

Uncovering Biases with Reflective Large Language Models

Edward Y. Chang

Computer Science, Stanford University

echang@cs.stanford.edu

February 15th, 2024

Abstract

Biases inherent in human endeavors pose significant challenges for machine learning, particularly in supervised learning that relies on potentially biased "ground truth" data. This reliance, coupled with models' tendency to generalize based on statistical maximal likelihood, can propagate and amplify biases, exacerbating societal issues. To address this, our study proposes a reflective methodology utilizing multiple Large Language Models (LLMs) engaged in a dynamic dialogue to uncover diverse perspectives. By leveraging conditional statistics, information theory, and divergence metrics, this novel approach fosters context-dependent linguistic behaviors, promoting unbiased outputs. Furthermore, it enables measurable progress tracking and explainable remediation actions to address identified biases.

1 Introduction

AI systems are increasingly being integrated into critical sectors such as education, healthcare, and public policy, where their decisions can have profound impacts. Despite their potential, these systems are prone to exhibit discriminatory behaviors, propagate existing biases, or make errors. Researchers in machine learning are diligently addressing these challenges by investigating the sources, patterns, and types of biases inherent in AI systems (Mehrabani et al., 2021). While achieving absolute fairness is complicated by diverse cultural, religious, and ideological perspectives, the primary objective remains to minimize the propagation of biases within machine learning models (Kleinberg et al., 2017; Mehrabani et al., 2021; Selbst et al., 2019; Gautam and Srinath, 2024; Baeza-Yates, 2018).

In this data-centric era, the accuracy of training data, especially the ground-truth labels, is crucial. Machine learning algorithms are designed not to alter the data but to accurately reflect any biases

present in the labels. Incorrect labels, such as a biased news article marked as neutral or a wrong medical diagnosis, can mislead models, resulting in harmful outcomes. Consequently, our research focuses on identifying and correcting mislabeled data to effectively mitigate bias and ensure the responsible application of AI.

Evidence of annotation biases is illustrated in Section 4. Tables 1 and 2 present real data (Budak et al., 2016) showing how annotators' political affiliations can influence their labeling of news articles. For instance, annotators aligned with the Democratic party are more inclined to perceive scandals involving Democrats negatively, whereas Republican annotators might view the same incidents neutrally. Conversely, Republican annotators might downplay criticisms directed at their party, whereas Democrats might view them as justified, underscoring the influence of personal ideologies on annotation practices.

To counter the perpetuation of these biases through classifiers, we propose a check-and-balance framework wherein two Large Language Models (LLMs) engage in dialogue to scrutinize and challenge human annotations. One LLM supports the original annotation while the other introduces alternative perspectives, thereby enriching the understanding of the content. This dialogue is structured to foster a productive exchange that cultivates balanced insights into the discussed topics and makes recommendations to the editorial board if concerns arise.

To evaluate the effectiveness of this dialogue, we employ several metrics grounded in statistical and information theory principles. Measures such as Shannon entropy (Shannon, 1948) and mutual information (Cover and Thomas, 2006) assess enhancements in shared understanding, while metrics like Jensen-Shannon divergence (JSD) (Lin, 1991), Wasserstein distance (WD) (Kantorovich, 1942), and cross-entropy (CE) (Shore and Johnson, 1980)

track the productivity of the dialogue. The process is transparent, allowing human supervisors to review and adjust annotations based on the dialogue outcomes, thus ensuring recommendations are rigorously examined. Our empirical studies confirm the efficacy of this approach.

The contributions of this paper are threefold:

1. *Enhanced Ground Truth Validation*: We leverage structured dialogues among multiple LLMs to refine and cross-verify ground-truth labels, providing a robust mechanism to mitigate biases inherent in traditional training datasets. This approach enhances the reliability of data annotations and introduces an interpretable strategy for bias mitigation.
2. *Systematic Bias Reduction*: Through contentious and collaborative debates, our framework actively uncovers and addresses biases within the labels, thereby promoting the creation of more neutral annotations that consider comprehensive perspectives.
3. *Diversity, Quality, and Divergence Metrics*: Using metrics rooted in statistical and information theory, we quantitatively measure the diversity of perspectives (Shannon entropy), the quality of information exchange (mutual information), and the progress and convergence of the dialogue (JSD, WD, and CE), enhancing the integrity and neutrality of annotations.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses challenges and reviews related work; Section 3 describes the core maxims, theorem, and algorithm; Section 4 presents experiments illustrating successful bias identification and mitigation; and the final section concludes with insights on future work and perceived limitations.

2 Related Work

This study focuses on mitigating training data label (ground truth) bias, a primary concern in machine learning (Mehrabi et al., 2021). Accurate labeling is crucial, as a label that aligns with biased content reinforces that bias, while a label that correctly identifies it allows for education and correction (Baeza-Yates, 2018; Danks and London, 2017). This underscores the importance of label accuracy in minimizing bias propagation.

This work specifically addresses mislabeled ground truth and explores remediation actions. Efforts to improve annotation accuracy can be broadly categorized into three approaches:

Cross-Validation with Multiple Annotators:

Ensemble methods, utilizing multiple annotators and statistical techniques, can mitigate individual biases and enhance data reliability (Snow et al., 2008). This approach has been successful in tasks with broad consensus, such as image annotation with ImageNet (Deng et al., 2009; Krizhevsky et al., 2012). However, it may be less effective for complex or biased content, where subtle interpretations are required. For instance, the term “discovered” in reference to Columbus’s arrival in the Americas reflects a Western bias, while “encounter” offers a more accurate representation from Indigenous perspectives (Wikipedia, 2023; Mostafazadeh Davani et al., 2022). Relying on majority votes in such cases can be counterproductive, and while diverse annotator pools are important, the inherent limitations of human annotation, including the assumption of a single truth, must be acknowledged (Aroyo and Welty, 2015).

Cross-Validation between Machine and Human Annotators:

Integrating machine learning algorithms into the annotation process can improve quality by leveraging both human expertise and machine efficiency (Wang et al., 2021). Semi-supervised learning, which utilizes both labeled and unlabeled data, is one such technique (Ratner et al., 2017). However, machine learning algorithms can be inherently biased due to their training data, and ensemble methods may not fully resolve these underlying biases (Wang et al., 2021; Baeza-Yates, 2018).

GAI Opportunity: The emergence of GAI and LLMs, with their vast knowledge base and powerful Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017), presents a new avenue for addressing annotation bias. LLMs can potentially uncover diverse perspectives on a given topic, including historical shifts and evolving narratives. Recent studies have explored combining LLM output with human feedback for annotation tasks (Tan et al., 2024).

However, due to their “maximal likelihood” next-token prediction training objective, LLMs may prioritize popular viewpoints over minority ones. This work addresses this limitation by proposing a novel approach, grounded in statistical and information theories, that aims to uncover and balance diverse viewpoints, ensuring that both majority and minority perspectives are adequately represented in the annotation process.

3 EVINCE Algorithm

Expanding on our prior work (Chang, 2023a, 2024) with theoretical foundations and quantitative metrics, EVINCE (Entropy and Variation IN Conditional Exchanges) leverages LLMs to promote content neutrality through the incorporation of diverse perspectives.

EVINCE facilitates structured dialogues between LLMs to address the “maximal likelihood” bias inherent in conventional information retrieval systems. This bias manifests in search engines like Google, where popular viewpoints are often prioritized based on metrics like click-through rates (Adams-Hands, 2023), potentially sidelining less common perspectives. Similarly, LLM text generation, which relies on predicting the next most likely token, can inadvertently amplify existing biases present in the training data (Li et al., 2023).

To foster divergent perspectives, EVINCE addresses two sub-goals:

- *Exploration*: Encouraging the generation of a wide array of viewpoints.
- *Meaningful Diversity*: Ensuring collected perspectives are substantive and not merely contrarian for the sake of disagreement.

EVINCE achieves these goals by analyzing probability distributions of top-k labels elicited from each LLM in the committee. Through this analysis, individual entropies, cross-entropy between distributions, and mutual information are computed. (For detailed metrics and formulas, refer to Appendix A.) Based on this quantitative assessment, EVINCE dynamically adjusts its linguistic behaviors (e.g. more contentious vs. more conciliatory) to optimize the annotation recommendations.

The initial phase of the EVINCE algorithm aims to induce *dual entropy* and high cross-entropy between the LLM-generated distributions. I will prove shortly that *dual entropy* is the ideal condition to foster information exchange between LLMs. This signifies disagreement and creates a fertile ground for novel perspective discovery and exchange. Through iterative dialogue, mutual information increases while divergence decreases, ultimately converging towards a consensus.

3.1 Maxims and Optimal Theorem

Maxim 1: Orchestrate Two Equally Competent LLMs in Structured Debate: Integrating two equally competent LLMs ensures a balanced exchange of insights and avoids bias from knowledge

asymmetry. This adversarial setup fosters diversity in predictions, each supported by justifications, promoting critical evaluation and uncovering potential blind spots. The concern is not about the potential non-overlapping training data, as information exchange can remedy this. Instead, the focus is on ensuring that both models have similar quality, primarily determined by their size, to prevent one model from dominating the other due to a disparity in reasoning quality.

Maxim 2: Encourage the Accurate Rather Than the “Popular” Prediction: Typically, LLMs, with their maximum likelihood next-token prediction objective, tend to favor the most popular predictions. By conditioning LLMs within specific contexts, we can prioritize accuracy over popularity, thus mitigating confirmation biases.

Maxim 3: Combine Predictions Weighted by Diversity and Quality: Weighting the probability distributions from two LLMs based on diverse probabilistic insights and the quality of supporting arguments.

How? Following these three sub-maxims:

- **Maxim 3.1: Prediction Reliability:** Estimate the reliability of predictions using entropy-based measures to quantify uncertainty and information content. Typically, lower entropy indicates higher confidence in a prediction, suggesting higher reliability.
- **Maxim 3.2: Argument Quality:** Evaluate the quality of supporting arguments using techniques inspired by the Socratic method. This includes identifying logical fallacies and assessing the relevance and credibility of evidence.
- **Maxim 3.3: Aggregation:** Employ a weighted aggregation method, such as a Bayesian model, to combine weighted predictions accounting for both probabilistic insights and the quality of supporting arguments.

Maxim 4: Evaluating the Convergence Rate of the Predictions Across the Rounds: This maxim focuses on measuring how quickly and effectively the predictions from the LLMs converge over successive rounds, assessing the efficiency of the debate and aggregation mechanisms. Convergence is assessed by measuring mutual information and using proxy metrics such as Wasserstein distance and cross entropy. When mutual information is low or the similarity between predictions is high, the dialogue is considered to be converging.

Algorithm 1 Specifications of Algorithm EVINCE

- 1: **Input:** Information set S , Class labels C ; Two equally competent LLMs: LLM_A and LLM_B (**Maxim #1**);
 - 2: **Output:** P_f , final probability distribution over C ;
 - 3: **Variables:** t : debate round; $R = \emptyset$ aggregated arguments;
 $P_A^{(t)}, P_B^{(t)}$: prediction distributions of LLM_A and LLM_B on C of round t ; $R_A^{(t)}, R_B^{(t)}$: supporting reason sets;
 $\Delta = 90\%$: debate contentiousness, initialize to high to foster adversary between LLMs (**Maxim #2**);
 p : prompt = "Predict top- k probability distribution on C with S and R at contentiousness Δ ";
 - 4: **Functions:** CRIT(d) (Chang, 2023c), Critical Reading Inquisitive Template for evaluating argument quality;
 ARA (Guo et al., 2024), Algorithmic Robust Aggregation for optimal prediction aggregation (**Maxims #3**);
 - 5: **Initial Predictions** $t = 0$:
 LLMs generate their predictions in probability distributions with supporting reasons:
 $(P_A^{(t=0)}, R_A^{(t)}) = LLM_A(S, p), (P_B^{(t=0)}, R_B^{(t)}) = LLM_B(S, p)$.
 - 6: **Debate Iterations:**
 - 6.1. **Update Predictions:**
 Calculate the confidence-based weights using the inverse of entropy (**Maxim #3.1**):
 $\alpha = 1/(H(P_A^{(t)}) + 1), \beta = 1/(H(P_B^{(t)}) + 1)$.
 Use the blending mechanism to update predictions (**Maxim #3.3**):
 $P_A^{(t)} = \alpha P_A^{(t)} + (1 - \alpha) P_B^{(t)}, P_B^{(t)} = \beta P_B^{(t)} + (1 - \beta) P_A^{(t)}$.
 - 6.2. **LLMs Generate New Predictions:** Both LLMs use accumulated $R = R \cup R_A^{(t)} \cup R_B^{(t)}$.
 $(P_A^{(t+1)}, R_A^{(t+1)}) = LLM_A((P_B^{(t)}), R, p), (P_B^{(t+1)}, R_B^{(t+1)}) = LLM_B((P_A^{(t)}), R, p)$.
 - 6.3. **Exit Condition Check with Wasserstein distance (Maxim #4):**
 If $WD(P_A^{(t+1)}, P_B^{(t+1)}) < \epsilon$ **EXIT**; $t = t + 1, \Delta = \Delta \times 80\%$.
 - 7: **Final Decision:** Weighted prediction by quality scores of the evaluator e.g., CRIT (Chang, 2023c) (**Maxim #3.2**):
 $P_f = \Omega_A P_A^{(t+1)} + \Omega_B P_B^{(t+1)} / \Omega_A + \Omega_B$.
-

Problem Statement: Organize a structured dialogue between two equally competent large language models (LLMs), LLM_A and LLM_B , to conduct t rounds. At each round t , each model produces a probability distribution, denoted as $P_A^{(t)}$ and $P_B^{(t)}$, over C possible outcomes, accompanied by supporting arguments $R_A^{(t)}$ and $R_B^{(t)}$. The goal is to design an iterative debate process that leverages the structured exchange of arguments to enable the models to converge on an optimal prediction distribution P^* across the C classes.

3.2 Algorithm Specifications

With all proxy metrics and their pros, cons, and combined strengths comprehensively surveyed (Appendix A), Algorithm 1 formally specifies the algorithm of EVINCE with the maxims.

3.3 Entropy Duality Theorem (EDT)

Theorem EDT: Optimal Pairing of LLMs for Probabilistic Prediction Accuracy. The optimal pairing of LLMs for diagnosis accuracy, in terms of stability, accuracy, and robustness, occurs when the LLMs are 1) equivalent in the quality of the information they process, and 2) exhibit contrasting entropy values in their prediction distributions—one high and one low.

[Proof]: Given two LLMs, LLM_A and LLM_B ,

following Maxim #1 with prediction distributions P_A and P_B , respectively. The information entropy of LLM_A , $H(P_A)$, is high, and of LLM_B , $H(P_B)$, is low. The proof proceeds:

Step 1: Define combined prediction distribution. Let the combined prediction distribution of LLM_A and LLM_B be denoted as P_C . We can express P_C as a weighted average of P_A and P_B :

$$P_C = \alpha P_A + (1 - \alpha) P_B, \quad \text{where } 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1.$$

Step 2: Express the information entropy of the combined prediction distribution. Using the definition of information entropy, we calculate:

$$H(P_C) = - \sum_i P_C(x_i) \log_2 P_C(x_i) = - \sum_i [\alpha P_A(x_i) + (1 - \alpha) P_B(x_i)] \log_2 [\alpha P_A(x_i) + (1 - \alpha) P_B(x_i)].$$

Step 3: Apply Jensen’s Inequality to the information entropy of the combined prediction distribution. Jensen’s inequality is applied to the convex function $f(x) = -x \log_2 x$. For a convex function and a set of probabilities p_i , Jensen’s inequality states that:

$$f\left(\sum_i p_i x_i\right) \leq \sum_i p_i f(x_i)$$

Thus, the entropy of the combined distribution is:

$$H(P_C) \geq \alpha H(P_A) + (1 - \alpha) H(P_B)$$

where equality holds when $P_A = P_B$.

Step 4: Analyze the lower bound of the combined information entropy. As $H(P_A)$ is high and $H(P_B)$ is low, their relationship is:

$$H(P_A) = H(P_B) + \Delta, \quad \text{where } \Delta > 0.$$

Substituting into the inequality from Step 3 yields:
 $H(P_C) \geq \alpha[H(P_B)+\Delta]+(1-\alpha)H(P_B) = H(P_B)+\alpha\Delta.$

Step 5: Interpret the lower bound of the combined information entropy. The lower bound of $H(P_C)$, and hence the robustness of the model, is maximized when α is maximized, which corresponds to giving more weight to the high-entropy model (LLM_A). This setup facilitates the exploration of diverse possibilities and enhances robustness against noise and perturbations in the input data, while still ensuring that predictions are grounded by the more certain outcomes predicted by the low-entropy model (LLM_B).

Step 6: Conclude the proof. By combining the prediction distributions of LLM_A and LLM_B , with one having high information entropy and the other low, we achieve an optimal balance that maximizes the lower bound of the combined information entropy. This balance between exploration (high entropy) and exploitation (low entropy) optimizes overall prediction accuracy and robustness, as proved through information theory and the properties of entropy. Thus, the theorem is established.

4 Experiments

Our experimental framework aims to assess the feasibility of both detecting biases in textual content and implementing effective mitigation strategies. The first experiment focuses on bias detection, while the second explores the generation of balanced textual outputs as a corrective measure, moving beyond the limitations of prior studies that primarily focused on identification (Section 2).

We utilized GPT-4 via OpenAI API on Microsoft Azure, setting the temperature to 0.1 with maximum token size. The cost is around US\$1,000.

4.1 Experiment #1: Bias Detection

The aim of this experiment is to evaluate if personal ideology may affect annotations, and can EVINCE help flag and rectify the biases.

4.1.1 Dataset

The dataset for this experiment consists of 619 news articles (54.3% about Democrat scandals, 45.7% about Republican scandals) selected from a larger 2013 repository of 14,033 articles compiled by fifteen reputable news organizations (Budak et al., 2016). These articles cover diverse topics like civil rights, healthcare, elections, and national

security. This dataset is provided as supplementary material.

The articles were originally labeled through Amazon Mechanical Turk by 749 qualified U.S. workers, each annotating up to 1,000 randomly selected articles (Budak et al., 2016). For each “scandal” article in our subset, one Democrat and one Republican annotator independently classified its bias as “negatively biased,” “weak negative,” “neutral,” “weak positive,” or “positively biased.”

This subset is valuable due to its ground-truth labels provided by annotators from opposing political affiliations, revealing inherent biases in evaluating negative coverage of one’s own party. The original study (Budak et al., 2016) found that Republican annotators often perceive news about Republican scandals as negatively biased, while Democrat annotators tend to view such news as neutral or “just right,” potentially indicating satisfaction with the coverage’s perceived fairness.

4.1.2 Results on Democrat Scandals

We apply EVINCE to analyze these 619 news articles, comparing its labels with the dataset’s provided “ground truth.”

Table 1 compares the judgments of EVINCE (S), Republicans (R), and Democrats (D) on 16 representative articles concerning “Democrat Scandals.” As expected, Democrats’ judgments are generally more negative than Republicans’, with EVINCE’s assessments typically falling in between, except for two cases. Notably, there’s a 5-to-1 Democrat-to-Republican ratio in the “Negative” column and a 12-to-4 Republican-to-Democrat majority in the “Neutral” column.

Tables 5 and 6 in Appendix B provide detailed justifications for EVINCE’s ratings. To further investigate bias, we examine two specific articles: one from HuffPost (rated far left by AllSides Bias Chart (Allsides)) and another from Breitbart (rated far right).

* *D8 — HuffPost (Left):* EVINCE rates D8 (on the third row) as neutral, citing the article’s direct presentation of facts and inclusion of diverse perspectives on NSA surveillance practices and global reactions. This contrasts with Democrat-leaning annotators, who view the article as negatively biased towards Democrats, while Republican-leaning annotators favor it for exposing a Democratic scandal.

* *D69 — Breitbart (Right):* EVINCE assesses D69 as weakly negatively biased towards

News #	Categories	Negative	W. Negative	Neutral	W. Positive	Biases (DR,DS,SR)	Source
D1	Civil Rights	D,R,S	-	-	-	0,0,0	HuffPost
D2	Civil Rights	D,S	-	R	-	2,0,2	HuffPost
D8	Civil Rights	D	-	S	R	3,2,1	BBC
D31	Environment	D	-	R, S	-	2,2,0	CNN
D37	Politics	-	D,R,S	-	-	0,0,0	Yahoo
D69	Healthcare	D	-	R,S	-	2,2,0	Breitbart
D81	Economy	-	D,S	R	-	1,0,1	Breitbart
D98	Economy	D,S	R	-	-	1,0,1	Breitbart
D101	Education	-	D,S	R	-	1,0,1	New York Times
D106	Election	-	-	D,R,S	-	0,0,0	USA Today
D109	Elections	-	D,S	R	-	1,0,1	Reuters
D157	International	-	D,S	R	-	1,0,1	New York Times
D174	International	-	S	D,R	-	0,1,1	LA Times
D188	National Security	-	S	D,R	-	0,1,1	Wall Street Journal
D278	Civil Rights	-	D,S	R	-	1,0,1	Fox News
D336	Politics	-	-	D,R,S	-	0,0,0	New York Times
Total						15,8,11	

Table 1: Comparison of bias assessments among Democrats (D), Republicans (R), and EVINCE (S). It is observed that R and S are frequently placed to the right or in alignment with D, and only on two occasions does D precede S (highlighted in red).

Democrats, emphasizing its neutral tone and broad range of perspectives on NSA surveillance. This diverges from Democrat-leaning annotators, who rate it as strongly negative, but aligns with Republican-leaning annotators who deem it neutral.




Figure 1: Distances Between D, R, and S.

In the last row of Table 1, we quantify the distances between annotations from Democrats (D), Republicans (R), and EVINCE (S), denoted as DR, DS, and SR respectively. Each unit of distance represents one step on the annotation scale (e.g., “Negative” to “Weak Negative”). Figure 1 visualizes these distances in a triangular plot. DR, the disparity between Democrat and Republican annotators, is the longest, followed by SR and then DS. This indicates EVINCE’s statistical neutrality. These quantitative measures, along with the qualitative justifications in Appendix B, empower a human committee to decide whether adjustments or footnotes are warranted for polarized annotations.

4.1.3 Results on Republican Scandals

Table 2 presents the bias assessments from EVINCE (S), Republicans (R), and Democrats (D) on articles related to “Republican Scandals.” In contrast to the “Democrat Scandals” dataset, where Republican-leaning evaluations were more favorable, this dataset reveals a shift, with Republican-leaning assessments being notably more critical and Democrat-leaning assessments relatively neutral. The distance triangle for “Republican Scandals” mirrors the pattern seen in Figure 1, with the divergence between Republican and Democrat annotators being the largest (15). The distances between EVINCE and Democrat-leaning annotators (9) and between EVINCE and Republican-leaning annotators (11) are smaller, further highlighting EVINCE’s relative neutrality.




Figure 2: Bias Rating Distributions Show Strong Biases. D is more negative on how D scandals were reported (the sub-figure on the left), R is more negative on how R scandals were reported (the sub-figure on the right).

Figure 2 illustrates the distribution of ratings for

News #	Categories	Negative	W. Negative	Neutral	W. Positive	Biases (DR,DS,SR)	Source
R1	International	R,S	-	D	-	2,2,0	New York Times
R7	National Security	-	-	D,R,S	-	0,0,0	New York Times
R15	Economy	-	R	D,S	-	1,0,1	Huffington Post
R69	Elections	-	D,S,R	-	-	0,0,0	Reuters
R124	Gay Rights	R	S	D	-	2,1,1	Fox
R125	Crime	-	R,S	D	-	1,1,1	Fox
R180	Elections	-	-	D,R,S	-	0,0,0	AP
R191	Elections	-	R	D,S	-	1,0,1	CNN
R214	Gay Rights	R,S	-	D	-	2,2,0	Dailykos
R221	Economy	-	R	D,S	-	1,0,1	Wall Street Journal
R233	Economy	-	R,S	D	-	1,1,0	Fox
R235	Civil Rights	D,R	-	S	-	0,2,2	Reuters
R269	Healthcare	-	R	D,S	-	1,0,1	New York Times
R274	Healthcare	-	R	D,S	-	1,0,1	USA Today
R280	Politics	D,S	-	R	-	2,0,2	Fox
Total						15,9,11	

Table 2: Comparison of bias assessments. It is observed that D and S are frequently placed to the right or in alignment with R, and only on one occasion does D precede S (highlighted in red).

all scandals across four scenarios:

1) Democrat-leaning annotators rating Democrat scandals, 2) Republican-leaning annotators rating Democrat scandals, 3) Democrat-leaning annotators rating Republican scandals, and 4) Republican-leaning annotators rating Republican scandals.

The figure reveals a clear pattern: Democrat-leaning annotators tend to rate news about Democrat scandals more negatively, while Republican-leaning annotators exhibit similar negativity towards reports on Republican scandals. The gap between these ratings is approximately one class-label (e.g., between “weak negative” and “neutral”), highlighting a tendency within both parties to defend their own and criticize the opposition.

EVINCE, operating without emotional influence and refined through structured debate, consistently provides a more balanced, centrist perspective. This contributes to a more impartial discourse by mitigating partisan biases. EVINCE’s justifications, documented in Appendix B, are transparent and reasonable. An editorial board can review these findings and decide whether to adjust labels or present both perspectives with explanations.

This experiment demonstrates that EVINCE effectively delivers centrist judgments supported by rationales. For a deeper understanding of EVINCE’s bias assessment process, comprehensive justifications for each of the 31 analyzed articles are available in Appendix B.

4.2 Experiment #2: Bias Mitigation

This experiment illustrates EVINCE’s ability to identify bias in text, provide reasoned justifications, and propose remediation through the integra-

Agent	Arguments
Agent A R #1	Christopher Columbus’s voyages were pivotal in expanding European knowledge and trade. His journeys opened up the Americas to European colonization, significantly altering the course of history in four aspects: 1) expansion of knowledge and exploration, 2) positive economic impact, 3) historical significance, and 4) cultural exchange.
Agent B R #1	There are negative aspects and historical consequences of Columbus’s actions. Key arguments are 1) indigenous suffering and genocide, 2) economic exploitation, 3) cultural erasure, 4) environmental impact, and 5) ethical considerations.
Agent A R #3	The severe consequences were a result of broader colonial policies and practices that followed. Evaluating historical figures requires understanding the context of their times. While modern ethical standards are important, they should not overshadow the historical significance and contributions of Columbus’s voyages to global exploration and knowledge.
Agent A R #4	Agent A recognizes that mitigation efforts are part of an ongoing process. Historical scholarship is evolving, and the inclusion of indigenous perspectives, critical examinations of colonial legacies, and the acknowledgment of the complexities of historical figures like Columbus are essential steps toward more equitable and inclusive narratives.

Table 3: Debate arguments leading to neutrality

tion of diverse perspectives. We demonstrate how EVINCE utilizes statistical and information theory metrics to facilitate multi-agent dialogue, circumventing the “maximum likelihood” trap inherent in next-token generation and uncovering information from multiple viewpoints.

Using the example of the Euro-centric perspective on Christopher Columbus’ Wikipedia page regarding his voyages to America, EVINCE em-




Figure 3: Convergence of all metrics, Wasserstein, normalized mutual information, normalized cross entropy

employs two GPT-4 instances: Agent A, supporting the Euro-centric view, and Agent B, opposing it. Table 3 summarizes Agent A’s key arguments and its evolving stance throughout the debate.

Guided by the maxims and entropy duality theorem from Section 3, we initiate the debate by prompting both agents to defend their positions rigorously and score each other’s bias using a five-label distribution (negative, weak negative, neutral, weak positive, positive). Figure 3 tracks the dialogue’s progress through Wasserstein distance (WD) (Kantorovich, 1942), normalized cross entropy (CE) (Shannon, 1948), and normalized mutual information (MI) (Cover and Thomas, 2006). Initially, each agent is expected to perceive itself as neutral and the other as biased. The debate concludes when the bias distributions converge and mutual information plateaus, indicating a shared understanding.

Observations and Extended Findings

Our initial observation highlights a key challenge in working with LLMs: without explicit and repeated reminders of their assigned stance (pro-discovery or pro-encounter), GPT-4 instances can revert to default statistical behavior, evaluating their own arguments based on overall language patterns rather than the intended perspective. This was evident when Agent B, despite being assigned to support the Indigenous perspective, initially rated its own arguments as “positively biased.” A reminder to adhere to its assigned role prompted a correction to “neutral,” underscoring the importance of careful context management and reinforcement, especially given the limited token size of LLMs.

The second observation demonstrates a positive outcome of the debate process. The revised bias distributions, incorporating rational responses that

acknowledge both positive and negative aspects of Columbus’s voyages, show a shift towards a more balanced perspective. Agent A moves towards neutrality while acknowledging historical context, while Agent B maintains a critical stance but strives for balanced representation. This approach facilitates a nuanced and comprehensive understanding of Columbus’s legacy.

EVINCE and its predecessor have proven effective across diverse domains, including healthcare (Chang and et al., 2023), business planning (Tsao, 2023), and geopolitical analysis (Chang, 2023b). In healthcare, for example, GPT-4 and Gemini LLMs have been successfully employed to address misdiagnosis. Across six diverse subjects, we consistently initiated debates with high contentiousness, transitioning towards collaboration to formulate effective bias mitigation strategies.

5 Concluding Remarks

This study demonstrates a significant advancement in mitigating bias in public articles, such as those found in Wikipedia and news sources, by leveraging multiple LLMs through an adversarial dialogue framework. EVINCE effectively identifies biases, provides justifications, and recommends remedial actions to authors and editorial boards, facilitating a balanced perspective that surpasses traditional human annotation methods. The debate-driven methodology, incorporating diverse viewpoints and guided by information-theoretic metrics, significantly enhances content neutrality and quality.

Furthermore, our work has led to the development of the dual entropy theory and several maxims with metrics to evaluate content’s logical coherence and credibility, ensuring a comprehensive inclusion of perspectives while maintaining accuracy. This study also highlights the limitations of human-labeled data, revealing significant rates of mislabeling and misdiagnosis, emphasizing the challenges of subjective labeling and heuristic approaches.

Future work will focus on deploying EVINCE with platforms like Wikipedia to provide real-time perspective suggestions, empowering users with diverse viewpoints and promoting informed discourse. To further safeguard AI safety and ethics, we will investigate the potential of integrating EVINCE with other bias mitigation techniques, aiming to create a comprehensive and robust framework for ensuring fairness and impartiality in both AI-generated and human-curated content.

Limitations

Several key research questions remain open in the field of multi-LLM research. First, it is crucial to investigate whether the adversarial behavior exhibited by LLMs is genuine or artificially constructed based on their training data. Further research is needed to determine if these models can trace back to minority perspectives within their training data, validating the authenticity of adversarial stances.

Second, the metrics proposed for measuring debate quality and consensus convergence need more comprehensive evaluation. Assessing these metrics thoroughly will help identify and address their limitations, ensuring they provide reliable and meaningful insights into the dynamics of multi-LLM debates.

Third, the cost of supporting multi-LLM, multi-round dialogue increases about tenfold. Ideally, the framework should be integrated into an LLM to conduct internal cross-validation before generating output, reducing the need for external multi-round communication. We have been investigating the use of a lightweight, independent guardrail-LLM to provide ethical advice and mitigate this cost issue. However, this approach must be carefully implemented to avoid introducing catastrophic forgetting (Kirkpatrick et al., 2017; Rusu et al., 2016), where the integration of new knowledge or parameters can lead to the loss of previously learned information in the knowledge-LLMs.

While we believe our work is among the earliest proposals for multi-LLM debate frameworks (July 2023), providing definitive evidence is challenging due to anonymity policies on platforms like arXiv and the difficulty of identifying all subsequent work that may have been influenced by our ideas. Nevertheless, we are confident in the originality of our approach, which conditions the linguistic behaviors of LLMs with carefully guided theories and metrics. We hope that this work will inspire further research and development in this promising area.

Ethical Statements

This research, conducted in alignment with the Association for Computational Linguistics’ ethical guidelines, primarily aims to mitigate fairness and biases in computational linguistics and to address the challenges of inaccurate and biased information. We have not involved any direct human or animal subjects in our study. All data utilized for computational analysis is sourced from publicly available

datasets or collected with explicit consent, respecting privacy and data protection standards.

We have implemented rigorous measures to anonymize any sensitive data to safeguard individual privacy. Our algorithms are specifically designed to promote fairness, actively working to identify and rectify biases with LLMs. Additionally, this study contributes to the detection and correction of inaccurate and misleading information, a crucial step towards ensuring the integrity and reliability of data in natural language processing.

We acknowledge the potential impact of our research, especially in the context of misinformation and bias in AI technologies. Our commitment is to foster advancements in the field that are both ethically responsible and socially conscious, acknowledging the significant role these technologies play in shaping public discourse and information dissemination.

In the execution of this project, we utilized GPT-4, specifically for the purposes of conducting multi-LLM debates and providing editorial assistance. Apart from these specified uses, no artificial intelligence tools were employed in any other aspects of this work’s completion.

References

- Isaac Adams-Hands. 2023. [Google algorithms: Decoding the secrets for improved search rankings.](#)
- Allsides. [Allsides Media Bias Chart.](#)
- Lora Aroyo and Chris Welty. 2015. Truth is a lie: Crowd truth and the seven myths of human annotation. *AI Magazine*, 36(1):15–24.
- Ricardo Baeza-Yates. 2018. Bias on the web. *Communications of the ACM*, 61(6):54–61.
- Ceren Budak, Sharad Goel, and Justin M. Rao. 2016. [Fair and Balanced? Quantifying Media Bias through Crowdsourced Content Analysis.](#) *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(S1):250–271.
- Edward Y. Chang. 2023a. Examining GPT-4’s Capabilities and Enhancement with SocraSynth. In *The 10th International Conference on Computational Science and Computational Intelligence*.
- Edward Y. Chang. 2023b. LLM Debate on the Middle East Conflict: Is It Resolvable? *Stanford University InfoLab Technical Report*.
- Edward Y. Chang. 2023c. [Prompting Large Language Models With the Socratic Method.](#) *IEEE 13th Annual Computing and Communication Workshop and Conference*.

- Edward Y. Chang. 2024. *The Path To Artificial General Intelligence — Insights from Adversarial LLM Dialogue*. Ailly.ai.
- Jocelyn J. Chang and et al. 2023. SocraHealth: Enhancing Medical Diagnosis and Correcting Historical Records. In *The 10th International Conf. on Computational Science and Computational Intelligence*.
- T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. 2006. *Elements of Information Theory*, 2 edition. John Wiley & Sons.
- David Danks and Alex John London. 2017. Algorithmic bias in autonomous systems. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 4691–4697.
- Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. 2009. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 248–255.
- Sanjana Gautam and Mukund Srinath. 2024. [Blind spots and biases: Exploring the role of annotator cognitive biases in nlp](#).
- Yongkang Guo, Jason D. Hartline, Zhihuan Huang, Yuqing Kong, Anant Shah, and Fang-Yi Yu. 2024. [Algorithmic robust forecast aggregation](#).
- Leonid V Kantorovich. 1942. On the translocation of masses. *Doklady Akademii Nauk*, 37(7-8):199–201.
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. 2017. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526.
- Jon Kleinberg, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Manish Raghavan. 2017. Inherent trade-offs in the fair determination of risk scores. *Proceedings of Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2012. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 60(6):84–90.
- Solomon Kullback. 1951. *Information Theory and Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Lei Li, Yongfeng Zhang, Dugang Liu, and Li Chen. 2023. [Large language models for generative recommendation: A survey and visionary discussions](#).
- Jianhua Lin. 1991. Divergence measures based on the shannon entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information theory*, 37(1):145–151.
- Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. 2021. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 54(6):1–35.
- Aida Mostafazadeh Davani, Mark Díaz, and Vinodkumar Prabhakaran. 2022. [Dealing with disagreements: Looking beyond the majority vote in subjective annotations](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:92–110.
- Alexander Ratner, Stephen H. Bach, Henry Ehrenberg, Jason Fries, Sen Wu, and Christopher Ré. 2017. [Snorkel: rapid training data creation with weak supervision](#). *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 11(3):269–282.
- Andrei A. Rusu, Sergio Gomez Colmenarejo, Caglar Gulcehre, Guillaume Desjardins, James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Raia Hadsell. 2016. [Policy distillation](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Andrew D Selbst, Danah Boyd, Sorelle A Friedler, Suresh Venkatasubramanian, and Janet Vertesi. 2019. Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 59–68.
- Claude E. Shannon. 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3):379–423.
- John E. Shore and Rodney W. Johnson. 1980. Axiomatic derivation of the principle of maximum entropy and the principle of minimum cross-entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 26(1):26–37.
- Rion Snow, Brendan O’Connor, Daniel Jurafsky, and Andrew Ng. 2008. Cheap and fast – but is it good? evaluating non-expert annotations for natural language tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2008 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 254–263. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhen Tan, Alimohammad Beigi, Song Wang, Ruocheng Guo, Amrita Bhattacharjee, Bohan Jiang, Mansoor Karami, Jundong Li, Lu Cheng, and Huan Liu. 2024. [Large language models for data annotation: A survey](#).
- Wen-Kwang Tsao. 2023. Multi-Agent Reasoning with Large Language Models for Effective Corporate Planning. In *The 10th International Conf. on Computational Science and Computational Intelligence*.
- Ashish Vaswani et al. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*.
- Zijie J. Wang, Dongjin Choi, Shenyu Xu, and Diyi Yang. 2021. [Putting humans in the natural language processing loop: A survey](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Bridging Human–Computer Interaction and Natural Language Processing*, pages 47–52. Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wikipedia. 2023. [Bias](#). *Wikipedia*.

Metric	Pros	Cons	Remedies
Cross Entropy (CE) (Shore and Johnson, 1980)	Measures how well the predictions of one model fit the actual distribution of another model’s outputs (asymmetric).	Computationally intensive especially with large models and data sets; sensitive to the exact nature of probability distributions.	Optimize computation strategies; use approximations or sampling methods to manage large data sets or complex models.
Entropy Shannon (Shannon, 1948)	Indicates level of diversity or predictability; high values suggest exploration of possibilities, and low for confidence on few choices	High entropy might indicate noise rather than useful diversity; low entropy might mask important variability.	Use critical reading methods (Appendix A) to assess argument quality; implement noise detection to differentiate between useful diversity and noise.
Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JS) (Lin, 1991)	Symmetric and bounded (0 to 1), providing an interpretable measure of distributional differences.	May be less sensitive to small differences between distributions.	Increase sensitivity settings or resolution of the metric; combine with other metrics to capture finer distinctions between distributions.
KL Divergence (Kullback, 1951)	Measures diff. between two distributions; useful for comparing a model’s dist. to a reference dist.	Asymmetric; not well-defined if the reference distribution has zero probabilities	Use smoothing techniques to avoid zero probabilities; consider symmetric alternatives like JS divergence
Mutual Info. (Shore and Johnson, 1980)	Measures reduction of uncertainty; symmetric.	Does not indicate the directionality of information flow.	Supplement with directional information metrics; normalized with max entropy of A and B.
Wasserstein Distance (WD) (Kantorovich, 1942)	Direct measure of how similar or different the model outputs are; it depicts symmetric relationship.	Not bounded but can be normalized or bounded for consistent interpretation.	Define context-specific bounds for low, medium, and high divergence; consider normalizing it for non-directional comparisons.

Table 4: Summary of metrics for assessing LLM debates (equations are presented in Appendix E)

Appendix A: Quality Metrics and Formulas

Table 4 lists the metrics employed by EVINCE to quantify agreement, diversity, and mutual information, promoting productive information exchange and enhancing prediction quality. Measures such as Shannon entropy, Wasserstein distance (WD), Jensen-Shannon (JS) divergence, mutual information (MI), and cross-entropy (CE) are used complementarily. WD and CE are particularly valued for their ability to handle simplicity and information asymmetry, respectively.

The rest of this appendix outlines the mathematical formulas for various data analysis metrics used in probabilistic and statistical modeling.

Kullback-Leibler Divergence

The Kullback-Leibler Divergence measures the difference between two probability distributions:

$$D_{KL}(P\|Q) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x) \log \left(\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \right).$$

Jensen-Shannon Divergence

The Jensen-Shannon Divergence is a symmetrized and smoothed version of the KL Divergence:

$$JSD(P\|Q) = \frac{1}{2}D_{KL}(P\|M) + \frac{1}{2}D_{KL}(Q\|M)$$

where $M = \frac{1}{2}(P + Q)$.

Wasserstein Distance

The Wasserstein Distance, also known as the Earth Mover’s Distance (EMD), measures the distance

between two probability distributions:

$$W(P, Q) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma(P, Q)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} d(x, y) d\gamma(x, y).$$

Cross Entropy

Cross Entropy measures the average number of bits required to identify an event from a set of possibilities, under a specific model:

$$H(P, Q) = - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x) \log(Q(x)).$$

Mutual Information

Mutual Information measures the amount of information that one random variable contains about another random variable:

$$I(X; Y) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x, y) \log \left(\frac{p(x, y)}{p(x)p(y)} \right).$$

Normalized Mutual Information

Normalized Mutual Information is calculated as the mutual information divided by the maximum of the entropies of the variables:

$$NMI(X; Y) = \frac{I(X; Y)}{\max(H(X), H(Y))}.$$

Appendix B: Experiment #1 Justifications of 31 Biased Articles

In Section 4.1, we note that EVINCE processed 31 news articles to assess their neutrality. In addition to the final decision, we detail the justifications EVINCE provides at the debate’s end. These justifications are documented in four tables: Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8.

#	Rating S,D,R	EVINCE Justifications
D1	5,5,5	The article discusses the controversy surrounding the IRS's alleged targeting of conservative groups, focusing on Rep. Darrell Issa's stance against releasing full transcripts from IRS interviews. Issa argues that full disclosure would compromise the investigation, a position criticized by Rep. Elijah Cummings, who advocates for transparency. The debate highlights political tensions, with implications of bias in the handling of the investigation. The article portrays a complex interplay of political, ideological, and possibly historical biases, reflecting the contentious nature of the IRS scandal and its investigation.
D2	5,5,3	The article discusses Michele Bachmann's statement that the IRS scandal, involving the targeting of conservative groups, undermines the credibility of the 2012 election. Bachmann accuses the Obama administration of lying and questions the impartiality of the IRS, particularly in relation to health care coverage for conservatives. The article reflects political and ideological biases, given its focus on Bachmann's perspective and the implications for the election's integrity and government trustworthiness. The perception of bias in Michele Bachmann's statement about the IRS scandal primarily stems from the framing and implications of her comments. She directly links the IRS's actions to the credibility of the 2012 election and the Obama administration, suggesting a deliberate misuse of power for political gain. This perspective inherently carries ideological and political biases by casting the issue in a light that emphasizes misconduct by one political group over another, without presenting counterarguments or broader context that might mitigate or challenge that viewpoint.
D8	3,5,2	The reporting appears to maintain a neutral tone by directly stating the facts and comments made by John Kerry and others involved without inserting opinionated language. It discusses the global reaction to the NSA's surveillance practices and includes Kerry's acknowledgment of overreach, as well as the international and domestic fallout from these revelations. The inclusion of various perspectives, including those from technology companies and international officials, alongside Kerry's comments, aims to provide a balanced view of the situation.
D31	3,5,3	The CNN article appears to report on Ray Nagin's indictment with a focus on the factual and legal aspects of the case, without displaying overt biases related to politics, ideology, religion, gender, race, socioeconomic status, culture, geography, or history. By sticking closely to the details of the indictment and Nagin's public actions and statements, the article provides a comprehensive overview of the charges against him while maintaining journalistic neutrality.
D37	4,4,4	The article outlines how Senate Democrats, led by Sen. Chuck Schumer, strategically navigated the border security issue to secure aid for Ukraine while potentially shifting the political narrative around immigration policy. Schumer's approach to integrate border security into the aid package discussions aimed to both address the issue and leverage political gain. It suggests a calculated maneuver to position Democrats favorably on border security and hold Republicans accountable for any failure to pass the legislation, demonstrating a nuanced political strategy in the face of complex legislative challenges.
D69	3,5,3	The article has a clear perspective that favors religious liberty arguments against the HHS Mandate of Obamacare. It specifically highlights cases where the mandate was challenged on religious grounds, suggesting a bias towards those opposing the mandate. The framing and choice of sources, emphasizing victories against the mandate and quoting lawyers from organizations focused on religious freedom, contribute to a viewpoint that may not fully account for counterarguments or the broader context of healthcare policy. It leans towards a particular ideological stance, making it less of a neutral report.
D81	4,4,3	The article's focus on the possibility of conservative-owned car dealerships being targeted for closures during the General Motors bailout could imply a certain bias by emphasizing a narrative of political victimization without presenting a comprehensive range of perspectives or evidence. It suggests a parallel with the IRS's targeting of Tea Party groups, which could lead readers to infer a broader pattern of political discrimination without definitive proof. The call for an investigation by the Congressmen is legitimate news, but the framing and selection of information could influence the reader's perception of the events.
D98	5,5,4	Yes, the article itself exhibits bias by focusing solely on criticizing the media's treatment of Obama's vacations compared to Bush's, without offering a balanced view or acknowledging any reasons why coverage might differ. It selectively presents information to support its claim of a double standard, which is a characteristic of biased reporting.
D101	4,4,3	The article describes President Obama's strategy to navigate through political controversies by focusing on legislative actions and executive orders that bypass Republican opposition. It highlights the White House's efforts to concentrate on immigration reform, budget deals, healthcare law implementation, and keeping student loan rates low. The narrative suggests a proactive approach to governance amidst challenges, aiming to draw a contrast with what is portrayed as Republican political gamesmanship. This portrayal might be viewed as leaning towards a positive depiction of Obama's administration's efforts to prioritize policy over politics. It presents his efforts in a positive light, emphasizing a proactive and policy-driven approach amidst challenges.

Table 5: The First 9 of 16 Democrat Scandals News Articles Rated by EVINCE and its Justifications. The rating column starts with EVINCE's rating, the Democrat rater (in blue), and then Republican rater (in red).

D106	3,3,3	The article reports on former Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick's sentencing to 28 years in prison for public corruption, emphasizing the gravity of his crimes against the city's welfare. It contrasts Kilpatrick's actions with the impact on Detroit, highlighting the judicial and public response to his extensive criminal activities. The reporting focuses on factual recounting of the trial's outcome, Kilpatrick's and his co-defendant's crimes, and the broader implications for Detroit, without evident bias towards political, ideological, or other specific perspectives.
D109	4,4,3	The article's bias primarily stems from its focus on internal Democratic opposition to Lawrence Summers' Federal Reserve Chair nomination, highlighting a lack of unity and strategy within the party and the White House's mismanagement of the nomination process. It suggests an underestimation of the opposition's seriousness by the White House, portraying the administration in a somewhat negative light for not engaging more proactively with concerned Senate Democrats.
D157	4,4,3	The article discusses the challenges in U.S.-Germany intelligence relations following revelations of U.S. surveillance on Chancellor Merkel. Despite efforts to rebuild trust, significant differences in surveillance philosophies persist, with the U.S. prioritizing security interests and Germany emphasizing privacy and alliance values. The situation reflects broader tensions in U.S. relations with allies over privacy and surveillance practices. The article's framing might suggest a bias towards highlighting the challenges and frictions in the U.S.-Germany intelligence relations, particularly emphasizing Germany's privacy concerns and skepticism towards U.S. surveillance practices. It portrays the U.S. stance as unyielding and contrasts this with Germany's emphasis on privacy and legal constraints, potentially casting the U.S. in a more negative light regarding international surveillance and cooperation.
D174	4,3,3	The article reports on House Speaker John Boehner and House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, both Republicans, expressing support for President Obama's proposal to authorize military action against Syria in response to the use of chemical weapons. This bipartisan backing is seen as crucial for Obama in gaining Congressional approval. The leaders emphasized the need for the U.S. to stand against such behavior internationally and the importance of the administration convincing both Congress and the American public of the strike's necessity. The reporting appears balanced, focusing on factual statements and actions by political leaders regarding support for military action in Syria. It provides viewpoints from both Republican and Democratic leaders, their reasoning, and the challenges involved in convincing Congress and the American public. The emphasis on bipartisan support and the detailed reporting of various opinions and statements help maintain a neutral tone without apparent bias towards one political viewpoint or another.
D188	4,3,3	The article reports that Hillary Clinton received warnings about security threats in Benghazi before the 2012 attack through emails. These were part of around 300 emails released by the State Department, which also show Clinton's responses and thoughts during the aftermath. The political controversy regarding the Obama administration's initial assessment of the attack's cause is also mentioned, with references to Susan Rice's statements on talk shows. The reporting may exhibit bias through selective emphasis on Clinton's receipt of warnings about security threats in Benghazi and her responses, potentially framing her actions or inactions in a negative light. The focus on the political controversy and the administration's initial assessment of the attack's cause could also influence perceptions of responsibility or competence.
D278	4,4,3	The article discusses a House committee investigation into whether Attorney General Eric Holder misled Congress regarding the Department of Justice's pursuit of journalists' personal records. It highlights Holder's previous testimony claiming no involvement in prosecuting press for material disclosure, contrasted with the DOJ's actions against Fox News reporter James Rosen, who was labeled a potential "co-conspirator" but not charged.... The article's tone suggests potential bias by emphasizing allegations that Eric Holder may have misled Congress, primarily focusing on criticisms from Republican figures and conservative critics. It uses specific incidents to question Holder's integrity and the Justice Department's actions under his leadership, possibly framing the narrative to highlight governmental overreach and lack of transparency.
D336	3,3,3	The article reports on a scandal involving overcharging the Navy for ship supplies by Inchcape Shipping Services, owned by the government of Dubai, expanding beyond the Pacific Fleet to include Navy operations in the Middle East, Africa, and South America. The Justice Department is investigating allegations of Inchcape, through subcontractors, overcharging millions of dollars. This follows a separate criminal investigation into Glenn Defense Marine Asia for bribing Navy officials for overbilling. The Navy has suspended Inchcape from new contracts, marking a significant issue of fraud and corruption within Navy contracting. The reporting appears balanced, focusing on the factual aspects of the scandal and the investigation by the Justice Department. It cites sources and includes statements from involved parties, aiming to present a comprehensive view of the situation without apparent bias toward any side.

Table 6: The Last 7 of 16 Democrat Scandals News Articles Rated by EVINCE and its Justifications. The rating column starts with EVINCE's rating, the Democrat rater (in blue), and then Republican rater (in red).

#	Rating S,D,R	EVINCE Justifications
R1	5,3,5	The editorial from The New York Times Editorial Board exhibits a clear bias against the Republican party's handling of the Benghazi attack investigation, framing it as politically motivated rather than a genuine effort to address security failures or seek accountability. The language and tone used in the editorial are critical and dismissive of the Republicans' actions, suggesting a political and ideological bias. While editorials are inherently opinion-based and are expected to take a stance, this piece clearly communicates a stance that is critical of the Republicans' focus on Benghazi, suggesting a lack of neutrality in its assessment of the motives and actions surrounding the investigation.
R7	3,3,3	The article reports on allegations by Senator Mitch McConnell that his campaign headquarters were wiretapped, with the FBI investigating these claims. A recording of McConnell's team discussing potential attacks on Ashley Judd, who was considering running against him, was released by Mother Jones. McConnell accused the political left of this action, describing it as a "Nixonian move." The recording included discussions on various strategies to undermine potential opponents, highlighting a focus on Judd's personal struggles and political views. The controversy has prompted responses from both Republican and Democratic officials, reflecting the tense political atmosphere.
R15	3,3,4	The report appears to present the information neutrally, stating both President Obama's rejection of the Republican proposal and the subsequent pushback from Republican sources who claim otherwise. It includes statements from both sides and provides context about the ongoing negotiations without overtly favoring one perspective over the other. Therefore, based on the information provided, the report does not appear to exhibit bias.
R69	4,4,4	The report discusses how young Republicans are seeking a different message for elections, emphasizing a departure from divisive social issues and a focus on fiscal responsibility, national defense, and energy advancement. Selection Bias: The article primarily focuses on young Republicans who are seeking a different message for the party. It doesn't provide as much insight into young Republicans who may still align with traditional conservative values, which could create a slight bias toward the viewpoints of those seeking change. Language Bias: Certain language choices, such as describing divisive social issues as "anti-abortion, anti-gay, and anti-environment stances," may reflect a bias toward more progressive viewpoints on these issues. A more neutral description might be "positions on abortion, same-sex marriage, and environmental policy." Source Bias: The perspectives provided in the article are mainly from young Republicans themselves. While including these voices is essential, the article could benefit from additional perspectives from political analysts or experts to provide more context and balance.
R124	4,3,5	The article provides a factual recount of the events surrounding Dr. Ben Carson's comments on gay marriage and the backlash from Johns Hopkins students. It maintains a relatively neutral tone and allows for the inclusion of multiple perspectives, including Carson's own response and apology. However, the lack of in-depth analysis into the implications of Carson's comparisons or the broader context of the gay marriage debate might leave readers without a complete understanding of the controversy's depth. Furthermore, the article does not explicitly offer viewpoints opposing Carson's beyond the students' petition, which could be seen as a form of omission bias. Yet, it does not overtly favor Carson or dismiss the students' concerns, striving instead to report on the unfolding situation.
R125	4,3,4	The news article on the Zimmerman verdict and the subsequent calls for a Florida boycott provides a complex mix of reporting that touches on several sensitive themes, including political and ideological biases, as well as racial and socio-economic considerations. While the article attempts to cover a contentious and complex issue by incorporating diverse viewpoints, the focus on political figures, racial dynamics, and economic repercussions could introduce biases in how the information is perceived. To mitigate these biases, the reporting could benefit from a more in-depth exploration of the legal and historical contexts, a broader range of perspectives, and a careful consideration of how the information presented might influence public perception.
R180	3,3,3	The AP article provides a balanced account of the corruption scandal involving three politically involved sisters in Pennsylvania. It maintains an objective tone while delivering comprehensive background information that situates the legal outcomes within the broader context of the Orie family's public and political life. The reporting is factual and avoids taking sides, instead focusing on the legal facts and the personal and political fallout for the individuals involved.
R191	3,3,4	The CNN article attempts to navigate the complexities of Mark Sanford's political comeback attempt in a balanced manner, focusing on the potential impact of his past infidelity on female voters and the broader electoral implications. By presenting viewpoints from both sides of the political aisle, incorporating a range of sources, and providing necessary background and context, the article strives for neutrality. While the subject matter inherently involves sensitive and potentially polarizing topics, the article's approach is to inform readers about the electoral dynamics at play without overt bias.

Table 7: The First 8 of 15 Republican Scandals News Articles Rated by EVINCE and its Justifications. The rating column starts with EVINCE's rating, the Democrat rater (in blue), and then Republican rater (in red).

#	Rating S,D,R	EVINCE Justifications
R214	5,3,5	The Daily Kos article clearly exhibits political and ideological bias, with a tone and language that are critical of the Republicans. It uses the incident involving Dave Agema to argue that the party's efforts to rebrand itself as more tolerant and inclusive are undermined by its members' actions. While the article includes factual information regarding the incident and the party's response, its presentation and commentary are aligned with a progressive viewpoint, aiming to highlight and criticize perceived contradictions and failures within the Republican Party. This approach is consistent with opinion journalism but introduces bias through its critical tone, selective presentation of information, and framing of the incident as emblematic of broader issues within the party.
R221	3,3,4	"Hurricane Christie" presents Governor Chris Christie's critique of House Republicans in a manner that emphasizes party conflict and personal betrayal. The dramatic framing, choice of language, and focus on internal discord may introduce bias by portraying Christie's actions in a specific light and emphasizing the divide within the Republican Party. The article's approach to presenting these events can influence readers' perceptions, potentially leading them to see the situation through a lens of heightened drama and internal strife.
R233	4,3,4	While the article attempts to cover the last-ditch efforts by House Republicans to avert a government shutdown and the standoff with Senate Democrats, the framing and language used may introduce a bias towards portraying the Republican efforts in a more favorable light. By emphasizing the Republican narrative of seeking negotiation and characterizing the Democratic response as dismissive, the article could be perceived as leaning towards a particular political perspective. The inclusion of quotes and perspectives from both sides does provide a degree of balance, but the overall presentation and emphasis could influence readers' perceptions of the shutdown negotiations.
R235	3,5,5	Without knowledge of the author or publication, this text attempts to navigate a complex and sensitive story by providing details from multiple sources, including the main figures involved, political watchdog groups, and law enforcement. It balances the serious allegations with responses from the accused, background information, and the current status of investigations. While the focus on unsubstantiated claims could inherently sway public opinion, the article's inclusion of diverse perspectives and context aims to mitigate overt bias.
R269	3,3,4	The article reports on President Obama's efforts to address the government shutdown, his challenge to Speaker John Boehner regarding the passage of a budget measure, and the broader context of the political standoff over the Affordable Care Act and the debt ceiling. To evaluate the article for bias, we'll examine it against various criteria...
R274	3,3,4	The article presents a relatively balanced view of the internal GOP conflict over the strategy to defund the ACA, highlighting arguments from both sides of the debate within the party. It focuses on the political and strategic dimensions of the issue, providing insights into the perspectives of key figures and factions within the Republican Party. While the article could potentially be seen as emphasizing party divisions, which might align with certain political narratives, it does so in the context of exploring a significant and newsworthy internal debate. The absence of discussion on the socioeconomic, cultural, and historical contexts of the ACA debate, however, suggests areas where the reporting could be expanded to provide a more comprehensive view of the issue. The article strives to present a comprehensive view of the government shutdown, the debate over the Affordable Care Act, and the looming debt ceiling crisis by including perspectives from both the Obama administration and Republican leaders. While there is an emphasis on Obama's attempts to resolve the situation and his calls for Congress to act, the inclusion of Republican viewpoints and the mention of the piecemeal funding bills passed by the House attempt to provide a balanced perspective. The reporting appears to aim for neutrality by focusing on the facts of the political standoff and the implications for federal operations and the nation's financial credibility.
R280	5,5,3	The article from Fox News by Jay Sekulow, titled "Obama's fingerprints all over IRS Tea Party scandal," presents a viewpoint that directly implicates President Obama in the IRS scandal involving the targeting of conservative groups. The author argues that the scandal was not only known but encouraged by senior IRS officials, Congressional Democrats, the White House, and further fueled by the mainstream media. To assess the article for bias, let's evaluate it against various criteria: The article "Obama's fingerprints all over IRS Tea Party scandal" demonstrates clear political and ideological biases, with a narrative constructed to directly implicate President Obama in the IRS targeting scandal. By selectively quoting Obama and drawing connections to actions by the IRS, the article aims to present a cohesive narrative that places responsibility for the scandal on the president. This framing serves to reinforce the viewpoint of those who see the actions as politically motivated and indicative of broader issues of governance and accountability under the Obama administration. The choice of language, historical comparisons, and the leveraging of the author's and platform's ideological stances contribute to a biased presentation of the events surrounding the IRS scandal.

Table 8: The Last 7 of 15 Republican Scandals News Articles Rated by EVINCE and its Justifications. The rating column starts with EVINCE's rating, the Democrat rater (in blue), and then Republican rater (in red).

Appendix C: Experiment Dataset

In Section 4.1, we introduce a set of 619 articles on “Democrats Scandals” (54.3%) and “Republicans Scandals” (45.7%). This subset is notable for its ground-truth labels, provided by annotators from

both political spectrums, which reflect inherent biases in reviewing negative coverage about one’s own party. This dataset is provided as supplementary material.