parsing via uncertainty. *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, 2022.
- Lin, Z., Trivedi, S., and Sun, J. Generating with confidence: Uncertainty quantification for black-box large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19187*, 2023.
- MacKay, D. J. A practical bayesian framework for back-propagation networks. *Neural computation*, 4(3), 1992.

- MacKay, D. J. C. *Information Theory, Inference, and Learning Algorithms*. Copyright Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Malinin, A. and Gales, M. Uncertainty estimation in autoregressive structured prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07650*, 2020.
- Malinin, A. and Gales, M. Uncertainty estimation in autoregressive structured prediction. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=jN5y-zb5Q7m>.
- Manakul, P., Liusie, A., and Gales, M. SelfCheckGPT: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models. In Bouamor, H., Pino, J., and Bali, K. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 9004–9017, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.557. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.557>.
- Neal, R. M. *Bayesian learning for neural networks*, volume 118. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- Osband, I. Risk versus uncertainty in deep learning: Bayes, bootstrap and the dangers of dropout. *NeurIPS Workshop on Bayesian Deep Learning*, 2016.
- Talmor, A., Herzig, J., Lourie, N., and Berant, J. CommonsenseQA: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 4149–4158, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1421. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1421>.
- Team, G., Mesnard, T., Hardin, C., Dadashi, R., Bhupatiraju, S., Pathak, S., Sifre, L., Rivière, M., Kale, M. S., Love, J., et al. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*, 2024.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Wu, Z., Geiger, A., Arora, A., Huang, J., Wang, Z., Goodman, N., Manning, C., and Potts, C. pyvene: A library for understanding and improving PyTorch models via interventions. In Chang, K.-W., Lee, A., and Rajani, N. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*, pp. 158–165, Mexico City, Mexico, June 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.naacl-demo.16>.
- Xiao, Y. and Wang, W. Y. On hallucination and predictive uncertainty in conditional language generation. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, 2021.
- Zhao, W. X., Zhou, K., Li, J., Tang, T., Wang, X., Hou, Y., Min, Y., Zhang, B., Zhang, J., Dong, Z., et al. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.

A. Implementation Details

A.1. Datasets

We use in-context examples to demonstrate correct answer formatting and simplify answer extraction following free-form rationales, where applicable. For **GSM8K** and **CSQA**, we adopt the examplers in (Wei et al., 2022) as our in-context-learning examples. For **TriviaQA**, we ensemble a 10-shot prompt from the first 10 training examples following (Kuhn et al., 2023a).

On **Mistral-7B**, **Llama-2-7B-chat** and **Llama-2-13B-chat**, we concatenate in-context learning examples to form prompt using format **Q:...A:...Q:...A:....**. An example prompt for **TriviaQA** is:

Q: Which Oscar-nominated film had You Sexy Thing as its theme song? A: The Full Monty Q: Which Joan’s career revived in Whatever Happened to Baby Jane? A: Crawford Q: Which much-loved actor won the Best Actor Oscar for The Philadelphia Story? A: James Stewart (...) Q: In which river is the Boulder Dam? A:

If the model continues the **Q:...A:...** format after completing the answer, we trim generations using pattern matching with stopwords. For **Gemma-2B-it** and **Phi-3-mini-instruct**, we apply the chat template available on the respective model tokenizers as available on Huggingface.

In evaluation, when the model fails to produce the answer with the correct format, we treat it as invalid.

A.2. Models

All models evaluated in this work are off-the-shelf with no additional fine-tuning. We inject noise into roughly the top third of layers. Specifically, **Gemma-2B-it** has 18 layers in total, and we inject noise into layers 12-18. Similarly, for **Phi-3-mini-4k-instruct**, which has 30 layers, noise is injected into layers 20-30; for **Mistral-7B-Instruct** and **Llama-2-7B-chat**, both with 32 layers, noise is injected into layers 20-32; and for **Llama-2-13B-chat** with 40 layers, noise is injected into layers 25-40.

All models evaluated in this work are off-the-shelf with no additional fine-tuning. Perturbations on the model are implemented using **pyvene** (Wu et al., 2024). We run all of our experiments on 80GB NVIDIA A100s. And there is no noticeable latency overhead with or without noise injection, confirming that our method introduces no practical delay.

A.3. Noise Magnitude Selection

We select the noise magnitude α based on the results of the validation datasets. On **Gemma-2-it**, we set α as 0.05, 0.09, 0.11 for **GSM8K**, **CSQA**, **TriviaQA**, respectively. On **Phi-3-mini-instruct**, we set α as 0.05, 0.07, 0.09 for **GSM8K**, **CSQA**, **TriviaQA**, respectively. On **Mistral-7B-Instruct**, we set α as 0.03, 0.07, 0.03 for **GSM8K**, **CSQA**, **TriviaQA**, respectively. On **Llama-2-7B-chat**, we set α as 0.07, 0.03, 0.09 for **GSM8K**, **CSQA**, **TriviaQA**, respectively. On **Llama-2-13B-chat**, we set α as 0.05, 0.05, 0.09 for **GSM8K**, **CSQA**, **TriviaQA**, respectively.

Alternatively, if per-dataset tuning raises computational concerns, hyperparameters can be selected per model instead. For example, using $\alpha = 0.05$ across all datasets on **Llama-2-13B-chat** (jointly tuned on the validation set), noise injection improves detection AUROC for all datasets: **GSM8K** improves from 77.20 to 79.23, **CSQA** from 67.44 to 69.10, and **TriviaQA** from 73.39 to 74.37. While per-model selection may not achieve the same performance as per-dataset tuning, it remains an effective strategy for enhancing hallucination detection.

B. Connection Between Weights and Bias Perturbation

We now show that injecting noise into the bias and the weight has a similar effect.

Consider an intermediate MLP layer with input h^{in} and activation h^{out} . Assume the model is well-regularized, such that the input h^{in} has a similar average magnitude $\sum_j h_j^{\text{in}}$ across samples. For computing the i^{th} output element h_i^{out} , applying uniform noise into the corresponding weights $\theta_{i,j}$ is equivalent to injecting uniform noise from a rescaled magnitude into the layer’s bias γ_i . Let ϵ be noise sampled from uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(0, \beta)$. The output after injecting noise into the weights is computed as follows:

$$\mathbf{h}_{\text{out}}^i = \sigma\left(\sum_j (\theta_{i,j} + \epsilon)\mathbf{h}_j^{\text{in}} + \gamma_i\right) \tag{6}$$

$$= \sigma\left(\sum_j \theta_{i,j}\mathbf{h}_j^{\text{in}} + \sum_j \epsilon\mathbf{h}_j^{\text{in}} + \gamma_i\right) \tag{7}$$

$$= \sigma\left(\sum_j \theta_{i,j}\mathbf{h}_j^{\text{in}} + \left(\epsilon \sum_j \mathbf{h}_j^{\text{in}} + \gamma_i\right)\right), \tag{8}$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the activation function. By our well-regularization assumption, this is equivalent to perturbing the bias γ^i with noise sampled from $\mathcal{U}(0, \beta \sum_j \mathbf{h}_j^{\text{in}})$.

C. Perturbing the Attention Block: An Alternative Bayesian Approach

In this section, we explore an alternative instantiation of the Bayesian perspective by injecting noise into the attention block, as opposed to the MLP layer (see Figure 1). Specifically, we inject noise into the attention block activation, akin to modifying the unperturbed (zero) bias of the attention mechanism. In Table 7, we experiment with `Llama-2-7B-chat` on CSQA, perturbing the 20-32 layer activations with uniform noise. We sweep the noise magnitude α from 0.01, 0.03, 0.05, 0.07, 0.09 and report the best performance at $\alpha = 0.01$. Our experiments show that this alternative perturbation achieves performance similar to MLP-activation perturbation, with both approaches enhancing hallucination detection. This further demonstrates the general effectiveness of Bayesian-inspired noise injection in capturing both aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty, ultimately enhancing hallucination detection.

Table 7. Analysis on Perturbation Position. Noise injection at the attention activation (third row) performs comparably to injection at the MLP activation (second row), both improving detection effectiveness compared to no noise (first row), as indicated by higher AUROC scores. This further demonstrates the general effectiveness of Bayesian-inspired noise injection in capturing both aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty. Evaluation performed on the CSQA dataset with the `Llama-2-7B-chat` model across 10 samples.

	AUROC
No Noise	67.55
Noise Injection at MLP output	69.95
Noise Injection at Attention output	69.10