

Beyond Accuracy: The Role of Calibration in Self-Improving Large Language Models

Liangjie Huang

University of Illinois Chicago
lhuan85@uic.edu

Dawei Li

Arizona State University
daweili5@asu.edu

Huan Liu

Arizona State University
huanliu@asu.edu

Lu Cheng

University of Illinois Chicago
lucheng@uic.edu

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable self-improvement capabilities, whereby models iteratively revise their outputs through self-generated feedback. While this reflective mechanism has shown promise in enhancing task performance, recent studies suggest that it may also introduce undesirable biases—most notably, self-bias, or the tendency of LLMs to favor their own prior outputs. In this work, we extend this line of inquiry by investigating the impact on confidence estimation. We evaluate three representative self-improvement paradigms—basic prompting, Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting, and tuning-based methods—and find that iterative self-improvement can lead to systematic overconfidence, as evidenced by a steadily increasing Expected Calibration Error (ECE) and lower accuracy with high confidence. We then further explore the integration of confidence calibration techniques with self-improvement. Specifically, we compare three strategies: (1) applying calibration after multiple rounds of self-improvement, (2) calibrating before self-improvement, and (3) applying calibration iteratively at each self-improvement step. Our results show that iterative calibration is most effective in reducing ECE, yielding improved calibration. Our work pioneers the study of self-improving LLMs from a calibration perspective, offering valuable insights into balancing model performance and reliability.

1 Introduction

The development of Large Language Models (LLMs) has catalyzed transformative changes across numerous domains, from natural language understanding and generation (Storks et al., 2019; Weld et al., 2022) to assisting in complex question-answering and decision-making processes (Li et al., 2025b; 2024a; Tan et al., 2024). To handle this, one of the emerging techniques for LLMs is self-improvement (Bai et al., 2022; Kim et al., 2023), wherein LLMs iteratively review their own responses and refine their outputs based on self-generated feedback to enhancing the performance. This process fosters human-like reflective thinking and has proven effective across a range of tasks and applications (Tong et al., 2024; Pan et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024b).

However, some recent studies also report cases where LLM-based self-improvement does not bring a significant boost and can even degrade the model’s performance (Zhang et al., 2024a; Wu et al., 2024). One contributing factor to this counterintuitive outcome is self-bias (Xu et al., 2024b; Wataoka et al., 2024; Li et al., 2025a)—the tendency of LLMs to favor their own generated content. This cognitive bias impedes LLMs from providing impartial feedback on their outputs, thereby hindering effective self-correction and self-improvement.

Borrowing this insight, we propose our **first** research question: *Will self-improvement also lead to bias in confidence estimation?* As LLMs become increasingly integral to both research




Figure 1: The two research questions and overview of our exploration process in this work.

and industry applications (Zhu et al., 2025), the ability to accurately express confidence or uncertainty in their outputs is crucial (Su et al., 2024), particularly in high-risk scenarios (Thirunavukarasu et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024c). If self-improvement methods introduce self-bias in confidence estimation, this could pose a significant threat to LLM safety and reliability, creating substantial challenges in the pursuit of trustworthy AI (Sun et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2025). To investigate this, we examine three types of self-improvement methods in our experiments: **Basic prompting**, **Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting**, and **Tuning-based approaches** (First et al., 2023; Han et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024b; Akyürek et al., 2023; Xie et al., 2025). We implement each method and analyze its impact on LLMs’ confidence estimation performance. Our results reveal a clear trend of increasing overconfidence as self-improvement iterations progress, leading to a continuously rising Expected Calibration Error (ECE) score (Guo et al., 2017).

As calibration Guo et al. (2017); Geng et al. (2023); Xie et al. (2024b) serves as an effective technique to align a model’s confidence with its correctness and thus improve models confidence estimation, we pose our **second** research question: *How to combine calibration with the self-improvement method to mitigate the confidence estimation bias?* To explore this, we examine the compounded effects of calibration and self-improvement. Specifically, we evaluate three experimental settings to analyze their interaction: (1) **multiple self-improvement iterations followed by calibration**, (2) **calibration applied before multiple self-improvement iterations**, and (3) **iterative calibration and self-improvement at each step**. Our results indicate that applying calibration before self-improvement leads to sustained improvements over time. Meanwhile, self-improvement then calibration achieves the best ECE score, resulting in better-calibrated confidence estimates.

To summarize, our contribution in this paper is in two-fold:

- From a novel perspective of calibration, we first propose to explore self-improvement’s impact on LLMs’ confidence estimation and reveal a significant overconfidence issue caused by iterative self-improvement.
- We explore several self-improvement paradigms to showcase the compounded effect when combining self-improvement with calibration, producing LLMs that are both effective and reliable in real-world applications.

2 Related Work

Self-Improvement generally refers to the way that LLMs try to review and correct their own mistakes to achieve performance improvement on their own. Broader view on this topic can be categorized into three types of methods (Kamoi et al., 2024): *Intrinsic Improvement*, *External Information* and *Fine-tuning*. Intrinsic Improvement means LLMs generate feedbacks to their own responses and correct themselves (Kim et al., 2023; Dhuliawala et al.). Recently, some researchers found that intrinsic improvement can be affected by the prompting mechanism. Specifically, prompting with CoT and self-refinement style have gained effective results (Shinn et al., 2023; Madaan et al., 2023; Fu et al., 2025). An iterative and intrinsic self-improvement process where LLMs generates a response, receives feedback via a feedback model, and refines its output using the same model as a refinement model. *External information* will introduce some extra tools to help check the responses from LLMs. These include many scopes, such as code executors (Chen et al., 2023), search engines (Zhao et al., 2023), human feedback (Chen et al., 2024) and so on. *Fine-tuning* for self-improvement generates feedback and then refines its responses, so that it achieves self-improvement via learning from these corpus. Popular methods in this branch are supervised fine-tuning (First et al., 2023; Han et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024b) and reinforcement learning (RL) (Akyürek et al., 2023; Xie et al., 2025).

In this study, we focus on intrinsic self-improvement, a concept that has attracted considerable debate in recent years. On the one hand, studies such as Bai et al. (2022) suggest that prompting LLMs can enable them to self-correct harmful outputs. Other work, including self-refine approaches (Madaan et al., 2023) and RCI Prompting (Kim et al., 2023), demonstrates how LLMs can iteratively refine their own responses in reasoning tasks. On the other hand, Huang et al. (2023a) indicates that LLMs may struggle to enhance their performance without external feedback, and that their performance can even degrade after self-improvement attempts. Further research similarly reports that achieving self-improvement by solely relying on prompts remains challenging (Gou et al., 2023; Olausson et al., 2023). These findings motivate us to investigate the underlying mechanisms and conditions under which intrinsic self-improvement can be most effectively realized. Additionally, we also adopt supervised fine-tuning method for self-improvement, considering its efficiency and effectiveness compared with the RL-based one.

Calibration. Popular methods for calibrating language models can be broadly classified into five categories: verbalization-based, self-consistency-based, logit-based, internal state-based, and surrogate approaches (Geng et al., 2023; Xie et al., 2024b). Verbalization-based methods leverage an LLM to explicitly express uncertainty about its answers. For instance, Xu et al. (2024a) fine-tune its language models and then prompt the LLMs to indicate the confidence of its response by generating a probability scaler. Self-consistency-based methods rely on the intuition that confident models produce consistent outputs. Consequently, these methods sample multiple responses and estimate confidence by clustering outputs based on similarity (Huang et al., 2024). Internal state-based examines how the model’s internal layers (like attention heads or hidden states) respond during generation (Azaria & Mitchell, 2023; Li et al., 2023). And surrogate models are used to mimic or approximate a black-box LLM in order to estimate confidence or uncertainty (Shrivastava et al., 2023).

However, both verbalization-based and self-consistency-based methods may be constrained by the LM’s ability to follow instructions accurately. Appropriate layers or heads in internal state-based methods vary a lot and thus are hard to unify for comparison. And the surrogate model is not the same as the target model. For a better fit to our research goal, logit-based methods directly utilize predicted token probabilities to evaluate response confidence (Huang et al., 2023b). Typically, logits are transformed or calculated to represent the forecasted confidence. The logits are believed to have the capacity to offer a more nuanced understanding of confidence knowledge (Widmann et al., 2021; Kuhn et al.; Jang et al., 2024). Notably, as a logits-based method, temperature scaling has been widely applied in LLMs for answering questions. By adjusting the temperature parameter, it influences the model’s probability distribution over possible answers, thereby enhancing its performance in selecting the correct option (Peeperkorn et al., 2024; Xie et al., 2024a; Shen et al., 2024).

In this work, we thus use logits-based calibration approach to discover the relationship between self-improvement and calibration in multi domains.

3 Methods

In this section, we introduce the three backbone techniques for self-improvement, as well as various manners to marry self-improvement methods with calibration. The overall framework can be found in Figure 1.

3.1 Self-Improvement

Basic Prompting. Basic prompting in this work refers to clearly and directly prompt LLMs to answer questions without guiding the LLM to output its CoT. As shown in left panel of Figure 1, an LLM generates an answer $a^{(0)} = \text{LLM}(q)$ given query q . Subsequently, this initial answer undergoes an evaluation phase, where feedback $f^{(t)}$ in round t is produced. This feedback is then in a subsequent step "Answer Refining," to revise the answer given the feedback to get $a^{(t+1)}$.

$$f^{(t)} = \text{LLM}(q, a^{(t)}), \quad t \geq 0; \quad a^{(t+1)} = \text{LLM}(q, a^{(t)}, f^{(t)}). \quad (1)$$

This iterative loop above involving answer generation, feedback provision, and refinement contributes to enhancing the LLM’s performance (Madaan et al., 2023).

Chain-of-Thought (CoT) Prompting. CoT Prompting (Wei et al., 2022) involves guiding LLMs through step-by-step reasoning to solve complex problems, generate detailed explanation or feedback. Recent advancement, including the emerging DeepSeek-R1 models (Guo et al., 2025), leverage CoT by explicitly generating structured intermediate steps, significantly boosting the reasoning capabilities. We also introduce this technique as one of our self-improvement methods. Instead of directly outputting answers from LLMs, we first guide the language models to generate a CoT response $c = \text{LLM}_{\text{CoT}}(q)$, explicitly articulating the reasoning steps involved in answering the query. After getting the CoT for a specific question, we then use this generated CoT as new context to guide the LLM to provide the answer $a = \text{LLM}(q, c)$:

$$f^{(t)} = \text{LLM}(q, c, a^{(t)}), \quad a^{(t+1)} = \text{LLM}(q, c, a^{(t)}, f^{(t)}). \quad (2)$$

Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT). Apart from prompting, we also utilize SFT (Dong et al., 2024a;b) with specific datasets to investigate the reasoning ability in LLMs, thereby exploring its role in self-improvement and calibration. A SFT loss is typically defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SFT}}(\theta) = - \sum_{(q,y) \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^I \log p_{\theta}(y_i | q, y_{<i}). \quad (3)$$

Noted that I is the total number of tokens in the target output sequence y . And $p_{\theta}(y_i | q, y_{<i})$ is the probability assigned by the model to token y_i . Query q is input sequence, which means the question prompt. i is to locate output sequence position. θ is the model parameters. \mathcal{D} is the finetuning dataset, a collection of question query and the according answer pairs.

3.2 Calibration

In the context of LLMs, calibration refers to how well an LLM’s predicted confidence aligns with its actual accuracy. As one of the most common calibration approaches, temperature scaling (Guo et al., 2017) is a post-hoc calibration strategy that aligns model predictions with observed probabilities. We adapt the method from (Shen et al., 2024), a temperature scaling calibration approach tailored to LLMs that learns an auxiliary model to map the outputs of

the LLM to better-calibrated probabilities. The calibration formula is shown below:

$$p(y_n|q_n, \tau_k; W) = \frac{\exp(w_y^T \phi(q_n; W) / \tau_k)}{\sum_{v'} \exp(w_{v'}^T \phi(q_n; W) / \tau_k)}. \quad (4)$$

The key idea is to train a neuro network to fit the logits distribution and then use the network to infer task-specific latent temperatures τ , allowing the model to adapt to new questions with learned parameters. $\phi(q_n; W)$ is the feature that the language model produces for the input token sequence q_n . $\sum_{v'} \exp(w_{v'}^T \phi(q_n; W) / \tau_k)$ is the sum of exponential over all possible tokens v' in the vocabulary. W and w are model parameters and the logit vector transformation, respectively. The method is computationally efficient, to preserve the accuracy of the LLM, and takes a step towards being universal among different tasks.

3.3 Marrying Self-improvement with Calibration

We propose three methods to answer the second research question, via marrying self-improvement with calibration, as shown in Figure 1.

The Iterative Method refers to a process where each round consists of basic-prompting-based self-improvement followed by calibration. It facilitates a direct observation of how self-improvement and calibration mutually enhance or constrain each other during successive iterations.

$$a^{(t+1)} = \text{Calibrate}\left(\text{Self-Improve}(a^{(t)})\right), \quad t = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (5)$$

In the equation, $a^{(0)}$ is the initial response from LLM for query q and $a^{(t+1)}$ is the result after self-improvement and calibration in each round.

Calibration then Self-improvement performs calibration only once at the beginning, and in the subsequent rounds, only self-improvement is conducted.

$$a^{(0)} = \text{Calibrate}\left(a^{(0)}\right); \quad a^{(t+1)} = \text{Self-Improve}\left(a^{(t)}\right), \quad t = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (6)$$

This helps determine if an initial calibration provides a stronger foundation for subsequent self-improvements, reducing the risk of deviation from the ideal state.

In **Multi Self-Improvement then Calibration**, it instructs the LLM to perform T rounds of self-improvement first, followed by a single calibration:

$$a^{(t+1)} = \text{Self-Improve}\left(a^{(t)}\right), \quad t = 0, 1, 2, \dots, T-1. \quad a^{(\text{final})} = \text{Calibrate}\left(a^{(T)}\right). \quad (7)$$

This design allows the model to freely explore and maximize its potential before using calibration to correct accumulated errors and biases. It also helps to assess whether a single calibration step remains effective in correcting deviations accumulated through multiple self-improvement iterations.

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Set Up

Models. In this paper, we use popular open-source LLMs. Specifically, Llama-2-7b-chat-hf (Touvron et al., 2023) as a standard LLM and DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B (Guo et al., 2025) as a deep thinking model, denoted as Llama-deepseek in later section, are used to investigate the effectiveness and relationship between self-improvement and calibration.

Dataset. MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2020) is utilized in our paper for evaluation. The MMLU is a comprehensive benchmark, which covers 57 sub-datasets spanning various subjects including STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics), humanities, social sciences, and other specialized areas. It consists of multi-domain questions that assess

both world knowledge and problem-solving abilities, making it well-suited for evaluating calibration and self-improvement. We use all 57 sub-datasets for the experiments.

In terms of SFT dataset, we follow (Zhang et al., 2024b), which focuses on the self-correction abilities of small, open-source LMs, exploring whether they can self-correct with minimal guidance. We adopt their refined dataset to fine-tune the LLMs.

Evaluation Metrics. We investigate our research using these two metrics: Accuracy (ACC) for LLM prediction accuracy and ECE for model calibration measurement. ECE is a widely adopted metric that measures the discrepancy between predicted confidence and its actual accuracy. A high ECE score reflects poor calibration, indicating a significant discrepancy between the model’s predicted confidence and its empirical accuracy on the given dataset.

$$\text{ECE} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{|B_k|}{N} |\text{acc}(B_k) - \text{conf}(B_k)|. \quad (8)$$

ECE essentially computes a weighted sum of absolute differences between accuracy $\text{acc}(B_k)$ and confidence $\text{conf}(B_k)$ across bins. Here, we use 10 bins of width 0.1 each in $[0,1]$, where N denotes the number of model’s generations and K denotes the number of bins.

Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT). We performed SFT of the base models using Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2022). Specifically, the LoRA configuration employed a rank (r) of 32, along with a scaling factor (lora_alpha) of 16. LoRA dropout was set to 0.05. Training was conducted using a batch size of 8. To efficiently manage GPU memory, gradient checkpointing was enabled. The maximum gradient norm was clipped at 0.3 to ensure training stability. We fine-tuned the model for five epochs using a learning rate of $2e-4$, coupled with a cosine learning rate scheduler and a warm-up ratio of 0.05. Additionally, training with BF16 was utilized to enhance training efficiency. One A100 GPU was used in our experiment.

4.2 Results and Analysis

In this section, we will be answering the following research questions introduced in the Introduction with the experiment results analysis.

- **RQ 1:** Will self-improvement lead to LLM self-bias in confidence estimation?
- **RQ 2:** What are the compounded effects of marrying calibration and self-improvement on model performance?

4.2.1 RQ 1: Will self-improvement lead to bias in confidence estimation?

As seen in Figure 2, the two upper charts are the accuracy scores of Llama-deepseek and Llama, on the left and right respectively. Similarly, the two bottom charts are the ECE scores.

Longer CoT generally enhances model accuracy but model’s inherent reasoning capacity can modulate its effectiveness. Longer CoT consistently yielded the highest accuracy across both Llama-deepseek and Llama, with Llama-deepseek demonstrating a clear trend of progressive self-improvement over multiple rounds (Jin et al., 2024). While Llama’s accuracy eventually declined after several rounds of self-improvement using a longer CoT, it still outperformed other self-improvement methods within Llama. Notably, the CoT methods with 512 tokens in Llama experienced a late drop in accuracy due to the 4096-token context limitation. Moreover, CoT length significantly influenced inference accuracy: longer CoT (512-token limit) reliably produced higher accuracy compared to shorter CoT (128-token limit). Interestingly, for Llama—the weaker of the two base models—shorter CoT sequences provide a moderate boost, suggesting limited CoT can still benefit models of relatively constrained reasoning capabilities.

The effectiveness of prompting-based methods appears to be strongly influenced by the model’s intrinsic reasoning capabilities. In Llama-deepseek, while basic prompting




Figure 2: Results of Self-Improvement in Different Methods.

Note. Basic means the basic prompting method and cot is for CoT prompting with different length of tokens. Tuned stands for the fine-tuned method

experienced a slight decline in accuracy initially, it subsequently facilitated continuous error correction and progressive improvement. By contrast, Llama exhibited a general deterioration in ACC as the number of prompting rounds increased, with basic prompting ultimately yielding the lowest accuracy among all tested self-improvement strategies.

SFT may be more beneficial for weaker models. Our fine-tuning experiments revealed divergent outcomes in these two models. In Llama-Deepseek, both CoT with 128 and 512 tokens exhibited lower ACC than the original basic prompting method and the fine-tuning ones. Notably, fine-tuned basic prompting resulted in the poorest ACC among all conditions, with one of the highest ECE. This indicates that calibration worsened for Llama-deepseek post-fine-tuning. In Llama, however, fine-tuning produced improvements: both fine-tuned methods surpassed the original basic prompting in terms of ACC, and their ECE also improved, suggesting better calibration. The performance drop in Llama-deepseek after fine-tuning may stem from a mismatch between the fine-tuning dataset and the reasoning dataset, thereby causing noticeable degradation. As Llama-deepseek possesses stronger inherent reasoning capabilities, it may be ill-suited to the chosen dataset and approach. In contrast, Llama, with weaker intrinsic reasoning ability, appears to benefit from fine-tuning, which leads to more pronounced gains.

In addition, Llama-deepseek exhibited a substantially higher initial ECE than Llama and maintained a high level in all self-improvement experiments, suggesting poor calibration under iterative improvement. In contrast, although basic prompting yielded the highest ECE among Llama’s self-improvement methods, its ECE does not exceed 0.7—lower than that of Llama-deepseek—indicating that Llama remains inherently better calibrated than Llama-deepseek. Moreover, ECE values tended to be lower when CoT reasoning was applied, particularly in Llama. To further investigate these findings, we propose conducting confidence distribution bias experiments to compare predicted confidence versus actual accuracy across various confidence intervals (e.g., 0.1–0.2, 0.2–0.3, etc.) under both basic and CoT prompting for the two LLMs.

Self-Bias in Confidence Estimation. We use the longer CoT and basic prompting to illustrate self-improvement performance at the initial and intermediate stages. The x-axis




Figure 3: Llama-deepSeek’s accuracy and confidence distribution.

in Figure 3 represents confidence levels divided into ten bins, while the y-axis denotes the corresponding accuracy.

We can observe that in Llama-deepseek, there is no substantial calibration improvement from the first to the fifth round; rather, the performance appears to deteriorate. In particular, the accuracy of high-confidence predictions decreases, suggesting that self-improvement might have exacerbated overconfidence in certain areas. Furthermore, during Llama-deepseek’s self-improvement with basic prompting, a notable dip in confidence occurs in the 0.2–0.3 interval.




Figure 4: Llama’s accuracy and confidence distribution.

In Figure 4, we observe that in the initial round for Llama, the relationship between confidence and accuracy generally aligns with expectations: as confidence increases, accuracy also improves. However, in the high-confidence region, the model exhibits a tendency toward overconfidence, characterized by high confidence yet relatively lower accuracy. By the fifth round of self-improvement, this issue becomes more pronounced, exacerbating the overconfidence effect. Similarly, during the fifth round of CoT, we observe a sudden rise in accuracy within the 0.3–0.4 confidence range. Based on these, we thus can conclude that **prompting and fine-tuning based methods in iterative self-improvement can introduce or amplify self-biases in confidence estimation.**

4.2.2 RQ 2: What are the compounded effects of marrying calibration and self-improvement on model performance?

As calibration serves as an effective technique to align a model’s confidence with its correctness and thus improve models confidence estimation, we propose three experiments using the basic prompting approach to investigate the RQ2. The results highlight notable commonalities and distinctions between the LLMs, as shown in Figure 5.

ECE can be diminished when combined with self-improvement after calibration. Multi self-improvement–then–calibration methods yield reduced ECE, with the latter achieving a markedly lower ECE compared to the other two approaches. Despite performing calibration after each round, the iterative method continues to exhibit relatively high ECE, possibly because the alternating introduction of self-improvement dilutes the calibration effect and consequently compromises alignment between confidence and accuracy. Furthermore, both




Figure 5: Self-Improve and Calibration Relationship Experiment Result.

Note. Cms means calibration then multi self-improvement and msc is multi self-improvement then calibration. Ics stands for iterative calibration and self-improvement

the “calibration then multi self-improvement” and “iterative” methods produce relatively high ECE—particularly in Llama, where ECE increases substantially compared to self-improvement alone. One explanation for this phenomenon is that calibration is primarily intended to align the model’s confidence with its actual accuracy. However, during self-improvement, the model refines its responses based on self-generated feedback, which can shift its confidence distribution. As a result, the self-bias dominates over calibration effect when the calibration is performed at the beginning.

Calibration can serve as a better foundation in self-improvement for stronger LLM. The “calibration then multi self-improvement” strategy in Llama-deepseek shows steady improvement of ACC, surpassing the performance of Llama-deepseek’s longer CoT in pure self-improvement setting. Additionally, unlike basic prompting-based self-improvement, this method does not exhibit an initial accuracy drop. In Llama-deepseek, the multi self-improvement-then-calibration approach effectively rectifies errors in earlier stages while maintaining a relatively stable ECE; however, it manifests some fluctuations of ACC in later stages, suggesting a pronounced impact on model reasoning ability. Meanwhile, for Llama, the iterative method achieves the highest ACC across multiple rounds, although the overall trend still declines, reinforcing the notion that calibration is beneficial for self-improvement but Llama’s comparatively weaker intrinsic reasoning limits its capacity for effective self-correction.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we study the effect of self-improving LLM from a calibration perspective. The first research question we propose is will self-improvement leads to self-bias in confidence estimation. Based on our experiment results on three mainstream self-improvement approaches, we reveal an obvious trend of increasing overconfidence as self-improvement iterations progress, leading to a large ECE score value after the self-improvement process. This motivates our second research question on how to marry calibration with self-improvement to mitigate this overconfidence. With several potential solutions proposed and analyzed, we conclude that ECE can be largely diminished when applying calibration after

self-improvement. In the future, we will explore the calibration of self-improving LLMs in larger sizes of LLMs, as well as use a wider spectrum of calibration methods to validate the robustness and generalization of our findings. Besides, investigating self-improvement and calibration in multilingual or multimodal settings would provide a richer understanding of how overconfidence manifests in more complex scenarios.

References

- Afra Feyza Akyürek, Ekin Akyürek, Ashwin Kalyan, Peter Clark, Derry Tanti Wijaya, and Niket Tandon. RL4f: Generating natural language feedback with reinforcement learning for repairing model outputs. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 7716–7733, 2023.
- Amos Azaria and Tom Mitchell. The internal state of an llm knows when it’s lying. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pp. 967–976, 2023.
- Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Sandipan Kundu, Amanda Askell, Jackson Kernion, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Cameron McKinnon, et al. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022.
- A Chen, J Scheurer, JA Campos, T Korbak, JS Chan, SR Bowman, K Cho, and E Perez. Learning from natural language feedback. *Transactions on machine learning research*, 2024.
- Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Teaching large language models to self-debug. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05128*, 2023.
- Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Mojtaba Komeili, Jing Xu, Roberta Raileanu, Xian Li, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Jason E Weston. Chain-of-verification reduces hallucination in large language models. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Reliable and Responsible Foundation Models*.
- Guanting Dong, Hongyi Yuan, Keming Lu, Chengpeng Li, Mingfeng Xue, Dayiheng Liu, Wei Wang, Zheng Yuan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. How abilities in large language models are affected by supervised fine-tuning data composition. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 177–198, 2024a.
- Jiancheng Dong, Lei Jiang, Wei Jin, and Lu Cheng. Threshold filtering packing for supervised fine-tuning: Training related samples within packs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.09327*, 2024b.
- Emily First, Markus N Rabe, Talia Ringer, and Yuriy Brun. Baldur: Whole-proof generation and repair with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pp. 1229–1241, 2023.
- Tairan Fu, Javier Conde, Gonzalo Martínez, María Grandury, and Pedro Reviriego. Multiple choice questions: Reasoning makes large language models (llms) more self-confident even when they are wrong. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.09775*, 2025.
- Jiahui Geng, Fengyu Cai, Yuxia Wang, Heinz Koepl, Preslav Nakov, and Iryna Gurevych. A survey of confidence estimation and calibration in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08298*, 2023.
- Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Yujiu Yang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. Critic: Large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11738*, 2023.
- Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017.
- Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.

- Haixia Han, Jiaqing Liang, Jie Shi, Qianyu He, and Yanghua Xiao. Small language model can self-correct. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pp. 18162–18170, 2024.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2020.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2):3, 2022.
- Jie Huang, Xinyun Chen, Swaroop Mishra, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Adams Wei Yu, Xinying Song, and Denny Zhou. Large language models cannot self-correct reasoning yet. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01798*, 2023a.
- Yue Huang, Chujie Gao, Siyuan Wu, Haoran Wang, Xiangqi Wang, Yujun Zhou, Yanbo Wang, Jiayi Ye, Jiawen Shi, Qihui Zhang, et al. On the trustworthiness of generative foundation models: Guideline, assessment, and perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14296*, 2025.
- Yuheng Huang, Jiayang Song, Zhijie Wang, Shengming Zhao, Huaming Chen, Felix Juefei-Xu, and Lei Ma. Look before you leap: An exploratory study of uncertainty measurement for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10236*, 2023b.
- Yukun Huang, Yixin Liu, Raghuveer Thirukovalluru, Arman Cohan, and Bhuwan Dhingra. Calibrating long-form generations from large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06544*, 2024.
- Chaeyun Jang, Hyungi Lee, Seanie Lee, and Juho Lee. Calibrated decision-making through llm-assisted retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.08891*, 2024.
- Mingyu Jin, Qinkai Yu, Dong Shu, Haiyan Zhao, Wenyue Hua, Yanda Meng, Yongfeng Zhang, and Mengnan Du. The impact of reasoning step length on large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pp. 1830–1842, 2024.
- Ryo Kamoi, Yusen Zhang, Nan Zhang, Jiawei Han, and Rui Zhang. When can llms actually correct their own mistakes? a critical survey of self-correction of llms. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:1417–1440, 2024.
- Geunwoo Kim, Pierre Baldi, and Stephen McAleer. Language models can solve computer tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:39648–39677, 2023.
- Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. In *NeurIPS ML Safety Workshop*.
- Dawei Li, Bohan Jiang, Liangjie Huang, Alimohammad Beigi, Chengshuai Zhao, Zhen Tan, Amrita Bhattacharjee, Yuxuan Jiang, Canyu Chen, Tianhao Wu, et al. From generation to judgment: Opportunities and challenges of llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.16594*, 2024a.
- Dawei Li, Zhen Tan, Peijia Qian, Yifan Li, Kumar Satvik Chaudhary, Lijie Hu, and Jiayi Shen. Smoa: Improving multi-agent large language models with sparse mixture-of-agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.03284*, 2024b.
- Dawei Li, Shu Yang, Zhen Tan, Jae Baik, Sukwon Yun, Joseph Lee, Aaron Chacko, Bojian Hou, Duy Duong-Tran, Ying Ding, et al. Dalk: Dynamic co-augmentation of llms and kg to answer alzheimer’s disease questions with scientific literature. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pp. 2187–2205, 2024c.
- Dawei Li, Renliang Sun, Yue Huang, Ming Zhong, Bohan Jiang, Jiawei Han, Xiangliang Zhang, Wei Wang, and Huan Liu. Preference leakage: A contamination problem in llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.01534*, 2025a.

- Kenneth Li, Oam Patel, Fernanda Viégas, Hanspeter Pfister, and Martin Wattenberg. Inference-time intervention: Eliciting truthful answers from a language model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:41451–41530, 2023.
- Zhong-Zhi Li, Duzhen Zhang, Ming-Liang Zhang, Jiabin Zhang, Zengyan Liu, Yuxuan Yao, Haotian Xu, Junhao Zheng, Pei-Jie Wang, Xiuyi Chen, et al. From system 1 to system 2: A survey of reasoning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.17419*, 2025b.
- Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 46534–46594, 2023.
- Theo X Olausson, Jeevana Priya Inala, Chenglong Wang, Jianfeng Gao, and Armando Solar-Lezama. Is self-repair a silver bullet for code generation? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09896*, 2023.
- Liangming Pan, Michael Saxon, Wenda Xu, Deepak Nathani, Xinyi Wang, and William Yang Wang. Automatically correcting large language models: Surveying the landscape of diverse automated correction strategies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:484–506, 2024.
- Max Peeperkorn, Tom Kouwenhoven, Dan Brown, and Anna Jordanous. Is temperature the creativity parameter of large language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00492*, 2024.
- Maohao Shen, Subhro Das, Kristjan Greenewald, Prasanna Sattigeri, Gregory W Wornell, and Soumya Ghosh. Thermometer: Towards universal calibration for large language models. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:8634–8652, 2023.
- Vaishnavi Shrivastava, Percy Liang, and Ananya Kumar. Llamas know what gpts don’t show: Surrogate models for confidence estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08877*, 2023.
- Shane Storks, Qiaozhi Gao, and Joyce Y Chai. Commonsense reasoning for natural language understanding: A survey of benchmarks, resources, and approaches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.01172*, pp. 1–60, 2019.
- Jiayuan Su, Jing Luo, Hongwei Wang, and Lu Cheng. Api is enough: Conformal prediction for large language models without logit-access. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pp. 979–995, 2024.
- Lichao Sun, Yue Huang, Haoran Wang, Siyuan Wu, Qihui Zhang, et al. Trustllm: Trustworthiness in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05561*, 3, 2024.
- Zhen Tan, Dawei Li, Song Wang, Alimohammad Beigi, Bohan Jiang, Amrita Bhattacharjee, Mansoor Karami, Jundong Li, Lu Cheng, and Huan Liu. Large language models for data annotation and synthesis: A survey. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 930–957, 2024.
- Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, Laura Gutierrez, Ting Fang Tan, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine*, 29(8):1930–1940, 2023.
- Yongqi Tong, Dawei Li, Sizhe Wang, Yujia Wang, Fei Teng, and Jingbo Shang. Can llms learn from previous mistakes? investigating llms’ errors to boost for reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 3065–3080, 2024.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.

- Koki Wataoka, Tsubasa Takahashi, and Ryokan Ri. Self-preference bias in llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21819*, 2024.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Henry Weld, Xiaoqi Huang, Siyu Long, Josiah Poon, and Soyeon Caren Han. A survey of joint intent detection and slot filling models in natural language understanding. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(8):1–38, 2022.
- David Widmann, Fredrik Lindsten, and Dave Zachariah. Calibration tests beyond classification. In *International Conference on Learning Representations, Virtual conference, May 3–May 7, 2021*, pp. 1–37. International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR, 2021.
- Ting Wu, Xuefeng Li, and Pengfei Liu. Progress or regress? self-improvement reversal in post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05013*, 2024.
- Johnathan Xie, Annie Chen, Yoonho Lee, Eric Mitchell, and Chelsea Finn. Calibrating language models with adaptive temperature scaling. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 18128–18138, 2024a.
- Liangru Xie, Hui Liu, Jingying Zeng, Xianfeng Tang, Yan Han, Chen Luo, Jing Huang, Zhen Li, Suhang Wang, and Qi He. A survey of calibration process for black-box llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.12767*, 2024b.
- Zhihui Xie, Liyu Chen, Weichao Mao, Jingjing Xu, Lingpeng Kong, et al. Teaching language models to critique via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.03492*, 2025.
- Tianyang Xu, Shujin Wu, Shizhe Diao, Xiaoze Liu, Xingyao Wang, Yangyi Chen, and Jing Gao. Saysself: Teaching llms to express confidence with self-reflective rationales. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 5985–5998, 2024a.
- Wenda Xu, Guanglei Zhu, Xuandong Zhao, Liangming Pan, Lei Li, and William Wang. Pride and prejudice: Llm amplifies self-bias in self-refinement. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 15474–15492, 2024b.
- Qingjie Zhang, Han Qiu, Di Wang, Haoting Qian, Yiming Li, Tianwei Zhang, and Minlie Huang. Understanding the dark side of llms’ intrinsic self-correction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14959*, 2024a.
- Yunxiang Zhang, Muhammad Khalifa, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Jaekyeom Kim, Moontae Lee, Honglak Lee, and Lu Wang. Small language models need strong verifiers to self-correct reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17140*, 2024b.
- Ruochen Zhao, Xingxuan Li, Shafiq Joty, Chengwei Qin, and Lidong Bing. Verify-and-edit: A knowledge-enhanced chain-of-thought framework. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 5823–5840, 2023.
- Minjun Zhu, Yixuan Weng, Linyi Yang, and Yue Zhang. Deepreview: Improving llm-based paper review with human-like deep thinking process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.08569*, 2025.