
SELF-CHECK: USING LLMs TO ZERO-SHOT CHECK THEIR OWN STEP-BY-STEP REASONING

Ning Miao^{1*} Yee Whye Teh¹ Tom Rainforth¹

ABSTRACT

The recent progress in large language models (LLMs), especially the invention of chain-of-thoughts (CoT) prompting, makes it possible to solve reasoning problems. However, even the strongest LLMs are still struggling with more complicated problems that require non-linear thinking and multi-step reasoning. In this work, we explore whether LLMs have the ability to recognize their own errors, without resorting to external resources. In particular, we investigate whether they can be used to identify individual errors within a step-by-step reasoning. To this end, we propose a zero-shot verification scheme to recognize such errors. We then use this verification scheme to improve question-answering performance, by using it to perform weighted voting on different generated answers. We test the method on three math datasets—GSM8K, MathQA, and MATH—and find that it successfully recognizes errors and, in turn, increases final predictive performance.

1 INTRODUCTION

Recent years have witnessed dramatic changes in the areas of NLP and AI brought by large language models. From GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), PaLM (Chowdhery et al., 2022), Llama (Touvron et al., 2023) to GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023) and PaLM-2 (Google, 2023), the increasing model sizes and exploding amount of training data have empowered LLMs to achieve human-level performance on a large range of tasks, including summarization, translation, question answering and basic mathematical reasoning.

However, the performance of even the largest LLMs on complex reasoning problems is still unsatisfactory. For example, GPT-4 only correctly answers 42.5% of problems in the MATH dataset, which is far below human level. Such problems require careful multi-step reasoning to solve, where LLMs are prone to make mistakes. Namely, to solve such complex reasoning problems, LLMs need to generate many reasoning steps. Even though their error rate on a single step is low, the probability of LLMs generating at least one erroneous step can be fairly high, which makes final predictions less accurate.

It is thus necessary to check for errors in LLMs’ generated reasoning in order to filter out incorrect predictions and provide an estimation of confidence for a prediction. Recently, Cobbe et al. (2021) finetune GPT-3 to recognize errors in the whole reasoning process, and Li et al. (2022) train a BERT model (He et al., 2020) to check the correctness of each reasoning step. Ling et al. (2023) eliminate the need to finetune by performing few-shot checking on a special type of reasoning chains called Natural Program. To check a reasoning chain, most previous methods look for error patterns that match those in training data or instructions. However, there are an infinite number of error patterns, some of which are quite covert and deceptive. As a result, these methods do not work well without massive training data or examples.

To address this shortfall, we introduce SelfCheck, a zero-shot checking scheme for LLMs, which is based on step regeneration. SelfCheck works as a step-by-step checker, such that it individually checks each step in the LLMs reasoning process based on the available context. For each reasoning step in an LLM’s output reasoning, SelfCheck first collects related information to form a simpler context and then checks it by step-regeneration. Then it integrates the checking results of the individual steps to form a confidence score for the whole solution. Using confidence scores as weights to vote among multiple solutions for the same question, SelfCheck in turn allows us to improve question answering accuracy by focusing on the most accurate answer. SelfCheck mimics the procedure of human beings double-checking their solutions and completely bypasses the problem of pattern-matching style

¹Department of Statistics, University of Oxford. *Email: <ning.miao@stats.ox.ac.uk>.

checking. Its design is based on the key observation that LLMs are trained on far more generation tasks than checking tasks. SelfCheck works in a fully zero-shot manner to keep generalizability to different LLMs and tasks as well as to reduce the influence of prompt engineering on experimental results. Users of SelfCheck can easily change any of its components to a few-shot, or finetuned version to achieve better results on specific tasks.

We evaluate SelfCheck on three math tasks, namely GSM8K, MathQA, and MATH, in increasing order of difficulty. For all datasets, we find that using SelfCheck achieves a significant increase in prediction accuracies compared with majority voting. We also see that SelfCheck provides an accurate confidence estimation for LLM’s solutions, which decreases the proportion of incorrect solutions by 9%, 22.8%, and 16.2% on three datasets, after filtering out low-confidence solutions. We also perform an extensive analysis on the effect of per-question sample sizes and some critical design choices of step-checking methods, which, we hope, could provide some inspiration for future works on checking methods. Our code is available at <https://github.com/NingMiao/SelfCheck>.

To summarize, the main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We propose SelfCheck, an effective new schema for checking step-by-step reasoning in LLMs, which provides a better confidence estimation and in turn improves predictive accuracy.
- We demonstrate that LLMs can do effective self-verification without resorting to any external resources.

2 METHOD: SELF-CHECK

In this section, we propose **SelfCheck**, which is a scheme to check step-by-step solutions from an LLM by itself. For simplicity of illustration, we restrict our discussion to math problems, but SelfCheck can be easily applied to other domains that require multi-step reasoning.

We call the LLM that generates the original step-by-step solution the **generator**, which can be a zero or few-shot LLM. The input to the generator is a question and its output is a multi-step solution in the form of [Step 1, Step 2, ..., Step N]. SelfCheck first checks the correctness of each step of the solution and then integrate stepwise checking results to form a confidence score for the whole solution. In the following, we introduce how we perform step checking and the design of the integration function. Please see Figure 1 for a real example of how SelfCheck works.

2.1 STEP CHECKING

To check individual steps of the reasoning process, the first thing we should notice is that the correctness of each step is highly dependent on its context, namely the question and previous steps in the solution. As a result, it is not possible to check a single step without context. For example, we usually need to refer to previous steps for the definition of variables and the meaning of specific numbers. The target of the step checking in SelfCheck is thus to check the conditional correctness of each step based on the provided context. That is, we only care about catching errors at the current step, and can assume all information from its context to be correct.

A simple idea to achieve this would be feeding the current step as well as all its context to an LLM and directly asking the LLM to ‘check the correctness of the step’. However, in practice, we find that this task is too difficult for the LLM to do effectively. This is first because the checker needs to understand the key content in the step and then collect all related information from the context, before actually checking for its correctness. Moreover, ‘checking’ is not a common task in the training corpus of most LLMs, which means LLMs do not perform well even if we exemplify in detail how to do step-checking in the prompt.

To solve this problem, SelfCheck decomposes the checking task into 4 stages: *target extraction*, *information collection*, *step regeneration*, and *result comparison*. SelfCheck uses the LLM to execute each stage successively and uses the conclusion from the result comparison to predict the correctness of the original step. The main idea behind the decomposition is to make the LLM focus on an easier task that it is used to at each stage, which can be seen as a way of introducing inductive biases into LLMs. Specifically, we prompt the LLM to first figure out the target of the current step and what information it uses to achieve the target. Then we ask the LLM to re-achieve the target using only the collected information. The clear description of the target and the simplified context make the




Figure 1: A real example illustrating how SelfCheck works. The blocks show the question, the outputs of the generator, and the checker, respectively. To check the correctness of a certain step (step 4 in the example) in a multi-step reasoning procedure, SelfCheck goes through 4 stages before making a decision, which is elaborated in Section 2.1. Then the integration function combines the checking results of all steps to form a confidence score for the whole solution.

regeneration stage less challenging for an LLM. As a result, its output should be more reliable to serve as a reference. The last step would be comparing the original step with the regeneration output. If their main conclusions match/mismatch, we think the original step to be correct/wrong. In the following, we describe each of the subtasks and our specific instructions to the LLM.

Target extraction To check a step (for example, step 4 in Figure 1), we first need to figure out what the step is trying to do. Without a specific target, the regeneration stage would proceed in a random direction, making it impossible to serve as a reference to the original step. We thus use the LLM itself to extract the target of a step i using the question and all previous steps (step 0-3 in Figure 1) with the following prompt:

The following is a part of the solution to the problem [question]: [Step 0, Step 1, ..., Step i].
What specific action does the step [Step i] take? Please give a brief answer using a single sentence and do not copy the steps.

During execution, we copy the question and steps into [question] and [step] to form the actual input to the LLM. The reason for requesting a brief and single-sentence answer is to avoid getting too much detailed information, especially specific equations and values, which can be wrong and, consequently, mislead the regeneration stage.

Information collection To relieve the pressure of the regeneration stage and avoid unrelated information from affecting the result, we filter out information that is not directly related to the current step. Specifically, we ask the LLM to select useful items from the question and all previous items with the following prompt:

This is a math question: [question].
The following is information extracted from the question:
Information 0: [Information 0]
Information 1: [Information 1]
...

The following are the first a few steps in a solution to the problem:

Step 0: [Step 0]

Step 1: [Step 1]

...

Step i-1: [Step i-1]

Which previous steps or information does the next step [Step i] directly follow from?

[Information j] is simply the j-th sentence in the question. After retrieving the output, we extract step or information ids by regular expression. For example in Figure 1, the current step requires step 2 and 3 and no information from the question as context. The selected steps and information are then fed into the regeneration stage.

Step regeneration Given the target and necessary information of the step, we can now ask the LLM to regenerate it. Because the step is usually a small jump from previous conclusions, and the information collection stage has already filtered out irrelevant information, we can usually trust regeneration results. The prompt of this stage is

We are in the process of solving a math problem.

We have some information from the problem:

Information 0: [Information I_0]

Information 1: [Information I_1]

...

The following are some previous steps:

Step 0: [Step S_0]

Step 1: [Step S_1]

...

The target for the next step is: [Target].

Please try to achieve the target with the information from the problem or previous steps.

[Target] is the output from the target extraction stage and [Information] and [Step] are selected by the information collection stage.

Result comparison The last step is to compare results from the regeneration stage and the original step with the following prompt.

The following are 2 solutions to a math problem.

Solution 1: [Regeneration output]

Solution 2: [Step i]

Compare the key points from both solutions step by step and then check whether Solution 1 "supports", "contradicts" or "is not directly related to" the conclusion in Solution 2. Pay special attention to the difference in numbers.

If the regeneration output "supports" or "contradicts" the original step, we can conclude that the original step should be correct or wrong. Sometimes, the correctness of the original step cannot be directly inferred from the regeneration output. For example, when the target is to simplify an equation, the original step divides all terms by their common divisor while the regeneration step might combine like terms. In such cases, we are not sure about the correctness of the original step, which makes 'is not directly related to' the third output choice for SelfCheck.

2.2 RESULTS INTEGRATION

After getting a checking result for each step, we need an integration function ϕ to give a prediction of the overall correctness of the solution. The input of ϕ should be a vector in the form of $[w_0, w_1, \dots, w_n]$, where each item w_i represents the step checking result for step i . For simplicity, we assume $w_i \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, where $-1, 0, 1$ represents 'contradict', 'is not directly related to' and 'support' in the output of the result comparison stage. Specifically,

$$\phi([w_0, w_1, \dots, w_n]) = 2 * \text{Sigmoid} \left(-\lambda_{-1} \sum_{i=0}^n \mathbb{1}_{w_i=-1} - \lambda_0 \sum_{i=0}^n \mathbb{1}_{w_i=0} \right), \quad (1)$$

where λ_{-1} and λ_0 are two non-negative hyperparameters, chosen on a validation set. We call the output of ϕ the confidence score, which is a float number between 0 and 1. It can be directly used as the weight for voting or binarized by setting a threshold $t \in [0, 1]$ to form a binary checking result for a solution. We take negative steps (-1s) and neutral steps (0s) into consideration in Equation (1)

because the occurrence of a (possibly) incorrect step could make a reasoning chain to be incorrect. We ignore Os, which is less critical because a correct step usually keeps but not changes the correctness of a reasoning chain.

3 RELATED WORK

How to automatically check the correctness of a sequence of reasoning steps is a long-standing question. The following are 3 main research directions on it.

Training/finetuning a verifier The most straightforward idea would be training a separate verifier model to check the solution from the generator. For example, Cobbe et al. (2021) finetune a GPT-3 on GSM8K to predict the correctness of a solution as a whole. Li et al. (2022) take steps into consideration and train a binary *deberta-v3-large* (He et al., 2020) classifier to predict the probability of correctness for the solution and each step. Paul et al. (2023) train a critic model to provide structured feedback on intermediate reasoning steps. More recently, Lightman et al. (2023) build a large dataset, called PRM800K, which contains labels for step-wise correctness by crowdsourcing. They finetune a GPT-4 on PRM800K and achieve good results compared with majority voting. However, finetuning is not always possible due to the limitation of budget and time. For example, Cobbe et al. (2021) and Lightman et al. (2023) require finetuning GPT-3 (175B) and GPT-4 for the best performance. Moreover, finetuning or training on specific datasets or focusing on generating a specific type of feedback heavily limits the generalisability of the verifier, making them impossible to be applied to other domains. In comparison, SelfCheck is a fully zero-shot method, which requires no finetuning and zero training data. As a result, SelfCheck can be immediately deployed to work on multiple domains.

Verification with external resources Another chain of research focuses on using external resources to boost faithfulness or verify LLM results. Lyu et al. (2023) first translate a question into a symbolic reasoning chain by an LLM and solve the problem by a deterministic solver. Peng et al. (2023) introduce an external database to check for incorrect knowledge in LLM outputs. However, these methods are heavily limited by the ability of external tools. For example, deterministic symbolic solvers usually have strict constraints on the problem that they can solve. And Peng et al. (2023) can only check for factoid mistakes.

Few-shot verification Other works show the potential of using few-shot LLMs to correct errors. Bubeck et al. (2023) find that GPT-4 can serve as a judge to compare LLM outputs with reference answers. Weng et al. (2022) verify the whole solution by backward prediction. Specifically, they mask some information in the question, and make the solution to predict the masked information. If the masked information is recovered correctly, they label the solution as correct, and otherwise incorrect. However, this method is based on the hypothesis that a correct solution should keep every bit of information in the question while an incorrect one should not. It only holds for some very simple arithmetic or logic problems, making it unsuitable for more complex tasks. The verifier in Ling et al. (2023) relies on a specific solution format called Natural Program to check errors for each step. However, besides only being able to check solutions in a specific semi-symbolic form, they report worse performance compared with majority voting. Most of these methods directly ask LLMs to check reasoning chains, which usually leads to unsatisfactory results because checking is not a common task that LLMs are trained on. SelfCheck bypasses this problem by replacing checking with regeneration, whose benefits are shown clearly in Section 5.2.

4 EXPERIMENTS

We now run experiments on three math-reasoning datasets to evaluate SelfCheck’s effectiveness in checking multi-step reasoning and improving generation accuracies.

Datasets GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021), MathQA (Amini et al., 2019), and MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021) are three large-scale datasets consisting of math problems on primary school, middle school, and competition levels, containing 1319, 2985, and 5000 test samples, respectively. For GSM8K and MathQA, we evaluate our method on their whole test sets while tuning hyper-parameters on a small subset of their training set. Because of the limitation of resources, we use a subset of MATH¹

¹https://github.com/lzloceani/verify_cot/tree/main/results/chatgpt3.5/natural_program/MATH_np.json




Figure 2: SelfCheck achieves higher accuracies compared with the majority-voting baseline for all sample numbers.

test set from [Ling et al. \(2023\)](#). Besides the level of difficulty, the three datasets differ from each other in the following aspects. Firstly, MathQA provides 5 options for each problem, while GSM8K and MATH have no options. Secondly, GSM8K only has arithmetic problems, while MathQA and MATH contain more diverse problems in geometry, physics, probability, or algebra.

LLMs There are many choices of LLMs, including large-scale ones such as GPTs ([Brown et al., 2020](#)), PaLMs ([Chowdhery et al., 2022](#)) and Claude ([Anthropic](#)), as well as open-source ones such as LLaMA ([Touvron et al., 2023](#)) and FLAN ([Wei et al., 2021](#)). However, because of reasons such as access, budget, and computation resources, it is only possible for us to run experiments with the GPT-3.5 API. We could also set up small open-source LLMs such as LLaMA-13B or FLAN-11B on our own server. However, according to [Fu et al. \(2023\)](#), their accuracies are below 20% even on the simplest GSM8K dataset, which makes it meaningless to evaluate on them.

Baselines We use majority voting (or self-consistency decoding ([Wang et al., 2022](#)) in the context of CoT reasoning) as our main baseline following [Ling et al. \(2023\)](#) and [Lightman et al. \(2023\)](#). Despite its simplicity, majority voting is quite a strong baseline. Most zero or few-shot methods report similar or even worse results compared with it ([Weng et al., 2022](#); [Ling et al., 2023](#)). It is impossible to compare with finetuning based methods such as [Lightman et al. \(2023\)](#), where we have no access to their finetuned models.

Figure 2 shows the performance gain using confidence scores from SelfCheck to do weighted voting compared with vanilla majority voting. The upper row shows that accuracies of SelfCheck and majority voting have the same increasing tendency as the number of samples increases, which is a result of variance reduction. We can also see that the yellow lines are always above the blue ones, which is a result of SelfCheck giving higher weights to more correct solutions. The Δ -Accuracy plots in the lower row show that the improvement is significant for all sample numbers, but the gap is higher for smaller sample numbers. We leave analysis of this phenomenon and results for higher sample numbers on a smaller dataset in Section 5.1.

Besides serving as a weight calculator to improve the performance of voting, SelfCheck can also predict the correctness of a single solution. To do so, the simplest idea would be to set a threshold t to the confidence score. Any solution with a score above the threshold would be classified as correct or otherwise wrong. The results for different t are shown in Figure 3. For a more detailed analysis, we split the solutions into 2 sets, which contain real correct and real wrong solutions, respectively. The upper row shows the checking accuracies on each set. For small t , every solution will be classified as correct, so the accuracies for real correct samples Acc_c would be 1.0 while accuracies for real wrong samples Acc_w are 0.0. When t increases, the Acc_c increases and Acc_w drops. The lower row shows Acc_m the average of Acc_c and Acc_w , which is an indicator of the overall performance. For different datasets, Acc_m ranges from 60% to 65%. It is of course not optimal. However, it is enough to show the effectiveness of SelfCheck schema. Users can easily add more examples, finetune the LLM for different stages or combine SelfCheck with external tools, such as code interpreter to further improve performance.




Figure 3: Checking accuracies on reasoning process for different threshold t . ‘pred + in real +’ is the ratio of samples predicted as correct in all real correct samples. Similarly, ‘pred - in real -’ is the ratio of samples labeled as wrong in all real incorrect samples. The lower figures show the balanced average checking accuracy on three datasets.




Figure 4: When increasing the threshold t , the confidence of the predicted correct samples to real correct increases for GSM8K (67.5%→76.5%), MathQA (59.4%→82.2%) and MATH (34.6%→50.8%).

From another perspective, Figure 4 shows that for large t , the proportion of correct solutions (real +) in all verified solutions (pred +) is significantly higher than the case when $t = 0$. When $t = 0$, all solutions are labeled as correct, which equals the case without checking. Though this is at the cost of erroneously labeling about half of real correct samples as incorrect, it is an important feature for high-stake scenarios, where the risk of generating an incorrect solution can be much higher than rerunning the generation process.

5 ANALYSIS

In this section, we explore several interesting questions related to SelfCheck both empirically and theoretically. Limited by budget and time, all experiments in this section are on a small subset of MathQA test set with 100 randomly selected questions.

5.1 LARGER SAMPLE SIZE PER QUESTION?

In Figure 2, we can easily see that the performance gain of SelfCheck decreases as sample numbers increase from 2 to 10. However, it remains a question what will happen for larger sample numbers. If the gap converges to 0, it means SelfCheck is only a variance reduction method for majority voting, whose function can be replaced by simply increasing sample numbers for majority voting. Interestingly, we find in Figure 6 that though the accuracy of majority voting starts vibrating for sample numbers between 10 and 50, the accuracy of SelfCheck increases by about 5%. As shown in the lower figure in Figure 6, the performance gap exhibits a falling-rising pattern. To understand this pattern, we first need to decompose the prediction error of LLMs into variance and bias.

Variance For some questions, the probability of an LLM giving the correct answer is higher than any other answers, but a single run of LLM can still make mistakes, which is a result of the variance. By the law of large numbers, if we run the LLM infinite times, we are guaranteed to get the correct answer simply by majority voting. If we assume the probability of the correct answer to be p , and the probability of the most probable wrong answer to be q ($< p$), some simple calculation shows that the probability of getting an incorrect answer P_w after voting is exponentially decreasing with sample size n , which is upper bounded by $\lceil \frac{1-p}{q} \rceil (\frac{q}{p})^{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}$. As a result, when $n > 10$, the probability of making mistakes in this case is already very low, so continuing to increase n would not significantly increase the accuracy of majority voting.




Figure 5: Generation accuracies after we increase #sample to 50. p-value < 0.01 for #samples > 30 .

Bias For some other questions, the probability of the correct answer is not the highest among all possible answers, which reflects the bias of the LLM. In such cases, very large n makes majority voting perform worse by always outputting the incorrect answer. SelfCheck corrects the bias of LLMs by giving higher weights to real correct solutions and lower weights to incorrect answers. As n increases, the probability of LLM generating at least 1 real correct answer keeps increasing, which can be recognized and selected by SelfCheck. This explains the large accuracy increase of SelfCheck for large n and shows that **LLMs can correct their own biases, without any external supervision.**

5.2 FURTHER COMPARISONS

In order to figure out the effect of several critical design choices for SelfCheck, we compare SelfCheck with some of its variants. Figure 6 and Table 1 show generation accuracies and balanced checking accuracies of each variant. Table 1 shows the difficulty to achieve high checking accuracies for all methods. Nonetheless, any methods we considered with a checking accuracy $\geq 57.2\%$ are helpful to prediction performance.

Global vs step checking The first question is can we simply ask an LLM to perform a global checking on the whole solution without checking step by step. To answer it, we prompt the LLM to perform global checking with the following instruction:

The following is a question and a solution to it from a student. Carefully check whether the solution is correct step by step. End your response with your conclusion that starts with "Correct", "Wrong" or "Not Sure".
 Question: [Question]
 Solution: [Step 0, Step 1, ..., Step n]




Figure 6: Generation accuracies for different variants of SelfCheck.

However, we find the global checker outputs "correct" most of the time and rarely recognizes an error. Consequently, its performance in Figure 6 is very similar to majority voting and in Table 1 its accuracy is only higher than random guess (50%). Consequently, LLMs cannot deal with the difficulty of global checking, which makes step checking necessary.

Multiple stages vs Single stage The second question is do we really need to decompose step checking into several stages. To answer the question, we design the following prompt to do single-stage step checking.

The following is a question and the first a few steps in its solution.
 Question: [Question]

Solution: [Step 0, Step 1,..., Step i-1]
 Check the correctness of the next step: [Step i]
 Please consider the information it relies on and check step by step. Please end your response with your conclusion that starts with "Correct", "Wrong" or "Not Sure".

Figure 6 and Table 1 show though single-stage step checking is better than global checking, it is still significantly worse than our multi-stage SelfCheck. It indicates that the difficulty of checking a step is still too much for the LLM, so we need to decompose step checking into a pipeline of easier tasks. Figure 6

Regenerate then compare vs error check

We also need to justify our choice to replace direct error checking with step regeneration and comparison. To do so, we replace the regeneration stage and comparison stage with a verification stage. We first compare with a zero-shot version of the variant with the following prompt:

Given the following information:
 Information 0: [Information I_0]
 Information 1: [Information I_1]
 ...
 Step 0: [Step S_0]
 Step 1: [Step S_1]
 ...
 Check the correctness of the next step [Step i]
 Please check for grounding errors, reasoning errors and calculation errors step by step.
 Please end your response with your conclusion that starts with "Correct", "Wrong" or "Not Sure".

Table 1: Mean checking accuracies for different variants of SelfCheck.

Method	Accuracy (%)
Ours	66.7%
Global	55.0%
Single stage	57.2%
Regen->check (0-shot)	63.1%
Regen->check (1-shot)	64.2%

To make the verification stage stronger, we also compare a one-shot version with an example from Ling et al. (2023). Results in Figure 6 and Table 1 show that even with a very detailed and instructive example, direct verification still performs worse than our regeneration style checking, which supports our argument in Section 2.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduce SelfCheck, which is a step-by-step checking scheme for multi-step reasoning. By our multi-stage structure and the regeneration style checking, SelfCheck is effective in checking errors for errors, which, in turn, greatly increase prediction accuracies by weighted voting. Since SelfCheck works well in the zero-shot setting, we conclude that LLMs can check their own outputs without external supervision.

REFERENCES

- Aida Amini, Saadia Gabriel, Shanchuan Lin, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Yejin Choi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. MathQA: Towards interpretable math word problem solving with operation-based formalisms. 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. 2357–2367, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1245. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1245>.
- Anthropic. Meet claude. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/product>.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*, 2023.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*, 2022.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- Yao Fu, Litu Ou, Mingyu Chen, Yuhao Wan, Hao Peng, and Tushar Khot. Chain-of-thought hub: A continuous effort to measure large language models’ reasoning performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17306*, 2023.
- Google. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. DeBERTa: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 2021.
- Yifei Li, Zeqi Lin, Shizhuo Zhang, Qiang Fu, Bei Chen, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. On the advance of making language models better reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02336*, 2022.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*, 2023.
- Zhan Ling, Yunhao Fang, Xuanlin Li, Zhiao Huang, Mingu Lee, Roland Memisevic, and Hao Su. Deductive verification of chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03872*, 2023.
- Qing Lyu, Shreya Havaldar, Adam Stein, Li Zhang, Delip Rao, Eric Wong, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. Faithful chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13379*, 2023.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Debjit Paul, Mete Ismayilzada, Maxime Peyrard, Beatriz Borges, Antoine Bosselut, Robert West, and Boi Faltings. Refiner: Reasoning feedback on intermediate representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01904*, 2023.
- Baolin Peng, Michel Galley, Pengcheng He, Hao Cheng, Yujia Xie, Yu Hu, Qiuyuan Huang, Lars Liden, Zhou Yu, Weizhu Chen, et al. Check your facts and try again: Improving large language models with external knowledge and automated feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12813*, 2023.

Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.

Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

Yixuan Weng, Minjun Zhu, Shizhu He, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Large language models are reasoners with self-verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09561*, 2022.