

Option-ID Based Elimination For Multiple Choice Questions

Zhenhao Zhu¹, Bulou Liu²

¹Weiyang College, Tsinghua University

²Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University
zhuzhenh22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract

Multiple choice questions (MCQs) are a common and important task for evaluating large language models (LLMs). Based on common strategies humans use when answering MCQs, the process of elimination has been proposed as an effective problem-solving method. Existing methods to the process of elimination generally fall into two categories: one involves having the model directly select the incorrect answer, while the other involves scoring the options. However, both methods incur high computational costs and often perform worse than methods that answer based on option ID. To address this issue, this paper proposes a process of elimination based on option ID. We select 10 LLMs and conduct zero-shot experiments on 7 different datasets. The experimental results demonstrate that our method significantly improves the model’s performance. Further analysis reveals that the sequential elimination strategy can effectively enhance the model’s reasoning ability. Additionally, we find that sequential elimination is also applicable to few-shot settings and can be combined with debias methods to further improve model performance.

1 Introduction

MCQs are a common assessment tool that plays a crucial role in evaluating the reasoning and comprehension abilities of LLMs. Due to their simplicity and structured nature, MCQs are widely used in various contexts such as standardized testing and machine reading comprehension. As LLMs are increasingly applied across different domains, improving their performance on MCQs tasks has become an important area of research.

When humans solve MCQs, they typically rely on an elimination strategy, which involves first identifying and discarding obviously incorrect options, and then progressively narrowing down the range of possible answers until the correct one is identified. Based on this idea, some studies have

suggested that applying the elimination method to LLMs may serve as an effective way to enhance their MCQs answering capability. Existing approaches to the elimination method for LLMs can be broadly divided into two categories: one involves directly having the model identify and select the incorrect options (Balepur et al., 2024), while the other involves scoring each option and eliminating those with lower scores (Ma and Du, 2023). Although these methods improve model performance on MCQs tasks to some extent, they still have significant limitations. First, the elimination method based on incorrect options is not only computationally expensive but also difficult to design an optimal rule for extracting answers from the generated text. Second, the elimination method based on option scoring requires multiple inferences for each option, which is also resource-intensive. Furthermore, the effectiveness of both methods is often not as high as that of the option-ID based method (Robinson and Wingate, 2023) propose.

To address these issues, this study introduces an option-ID based elimination method. This method does not require scoring each option individually; instead, it selects the most likely incorrect option ID through a single forward inference, thereby simplifying the reasoning process and significantly reducing computational overhead. We select 10 different LLMs and conduct zero-shot experiments on 7 publicly available datasets. The experimental results show that the option-ID based elimination method significantly improves the model’s performance on MCQs tasks, especially on datasets related to logical reasoning. In addition, we further analyze the failure cases of the model when directly selecting incorrect options, and identify that these failures mainly stem from intrinsic limitations of the model itself. We then compare various elimination strategies, and the results demonstrate that the sequential elimination strategy offers a signif-

icant performance advantage. Finally, we found that the sequential elimination strategy not only enhances the model’s reasoning abilities but also performs well in few-shot learning scenarios, and can be combined with debias methods to further improve the model’s performance. Specifically, our contributions are threefold:

- We propose an option-ID based elimination method. Instead of scoring each option individually, this method selects the most likely incorrect option ID through a single forward inference, thus significantly simplifying the reasoning process and effectively reducing computational overhead.
- We select 10 LLMs and conduct zero-shot experiments on 7 publicly available datasets. The results show that the option-ID based elimination method significantly improves the model’s performance on MCQs tasks, particularly achieving better results on datasets involving logical reasoning.
- We analyze the advantages and disadvantages of various elimination strategies and found that the sequential elimination strategy offers a significant performance advantage. It not only enhances reasoning capabilities but also performs well in few-shot learning scenarios, and when combined with debias methods, it further improves the model’s performance.

2 Related Work

2.1 Large Language Models

In recent years, LLMs based on the Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) architecture have become the mainstream method. The introduction of models such as the GPT series has accelerated the development of the pre-training-fine-tuning paradigm, demonstrating the remarkable performance of large-scale pre-trained language models across a variety of downstream tasks. Notably, models like GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) have pushed the boundaries of LLM potential, achieving state-of-the-art performance across multiple tasks. In recent years, with the emergence of studies such as LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023a; Touvron et al., 2023b), researchers have further explored scaling laws and efficient training techniques, enhancing both the performance and efficiency of LLMs. Despite their impressive performance across a wide

range of tasks, these LLMs still face challenges, including issues related to model interpretability, bias and fairness (Gallegos et al., 2024), and their reliance on domain-specific knowledge.

2.2 Multiple Choice Questions

MCQs, due to their structured format and ease of evaluation, have become widely adopted in many applications centered around LLMs. For instance, in the automatic evaluation frameworks proposed by (Chiang et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2023b), GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023) is provided with a question and two candidate answers and is required to determine which answer is more accurate. This approach leverages the reasoning and comparison capabilities of LLMs to automate the evaluation process, thereby reducing the reliance on human annotations. Additionally, MCQs are commonly used in standard benchmark tests to assess the knowledge and reasoning abilities of language models, such as MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2020). Despite the widespread use of MCQs in evaluation, recent research has raised concerns about their robustness in the context of LLMs. For example, Chang et al. (2024) points out that LLMs exhibit high sensitivity to subtle variations in question phrasing or answer ordering, leading to inconsistent performance across different scenarios. Similarly, Yang et al. (2024) demonstrates that LLMs often display overconfidence in incorrect answers, particularly when distractors are semantically similar to the correct answer.

2.3 Process of Elimination (PoE)

As an important reasoning strategy, PoE has been widely studied across various domains. In the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP), particularly in reading comprehension tasks, PoE has proven to be an effective method. Parikh et al. (2018) introduces a neural network model for reading comprehension. By training models to identify and eliminate irrelevant options, they achieve significant improvements in reading comprehension tasks. Studies by (Ma and Du, 2023) suggest that language models can apply this strategy to MCQs task by computing the probabilities of candidate options. Furthermore, Balepur et al. (2024) evaluates whether generative LLMs can effectively reason out incorrect options through Chain-of-Thought (COT) reasoning.

3 Methodology

3.1 Problem Setting

For MCQs, we use q to denote the question, o_i to the option ID (e.g. A,B,C,D), y_i to the option, and x to the concatenation of the option IDs and the corresponding options.

3.2 Elimination Strategies

In this section, we introduce three elimination strategies. In contrast to traditional methods of calculating the probabilities of the options, we use the probabilities of the option IDs as a substitute. After the elimination of options, the option IDs are updated, e.g. when option C is eliminated, the original D will be updated as C. Specially, these strategies ensure that the relative positions of the remaining options remain unchanged after the elimination of options.

3.2.1 Eliminating One Option at a Time

First, we compute the probability for each option ID and select the option corresponding to the ID with the lowest probability as the eliminated option.

$$y_{eli} = \arg \min_i P(o_i | q, x), i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$$

Then, we remove the eliminated option from x , resulting in a new set x_{new} . Finally, we recompute the probabilities for the option IDs based on x_{new} to obtain the answer.

$$answer = \arg \max_i P(o_i | q, x_{new}), i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$$

3.2.2 Eliminating Two Options at a Time

Similar to the strategy in Section 3.2.1, the only difference is that, in the first step of elimination, two options are selected.

$$y_{eli} = \left\{ \arg \min_i P(o_i | q, x), \arg \min_{j \neq i} P(o_j | q, x) \right\}$$

$$i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$$

3.2.3 Sequential Elimination

The first step is the same as the strategy in Section 3.2.1. But after this step, we perform further elimination based on the x_{new} .

$$y_{eli} = \arg \min_i P(o_i | q, x_{new}), i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$$

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Datasets

To cover a broad range of domains, we conduct experiments on seven 4-options datasets. These datasets include: ARC-Challenge(Clark et al., 2018), OpenBookQA(Mihaylov et al., 2018), and five sub-datasets selected from the BIG-Bench tasks(Srivastava et al., 2023): Physics, Multiemo, Metaphor Understanding (MU), Phrase Relatedness (PR), and Conceptual Combinations (CC). For each dataset, we prioritize sampling from the test set. And if the number of samples exceeds 500, we randomly sample 500 examples; otherwise, we use all available samples.

4.2 Models

We select 10 mainstream LLMs, covering different parameter scales. Specifically, these include: Llama-3-8B(Grattafiori et al., 2024), Llama-3.1-8B(Grattafiori et al., 2024), Falcon3-1B/7B/10B(Team, 2024), Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2/0.3(Mistral, 2024), Qwen2-7B(qwe, 2024), OLMo-2-1124-7B(OLMo et al., 2024) and Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct (14B)(Abdin et al., 2024). Since We need to obtain output probabilities, all of these models are open-source and available on the HuggingFace platform. The temperature hyperparameter for all models is set to 0.1.

4.3 Baselines

We select the following 9 common methods as baselines for comparison.

- **Language Model (LM)**(baseline in Zhao et al., 2021) LM simply selects the option with the highest probability. Thus, LM can be written as follows:

$$\arg \max_i P(y_i | q)$$

For causal language models, e.g. GPT, $P(y_i | q)$ can be further decomposed as:

$$P(y_i | q) = \prod_{j=1}^{\ell_i} P(y_i^j | q, y_i^1, \dots, y_i^{j-1}).$$

where y_i^j is the j th token of y_i and ℓ_i is the number of tokens in y_i .

- **Average Log Probability (AVG)**(Brown et al., 2020) AVG takes the logarithm of the probabil-




Figure 1: 0-shot. 2 refers the elimination of two options at a time, 1 refers the elimination of one option at a time, and seq denotes sequential elimination. Each strategy subtracts the maximum value in the baselines and averages the results over 7 datasets / 10 LLMs. The detailed results can be found in the Appendix B.

LLMs	datasets	Our	Log	IE _{new}	NoLog ₁	NoLog ₂	NoLog _{seq}
Falcon3-7B	ARC-C	<u>85.8</u>	86.4	77.4	77.6	78.2	75.8
	Physics	94.3	<u>92.9</u>	90.3	87.2	91.6	<u>92.9</u>
	Multiemo	44.6	44.6	42.0	42.0	41.4	41.4
OLMo-2-1124-7B	ARC-C	74.8	<u>73.8</u>	60.0	58.4	57.2	55.4
	Physics	71.8	<u>67.8</u>	65.6	61.7	66.1	<u>68.3</u>
	Multiemo	46.4	<u>44.0</u>	41.0	40.6	41.0	41.2
Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	ARC-C	<u>89.6</u>	90.0	81.0	77.0	79.2	79.0
	Physics	89.4	<u>88.6</u>	86.3	84.6	87.2	85.5
	Multiemo	46.8	<u>44.6</u>	41.4	38.4	41.6	42.0

Table 1: Accuracy on three datasets (0-shot). Our refers the sequential elimination. 1 refers replacing an option with [MASK] at a time. 2 refers replacing two options with [MASK] at a time. The best results are in bold and the second-best results are underlined.

ities based on the LM and performs normalization.

$$\arg \max_i \frac{1}{\ell_i} \log P(y_i | q)$$

- **Domain Conditional PMI (PMI_{DC})**(Holtzman et al., 2021) PMI_{DC} reweights the option score by calculating the probability of the option in the specific task domain, allowing different valid answers to compete fairly.

$$\arg \max_i \log \frac{P(y_i | q)}{P(y_i | q_{domain})}.$$

Where q_{domain} is the string "Answer:" in our study.

- **Channel**(Min et al., 2022) Channel computes the probability of the question given the option,

assuming that $P(y_i | q) \propto P(q | y_i)$.

$$\arg \max_i \frac{1}{\ell_i} \log P(q | y_i)$$

- **Multiple Choice Prompt (MCP)**(Robinson and Wingate, 2023) MCP assigns an ID to each option and selects the answer based on the probabilities of IDs.

$$\arg \max_i P(o_i | q, x)$$

- **Text Generation (TG)**(Wei et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023b; Kojima et al., 2022) TG first generates a piece of text based on the input, and then extracts the answer from the generated text using manually designed specific rules.

$$\text{text} = \text{generate}(q, x)$$

$$\text{answer} = \text{extract}(\text{text})$$




Figure 2: Accuracy on two datasets (0-shot). 0 refers directly using MCP to answer. In the remaining cases, we first eliminate i options using sequential elimination, and then use MCP to answer. The detailed results can be found in the Appendix B.

- **Explicit Elimination (EE)**(Balepur et al., 2024) EE uses TG in both steps. First, Let the model select the incorrect option, then remove it from x , and finally answer. Similar to Section 3.2, EE also employs three strategies.

Incorrect option = extract(text)

answer = extract(text_{new})

- **All-Options Log Probability (AOLP)** (baseline in Ma and Du, 2023) AOLP calculates the probability of a specific option given all options.

$$\arg \max_i \log P(y_i | q, x)$$

- **Implicit Elimination (IE)**(Ma and Du, 2023) IE first computes $\log P(y_i | q, x)$ and calculates an average probability for all options. Options with probabilities below this threshold are replaced with a special text sequence "[MASK]". Then the probabilities of all options are recalculated, with the probabilities of the replaced options set to negative infinity.

$$y_{\text{mask}} = \{y_i | \log P(y_i | q, x) < \text{avg}\}.$$

$$\arg \max_i \log P(y_i | q, x_{\text{mask}})$$

4.4 Prompt

In our study, we use fixed prompts to ensure the consistency of experimental conditions. The specific content of the prompt can be found in Appendix A.

LLMs	data	MCP	EE _{new} ¹	EE _{new} ²	EE _{new} ^{seq}
F7B	A	83.6	64.2	49.4	43.8
	O	66.0	51.2	42.8	39.8
	M	85.3	31.9	12.1	21.6
F10B	A	85.0	77.8	48.6	71.8
	O	75.6	68.6	41.6	54.8
	M	87.9	62.9	2.6	47.4
O7B	A	70.0	65.0	46.2	60.0
	O	67.0	61.2	41.2	53.8
	M	74.1	72.4	20.7	31.0

Table 2: Accuracy on three datasets (0-shot). 1 refers selecting one incorrect option at a time. 2 refers selecting two incorrect options at a time. The best results are in bold.

5 Experimental Results

5.1 A Comparison of Three Elimination Methods

Among the three elimination methods, the EE method performs the worst, with its accuracy showing a significant drop compared to the other two methods. And the IE method, while generally inferior to our proposed approach, even underperforms the baseline MCP method on 6/7 datasets. Our model achieve outstanding results across all datasets and models, particularly when the sequential elimination strategy is applied, where its performance is especially remarkable. We also observe that in tasks involving logical reasoning, such as the CC, Physics datasets, our method show a significantly greater improvement compared to common-sense reasoning datasets (e.g. OpenBookQA). This aligns with human behavior when answering MCQs: when faced with complex reasoning, humans often improve their accuracy through a process of elimination.

Furthermore, from a computational cost perspective, the IE method requires multiple forward passes for each option, and the probabilities of multiple tokens must be computed for each option. In contrast, our approach only requires a single forward pass and computes the probability of a single token, significantly reducing computational complexity. Therefore, our method not only outperforms others in terms of effectiveness but also offers higher computational efficiency.

LLMs	ARC-C					OpenBookQA				
	Our	Cyc	Our _{cyc}	Pri	Our _{pri}	Our	Cyc	Our _{cyc}	Pri	Our _{pri}
Llama-3.1-8B	76.2	80.6	81.4	77.4	79.2	71.4	79.2	78.2	74.8	75.2
Falcon3-7B	85.8	85.8	86.6	85.8	85.0	66.0	82.0	83.8	75.4	77.2
Falcon3-10B	87.6	88.2	88.4	86.0	87.0	75.8	82.0	82.0	76.8	78.4
Phi-3-medium	89.6	89.8	92.6	86.6	90.2	74.8	83.6	84.2	70.4	74.2

Table 3: Accuracy on two datasets (0-shot). Our refers the sequential elimination. The best results are in bold. Sequential elimination combined with cyclic achieves the best or comparable performance on two datasets.

5.2 Which Elimination Strategy is Better?

Although our method outperforms IE in overall performance, this does not imply that our elimination strategies are necessarily superior to IE’s elimination strategy. The reason is that IE uses $\log P(y_i | q, x)$ as the evaluation metric, while we employ $P(o_i | q, x)$ for assessment. Based on this, we improve IE and propose two new elimination strategies. Specifically, IE_{new} uses $\log P(o_i | q, x)$ as the evaluation metric.

$$y_{mask} = \{y_i | \log P(o_i | q, x) < \text{avg}\}$$

One of the new strategies is to replace the using [MASK] option in IE_{new} with direct eliminating the options. We refer this strategy as Log.

$$y_{eli} = \{y_i | \log P(o_i | q, x) < \text{avg}\}$$

The other is based on the three strategies mentioned in Section 3.2, which replace options with [MASK] instead of eliminating them. We refer this strategy as NoLog.

$$y_{mask} = \arg \min_i P(o_i | q, x)$$

We select Falcon3-7B, OLMo-2-1124-7B, Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct and conduct experiments on ARC-Challenge, Physics and Multiemo.

In the Table 1, we can observe that the sequential elimination strategy consistently yields the best or near-optimal results in all cases. In contrast, the Log strategy performs slightly worse than the sequential elimination strategy in most cases, but demonstrates strong stability. In comparison, the two strategies IE_{new} and NoLog that replace options with [MASK] string generally perform worse and exhibit significant fluctuations in certain situations. For instance, on the OLMo-2-1124-7B, the accuracy of the IE_{new} and NoLog strategies significantly drops on the ARC-C datasets compared to the first two strategies. We attribute this

phenomenon to the fact that, despite replacing the options with [MASK] string, the model still tends to assign some probability mass to the IDs corresponding to these options, thereby influencing the probability distribution over the other option IDs. In turn, this affects the model’s stability and accuracy.

5.3 Can Sequential Elimination Enhance Model Reasoning?

In the Figure 1, it can be observed that the sequential elimination significantly outperforms the other two strategies. Therefore, we hypothesize that the step-by-step reasoning method of sequential elimination can enhance the model’s reasoning ability. To validate this hypothesis, we select two 5-options datasets Logical Deduction (LD) and Riddle Sense (RS)(Lin et al., 2021). We randomly sample 500 examples from each dataset. And we select Llama-3-8B, OLMo-2-1124-7B, Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct to conduct the experiment.

In the Figure 2, We observe that the sequential elimination consistently shows an improvement in accuracy across both datasets. Specifically, as the number of eliminated options increases, the model’s accuracy also improves. These results suggest that sequential elimination helps enhance model performance by effectively narrowing the option space. This is in line with our hypothesis that step-by-step reasoning is beneficial for enhancing the model’s reasoning ability.

5.4 What Causes EE Fail?

In an ideal scenario, the process by which the model selects the correct and incorrect answers should exhibit consistency. However, the poor performance in EE indicates that the model still lacks sufficient capability in choosing the wrong answers. That being said, we argue that this failure cannot be solely attributed to intrinsic factors of

LLMs	Method	ARC-C			Physics		
		1-shot	5-shot	10-shot	1-shot	5-shot	10-shot
Llama-3.1-8B	IE	54.1	50.3	50.3	28.5	32.6	32.6
	MCP	75.9	76.1	75.8	75.9	88.0	95.0
	Our	77.0	77.7	78.7	84.3	95.6	98.7
Falcon3-10B	IE	58.1	59.9	60.1	46.0	54.0	52.7
	MCP	86.4	85.5	85.7	82.2	89.6	92.2
	Our	87.4	86.9	86.7	87.8	92.1	95.4
Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	IE	66.9	69.6	68.9	57.0	54.8	58.4
	MCP	91.7	92.0	92.0	84.9	90.6	94.4
	Our	91.5	92.5	92.9	88.6	96.3	97.8

Table 4: Accuracy on two datasets. Our refers the sequential elimination. The results are averaged over three random seeds: 0, 1, and 2. The best results are in bold.

the model. Different prompts and hyperparameters such as temperature, top-p significantly affect the generated text, making it difficult to design a set of optimal extraction rules applicable to all scenarios. Based on this, we aim to further investigate the root causes of EE failures, to clarify whether they stem from external factors or from the inherent limitations of the model itself. We improve the EE and result in EE_{new} :

$$\text{Incorrect option} = \arg \max_i P(o_i | q, x)$$

We select Falcon3-7B/10B, OLMo-2-1124-7B and conduct experiments on ARC-Challenge, OpenBookQA, MU.

In the table 2, We observe a significant decline in performance for the EE_{new} compared to the MCP. By combining the experimental results of EE, we speculate that this performance drop is primarily due to intrinsic factors of the model. Additionally, we found that in the EE_{new} , the accuracy further decreases when performing sequential elimination compared to when only one option is eliminated. This suggests that errors propagate throughout the step-by-step reasoning process. We believe this phenomenon is closely related to the model’s training, which predominantly involves correct answers. As a result, there are fewer samples of incorrect options, limiting the model’s ability to understand and identify error options.

5.5 Can the Sequential Elimination be Combined with Debias Method?

Zheng et al. (2023a) has shown that LLMs exhibit token bias when performing MCQs task, mean-

ing that the model tends to assign more probability mass to certain option ID token a priori when predicting the answer from the option IDs. Therefore, it is natural to consider whether the two debias methods (cyclic and pride) proposed in this study could be combined with sequential elimination to further improve the model’s performance. To confirm this, we select Llama-3.1-8B, Falcon3-7B/10B, Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct and conduct experiments on ARC-Challenge, OpenBookQA.

Specifically, for the cyclic method, in each round, we first obtain the corrected option ID probabilities based on the cyclic permutation. Then, elimination is performed according to these probabilities, continuing until only one option remains.

$$y_{eli} = \arg \min_i P_{cyclic}(o_i | q, x)$$

For the pride method, in each round, we first obtain the probabilities of the original option IDs. Then, we correct these probabilities based on the prior probabilities. Finally, elimination is performed, continuing until only one option remains. Specially, we newly sample examples equivalent to 20% of the above datasets’ size to compute the Prior.

$$y_{eli} = \arg \min_i P(o_i | q, x) / \text{Prior}(o_i)$$

Table 3 shows the results of combining our method with cyclic and pride on two datasets. The results indicate that combining sequential elimination with the debias method generally leads to a significant improvement in model performance. In particular, the Our_{cyc} achieves the best results in most cases, far surpassing other methods.

5.6 Few-Shot

To further validate the generality and robustness of our method, we conduct additional experiments under different sample size settings beyond the zero-shot scenario, specifically considering few-shot setting with $K = 1$, $K = 5$, and $K = 10$. For comparison, we select two baseline methods: MCP and IE. MCP, which performs the best under the zero-shot setting, serves as a strong reference for comparison. IE is also chosen as a baseline to assess whether our method can still outperform it in the few-shot setting. We evaluate Llama-3.1-8B, Falcon3-10B and Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct on the ARC-Challenge and Physics datasets, and average the results across three random seeds (0, 1, and 2) to ensure the reliability of our findings.

In the Table 4, Our experimental results demonstrate that our method continues to outperform the others. In contrast, the overall performance of the IE method remains significantly lower than both our method and MCP. These results reinforce the robustness of our method, demonstrating that it maintains superior performance even under different sample size conditions.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel elimination method leveraging option IDs, which simplifies the reasoning process and significantly reduces computational overhead, offering a clear advantage over existing methods. Through zero-shot experiments on 7 publicly available datasets, we demonstrate that our method can notably improve model performance, particularly excelling in tasks that require logical reasoning. Furthermore, we conduct a systematic analysis of various elimination strategies, with the results indicating that the sequential elimination has a marked advantage in answering MCQs. It not only enhances the model’s reasoning capabilities but also performs well in few-shot learning scenarios. When combined with debias methods, it further improves the overall performance of the model. Our findings suggest that this strategy has broad applicability in MCQs answering tasks. Future work will focus on optimizing the method and exploring its generalization ability across a wider range of tasks.

7 Limitations

Our study has two main limitations. First, we employ fixed prompts without optimizing them, which

may constrain the model’s performance on specific tasks. Second, we don’t explore whether incorporating more complex prompting methods, such as Chain of Thought, could further enhance the model’s reasoning abilities and performance. Future research could focus on optimizing these two aspects.

Acknowledgments

References

2024. Qwen2 technical report.

Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Hany Awadalla, Ahmed Awadallah, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Alon Benhaim, Misha Bilenko, Johan Bjorck, Sébastien Bubeck, Martin Cai, Qin Cai, Vishrav Chaudhary, Dong Chen, Dongdong Chen, Weizhu Chen, Yen-Chun Chen, Yi-Ling Chen, Hao Cheng, Parul Chopra, Xiyang Dai, Matthew Dixon, Ronen Eldan, Victor Fragoso, Jianfeng Gao, Mei Gao, Min Gao, Amit Garg, Allie Del Giorno, Abhishek Goswami, Suriya Gunasekar, Emmanuel Haider, Junheng Hao, Russell J. Hewett, Wenxiang Hu, Jamie Huynh, Dan Iter, Sam Ade Jacobs, Mojan Javaheripi, Xin Jin, Nikos Karampatzis, Piero Kauffmann, Mahoud Khademi, Dongwoo Kim, Young Jin Kim, Lev Kurilenko, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuezhi Li, Yunsheng Li, Cheng Liang, Lars Liden, Xihui Lin, Zeqi Lin, Ce Liu, Liyuan Liu, David Majercak, Matt Mazzola, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Arindam Mitra, Hardik Modi, Anh Nguyen, Brandon Norick, Barun Patra, Daniel Perez-Becker, Marko Radmilac, Liliang Ren, Gustavo de Rosa, Corby Rosset, Sambudha Roy, Olatunji Ruwase, Olli Saarikivi, Amin Saied, Adil Salim, Michael Santacrose, Shital Shah, Ning Shang, Hiteshi Sharma, Yelong Shen, Swadheen Shukla, Xia Song, Masahiro Tanaka, Andrea Tupini, Praneetha Vaddamanu, Chunyu Wang, Guanhua Wang, Lijuan Wang, et al. 2024. [Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219*.

Nishant Balepur, Shramay Palta, and Rachel Rudinger. 2024. [It’s not easy being wrong: Large language models struggle with process of elimination reasoning](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07532*.

Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*,

- volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, Wei Ye, Yue Zhang, Yi Chang, Philip S. Yu, Qiang Yang, and Xing Xie. 2024. [A survey on evaluation of large language models](#). *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, 15(3).
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality](#).
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.
- Isabel O. Gallegos, Ryan A. Rossi, Joe Barrow, Md Mehrabim Tanjim, Sunghul Kim, Franck Dernoncourt, Tong Yu, Ruiyi Zhang, and Nesreen K. Ahmed. 2024. [Bias and fairness in large language models: A survey](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00770*.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhari, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Senten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Cristian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Allonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, Danny Wyatt, David Esibou, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jack Zhang, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billoock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Jun-teng Jia, et al. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ari Holtzman, Peter West, Vered Shwartz, Yejin Choi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2021. Surface form competition: Why the highest probability answer isn’t always right. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7038–7051, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Bill Yuchen Lin, Ziyi Wu, Yichi Yang, Dong-Ho Lee, and Xiang Ren. 2021. Riddlesense: Reasoning about riddle questions featuring linguistic creativity and commonsense knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL-IJCNLP 2021): Findings*. To appear.
- Chenkai Ma and Xinya Du. 2023. Poe: Process of elimination for multiple choice reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4487–4496, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Todor Mihaylov, Peter Clark, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2018. [Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2381–2391, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sewon Min, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Noisy channel language model prompting for few-shot text classification. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5316–5330, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mistral. 2024. [Mistral 7b: The best 7b model to date](#).
- Team OLMo, Pete Walsh, Luca Soldaini, Dirk Groeneveld, Kyle Lo, Shane Arora, Akshita Bhagia, Yuling Gu, Shengyi Huang, Matt Jordan, Nathan Lambert, Dustin Schwenk, Oyvind Tafjord, Taira Anderson, David Atkinson, Faeze Brahman, Christopher Clark, Pradeep Dasigi, Nouha Dziri, Michal Guerquin, Hamish Ivison, Pang Wei Koh, Jiacheng Liu, Saumya Malik, William Merrill, Lester James V. Miranda, Jacob Morrison, Tyler Murray, Crystal Nam, Valentina Pyatkin, Aman Rangapur, Michael Schmitz, Sam Skjonsberg, David Wadden, Christopher Wilhelm, Michael Wilson, Luke Zettlemoyer, Ali Farhadi, Noah A. Smith, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2024. [2 olmo 2 furious](#).
- OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.

- Soham Parikh, Ananya B. Sai, Preksha Nema, and Mitesh M. Khapra. 2018. Eliminet: A model for eliminating options for reading comprehension with multiple choice questions. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI'18)*, pages 4272–4278. AAAI Press.
- Joshua Robinson and David Wingate. 2023. Leveraging large language models for multiple choice question answering. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal MdShoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, and et al. 2023. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- TII Team. 2024. Falcon 3 family of open foundation models.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023a. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023b. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023b. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Haoyan Yang, Yixuan Wang, Xingyin Xu, Hanyuan Zhang, and Yirong Bian. 2024. [Can we trust llms? mitigate overconfidence bias in llms through knowledge transfer](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16856*.
- Tony Z Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12697–12706. PMLR.
- Chujie Zheng, Hao Zhou, Fandong Meng, Jie Zhou, and Minlie Huang. 2023a. [Large language models are not robust multiple choice selectors](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03882*.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. 2023b. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05685*.

A Prompt

Examples of the prompts used in our study. For methods that only require the input of a question, we use the following:

Question: Which process is the best example of a sudden change to Earth's surface?
Answer:

For methods that require both a question and options as input, we use the following:

Question: Which process is the best example of a sudden change to Earth's surface?
Choices:
A. landslides moving loose rocks downhill
B. sediments depositing on the seafloor
C. deltas forming at the mouth of rivers
D. mountains building up
Answer:

For methods that require directly selecting the incorrect option, we use the following:

Question: Which process is the best example of a sudden change to Earth's surface?
Choices:
A. landslides moving loose rocks downhill
B. sediments depositing on the seafloor
C. deltas forming at the mouth of rivers
D. mountains building up
Incorrect Answer:

Question: Which process is the best example of a sudden change to Earth's surface?
Choices:
A. landslides moving loose rocks downhill
B. sediments depositing on the seafloor
C. deltas forming at the mouth of rivers
D. mountains building up
Two Incorrect Answers:

B Detailed Results

LLMs	Our ₂	Our ₁	Our _{seq}	LM	AVG	PMI _{DC}	Channel	MCP	TG	EE ₂	EE ₁	EE _{seq}	AOLP	IE
Llama-3-8b	0.77	0.764	0.77	0.414	0.448	0.422	0.374	0.75	0.348	0.166	0.372	0.352	0.508	0.496
Llama-3.1-8B	0.768	0.76	0.762	0.438	0.472	0.416	0.362	0.742	0.426	0.22	0.442	0.418	0.536	0.548
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	0.778	0.776	0.784	0.472	0.508	0.498	0.312	0.75	0.732	0.456	0.748	0.722	0.656	0.678
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3	0.806	0.806	0.816	0.492	0.53	0.53	0.334	0.784	0.748	0.734	0.726	0.724	0.638	0.672
Falcon3-1B	0.526	0.53	0.526	0.33	0.386	0.374	0.342	0.444	0.168	0.202	0.17	0.168	0.344	0.346
Falcon3-7B	0.856	0.84	0.858	0.432	0.472	0.45	0.342	0.836	0.664	0.406	0.494	0.438	0.592	0.58
Falcon3-10B	0.872	0.858	0.876	0.472	0.51	0.44	0.386	0.85	0.26	0.158	0.28	0.278	0.57	0.582
Qwen2-7B	0.872	0.86	0.872	0.41	0.43	0.434	0.36	0.848	0.284	0.228	0.302	0.282	0.54	0.568
OLMo-2-1124-7B	0.744	0.728	0.748	0.438	0.484	0.414	0.34	0.7	0.43	0.238	0.286	0.2	0.466	0.468
Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	0.904	0.88	0.896	0.526	0.542	0.482	0.388	0.82	0.192	0.41	0.508	0.614	0.66	0.68

Table 5: Accuracy on ARC-Challenge (0-shot). 1 refers eliminating one option at a time. 2 refers eliminating two options at a time. seq refers sequential elimination.

LLMs	Our ₂	Our ₁	Our _{seq}	LM	AVG	PMI _{DC}	Channel	MCP	TG	EE ₂	EE ₁	EE _{seq}	AOLP	IE
Llama-3-8b	0.7	0.702	0.7	0.316	0.364	0.434	0.4	0.694	0.116	0.04	0.11	0.106	0.39	0.406
Llama-3.1-8B	0.708	0.726	0.714	0.314	0.362	0.428	0.378	0.718	0.204	0.078	0.188	0.19	0.424	0.406
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	0.74	0.718	0.732	0.35	0.38	0.41	0.352	0.722	0.71	0.468	0.674	0.664	0.502	0.508
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3	0.746	0.75	0.752	0.35	0.39	0.506	0.33	0.736	0.668	0.606	0.646	0.6	0.51	0.506
Falcon3-1B	0.55	0.522	0.506	0.286	0.32	0.404	0.316	0.366	0.172	0.238	0.168	0.166	0.356	0.364
Falcon3-7B	0.68	0.62	0.66	0.29	0.34	0.444	0.316	0.66	0.546	0.404	0.54	0.43	0.466	0.444
Falcon3-10B	0.778	0.738	0.758	0.314	0.35	0.468	0.336	0.756	0.228	0.114	0.206	0.22	0.416	0.43
Qwen2-7B	0.836	0.848	0.838	0.336	0.374	0.468	0.384	0.818	0.366	0.262	0.334	0.3	0.46	0.452
OLMo-2-1124-7B	0.7	0.662	0.69	0.306	0.38	0.468	0.374	0.67	0.344	0.22	0.228	0.134	0.394	0.412
Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	0.734	0.684	0.748	0.33	0.392	0.434	0.362	0.646	0.234	0.336	0.434	0.442	0.492	0.514

Table 6: Accuracy on OpenBookQA (0-shot). 1 refers eliminating one option at a time. 2 refers eliminating two options at a time. seq refers sequential elimination.

LLMs	Our ₂	Our ₁	Our _{seq}	LM	AVG	PMI _{DC}	Channel	MCP	TG	EE ₂	EE ₁	EE _{seq}	AOLP	IE
Llama-3-8b	0.8502	0.8458	0.8502	0.6035	0.652	0.489	0.5242	0.7974	0.2555	0.2159	0.2379	0.2467	0.3128	0.3392
Llama-3.1-8B	0.8502	0.837	0.859	0.6079	0.674	0.533	0.4581	0.7885	0.6388	0.511	0.6256	0.6432	0.2863	0.4009
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	0.8062	0.7665	0.815	0.5815	0.6344	0.6652	0.4141	0.7489	0.7137	0.0132	0.5991	0.5947	0.5903	0.6388
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3	0.7841	0.7489	0.793	0.5859	0.63	0.63	0.3744	0.7093	0.2291	0.1762	0.2026	0.1454	0.6167	0.6256
Falcon3-1B	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5947	0.7004	0.5286	0.5242	0.9956	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4934	0.4934
Falcon3-7B	0.9295	0.9119	0.9427	0.5507	0.6696	0.5947	0.4405	0.8062	0.6344	0.2335	0.326	0.2687	0.6476	0.6476
Falcon3-10B	0.8722	0.8546	0.8943	0.5727	0.652	0.511	0.3612	0.7974	0.4802	0.0617	0.2819	0.2423	0.3436	0.3524
Qwen2-7B	0.7533	0.7797	0.7533	0.5639	0.6564	0.5066	0.4537	0.696	0.1938	0.0749	0.1542	0.1454	0.4185	0.348
OLMo-2-1124-7B	0.7048	0.6344	0.7181	0.5859	0.6608	0.5154	0.2775	0.5463	0.0617	0.0264	0.0396	0.0396	0.4361	0.4097
Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	0.8943	0.8767	0.8943	0.5815	0.6608	0.5463	0.3172	0.8811	0.3789	0.0088	0.3392	0.2907	0.6035	0.5595

Table 7: Accuracy on Physics (0-shot). 1 refers eliminating one option at a time. 2 refers eliminating two options at a time. seq refers sequential elimination.

LLMs	Our ₂	Our ₁	Our _{seq}	LM	AVG	PMI _{DC}	Channel	MCP	TG	EE ₂	EE ₁	EE _{seq}	AOLP	IE
Llama-3-8b	0.472	0.462	0.5	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.366	0.002	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.128	0.128
Llama-3.1-8B	0.462	0.494	0.506	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.378	0.008	0.004	0.014	0.01	0.128	0.128
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	0.48	0.442	0.478	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.218	0.43	0.446	0.372	0.45	0.506	0.128	0.128
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3	0.492	0.452	0.498	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.178	0.438	0.436	0.462	0.462	0.468	0.128	0.128
Falcon3-1B	0.264	0.268	0.274	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.21	0.262	0.088	0.356	0.16	0.152	0.128	0.128
Falcon3-7B	0.45	0.462	0.446	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.45	0.318	0.342	0.338	0.312	0.128	0.128
Falcon3-10B	0.496	0.512	0.484	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.142	0.504	0.474	0.272	0.432	0.384	0.128	0.128
Qwen2-7B	0.516	0.532	0.524	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.548	0.536	0.326	0.548	0.536	0.128	0.128
OLMo-2-1124-7B	0.446	0.4	0.464	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.268	0.406	0.404	0.386	0.31	0.218	0.128	0.128
Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	0.466	0.362	0.468	0.128	0.128	0.128	0.13	0.256	0.21	0.12	0.188	0.142	0.128	0.128

Table 8: Accuracy on Multiemo (0-shot). 1 refers eliminating one option at a time. 2 refers eliminating two options at a time. seq refers sequential elimination.

LLMs	Our ₂	Our ₁	Our _{seq}	LM	AVG	PMI _{DC}	Channel	MCP	TG	EE ₂	EE ₁	EE _{seq}	AOLP	IE
Llama-3-8b	0.931	0.9052	0.9397	0.8707	0.8448	0.3017	0.3707	0.819	0.2414	0.1724	0.2759	0.2845	0.75	0.8362
Llama-3.1-8B	0.9224	0.8879	0.9224	0.9052	0.8707	0.3276	0.3966	0.819	0.0517	0.0259	0.0345	0.0517	0.7759	0.7931
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	0.9138	0.819	0.9138	0.7759	0.7672	0.5086	0.3966	0.7845	0.7931	0.3707	0.8707	0.7931	0.75	0.6983
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3	0.8879	0.8534	0.8879	0.8362	0.819	0.4655	0.4138	0.7672	0.7672	0.6897	0.7241	0.7069	0.7845	0.8448
Falcon3-1B	0.9052	0.8966	0.9138	0.8276	0.7845	0.319	0.431	0.5517	0.0172	0.0	0.0259	0.0172	0.8017	0.7672
Falcon3-7B	0.931	0.931	0.9569	0.8017	0.7845	0.2241	0.3707	0.8534	0.9052	0.0345	0.3362	0.181	0.819	0.8707
Falcon3-10B	0.8966	0.9138	0.9138	0.8017	0.7759	0.3362	0.431	0.8793	0.7069	0.1379	0.5517	0.5172	0.8017	0.8793
Qwen2-7B	0.8966	0.8621	0.9138	0.8621	0.8448	0.3448	0.3621	0.7931	0.1466	0.1293	0.181	0.1552	0.9138	0.9397
OLMo-2-1124-7B	0.9483	0.9224	0.9828	0.9138	0.9052	0.2586	0.4138	0.7414	0.3103	0.181	0.0517	0.0	0.8707	0.9138
Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	0.8793	0.819	0.8879	0.8707	0.8362	0.4569	0.3362	0.8448	0.2155	0.0603	0.4483	0.4483	0.8103	0.8103

Table 9: Accuracy on MU (0-shot). 1 refers eliminating one option at a time. 2 refers eliminating two options at a time. seq refers sequential elimination.

LLMs	Our ₂	Our ₁	Our _{seq}	LM	AVG	PMI _{DC}	Channel	MCP	TG	EE ₂	EE ₁	EE _{seq}	AOLP	IE
Llama-3-8b	0.94	0.92	0.92	0.54	0.56	0.4	0.69	0.91	0.1	0.11	0.11	0.08	0.38	0.39
Llama-3.1-8B	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.5	0.53	0.43	0.65	0.91	0.39	0.31	0.38	0.37	0.37	0.37
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	0.92	0.9	0.9	0.58	0.66	0.6	0.45	0.91	0.87	0.69	0.79	0.77	0.6	0.6
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.61	0.65	0.64	0.59	0.93	0.22	0.17	0.25	0.2	0.57	0.53
Falcon3-1B	0.75	0.78	0.63	0.43	0.45	0.48	0.25	0.64	0.01	0.18	0.06	0.08	0.39	0.39
Falcon3-7B	0.89	0.83	0.88	0.42	0.47	0.44	0.42	0.86	0.63	0.34	0.46	0.31	0.47	0.47
Falcon3-10B	0.97	0.94	0.97	0.47	0.49	0.47	0.65	0.94	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.09	0.38	0.38
Qwen2-7B	0.95	0.96	0.95	0.52	0.52	0.44	0.58	0.95	0.26	0.19	0.28	0.18	0.48	0.48
OLMo-2-1124-7B	0.95	0.95	0.94	0.53	0.56	0.46	0.58	0.97	0.4	0.06	0.15	0.05	0.45	0.44
Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	0.96	0.94	0.97	0.57	0.62	0.58	0.46	0.58	0.42	0.38	0.43	0.6	0.58	0.56

Table 10: Accuracy on PR (0-shot). 1 refers eliminating one option at a time. 2 refers eliminating two options at a time. seq refers sequential elimination.

LLMs	Our ₂	Our ₁	Our _{seq}	LM	AVG	PMI _{DC}	Channel	MCP	TG	EE ₂	EE ₁	EE _{seq}	AOLP	IE
Llama-3-8b	0.9223	0.9223	0.9223	0.534	0.5534	0.3398	0.3883	0.8738	0.0291	0.0291	0.0291	0.0194	0.6019	0.4757
Llama-3.1-8B	0.9417	0.8835	0.9417	0.5243	0.534	0.3883	0.3883	0.8835	0.0971	0.068	0.0777	0.0777	0.6019	0.5534
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	0.8058	0.7864	0.7864	0.534	0.4951	0.301	0.2816	0.7864	0.7767	0.3107	0.6893	0.6505	0.6796	0.6019
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3	0.835	0.8058	0.8447	0.6408	0.6019	0.4466	0.3301	0.7476	0.7476	0.7087	0.6699	0.6602	0.7087	0.6505
Falcon3-1B	0.7184	0.7282	0.7184	0.4563	0.466	0.4175	0.2524	0.6311	0.2816	0.0	0.2718	0.301	0.3786	0.2816
Falcon3-7B	0.9126	0.9126	0.9126	0.4951	0.5146	0.4175	0.3107	0.8835	0.7087	0.0777	0.5437	0.3301	0.6699	0.6408
Falcon3-10B	0.8544	0.8544	0.8447	0.534	0.5437	0.4272	0.3204	0.8544	0.3981	0.0583	0.3786	0.3592	0.699	0.6796
Qwen2-7B	0.8252	0.8155	0.835	0.5534	0.5922	0.4175	0.3398	0.7864	0.7282	0.4078	0.6602	0.6019	0.6311	0.699
OLMo-2-1124-7B	0.767	0.7864	0.8641	0.4563	0.5243	0.3981	0.2718	0.6408	0.3495	0.0485	0.0291	0.0	0.699	0.6602
Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	0.8447	0.8641	0.8447	0.5825	0.5728	0.4272	0.4078	0.8155	0.4757	0.3981	0.6117	0.5922	0.6699	0.6408

Table 11: Accuracy on CC (0-shot). 1 refers eliminating one option at a time. 2 refers eliminating two options at a time. seq refers sequential elimination.

LLMs	LD				RS			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
Llama-3-8b	0.358	0.352	0.388	0.388	0.564	0.566	0.584	0.594
OLMo-2-1124-7B	0.39	0.396	0.438	0.49	0.494	0.526	0.536	0.544
Phi-3-medium-128k-instruct	0.448	0.486	0.512	0.562	0.544	0.564	0.594	0.634

Table 12: Accuracy on two datasets (0-shot). The numbers 0, 1, 2, and 3 refer the number of options that have been eliminated.