

QuestBench: Can LLMs ask the right question to acquire information in reasoning tasks?

Belinda Z. Li², Been Kim¹ and Zi Wang¹

¹Google DeepMind, ²Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Work done as a student researcher at Google DeepMind.

Recently, a large amount of work has focused on improving large language models' (LLMs') performance on reasoning benchmarks such as math and logic. However, past work has largely assumed that tasks are well-defined. In the real world, queries to LLMs are often *underspecified*, only solvable through acquiring missing information. We formalize this as a constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) with missing variable assignments. Using a special case of this formalism where only one necessary variable assignment is missing, we can rigorously evaluate an LLM's ability to identify the minimal necessary question to ask and quantify axes of difficulty levels for each problem. We present QUESTBENCH, a set of underspecified reasoning tasks solvable by asking at most one question, which includes: (1) Logic-Q: Logical reasoning tasks with one missing proposition, (2) Planning-Q: PDDL planning problems with initial states that are partially-observed, (3) GSM-Q: Human-annotated grade school math problems with one missing variable assignment, and (4) GSME-Q: a version of GSM-Q where word problems are translated into equations by human annotators. The LLM is tasked with selecting the correct clarification question(s) from a list of options. While state-of-the-art models excel at GSM-Q and GSME-Q, their accuracy is only 40-50% on Logic-Q and Planning-Q. Analysis demonstrates that the ability to solve well-specified reasoning problems may not be sufficient for success on our benchmark: models have difficulty identifying the right question to ask, even when they can solve the fully specified version of the problem. Furthermore, in the Planning-Q domain, LLMs tend not to hedge, even when explicitly presented with the option to predict "not sure." This highlights the need for deeper investigation into models' information acquisition capabilities. Code and dataset are available at <https://github.com/google-deepmind/questbench>.

1. Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) are increasingly being applied to reasoning tasks such as math (Cobbe et al., 2021; Hendrycks et al., 2021; Li et al., 2024a), logic (Chen et al., 2024b; Creswell et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023) and planning/coding (Austin et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Curtis et al., 2024a; Silver et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024a). These applications typically assume well-specified tasks where all necessary information has been provided.

However, real-world scenarios often violate this assumption. Users may omit crucial details in math problems, and robots might operate in environments with partial observability. In such cases, LLMs need the ability to proactively gather missing information, for instance, by asking clarifying questions.




Figure 1 | A multi-choice question-asking task in QUESTBENCH with ground truth answers for accuracy evaluation. We construct question choices using the CSP translated from the verbal problem.

This work investigates whether LLMs can identify and acquire the missing information necessary to solve reasoning tasks. We formalize this information-gathering problem as an underspecified Constraint Satisfaction Problem (CSP). Our key idea is that many reasoning tasks can be modeled as determining the value of a target variable given a set of variables and constraints. A problem is *underspecified* if and only if the value of the target variable cannot be inferred from the given information. This formalization helps pinpoint the difference between semantic ambiguity (where multiple valid interpretations exist, but each yields a solvable answer) and underspecification (where the problem is unsolvable without additional information). We address the latter in this work. Figure 1 shows an example of an underspecified CSP derived from a grade school math problem, where the target variable *cups of feed in the final meal of the day* cannot be calculated without knowing the value of *cups of feed in the morning*.

We focus on a special case of underspecified CSPs where we only need to acquire one unknown variable’s value in order to solve for the target variable. We call these “1-sufficient CSPs”. We construct QUESTBENCH: a benchmark of question asking problems based on 1-sufficient CSPs. The model is given an underspecified problem and multiple choices for which variable to ask about. It must pick a relevant variable, one whose *value isn’t already known* (or derivable from the existing assigned variables), and is *sufficient* for computing the target variable. QUESTBENCH contains the ground truth correct choices for this variable. As we show in this work, modern models struggle to solve 1-sufficient CSPs.

QUESTBENCH consists of:

- **Logic-Q:** Logical reasoning tasks where the truth value of a missing proposition is needed to determine the correctness of a claim.
- **Planning-Q:** Blocks world planning problems in Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL) (Ghalab et al., 1998), with partially observed initial states, where one additional observation is needed to disambiguate the shortest path to a goal.
- **GSM-Q/GSME-Q:** Grade-school math problems that are missing conditions needed to derive the solution. GSM-Q consists of verbalized forms of problems, while GSME-Q consists of equation forms of problems. Both are annotated by humans.

These problems can generally be solved by either backwards search from the target variable or brute-force search validating one variable at a time. We use the complexity of these search algorithms to catalogue QUESTBENCH problems into four “axes” of difficulty: 1) the number of variables in the problem, 2) the number of constraints in the problem, 3) the search depth required by backwards search, and 4) the expected number of guesses required by brute-force search. These axes correspond to factors in the runtime complexity of CSP solvers (Section 3.3), and provide insight into what type of problems LLMs excel at, what they struggle with, and what strategies they may be employing to solve these problems.

We benchmarked state-of-the-art LLMs including GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2023), GPT-4-o1 Preview, Claude 3.5 Sonnet, Gemini 1.5 Pro and Gemini 2.0 Flash Thinking Experimental (Gemini Team Google, 2023, 2024) on QUESTBENCH. While these models demonstrate strong performance on GSM-Q and GSME-Q (over 80% accuracy), their performance on Logic-Q and Planning-Q is significantly lower (under 50% accuracy).

To investigate these discrepancies, we analyze the correlation between model accuracy and axes of difficulty in QUESTBENCH, finding differing trends between domains. For example, in Logic-Q, LLMs are more sensitive to the search depth than in Planning-Q, suggesting that models may be utilizing strategies similar to backwards search when solving Logic-Q, but not when solving Planning-Q. In general, our results suggest that the models may not be employing the same strategies across different

problem types, even within the same 1-sufficient CSP framework.

We also conduct ablation studies and correlation analyses to assess LLMs’ ability to 1) reason in the presence of sufficient information and 2) detect *whether* the problem is underspecified. We find that these abilities are correlated with identifying the right question to ask in our benchmark, but to varying degrees in varying domains. Moreover, we find that reasoning ability *helps* QUESTBENCH performance, but only up to a certain point.

Our contributions include (1) a constraint satisfaction-based problem formulation of asking clarification questions for reasoning, (2) QUESTBENCH, a novel benchmark with multi-choice problems for evaluating information-gathering abilities in reasoning tasks, (3) empirical evaluations and detailed analyses of SOTA or near-SOTA LLMs on QUESTBENCH.

2. Related work

Importance of Information Gathering. Actively gathering information is a critical skill for both humans and autonomous systems when solving problems under uncertainty. For humans, [Chouinard et al. \(2007\)](#) demonstrates that asking questions plays a crucial role in cognitive development, helping children resolve ambiguity and learn more effectively. Similarly, AI/ML researchers have extensively explored strategies for sequential data acquisition in various domains, including concept learning ([Angluin, 1988](#); [Sammut and Banerji, 1986](#)), active learning ([Cohn et al., 1996](#); [Gal et al., 2017](#); [Houlsby et al., 2011](#); [Ren et al., 2021](#); [Settles, 2009](#)), Bayesian optimization ([Auer, 2002](#); [Chen et al., 2022](#); [Fan et al., 2024](#); [Feurer et al., 2018](#); [Garnett, 2023](#); [Hennig and Schuler, 2012](#); [Kushner, 1962, 1964](#); [Moćkus, 1974](#); [Srinivas et al., 2010](#); [Wang and Jegelka, 2017](#); [Wang et al., 2024b](#)), reinforcement learning ([Ghavamzadeh et al., 2015](#); [Kaelbling et al., 1996](#); [Sutton, 2018](#)), and robot planning with partially observable states ([Curtis et al., 2024b](#); [Kaelbling and Lozano-Pérez, 2013](#); [Kaelbling et al., 1998](#); [Piquel and Toussaint, 2019](#)) or unknown models ([Wang et al., 2017, 2018, 2021](#)). [Wu \(2023\)](#) emphasizes the need for AI assistants to ask questions in the face of uncertainty, specifically in the context of code generation. Our work follows this tradition by evaluating how well large language models (LLMs) gather information through basic reasoning tasks.

Ambiguity in user requests. Natural language queries often contain ambiguity for a variety of reasons. Prior work has examined ambiguity in the context of semantics ([Kuhn et al., 2023b](#)), factual question-answering ([Min et al., 2020](#)), task-oriented dialogue intents ([Budzianowski et al., 2018](#); [Rastogi et al., 2020](#); [Zhang et al., 2024b](#)), personalized human preferences ([Chen et al., 2024a](#); [Handa et al., 2024](#); [Li et al., 2023](#)), and text-to-image generation ([Hahn et al., 2024](#)). [Chandu et al. \(2024\)](#) presents a visual question answering benchmark to identify epistemic and aleatory uncertainty, though the distinction between the two types of uncertainties can often be unclear. [Zhang et al. \(2024a\)](#) introduces a taxonomy of ambiguity, categorizing it into issues like unfamiliarity and different semantic question types (e.g., “who,” “what,” “where”).

In this paper, we focus on *underspecification* instead of ambiguity, where the user has not provided enough information for the LM to fulfill the request. This situation can arise because users may not know what information the model lacks, or what information is necessary to complete the task. We evaluate LLMs’ ability to address underspecification in structured reasoning tasks.

Information gathering benchmarks for LLMs. Most existing benchmarks focus on subjective or ambiguous tasks where there may be multiple valid clarifying questions, depending on context and user preference ([Aroyo and Welty, 2015](#); [Basile et al., 2021](#); [Davani et al., 2022](#); [Sandri et al., 2023](#); [Wan et al., 2023](#)). Task-oriented dialogue benchmarks ([Budzianowski et al., 2018](#); [Rastogi et al., 2020](#); [Zhang et al., 2024b](#)) and preference elicitation tasks ([Li et al., 2023](#)) involve inherently

subjective problems where no universal “right” question exists. This makes objective evaluation of information-gathering abilities difficult in these settings. In contrast, our work focuses on reasoning tasks with a clearly defined ground truth. For each task, the model needs to ask exactly one question, allowing for reliable evaluation of LLMs’ information-gathering capabilities.

Question-asking methods for LLMs. Several methods have been proposed to enhance LLMs’ ability to ask clarifying questions. These methods primarily address ambiguous or knowledge-based tasks, such as identifying a good recipe (Andukuri et al., 2024) or asking who won a sports event (Pang et al., 2024; Zhang and Choi, 2023). Some approaches directly prompt LLMs to ask clarifying questions (Kuhn et al., 2023a; Li et al., 2023), while others compute information gain to prioritize informative questions (Grand et al., 2024; Handa et al., 2024; Hu et al., 2024; Piriyaakulkij et al., 2024). Zhang and Choi (2023) breaks down question-asking into three stages: detecting when clarification is needed, identifying the appropriate question, and responding based on new information. While these methods are promising, they primarily focus on subjective tasks or require substantial user simulation. Our work introduces a new setting that emphasizes generating accurate clarifying questions for underspecified reasoning tasks, where the correct question is objectively determinable.

3. Problem formulation

Consider the following user request:

Example 3.1. *Please solve the math problem: Janet had some eggs (variable x_0) and ate one (variable x_1). How many eggs does she have now (target variable y)?*

The word problem can be parsed into equations $y = x_0 - x_1, x_1 = 1$. The LM cannot compute target variable y without knowing the value of variable x_0 . Other examples can be found in Figures 1 to 3. In these cases, the desired behavior is for the LM to ask the minimal set of questions that enables it to respond to the user query.

3.1. Distinguishing semantic ambiguity and underspecification

In this paper, we focus on problems that are semantically equivalent to constraint satisfaction problems,¹ which allow us to formalize underspecification. The semantic ambiguity could be sometimes confused with underspecification, as it also arises as a challenge during interpretation of the problem.

Solving a problem thus comprises of two stages:

1. A natural language query is parsed into a set of variables, a set of constraints, and a target variable corresponding to the desired response. In Example 3.1, there are variables x_0 (initial eggs), x_1 (eaten eggs), a constraint $y = x_0 - x_1$, and a target variable y (current eggs) .
2. The model solves for the target variable in the CSP.

Ambiguity may arise in either (or both) of these two stages:

1. Semantic ambiguity: There are multiple semantic interpretations of the problem at the parsing stage, inducing a distribution over possible CSPs.
2. Underspecification: For a given CSP, some variable assignments or constraints may be missing that makes it impossible to solve for the target variable.

Semantic ambiguity has been treated extensively in prior work (Kuhn et al., 2023b), and can vary between individuals or populations. This work focuses specifically on *underspecification*, which can be evaluated by formulating problems as CSPs with missing information.

¹Note: queries can also be viewed as a combination of *soft* constraints.

3.2. Formalizing underspecification

We formalize underspecification as follows. First, we define a CSP as a tuple $\langle X, D, C, A, y \rangle$:

- $X = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ is a set of N variables.
- $D = \{D_i\}_{i=1}^N$ is a set of domains for each variable in X .
- $C = \{c_j\}_{j=1}^M$ is a set of M constraints. Each constraint c_j can be viewed as a boolean function that takes in as input a list of variables in X , denoted as $[x_i]_{i \in I_j}$, and outputting True or False. We use the shorthand $c_j(\mathbf{x}_j)$ to denote $c_j([x_i]_{i \in I_j})$.
- $A = \bigwedge_{i \in I_A} (x_i = a_i)$ are assignments from variables to values, stating that for each $i \in I_A \subseteq [N]$, variable x_i is assigned a value $a_i \in D_i$.
- y is the target variable to solve for. Target y must satisfy the constraints and the variable assignments, $\bigwedge_{j \in [M]} c_j(\mathbf{x}_j) \wedge A$.

In Example 3.1, the variables are $\{x_0, x_1, y\}$ and the target is y . There is one constraint c_0 , which is $y = x_0 - x_1$. Target y must satisfy constraint c_0 and assignment $x_1 = 1$.

The *Known* predicate. For convenience, we introduce the *Known* predicate. $Known(x)$ means that the value of variable x is known. This can occur either if x is directly assigned a value (i.e. $A \implies \bigwedge_{i \in I_A} Known(x_i)$), or x 's value can be derived from the existing assignments and constraints. In Example 3.1, once x_0 and x_1 are known, y would also be known.

We can then formally define underspecified CSPs as follows.

Definition 3.1. A CSP is underspecified if and only if $\bigwedge_{j \in [M]} c_j(\mathbf{x}_j) \wedge A \implies \neg Known(y)$.

Conversely, if the CSP is not underspecified, it is well-specified. We use $Known(\mathcal{X})$ over a set of variables \mathcal{X} to denote that the values of all variables in \mathcal{X} are known, i.e., $Known(\mathcal{X}) = \bigwedge_{x \in \mathcal{X}} Known(x)$.

If knowing a set of variables is sufficient to determine the value of another variable, we call the set the “*sufficient set*”:

Definition 3.2. A set of variables $\mathcal{X} \subseteq X$ is a sufficient set (for y) if and only if

$$\bigwedge_{j \in [M]} c_j(\mathbf{x}_j) \wedge A \wedge Known(\mathcal{X}) \implies Known(y).$$

For efficient question asking, we wish to find the smallest sufficient set for the target variable:²

$$\hat{\mathcal{X}} = \arg \min_{\mathcal{X} \subseteq X} |\mathcal{X}| \quad \text{s.t. } \mathcal{X} \text{ is sufficient.}$$

In Example 3.1, a sufficient set for y is $\{x_0\}$ since $Known(\{x_0\}) \implies Known(y)$.

Finally, we define the special case where the size of the smallest sufficient set is 1.

Definition 3.3. An underspecified CSP is a 1-sufficient CSP if the size of its smallest sufficient sets is 1. The variable in a smallest sufficient set is a sufficient variable of the problem.

1-sufficient CSPs are fundamental for solving broader “ k -sufficient” CSPs, which always becomes 1-sufficient CSPs after asking $k - 1$ questions. That means, the accuracy on 1-sufficient CSPs provides an upper bound for that on “ k -sufficient” CSPs.

²There could be many smallest sufficient sets for an underspecified CSP.

3.3. Difficulty axes of 1-sufficient CSPs

Solving a 1-sufficient CSP entails identifying a sufficient variable for the target variable. While specific problem instances might allow for customized approaches, in general, 1-sufficient CSPs can be solved by brute-force or backward search. Brute-force search checks the sufficiency of every variable one at a time. Backward search builds a search tree starting from the target variable (root node) and recursively searches all variables (child nodes) involved in all constraints (edges) involving the parent node. These two methods allow us to formalize the following properties associated with the difficulty of each 1-sufficient CSP:

- $|X|$: The total number of variables.
- $|C|$: The total number of constraints.
- d : The depth of the backward search tree.
- \mathbb{E}_{BF} : The expected number of random guesses until selecting a correct choice of question³.

For example, in Example 3.1, there are 3 variables (x_0, x_1, y) , 1 constraint $(y = x_0 - x_1)$, and the search depth d is 1. Among choices (a) *No questions needed.*, (b) *What is the value of x_0 ?*, (c) *What is the value of x_1 ?*, only choice (b) is correct since we know the value of x_1 but not x_0 . The expected number of guesses \mathbb{E}_{BF} needed to find the correct question is 2.

4. Dataset descriptions for QUESTBENCH

We construct 1-sufficient CSPs in logical reasoning (Logic-Q), planning (Planning-Q), and math (GSM-Q/GSME-Q) domains. Each problem instance is composed of a user request, the full set of question choices and a subset including correct questions. We evaluate whether models can pick out a correct question from the question choices. See Table 1 for dataset statistics.

	#Tasks	$ X $ / #Choices	d	$ C $		b	\mathbb{E}_{BF}
				min	max (mean)		
Logic-Q	1150	10 – 59 (37.9)	1 – 12 (4.1)	8 – 108 (47.8)	-	1.2 – 15.0 (6.1)	
Planning-Q	7500	25 – 64 (46.0)	1 – 14 (6.9)	-	4 – 7 (5.7)	3.0 – 33.0 (18.5)	
GSM-Q	23642	2 – 27 (3.5)	1 – 7 (2.1)	1 – 9 (3.0)	-	2.5 – 18.5 (5.0)	
GSME-Q	6590	2 – 27 (3.5)	1 – 7 (2.1)	1 – 9 (3.1)	-	2.5 – 18.5 (4.9)	

Table 1 | Dataset sizes and properties (Section 3.3) for each domain in QUESTBENCH. We use b to denote the number of blocks for the Blocks World planning problems.

4.1. Logic-Q

SimpleLogic (Zhang et al., 2023) is a propositional logic benchmark, which consists of

1. a set of *rules* about an imaginary person named Alice, for example: *If Alice is jittery and strange, then Alice is stubborn.*
2. a set of *properties* that hold true about Alice, for example: *Alice is smart. Alice is not stubborn.*
3. a question about an unknown property of Alice, for example: *Is Alice pleasant?*

³We assume the random guesses are made without replacement. So we have $\mathbb{E}_{\text{BF}} = \frac{|X|+1}{s+1}$, where s is the number of sufficient variables. We leave the derivation as an exercise for the readers.

Problem Definition. We can define a CSP in this domain as follows:

- X is a set of all the potential properties of Alice that appears in all rules (e.g. *strange*, *jittery*, *worried*).
- $D = \{\{\text{TRUE}, \text{FALSE}\} \forall x \in X\}$. Each property in X can be either be true or false.
- A is the set of properties that we know to be true about Alice (e.g. *smart*, \neg *stubborn*).
- C is the set of rules about Alice. C takes the form of a conjunction of implicative constraints (e.g. in the above example, $\text{strange} \wedge \text{jittery} \implies \text{stubborn}$).

$$C = \bigwedge_{i \in [M]} c_i = \bigwedge_{i \in [M]} \left(\left(\bigwedge_{j \in [M_i]} x_{i,j} \right) \implies x_{i,M_i+1} \right)$$

where $x_{i,j}$ can take any value in the set X .

- y is the property that we are being asked about, e.g. *pleasant* in the above example.

To create Logic-Q, we discard the assignments A 's that are already present in the original fully-specified CSPs in the SimpleLogic dataset. We then construct new \tilde{A} 's such that a single additional property of Alice is sufficient to determine whether the goal property is true or false. We do this by performing backward search from y and $\neg y$ for each problem, to obtain a set of all possible variable assignments that would imply y , and another set for $\neg y$. Each assignment from each set, in conjunction with their corresponding X, C, D, y , make up a *base* CSP. We then iteratively withhold one shared variable assignment from the two sets (such that assigning that variable deterministically implies either y or $\neg y$) and check whether the problem is now underspecified. See more details in Appendix A.1. In the end of this process, we get $\langle X, D, \tilde{A}, C, y \rangle$, which form a 1-sufficient CSP.

4.2. Planning-Q

We adapt the Blocks World domain from PyperPlan (Alkhazraji et al., 2020), a pick-and-place task involving n blocks which can be set on the table or stacked on top of each other.

Blocks World consists of the following predicates:

(ontable ?a), (clear ?a), (handempty), (holding ?a), (on ?a ?b).

Predicates can be applied to blocks (e.g. a) to construct an atom (e.g., (ontable a)). A state is a conjunction of atoms or their negations, e.g.

(ontable a), (holding b), \neg (on a b).

Note that not all states are valid under this definition. In each valid state, there are a set of actions that can potentially be applied to it to transition to another state. Each action has a precondition specifying atoms the state must satisfy before applying the action, and an effect specifying atoms the next state must satisfy after applying the action. An example of an action:

```
stack(?a, ?b)
:precondition (and (holding ?a) (clear ?b))
:effect (and (not (holding ?a)) (not (clear ?b))
         (clear ?a) (handempty) (on ?a ?b))
```




Figure 2 | An example in Logic-Q. The prompt provided to the LM is on the left hand side. The ground truth answer is in red. The symbolic CSP used to construct the questions is shown on the right hand side.

Given an initial state and a goal state, the model is expected to plan the *shortest* action sequence to the goal state, e.g., `[pick-up(b), stack(b,a)]`.

Problem Definition The problem can be expressed as a CSP $\langle X, D, C, A, y \rangle$ as follows:

- X is the set of all atoms (predicates applied to objects) in the initial state.
- $D = \{\{TRUE, FALSE\} \forall x \in X\}$. Each atom must be either true or false.
- A is the set of atoms with known values in the initial state.
- C is the set of constraints. For any sequence of actions $[q_t]_{t \in [n]}$ and their corresponding sequence of states $[s_t]_{t \in [n]}$, each pair of current state s_t and next state s_{t+1} must satisfy the precondition and effect of action q_t , i.e.,

$$\forall p \in \text{PRE}(q_t), s_t \Rightarrow p \quad (\text{preconditions of } q_t \text{ must hold in } s_t)$$

$$\forall e \in \text{EFFECTS}(q_t), s_{t+1} \Rightarrow e \quad (\text{effects of } q_t \text{ must hold in } s_{t+1})$$

- y is the shortest action sequence from the initial state to the goal state.⁴

We construct the Planning-Q dataset as a mix of 1-sufficient and well-specified problems. In 1-sufficient problems, the initial state is 1-sufficient – we only know the values of certain atoms of the initial state, and must ask the value of at most a single other atom in order to find the shortest action sequence. In well-specified problems, the shortest action sequence is the same regardless of uncertainty about the initial state. For example, in Fig. 3, if we knew that `(on d b)` is false, then we do not need additional information in order to find the shortest path, even though the initial state is still underspecified. In these cases, we expect the LLM to select the choice “No questions needed.”

The well-specified problems are constructed through backwards breadth-first-search, which derives all initial states from which there is a single, unambiguous shortest path to the goal. These initial states, taken with the corresponding X, D, C, y constitute the base CSPs. The 1-sufficient problems are constructed by taking each base CSP and removing one proposition. Checks are performed to ensure they are truly well-specified or 1-sufficient. More details in Appendix A.2.

4.3. GSM-Q and GSME-Q

In general, grade-school math problems can be parsed into simple algebra problems where a sequence of variable substitutions can fully solve the problem. We construct underspecified grade-school math problems from GSM-Plus’ “distractor” setting (Li et al., 2024a), which was derived from adding

⁴It is not meaningful to set y to be any action sequence (not just the shortest one) to the goal, since all initial states can get to the goal state through some path in BlocksWorld, so no information needs to be gathered.




Figure 3 | An example in Planning-Q. The ground-truth answer is given in red. The prompt given to the LM (left) includes the full task specification in PDDL, which we omit for simplicity and instead display visually. Possible initial states are constructed from the partial initial state and are grouped based on plans to the goal. These groups of initial states are used for constructing the questions.

a single piece of distractor information to math problems in GSM8k (Cobbe et al., 2021) that is irrelevant to deriving the goal variable. This allows us to isolate whether LLMs can identify which specific variables are relevant to a goal variable. An example can be seen in Figure 1.

Problem Definition. Every problem in GSM-Q and GSME-Q is equivalent to a 1-sufficient CSP $\langle X, D, C, A, y \rangle$ where

- X is a set of variables in the problem.
- D is possible values x can take on, generally $\mathbb{N}, \forall x \in X$.
- C is a set of equations relating variables in the problem to each other.
- $A = \tilde{A}$ variable assignments from the problem with a single variable withheld.
- y variable the user wants to solve for.

GSM-Q are underspecified math questions written in English words (i.e., word problems), while GSME-Q are underspecified math questions written in equations.

Construction. To construct GSM-Q/GSME-Q dataset out of GSM-Plus, we use human annotators to translate a word problem into a set of variables and equations. First, we ask annotators to try and solve the word problems on their own. If they cannot solve the problem due to semantic ambiguity, or answer the problem in a way that doesn’t match the original answer in GSM-Plus (due to interpreting the problem differently, or erroneous problems in GSM-Plus), we discard the problem entirely.

Next, we ask annotators to try and parse each math word problem into a set of variables X , equations C , assignments A , and a goal variable y . We assume domains D for each variable is the set of natural numbers. We had three different annotators provide CSPs for each math problem, resulting in different CSPs (different annotators may have different interpretations of a problem). We further perform automated checks to ensure the annotated CSPs actually result in the correct answer, discarding any CSP which we weren’t able to parse or provided incorrect answers. We use all valid CSPs resulting from this process, including different CSPs corresponding to the same math problem. This gives us the set of fully-specified, high quality CSPs. These constitute the *base CSPs* in this domain.

To make these CSPs *underspecified*, we withhold both *distractor* variable assignments $\{d_i\}_{i=0}^n$ that *aren’t* essential to computing y , as well as a single variable assignment $a \in A$ that is required for computing the goal, creating $\tilde{A} = A \setminus (\{d_i\}_{i=0}^n \cup \{a\})$. Asking about the value of the variable corresponding to a is necessary and sufficient for deriving the value of target variable y .

These underspecified CSPs are consolidated into GSME-Q. To convert them back into word problems for GSM-Q, we show annotators the original word problem and the CSP form of the problem, and ask them to remove a and the distractors $\{d_i\}_{i=0}^n$ from the word problem.

Annotation Details We recruited a total of 21 annotators (11 male, 10 female) from five countries to annotate our tasks. Annotators were all fluent in English and between the ages of 25 – 45. We paid an average of \$27 – \$55 per hour per annotator. Details including full instructions provided to annotators and screenshots of the annotation interface for each task, can be found in Appendix A.3.

5. Results and analyses

In this section, we present experiment results on QUESTBENCH. We evaluated GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2023), GPT-4-o1 Preview, Claude 3.5 Sonnet, Gemini 1.5 Pro, Gemini 1.5 Flash, Gemini 2.0 Flash Thinking Experimental (Gemini Team Google, 2023, 2024), and open-sourced Gemma models (Gemma Team, 2024) in zero-shot (ZS), chain-of-thought (CoT), and four-shot settings (4S)

		Logic-Q	Planning-Q	GSME-Q	GSM-Q
ZS	o1-preview	49.91%	42.31%	98.01%	91.32%
	Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21	37.39%	47.32%	96.69%	84.72%
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	30.09%	7.53%	94.70%	91.32%
	GPT-4o	27.39%	24.49%	96.69%	86.81%
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	29.13%	19.80%	48.34%	77.78%
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	16.78%	8.52%	96.69%	71.88%
	Gemma 2 2B IT	0.09%	10.76%	32.45%	49.65%
	Gemma 2 9B IT	26.00%	14.36%	75.50%	40.97%
ZS + CoT	Gemma 2 27B IT	29.39%	7.64%	73.51%	71.18%
	Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21	34.61%	46.24%	96.03%	86.11%
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	36.78%	34.03%	74.17%	90.97%
	GPT-4o	31.57%	16.36%	99.34%	92.01%
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	29.22%	21.27%	96.69%	79.17%
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	18.70%	9.29%	98.68%	76.74%
	Gemma 2 2B IT	0.26%	3.01%	56.95%	68.40%
	Gemma 2 9B IT	24.61%	10.27%	56.95%	36.46%
4S	Gemma 2 27B IT	31.22%	9.96%	80.79%	79.51%
	Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21	38.43%	19.32%	96.69%	92.71%
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	36.00%	34.56%	95.36%	94.10%
	GPT-4o	25.57%	11.48%	96.03%	84.03%
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	26.35%	18.80%	92.05%	85.42%
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	15.48%	18.29%	95.36%	80.90%
	Gemma 2 2B IT	25.13%	7.51%	90.73%	37.50%
	Gemma 2 9B IT	21.57%	5.15%	86.75%	55.56%
BFS	Gemma 2 27B IT	26.26%	10.71%	96.69%	66.67%
	Depth 3	39.0%	5.75%	87.4%	86.1%
	Depth 5	80.6%	27.2%	100%	100%
BFS	Depth 10	99.8%	93.9%	100%	100%

Table 2 | Language model accuracies at predicting the right question in QUESTBENCH. As a baseline, we include breadth-first-search (BFS) up to a fixed depth on each dataset. Results show that the best models saturate GSME-Q and GSM-Q, but fail to perform beyond 50% on Logic-Q and Planning-Q.

settings. For GSM-Q and GSME-Q, we present results on a subset of 288 and 151 representative tasks, respectively. All results are based on publicly available APIs or models. Our experiments were done from 06/2024 to 03/2025, and some models/APIs may have been updated during this time.

5.1. Evaluation of clarification question accuracy

QUESTBENCH is a multi-choice benchmark with ground truth choices, each of which is a clarification question. We evaluated whether the LLM generates a *correct* choice for each question. Table 2 shows LLM accuracies in different setups. For reference, we also evaluated the accuracy of breadth-first-search up to a depth n .

Generally, we found that all models we tested struggled to perform beyond 50% on our Logic-Q and Planning-Q domains. Neither chain of thought nor few-shot examples resulted in significant gains across all models in either domain. However, LMs were generally able to saturate performance on GSME-Q and GSM-Q. We suspect that this is due to these domains having a smaller number of variables and constraints, and requiring shallower search depth than the other two domains. Additionally, LMs may have been specifically studied and optimized for solving these sorts of math problems.

		ZS				ZS + CoT			4S		
		o1- preview	Gemini 2.0 FTE	Claude 3.5S	GPT- 4o	Gemini 2.0 FTE	Claude 3.5S	GPT- 4o	Gemini 2.0 FTE	Claude 3.5S	GPT- 4o
Logic-Q	d	-0.23	-0.20	-0.19	-0.19	-0.15	-0.18	-0.22	-0.28	-0.28	-0.20
	$ X $	-0.27	-0.21	-0.15	-0.16	-0.11	-0.13	-0.22	-0.18	-0.27	-0.18
	$ C $	-0.22	-0.23	-0.11	-0.11	-0.22	-0.13	-0.18	-0.18	-0.24	-0.20
	\mathbb{E}_{BF}	-0.41	-0.30	-0.26	-0.26	-0.16	-0.23	-0.35	-0.28	-0.31	-0.30
Planning-Q	d	0.01	-0.11	0.07	0.04	-0.10	0.09	-0.06	-0.08	0.10	-0.06
	$ X $	-0.06	-0.11	-0.04	-0.07	-0.11	-0.00	-0.09	-0.14	-0.01	-0.10
	b	-0.06	-0.11	-0.04	-0.07	-0.11	-0.00	-0.09	-0.14	-0.01	-0.10
	\mathbb{E}_{BF}	-0.54	-0.14	-0.27	-0.28	-0.12	-0.56	-0.41	-0.35	-0.48	-0.41
GSME-Q	d	-0.21	-0.26	-0.14	-0.10	-0.27	-0.06	-0.14	-0.20	-0.05	-0.10
	$ X $	-0.24	-0.27	-0.21	-0.09	-0.31	-0.11	-0.14	-0.29	-0.25	-0.22
	$ C $	-0.24	-0.30	-0.24	-0.25	-0.34	0.04	-0.14	-0.30	-0.26	-0.29
	\mathbb{E}_{BF}	-0.24	-0.27	-0.21	-0.09	-0.31	-0.11	-0.14	-0.29	-0.25	-0.22
GSM-Q	d	-0.03	-0.01	-0.06	-0.03	-0.01	-0.09	-0.01	-0.00	-0.01	-0.03
	$ X $	-0.02	-0.19	-0.13	-0.09	-0.18	-0.19	-0.14	-0.07	-0.05	-0.07
	$ C $	0.01	-0.05	-0.11	-0.03	-0.07	-0.16	-0.09	-0.01	-0.05	-0.05
	\mathbb{E}_{BF}	-0.02	-0.19	-0.13	-0.09	-0.18	-0.19	-0.14	-0.07	-0.05	-0.07

Table 3 | Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient between various axes and accuracy for at predicting the right question. **Bolded** values indicate a statistical significance correlation between the axis and model accuracy ($p < 0.05$). **Colored** values are moderately strong correlations. We abbreviate Claude 3.5 Sonnet to Claude 3.5S and Gemini 2.0 Flash Thinking Experiment 01-21 to Gemini 2.0 FTE. We observe moderate to mild negative correlation between these factors and model performance in Logic-Q and Planning-Q, and sometimes in GSME-Q.

Comparing GSME-Q to GSM-Q, we found that models generally had a harder time reasoning about verbalized versions of problems than if they were presented in raw equation forms. We hypothesize that, at least for the problems in QUESTBENCH, identifying missing information requires building up a search tree, which can be easier if the problem were presented symbolically than verbally.

5.2. Correlation between problem complexity and clarification question accuracy

1-sufficient CSPs can generally be solved through either brute-force (forward) search or backwards search. We can approximately quantify the difficulty of each problem in QUESTBENCH based on the runtime of each search algorithm on that problem. If there is a correlation between the factors that determine search complexity and the performance of the LLM, this serves as a high-level signal for the types of mechanisms LLMs may be using to succeed in these tasks.

Specifically, we analyze the correlation between LLM performance and factors listed in Section 3.3. The runtime complexity of each search algorithm in the Logic-Q and Planning-Q domains can be expressed as a function of these factors, see Table 4, where the complexity of brute-force search holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

We report Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients between accuracy and these factors in Table 3, and plot accuracy across each factor in Figure 4. The runtime complexity derivations of each search algorithm in each domain are in Appendices C.1 and C.2.

Logic-Q Table 3 and Figure 4 show that the LLMs’ performances correlate negatively with




Figure 4 | LM accuracies across varying backwards search depths d , number variables $|X|$, number constraints $|C|$, and expected number brute-force guesses E_{BF} for each domain, model, and prompt setting. To make the graph less noisy, we aggregate units of 5 on the x -axis for the Logic-Q setting for $|X|$ and $|C|$.

	Logic-Q	Planning-Q
Brute-force Search	$O((X + C)\mathbb{E}_{BF}/\delta)$	$O(4^{ X }b^2\mathbb{E}_{BF}/\delta)$
Backwards Search	$O(X ^{ C d})$	$O(b^{2d})$ or $O(3^{ X d})$

Table 4 | Runtime complexities of brute-force and backwards search in Logic-Q and Planning-Q. Derivation details can be found in Appendices C.1 and C.2.

backwards search depth d , number of variables $|X|$, number of constraints $|C|$, and expected number of brute-force guesses \mathbb{E}_{BF} . These correlations are statistically significant for most LLMs in this domain, indicating that in Logic-Q, brute-force and backwards search are moderately good approximations for the type of reasoning LLMs are required to perform.

Planning-Q Results show that the LLMs’ performances have very weak or no correlations with d , $|X|$, b , suggesting that LLMs may be using mechanisms other than the backwards search in planning. This is reasonable as these search algorithms generally require exponential-time search, while Transformers theoretically cannot perform non-polynomial-time-computation within a polynomial amount of chain-of-thought (Li et al., 2024b). However, some models’ accuracies have moderately strong correlation with \mathbb{E}_{BF} despite nearly no correlation with $|X|$ or b . This indicates that those LLMs might be randomly guessing, or verifying one choice at a time (the \mathbb{E}_{BF} factor in Table 4 for brute-force search), but perhaps not using breath-first search for verification.

5.3. Is asking the right question harder than solving the problem?

Ablation study. To better understand the relationship between question-asking and reasoning, we conducted an ablation study filtering for examples where the language model (LM) correctly answered the well-specified version of a task. By doing so, we can isolate the challenge of *asking* the right question from that of *solving* the underlying reasoning problem. This setup allows us to estimate how much more difficult question-asking is relative to reasoning.

We began by constructing a well-specified variant of QUESTBENCH, in which we restored one sufficient piece of missing information in each 1-sufficient problem. This yielded well-specified CSPs for which the target variable y can be determined without gathering new information. We then prompted LMs to directly solve these CSPs:

- In **Logic-Q**, the task is to determine the truth value of a target property about Alice.
- In **Planning-Q**, the model finds a valid plan from a given start state to a goal.
- In **GSM-Q**, we used the original GSM-plus math problems as-is.
- In **GSME-Q**, we used the GSM-plus problems translated into CSPs by the human annotators.

The prompts we used for this evaluation are provided in Appendix B.2, and evaluations on this well-specified variant of QUESTBENCH are reported in Table 9.

We then restricted our evaluation of question-asking to only those examples where the model correctly answered at least one corresponding well-specified variant.⁵ Results of this filtered evaluation are shown in Table 5, including accuracy, differences from unfiltered performance (Table 2), and the number of retained examples. Results for GSM-Q and GSME-Q can be found in Table 10.

We observed that question-asking accuracy increased up to 54% in **Planning-Q** after filtering but remained effectively unchanged in **Logic-Q**. This suggests that while reasoning ability may be a

⁵Note that each original QUESTBENCH example may yield multiple well-specified variants, since there can be multiple 1-sufficient variables; we retained only those where the model succeeded on at least one.

		Logic-Q			Planning-Q		
		Acc	Diff	# samples	Acc	Diff	# samples
ZS	Gemini 2.0 FTE	37.4%	0.0%	1150	53.8%	6.5%	4273
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	30.8%	0.7%	1120	11.3%	3.8%	4368
	GPT-4o	27.4%	0.0%	1150	33.4%	8.9%	2275
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	29.6%	0.5%	1127	28.7%	8.9%	2175
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	17.1%	0.3%	1127	16.1%	7.6%	1288
	Gemma 2 2B IT	0.1%	0.0%	1101	0.0%	-10.8%	1
	Gemma 2 9B IT	26.2%	0.2%	1116	21.1%	6.7%	95
	Gemma 2 27B IT	29.8%	0.4%	1111	30.8%	23.1%	117
ZS + CoT	Gemini 2.0 FTE	34.6%	0.0%	1150	52.3%	6.1%	4318
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	37.0%	0.2%	1132	43.4%	9.4%	5176
	GPT-4o	32.0%	0.4%	1133	35.7%	19.3%	1339
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	29.4%	0.2%	1132	28.1%	6.8%	2456
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	19.0%	0.3%	1130	20.4%	11.1%	1386
	Gemma 2 2B IT	0.3%	0.0%	1088	-	-	0
	Gemma 2 9B IT	25.4%	0.8%	1097	21.9%	11.7%	73
	Gemma 2 27B IT	32.3%	1.1%	1090	28.0%	18.0%	75
4S	Gemini 2.0 FTE	38.5%	0.1%	1147	28.5%	9.2%	4016
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	36.3%	0.3%	1131	44.7%	10.1%	4264
	GPT-4o	25.5%	-0.1%	1143	20.1%	8.6%	2780
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	26.8%	0.4%	1102	32.2%	13.4%	2935
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	15.6%	0.1%	1133	24.3%	6.0%	3429
	Gemma 2 2B IT	25.1%	-0.0%	1148	22.2%	14.7%	9
	Gemma 2 9B IT	21.4%	-0.2%	1135	11.7%	6.6%	726
	Gemma 2 27B IT	26.4%	0.1%	1130	22.7%	12.0%	546

Table 5 | Ablation: Language model accuracies at predicting the right question to ask on *only* filtered QUESTBENCH problems of which at least one well-specified version can be answered correctly by the model + prompt method. We use Gemini 2.0 FTE as a shorthand for Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21. See Section 5.3 for the experimental setup. **Acc** indicates accuracy on the filtered version of QUESTBENCH, **Diff** indicates difference between the accuracy in the filtered version vs. the original QUESTBENCH dataset (Table 2), and **# samples** indicates the number of samples in the filtered dataset, out of 1150 and 7500 examples in the original Logic-Q and Planning-Q, respectively. We **bold** all accuracy differences greater than zero.

necessary component of effective question-asking, it may not be sufficient. Notably, models reasoned significantly better on the well-specified version of Logic-Q than Planning-Q (see Table 9), yet this improvement did not translate to better question-asking performance in Logic-Q. This implies that even when reasoning is strong, models may still struggle to identify what information is missing.

Correlation analysis. We also examined whether LMs’ abilities to reason in the presence of sufficient information *correlates* with their ability to identify the missing information in a question. Recall that we constructed the 1-sufficient problems in QUESTBENCH by withholding 1 variable from a well-specified *base* CSP (see Section 4). Then, we constructed multiple well-specified questions from each 1-sufficient problem by restoring 1 variable at a time (note these questions will all be slightly different variants of the base CSP).

For each (model, base CSP) pair, we computed (1) the model’s mean accuracy on reasoning over and solving the corresponding well-specified problems, and (2) the model’s mean question-asking accuracy on the 1-sufficient problems derived from that base CSP (i.e., whether the model correctly

identifies which variable is required).

Both accuracies were averaged across different prompt modes. This gave us one list of accuracies for reasoning in the presence of sufficient information, and another for question-asking, with each entry corresponding to a specific (model, base CSP) pair. To assess the relationship between reasoning and question-asking abilities, we computed Spearman’s rank correlation between the two lists. A high correlation would indicate that models better at reasoning with complete information also tend to be better at identifying what’s missing when information is incomplete.

Table 6 shows statistically significant, mild-to-moderate positive correlations in all domains, suggesting that reasoning capability is generally correlated with improved question-asking performance in our domain. This aligns with our findings from the ablation study: while reasoning ability may be a necessary ingredient for effective question-asking, it may not be sufficient on its own—potentially explaining why the observed correlations, though statistically significant, remain modest in magnitude.

	ρ	p -value
Logic-Q	0.24	1.9e-98
Planning-Q	0.40	0.0
GSME-Q	0.30	4.5e-10
GSM-Q	0.22	6.4e-6

Table 6 | Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients (ρ) between LMs’ ability to solve a reasoning problem and to identify the missing information in the problem. The correlations are statistically significant and positive across domains, showing that the two abilities are relevant.

5.4. Detecting underspecification and recognizing uncertainty

We also investigated whether LLMs can *detect* underspecified problems and identify their own uncertainty. We did this by sampling the well-specified variants of QUESTBENCH from Section 5.3 and the original examples of QUESTBENCH, creating a mix of 1-sufficient and well-specified problems. For each problem, we asked LMs to either 1) identify the target variable’s value if the problem is well-specified (this is analogous to the setup in Section 5.3), or 2) say “not sure” if the problem is 1-sufficient. The prompts for this setting can be found in Appendix B.3.

Table 7 shows the F1 scores for the “not sure” class and results of Random, a baseline where a random set of examples (of the same size as ground-truth “not sure” set) are assigned “not sure”. Surprisingly, we found that performance *did not always* improve substantially with model size, particularly in the Planning-Q domain where all models performed at most 5% better than the Random baseline. We hypothesize that Planning-Q problems are sufficiently difficult that models cannot recognize uncertainty, and thus opt to guess randomly instead of answering (truthfully) that they are uncertain. As further support for this hypothesis, we found that Gemini Flash Thinking, Claude 3.5, and GPT-4o predict “not sure” on only 1.4%, 4.6%, and 0.7% of cases in the zero-shot (no chain-of-thought) setting on Planning-Q, when the ground-truth ratio is 41.8%. This is in line with prior work that finds RLHF post-training tends to encourage model overconfidence (Kadavath et al., 2022; Leng et al., 2025; OpenAI, 2023).

Correlation with missing information identification. We examined whether LMs’ ability to detect *whether* a problem is underspecified correlates with their ability to identify *what* specific information is missing. Similar to the correlation analyses in §5.3, for each (model, base CSP) pair, we computed the model’s average F1 score in predicting whether a question is underspecified, and its average accuracy in identifying the correct missing variable in the corresponding 1-sufficient problems. We then computed Spearman’s rank correlation of the two lists of accuracies for all (model, base CSP) pairs. This evaluates whether models that are better at recognizing underspecification are also better at identifying the source of that underspecification.

		Logic-Q	Planning-Q	GSME-Q	GSM-Q
ZS	Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21	60.87	0.82	22.35	36.83
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	57.09	10.77	65.22	59.85
	GPT-4o	36.26	1.23	30.27	60.87
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	47.44	9.88	12.42	55.28
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	34.03	0.00	39.41	51.16
	Gemma 2 2B IT	47.03	0.00	2.56	4.08
	Gemma 2 9B IT	48.39	0.00	40.66	74.67
	Gemma 2 27B IT	50.29	0.10	6.13	56.93
ZS + CoT	Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21	61.70	0.89	12.42	28.57
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	58.87	15.45	96.58	68.49
	GPT-4o	45.95	0.37	83.70	62.86
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	53.37	4.15	88.15	65.11
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	55.71	4.53	90.59	69.09
	Gemma 2 2B IT	35.96	0.05	53.40	21.67
	Gemma 2 9B IT	48.98	0.00	64.91	67.12
	Gemma 2 27B IT	47.87	0.74	91.37	60.19
4S	Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21	57.95	5.42	74.90	50.00
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	51.65	31.52	91.37	86.41
	GPT-4o	24.49	13.39	40.21	82.69
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	32.35	9.49	66.37	78.74
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	27.62	20.82	75.21	75.95
	Gemma 2 2B IT	37.95	46.52	15.03	61.75
	Gemma 2 9B IT	43.75	2.85	16.00	70.62
	Gemma 2 27B IT	36.04	9.06	15.20	75.14
Random	(proportional)	41.97	41.75	42.90	50.0

Table 7 | F1 scores for identifying which problems are underspecified in QUESTBENCH. We include a random baseline where a randomly-sampled, proportional number of examples are labeled “not sure”. We found that most LLMs have difficulty assessing when problems are underspecified, particularly in difficult domains like Planning-Q.

Table 8 shows statistically significant weak correlations in all domains, which suggest that the abilities to detect missing information and to pinpoint what is missing, while related, are only partially overlapping, particularly in the more complex Logic-Q and Planning-Q domains.

	ρ	p -value
Logic-Q	0.09	2.7e-10
Planning-Q	0.11	1.1e-08
GSME-Q	0.29	1.1e-08
GSM-Q	0.26	1.1e-07

Table 8 | Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients (ρ) show that LLMs’ abilities to identify *whether* they do not know v.s. *what* they do not know are weakly correlated.

6. Conclusion

We introduce a collection of benchmarks for identifying underspecification and asking clarification questions in reasoning problems, which we posit is an essential skill necessary for LLMs’ to perform tasks under uncertainty. We found that SOTA and near-SOTA LLMs are relatively good at identifying missing information in simple algebra problems, but struggle with more complex tasks involving logic and planning. Their performance is sometimes negatively correlated with factors that increase problem complexity, such as search depth and expected number of brute-force guesses. Our ablation studies and correlation experiments suggest that reasoning ability is necessary – but may not be sufficient – to enable models to ask the right question. Our work underscores the areas where significant progress can be made in enabling systems to ask for clarifying information and acknowledge uncertainty.

References

- Y. Alkhazraji, M. Frorath, M. Grützner, M. Helmert, T. Liebetraut, R. Mattmüller, M. Ortlieb, J. Seipp, T. Springenberg, P. Stahl, and J. Wülfing. Pyperplan. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3700819>, 2020. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3700819>.
- C. Andukuri, J.-P. Fränken, T. Gerstenberg, and N. D. Goodman. STaR-GATE: Teaching language models to ask clarifying questions. In *Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024.
- D. Angluin. Queries and concept learning. *Machine learning*, 2:319–342, 1988.
- L. Aroyo and C. Welty. Truth is a lie: Crowd truth and the seven myths of human annotation. *AI Magazine*, 36(1):15–24, 2015.
- P. Auer. Using confidence bounds for exploitation-exploration tradeoffs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*, 3:397–422, 2002.
- J. Austin, A. Odena, M. Nye, M. Bosma, H. Michalewski, D. Dohan, E. Jiang, C. Cai, M. Terry, Q. Le, et al. Program synthesis with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*, 2021.
- V. Basile, M. Fell, T. Fornaciari, D. Hovy, S. Paun, B. Plank, M. Poesio, A. Uma, et al. We need to consider disagreement in evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 1st workshop on benchmarking: past, present and future*, pages 15–21. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021.
- P. Budzianowski, T.-H. Wen, B.-H. Tseng, I. Casanueva, U. Stefan, R. Osman, and M. Gašić. Multiwoz - a large-scale multi-domain wizard-of-oz dataset for task-oriented dialogue modelling. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2018.
- K. R. Chandu, L. Li, A. Awadalla, X. Lu, J. S. Park, J. Hessel, L. Wang, and Y. Choi. Certainly uncertain: A benchmark and metric for multimodal epistemic and aleatoric awareness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01942*, 2024.
- M. Chen, J. Tworek, H. Jun, Q. Yuan, H. P. D. O. Pinto, J. Kaplan, H. Edwards, Y. Burda, N. Joseph, G. Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- S. Chen, S. Wiseman, and B. Dhingra. ChatShop: Interactive information seeking with language agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09911*, 2024a.
- X. Chen, R. A. Chi, X. Wang, and D. Zhou. Premise order matters in reasoning with large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024b.
- Y. Chen, X. Song, C. Lee, Z. Wang, Q. Zhang, D. Dohan, K. Kawakami, G. Kochanski, A. Doucet, M. Ranzato, S. Perel, and N. de Freitas. Towards learning universal hyperparameter optimizers with transformers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- M. M. Chouinard, P. L. Harris, and M. P. Maratsos. Children’s questions: A mechanism for cognitive development. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, pages i–129, 2007.
- K. Cobbe, V. Kosaraju, M. Bavarian, M. Chen, H. Jun, L. Kaiser, M. Plappert, J. Tworek, J. Hilton, R. Nakano, C. Hesse, and J. Schulman. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- D. A. Cohn, Z. Ghahramani, and M. I. Jordan. Active learning with statistical models. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research (JAIR)*, 4:129–145, 1996.

- A. Creswell, M. Shanahan, and I. Higgins. Selection-inference: Exploiting large language models for interpretable logical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09712*, 2022.
- A. Curtis, N. Kumar, J. Cao, T. Lozano-Pérez, and L. P. Kaelbling. Trust the proc3s: Solving long-horizon robotics problems with llms and constraint satisfaction. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2024a.
- A. Curtis, G. Matheos, N. Gothoskar, V. Mansinghka, J. Tenenbaum, T. Lozano-Pérez, and L. P. Kaelbling. Partially observable task and motion planning with uncertainty and risk awareness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10454*, 2024b.
- A. M. Davani, M. Díaz, and V. Prabhakaran. Dealing with disagreements: Looking beyond the majority vote in subjective annotations. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10: 92–110, 2022.
- Z. Fan, X. Han, and Z. Wang. Transfer learning for Bayesian optimization on heterogeneous search spaces. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research (TMLR)*, 2024.
- M. Feurer, B. Letham, F. Hutter, and E. Bakshy. Practical transfer learning for Bayesian optimization. *arXiv:1802.02219 [stat.ML]*, 2018.
- Y. Gal, R. Islam, and Z. Ghahramani. Deep Bayesian active learning with image data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1183–1192. PMLR, 2017.
- R. Garnett. *Bayesian optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- Gemini Team Google. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv:2312.11805 [cs.CL]*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11805>.
- Gemini Team Google. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv:2403.05530 [cs.CL]*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.05530>.
- Gemma Team. Gemma: Open models based on Gemini research and technology. *arXiv:2403.08295 [cs.CL]*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08295>.
- M. Ghallab, A. Howe, C. Knoblock, D. McDermott, A. Ram, M. Veloso, D. Weld, D. W. SRI, A. Barrett, D. Christianson, et al. PDDL – the planning domain definition language. *Technical Report CVC TR98003/DCS TR1165*. New Haven, CT: Yale Center for Computational Vision and Control., 1998.
- M. Ghavamzadeh, S. Mannor, J. Pineau, A. Tamar, et al. Bayesian reinforcement learning: A survey. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 8(5–6):359–483, 2015.
- G. Grand, V. Pepe, J. Andreas, and J. B. Tenenbaum. Loose lips sink ships: Asking questions in battleship with language-informed program sampling, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.19471>.
- M. Hahn, W. Zeng, N. Kannen, R. Galt, K. Badola, B. Kim, and Z. Wang. Proactive agents for multi-turn text-to-image generation under uncertainty. *arXiv:2412.06771 [cs.AI]*, 2024.
- K. Handa, Y. Gal, E. Pavlick, N. Goodman, J. Andreas, A. Tamkin, and B. Z. Li. Bayesian preference elicitation with language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.05534>.
- D. Hendrycks, C. Burns, S. Kadavath, A. Arora, S. Basart, E. Tang, D. Song, and J. Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*, 2021.
- P. Hennig and C. J. Schuler. Entropy search for information-efficient global optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*, 13:1809–1837, 2012.

- N. Houlsby, F. Huszár, Z. Ghahramani, and M. Lengyel. Bayesian active learning for classification and preference learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1112.5745*, 2011.
- Z. Hu, C. Liu, X. Feng, Y. Zhao, S.-K. Ng, A. T. Luu, J. He, P. W. Koh, and B. Hooi. Uncertainty of thoughts: Uncertainty-aware planning enhances information seeking in large language models. *arXiv:2402.03271 [cs.CL]*, 2024.
- S. Kadavath, T. Conerly, A. Askell, T. Henighan, D. Drain, E. Perez, N. Schiefer, Z. Hatfield-Dodds, N. DasSarma, E. Tran-Johnson, S. Johnston, S. El-Showk, A. Jones, N. Elhage, T. Hume, A. Chen, Y. Bai, S. Bowman, S. Fort, D. Ganguli, D. Hernandez, J. Jacobson, J. Kernion, S. Kravec, L. Lovitt, K. Ndousse, C. Olsson, S. Ringer, D. Amodei, T. Brown, J. Clark, N. Joseph, B. Mann, S. McCandlish, C. Olah, and J. Kaplan. Language models (mostly) know what they know, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.05221>.
- L. P. Kaelbling and T. Lozano-Pérez. Integrated task and motion planning in belief space. *International Journal of Robotics Research (IJRR)*, 32(9-10):1194–1227, 2013.
- L. P. Kaelbling, M. L. Littman, and A. W. Moore. Reinforcement learning: A survey. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research (JAIR)*, 4:237–285, 1996.
- L. P. Kaelbling, M. L. Littman, and A. R. Cassandra. Planning and acting in partially observable stochastic domains. *Artificial Intelligence*, 101(1-2):99–134, 1998.
- L. Kuhn, Y. Gal, and S. Farquhar. CLAM: Selective clarification for ambiguous questions with generative language models. *arXiv:2212.07769 [cs.CL]*, 2023a.
- L. Kuhn, Y. Gal, and S. Farquhar. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023b.
- H. J. Kushner. A versatile stochastic model of a function of unknown and time varying form. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 5(1):150–167, 1962.
- H. J. Kushner. A new method of locating the maximum point of an arbitrary multipeak curve in the presence of noise. *Journal of Fluids Engineering*, 86(1):97–106, 1964.
- J. Leng, C. Huang, B. Zhu, and J. Huang. Taming overconfidence in LLMs: Reward calibration in RLHF. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=l0tg0jzsdL>.
- B. Z. Li, A. Tamkin, N. Goodman, and J. Andreas. Eliciting human preferences with language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.11589>.
- Q. Li, L. Cui, X. Zhao, L. Kong, and W. Bi. GSM-plus: A comprehensive benchmark for evaluating the robustness of LLMs as mathematical problem solvers. In L.-W. Ku, A. Martins, and V. Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2961–2984, Bangkok, Thailand, Aug. 2024a. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.163. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.163>.
- Z. Li, H. Liu, D. Zhou, and T. Ma. Chain of thought empowers transformers to solve inherently serial problems. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024b. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3EWTEy9MTM>.

- S. Min, J. Michael, H. Hajishirzi, and L. Zettlemoyer. AmbigQA: Answering ambiguous open-domain questions. In *EMNLP*, 2020.
- J. Močkus. On Bayesian methods for seeking the extremum. In *Optimization Techniques IFIP Technical Conference*, 1974.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- J.-C. Pang, H.-B. Fan, P. Wang, J.-H. Xiao, N. Tang, S.-H. Yang, C. Jia, S.-J. Huang, and Y. Yu. Empowering language models with active inquiry for deeper understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03719*, 2024.
- C. Piquet and M. Toussaint. Combined task and motion planning under partial observability: An optimization-based approach. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2019.
- W. T. Piriyakulkij, V. Kuleshov, and K. Ellis. Active preference inference using language models and probabilistic reasoning, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.12009>.
- A. Rastogi, X. Zang, S. Sunkara, R. Gupta, and P. Khaitan. Towards scalable multi-domain conversational agents: The schema-guided dialogue dataset. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(05):8689–8696, 2020.
- P. Ren, Y. Xiao, X. Chang, P.-Y. Huang, Z. Li, B. B. Gupta, X. Chen, and X. Wang. A survey of deep active learning. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 54(9):1–40, 2021.
- C. Sammut and R. B. Banerji. Learning concepts by asking questions. *Machine learning: An artificial intelligence approach*, 2:167–192, 1986.
- M. Sandri, E. Leonardelli, S. Tonelli, and E. Ježek. Why don’t you do it right? analysing annotators’ disagreement in subjective tasks. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2428–2441, 2023.
- B. Settles. Active learning literature survey. Computer Sciences Technical Report 1648, University of Wisconsin–Madison, 2009.
- T. Silver, S. Dan, K. Srinivas, J. B. Tenenbaum, L. Kaelbling, and M. Katz. Generalized planning in PDDL domains with pretrained large language models. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2024.
- N. Srinivas, A. Krause, S. M. Kakade, and M. Seeger. Gaussian process optimization in the bandit setting: No regret and experimental design. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2010.
- R. S. Sutton. Reinforcement learning: An introduction. *A Bradford Book*, 2018.
- R. Wan, J. Kim, and D. Kang. Everyone’s voice matters: Quantifying annotation disagreement using demographic information. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 37(12):14523–14530, 2023.
- B. Wang, Z. Wang, X. Wang, Y. Cao, R. A Saurous, and Y. Kim. Grammar prompting for domain-specific language generation with large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024a.
- Z. Wang and S. Jegelka. Max-value entropy search for efficient Bayesian optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2017.

- Z. Wang, S. Jegelka, L. P. Kaelbling, and T. Lozano-Pérez. Focused model-learning and planning for non-Gaussian continuous state-action systems. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2017.
- Z. Wang, C. R. Garrett, L. P. Kaelbling, and T. Lozano-Pérez. Active model learning and diverse action sampling for task and motion planning. In *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 4107–4114. IEEE, 2018.
- Z. Wang, C. R. Garrett, L. P. Kaelbling, and T. Lozano-Pérez. Learning compositional models of robot skills for task and motion planning. *International Journal of Robotics Research (IJRR)*, 40(6-7): 866–894, 2021.
- Z. Wang, G. E. Dahl, K. Swersky, C. Lee, Z. Nado, J. Gilmer, J. Snoek, and Z. Ghahramani. Pre-trained Gaussian processes for Bayesian optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*, 25 (212):1–83, 2024b.
- J. J. Wu. Large language models should ask clarifying questions to increase confidence in generated code. In *Annual Symposium on Machine Programming (MAPS)*, 2023.
- H. Zhang, L. H. Li, T. Meng, K.-W. Chang, and G. Van Den Broeck. On the paradox of learning to reason from data. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI '23*, 2023. ISBN 978-1-956792-03-4. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2023/375. URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2023/375>.
- M. J. Zhang and E. Choi. Clarify when necessary: Resolving ambiguity through interaction with LMs. *arXiv:2311.09469 [cs.CL]*, 2023.
- T. Zhang, P. Qin, Y. Deng, C. Huang, W. Lei, J. Liu, D. Jin, H. Liang, and T.-S. Chua. CLAMBER: A benchmark of identifying and clarifying ambiguous information needs in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2024a.
- X. Zhang, Y. Deng, Z. Ren, S.-K. Ng, and T.-S. Chua. Ask-before-plan: Proactive language agents for real-world planning. *arXiv:2406.12639 [cs.CL]*, 2024b.

A. Dataset Construction Details

A.1. Logic-Q

We create 1-sufficient CSPs out of SimpleLogic problems by first discarding the A 's that are already present in the dataset. We then identify all assignments $A^{(y)} = \{A_i^{(y)} : A_i^{(y)} \implies y\}_{i=0}^M$ to (a subset of) variables in $X \setminus y$ which would imply y is true, and similarly all assignments $A^{(\neg y)} = \{A_i^{(\neg y)} : A_i^{(\neg y)} \implies \neg y\}_{i=0}^{M'}$ that imply y is false. These sets are found through recursive backwards search starting from y or $\neg y$, see Appendix A.1.1.

Once we have the full set of assignments which imply y , to make them underspecified, we examine all pairs of assignments $(A_i^{(y)}, A_j^{(\neg y)}) \in \{A_i^{(y)}\}_{i=0}^M \times \{A_j^{(\neg y)}\}_{j=0}^{M'}$ where $A_i^{(y)}$ and $A_j^{(\neg y)}$ differ on an assignment to a single variable x_d . This means that if we remove x_d 's assignment from both $A_i^{(y)}$ and $A_j^{(\neg y)}$ (creating $A_i^{(y)} \setminus x_d$ and $A_j^{(\neg y)} \setminus x_d$), then knowing $(A_i^{(y)} \setminus x_d \wedge A_j^{(\neg y)} \setminus x_d)$ is true means knowing x_d 's value is sufficient to determine whether y or $\neg y$ is true,

$$\text{Known}(x_d) \wedge (A_i^{(y)} \setminus x_d) \wedge (A_j^{(\neg y)} \setminus x_d) \implies \text{Known}(y).$$

We conduct further checks (see Appendix A.1.2) to ensure that the assignments themselves do not already imply a value for y ,

$$(A_i^{(y)} \setminus x_d) \wedge (A_j^{(\neg y)} \setminus x_d) \implies \neg \text{Known}(y),$$

discarding any assignment from that doesn't satisfy the above property. We define $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ as the set of assignments satisfying the two properties above, and \tilde{A} as an element of this set.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \{ & (A_i^{(y)} \setminus x_d) \wedge (A_j^{(\neg y)} \setminus x_d) : \\ & \exists x_d \in X, \\ & \left(\text{Known}(x_d) \wedge (A_i^{(y)} \setminus x_d) \wedge (A_j^{(\neg y)} \setminus x_d) \implies \text{Known}(y) \right) \\ & \wedge \left((A_i^{(y)} \setminus x_d) \wedge (A_j^{(\neg y)} \setminus x_d) \implies \neg \text{Known}(y) \right) \} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the sufficient set of each $\tilde{A} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is defined as

$$C(\tilde{A}) = \{x : (\text{Known}(x_d) \wedge \tilde{A} \implies \text{Known}(y)) \wedge (\tilde{A} \implies \neg \text{Known}(y))\}. \quad (2)$$

A.1.1. Constructing all assignments that imply goal is true

We begin by doing backwards search through the constraints C to iteratively derive the set of assignments which imply y is true. At each iteration, we keep track of a disjunction of conjunctions of variables that must be set in order for the goal variable to be true. We start from the most trivial assignment – just setting goal variable itself y to true.

$$g_0 = y$$

We then find all rules which imply y is true and add the relevant variable assignments to our set. For example, suppose we have rule $a \wedge b \rightarrow y$ and $c \wedge \neg d \rightarrow y$, then at the first iteration, we expand our disjunction of conjunctions to include

$$g_1 = (a \wedge b) \vee (c \wedge \neg d)$$

We then iterate through each conjunction, and apply the above procedure on each variable in the conjunction. For example, if we have $e \wedge f \implies b$ and $e \wedge g \wedge h \implies b$ and $e \wedge x \implies c$ in the constraints, then we expand as:

$$g_2 = ((a \wedge ((e \wedge f) \vee (e \wedge g \wedge h)))) \vee ((e \wedge x) \wedge \neg d)$$

Which we can then apply the distributive property to, obtaining

$$g_2 = (a \wedge e \wedge f) \vee (a \wedge e \wedge g \wedge h) \vee (e \wedge x \wedge \neg d)$$

More formally, we decompose each constraint C_i into $\text{PREMISES}(C_i) \implies \text{CONCLUSION}(C_i)$ ⁶, where $\text{PREMISES}(C_i)$ is a set of terms that participate in the conjunction, while $\text{CONCLUSION}(C_i)$ is a single term implied by $\text{PREMISES}(C_i)$. Backwards search is thus formalized as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} g_0 &= y \\ g_1 &= \bigvee_i^{[N]} \left(\bigwedge_j^{[M_i]} t_{i,j} \right), \quad \forall t_{i,j} \in \text{PREMISES}(C_i), \forall C_i \text{ where } \text{CONCLUSION}(C_i) = y \\ g_2 &= \bigvee_i^{[N]} \left(\bigwedge_j^{[M_i]} \left(\bigvee_k^{[N_j]} \left(\bigwedge_\ell^{[M_k]} t_{i,j,k,\ell} \right) \right) \right), \quad \forall t_{i,j,k,\ell} \in \text{PREMISES}(C_{i,j,k}), \\ &\quad \forall C_{i,j,k} \text{ where } \text{CONCLUSION}(C_{i,j,k}) = t_{i,j}, \dots \\ &= \bigvee_i^{[N]} \bigvee_{\substack{k', \\ \forall (j,k') \in ((0,k'), \dots, (M_i, k')) \\ \forall ((0,k'), \dots, (M_i, k')) \in \\ \times \{ \{ (j,k) \mid \forall k \in [N_j] \} \mid \forall j \in [M_i] \} \\ \forall t_{i,(j,k'),\ell} \in \text{PREMISES}(C_{i,(j,k')}), \\ \forall C_{i,(j,k')} \in \times_j \{ C_{i,j,k} \mid \forall C_{i,j,k} \text{ where } \text{CONCLUSION}(C_{i,j,k}) = t_{i,j} \} \\ \text{taking all combinations of } k \text{ rules that can form each } j \text{ term}}} \bigwedge_j^{[M_i]} \bigwedge_\ell^{[M_k]} t_{i,(j,k'),\ell} \\ &= \bigvee_{i_2} \bigwedge_{j_2} t_{i_2, j_2} \quad \text{re-indexing} \\ &\dots \end{aligned}$$

to infer all sets of variable assignments that implies y . Similarly, we repeat the process starting from $\neg y$.

This gives us the full set of variable assignments $A^{(y)}$ which imply y is true. We also repeat this backwards-search procedure starting from $\neg y$ to get the full set of variable assignments $A^{(\neg y)}$ which imply $\neg y$ is true.

A.1.2. Checking 1-sufficiency

After constructing potential 1-sufficient assignments $A^{y,-1} = \{(A_i^{(y)} \setminus x_d) \wedge (A_j^{(\neg y)} \setminus x_d) \mid \forall x_d \in X\}$, we conduct several further checks to ensure they are 1-sufficient:

⁶Note that any rule of form $a \wedge b \wedge c \implies d$ is equivalent to $a \wedge b \wedge \neg d \implies \neg c$, $a \wedge \neg b \wedge c \implies \neg d$, etc. We consider all possible cycles by writing C_i in the form of a disjunction, $\neg a \vee \neg b \vee \neg c \vee d$ and seeking all disjunctions that contain a particular term (e.g. d), meaning they are implied by the conjunction of the negation of the rest of the terms (e.g. $a \wedge b \wedge c$).

1. First, we check that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall A_i^{y,-1} \in A^{y,-1}, \\ \left(\forall A_i^{(y)} \in A^{(y)}, A_i^{y,-1} \not\Rightarrow A^{(y)} \right) \wedge \\ \left(\forall A_i^{(\neg y)} \in A^{(\neg y)}, A_i^{y,-1} \not\Rightarrow A^{(\neg y)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

This ensures that $A_i^{y,-1}$ by itself is not sufficient to determine the value of y . We throw away any $A_i^{y,-1}$ that does not satisfy these two constraints.

2. For any $A_i^{y,-1} \in A^{y,-1}$, if exists another $A_{i'}^{y,-1} \in A^{y,-1}$ such that $A_{i'}^{y,-1} \Rightarrow A_i^{y,-1}$, then all variables in the sufficiency set of $A_{i'}^{y,-1}$ is also in the sufficiency set of $A_i^{y,-1}$. However, resolving $A_{i'}^{y,-1}$ may require shallower backwards search than resolving $A_i^{y,-1}$ (see Appendix C.1). To ensure that the LM conducts search to the full depth required for resolving $A_i^{y,-1}$, we construct an “invalid set” consisting of the elements of the resolution sets of $A_{i'}^{y,-1}$. During test-time, we tell the LM that it cannot ask about the value of any x'_d in the sufficiency set of $A_{i'}^{y,-1}$.

A.2. Planning-Q

We introduce some notation to describe the dataset construction procedure for Planning-Q. The fully-specified version of the Blocks World task with n blocks can be characterized as $\langle X, S, Q, s_0, y \rangle$ where

- X is the full set of atoms p that can be true of a state.
- S is the set of *physically-possible* fully-specified states, which can be represented as a full set of assignments from all variables in X to $\{\text{TRUE}, \text{FALSE}\}$.
- Q is a set of actions that operate on the current state and transitions it to a next state. Each action $q \in Q$ has a set of preconditions which must hold for the action to be applicable in the state, and a set of effects which hold after the action is applied. Pre-conditions and effects can be expressed as a conjunction of atoms x or negated atoms $\neg x$ for any $x \in X$. In the blocks setting, there are 4 types of actions which can be enacted on each block:

```
pick-up(?x)
  :precondition (and (clear ?x) (ontable ?x) (handempty))
  :effect (and (not (ontable ?x)) (not (clear ?x))
              (not (handempty)) (holding ?x))

put-down(?x)
  :precondition (holding ?x)
  :effect (and (not (holding ?x)) (clear ?x)
              (handempty) (ontable ?x))

stack(?x, ?y)
  :precondition (and (holding ?x) (clear ?y))
  :effect (and (not (holding ?x)) (not (clear ?y))
              (clear ?x) (handempty) (on ?x ?y))

unstack(?x, ?y)
  :precondition (and (on ?x ?y) (clear ?x) (handempty))
  :effect (and (holding ?x) (clear ?y) (not (clear ?x))
              (not (handempty)) (not (on ?x ?y))))
```

- s_0 is the initial state, which is in S .

- y is a conjunction of goal propositions which we wish to be true at the end of a plan. There are 6 possible y 's in this dataset, which were written manually by the authors:

$$\{(\text{on } b \ a), \\ (\text{and } (\text{on } b \ a) \ (\text{on } c \ b)), \\ (\text{and } (\text{on } b \ a) \ (\text{on } d \ c)), \\ (\text{and } (\text{on } b \ a) \ (\text{ontable } a)), \\ (\text{and } (\text{on } b \ a) \ (\text{ontable } a) \ (\text{on } c \ b)), \\ (\text{and } (\text{on } b \ a) \ (\text{ontable } a) \ (\text{on } d \ c) \ (\text{ontable } c))\}$$

Given the above, models are expected to construct an **optimal action sequence** $\hat{\tau} = [q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{k-1}]$ where $q_t \in Q$ for all q_t in the trajectory.

Definition: (Optimal) Action Sequence. An action sequence τ enables the robot to go from initial state s_0 to a goal state s_k where the goal conditions are satisfied ($s_k \implies y$). We use $\text{TRANSITION}(s_0, \tau)$ to denote the state of the robot after taking action sequence τ from state s_0 . We also use s_0, \dots, s_k to denote the sequence of intermediate states the robot goes through when taking the action sequence, where action a_i results in state s_{i+1} . An optimal sequence $\hat{\tau}$ is the shortest path that satisfy $\text{TRANSITION}(s_0, \tau)$ implies y .

$$\hat{\tau} = \arg \min_{\tau} |\tau| \quad \text{s.t. } \text{TRANSITION}(s_0, \tau) \implies y \quad (3)$$

Definition: Planner. We use Ψ_y to denote an optimal planner that can map initial states s_0 to an optimal actions sequence $\hat{\tau}$ to the goal y . The planner is implemented through breadth-first-search, on a search graph where the nodes are the states and the edges are the actions, starting from state s_0 and terminating in a state where y is true.

In order to make the planning problem underspecified, we construct a version of it where certain literals (a literal is an atom or its negation) in s_0 are withheld, such that the initial state is only partially observed.

Definition: Partial state. A partial state is one where a subset of atoms (variables in X) have been assigned values.

Definition: Consistent set. We say a full state s is consistent with a partial state \tilde{s} if $s \in S$ and $s \implies \tilde{s}$. The set of all states which are consistent with \tilde{s} is called the consistent set for \tilde{s} , which we denote with $F(\tilde{s})$.

We begin by inferring all partial states \tilde{s}_0 where there is only a single possible optimal action sequence from any $s_0 \in F(\tilde{s}_0)$ to the goal. In other words, if we know \tilde{s}_0 , we know the optimal trajectory to the goal. This gives us all the well-specified CSPs.

$$\tilde{S}_0 = \{\tilde{s}_0 : \exists \hat{\tau}, s_0 \in F(\tilde{s}_0) \implies \Psi(s_0) = \hat{\tau}\} = \{\tilde{s} : \tilde{s} \implies \text{Known}(\tau)\}. \quad (4)$$

The construction process for this set is given in Appendix A.2.1.

In order to construct 1-sufficient initial states, we withhold a single atom from each $\tilde{s}_0 \in \tilde{S}_0$ and check that knowing the truth value of a single additional atom in X is *necessary and sufficient* in order to disambiguate a **single optimal action sequence** to the goal. Details are given in Appendix A.2.2.

$$\tilde{S}'_0 = \{\tilde{s}'_0 : \exists x \in X, (\text{Known}(x) \wedge \tilde{s}'_0 \implies \text{Known}(\tau)) \wedge (\tilde{s}'_0 \implies \neg \text{Known}(\tau))\} \quad (5)$$

where the sufficient set of each \tilde{s}'_0 is defined as

$$C(\tilde{s}'_0) = \{x : (\text{Known}(x) \wedge \tilde{s}'_0 \implies \text{Known}(\tau)) \wedge (\tilde{s}'_0 \implies \neg \text{Known}(\tau))\}. \quad (6)$$

A.2.1. Deriving all well-specified partial states with the same optimal action sequence to goal

Given goal conditions y , first, we perform backwards breadth-first-search from y to derive the full set of optimal partial-state trajectories that end at y .

Definition: Partial-state Trajectories. A trajectory $\tilde{\tau}$ where the intermediary states are partial states, e.g. $[\tilde{s}_0, q_0, \tilde{s}_1, q_1, \dots, \tilde{s}_k]$, where $\tilde{s}_{1..K}$ are partial states. Partial-state trajectories are valid if for any consecutive state sequence $\tilde{s}_t, q_t, \tilde{s}_{t+1} \in \tilde{\tau}$, applying q_t to any full state $s_t \in F(\tilde{s}_t)$ arrives at some $s_{t+1} \in F(\tilde{s}_{t+1})$. They are optimal if the trajectory is the shortest trajectory from \tilde{s}_0 to \tilde{s}_k .

Starting from the atoms in y , we iteratively search each action and deduce the partial states from which applying that action result in y .

$$\begin{aligned}
 g_0 &= \{[y]\} \\
 g_1 &= \{[\tilde{s}, q, y], \forall q \in Q \forall \tilde{s} \text{ s.t. } \text{TRANSITION}(\tilde{s}, q) \implies y\} \\
 &\quad \text{find all partial states } \tilde{s} \text{ that transition into } y \text{ on some action } q, \\
 &\quad \text{prepend } \tilde{s}, q \text{ to the existing trajectories} \\
 &\dots \\
 g_{i+1} &= \{[\tilde{s}, q, \tilde{\tau}], \forall q \in Q \forall \tilde{s} \text{ s.t. } \exists \tilde{\tau} \in g_i \text{ where } \text{TRANSITION}(\tilde{s}, q) \implies \tilde{\tau}[0]\} \\
 &\quad \text{find all partial states } \tilde{s} \text{ that transitions from some action } q \text{ into an initial state } \tilde{\tau}[0] \\
 &\quad \text{of a trajectory } \tilde{\tau} \text{ found in the prior iteration } g_i. \text{ Prepend } \tilde{s}, q \text{ to that trajectory} \\
 &\dots
 \end{aligned}$$

We expand a search tree where each branch of the tree is partial trajectory. We terminate search for that branch if we arrive at a partial state \tilde{s} that is implied by a partial state we have already encountered (meaning we have already considered that partial state). This means in the worst case, we exhaust the space of all possible partial states. When all branches have terminated, we have the set of all optimal partial-state trajectories to the goal y , by taking the union $g_0 \cup g_1 \cup \dots$. The set of well-specified partial states \tilde{S}_0 is the initial states of all these trajectories.

A.2.2. Creating 1-sufficient partial states

To create 1-sufficient partial states from \tilde{S}_0 , we remove one proposition x_d from each $\tilde{s}_0 \in \tilde{S}_0$ to create $\tilde{S}'_0 = \{\tilde{s}_0 \setminus x_d \mid \forall x_d \in \tilde{s}_0 \forall \tilde{s}_0 \in \tilde{S}_0\}$ where $\tilde{s}_0' = \tilde{s}_0 \setminus x_d$ for some \tilde{s}_0 , and check that each of the following holds:

1. For all other $\tilde{s}_0'' \in \tilde{S}_0$, we check whether $\exists x \in X, \tilde{s}_0'' = \tilde{s}_0' \wedge x$, meaning that a single additional true atom brings us to another 1-sufficient partial state. In this case, we assign the salient atom x where $\tilde{s}_0'' = \tilde{s}_0' \wedge x$ to **FALSE**, to eliminate the possibility more than one question must be asked: for example, if x is asked and turns out to be true, then we are brought to \tilde{s}_0'' , which we know is 1-sufficient, meaning we must ask at least one other question.
2. For all physically-valid, well-specified states $s'_0 \in F(\tilde{s}_0')$ consistent with the 1-sufficient state \tilde{s}_0' , we check that there are at most two possible distinct optimal action sequences to the goal condition y :

$$|\{\Psi_y(s'_0), \forall s'_0 \in F(\tilde{s}_0')\}| \leq 2$$

- (a) If there is 1 unique action sequence, then we expect the LM response to be “*No questions needed.*”
- (b) If there are 2 unique action sequences τ_1, τ_2 , then we separated out \tilde{S}_0 into $\tilde{S}_0^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{S}_0^{(2)}$, where the optimal action sequence from all states in $\tilde{S}_0^{(1)}$ to the goal is τ_1 , while the optimal

action sequence from all states in $\tilde{S}_0^{(1)}$ to the goal is τ_2 ($\tilde{S}_0 = \tilde{S}_0^{(1)} \cup \tilde{S}_0^{(2)}$). We find the set of differentiating attributes between $\tilde{S}_0^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{S}_0^{(2)}$, that is to say, all attributes of states in $\tilde{S}_0^{(1)}$ that aren't present in any state of $\tilde{S}_0^{(2)}$, or vice versa (all attributes of states in $\tilde{S}_0^{(2)}$ that aren't present in any state of $\tilde{S}_0^{(1)}$). If any of these questions are asked, they would disambiguate whether the optimal action sequence is τ_1 or τ_2 .

This ensures that for all \tilde{s}_0' , asking about the truth value of x_d fully determines a unique optimal trajectory from the state to the goal conditions. If \tilde{s}_0' passes all of the above checks, we add it to the set of 1-sufficient partial states \tilde{S}'_0

A.3. GSME-Q

Full instructions we provided to annotators can be found below with interface screenshot in Figure 5.

You will be presented with a series of math problems. These math problems are written in words and may be ambiguous. Your task is to try to solve the problem. The problem may be ambiguous, which would make it unsolvable. However, if the problem is solvable, you will be asked to provide the answer, and may additionally be asked to translate the problem into a set of variables and equations given the information present in the problem. Two examples are provided below. Please read carefully and make sure you understand before proceeding.

Math problem 1:
If there are 10 eggs in a basket. Alice buys more eggs and increases her egg quantity by 200%, but she had also sold half of her eggs by then. How many eggs are there total?

You will be asked to try and solve the problem to check if it is ambiguous.

1. Try to solve this problem. What is the answer?: [text box]
 - Not sure. Explain why: [text box E]
 - What questions, when answered, could clarify this problem?: [text box Q]

In this case, the problem is ambiguous. You should check off "Not sure" and write why the problem is ambiguous in the explanation text box E. For example, in this case, you may write: it is unclear whether "increases by 200%" means 200% or 300% of her original amount. Furthermore, it is unclear which came first: did she sell half her eggs before increasing by 200%, or did she buy 200% more eggs first, then sell half her eggs.

Next, you should write some questions that could be asked to clarify this problem in text box Q. For example, you may write "does an increase by 200% mean 200% or 300% of the original amount?", "which happened first, Alice buying more eggs or Alice selling half her eggs?"

Here are some other examples of ambiguous questions that raters have found in this dataset. **Note:** there may be some subjectivity when deciding whether or not a particular problem is ambiguous. Please base it off your own interpretation.

Problem	Explanation
Janet buys a brooch for her daughter. She pays \$500 for the material to make it and then another \$800 for the jeweler to construct it. After that, she pays 10% of that to get it insured. How much did she pay?	The antecedent of "that" in "10% of that" is unspecified.
Josh decides to try flipping a house. He buys a house for \$80,000 and then puts in \$50,000 in repairs. This increased the value of the house by 150%. How much did he make?	What should be considered the initial value of the house is unclear. It could be taken as the initial purchase price or the initial purchase price plus repairs. Furthermore, it is unclear whether "increase by 150%" means 150% or 250% of the price.
Jason has a phone plan of 1000 minutes per month. Every day he has a 15-minute call with his boss, and he's had 300 extra minutes of call this month to other people. How many minutes does Jason have left if this month has 30 days?	The day of the month is not specified.
In a 60-item quiz, 40% of the questions are easy, and the rest are equally divided as average and difficult questions. If Aries is sure to get 75% of the easy questions, and half of the average and difficult questions correctly, how many points is she sure to get?	The number of points per question is not specified. They could all be worth one point or they could be weighted differently.
Mara added 3 slices of cake to a plate that already had 2 slices on it. She was getting hungrier so she tripled the number of slices she currently has. She ate 2 slices and while she was distracted, her friend stole 5 slices off her plate. What number of cake slices remained on the plate?	The order of events is unclear. Because of the temporal mismatch between "was getting" and "currently has" in the same sentence, a reader cannot know whether "the number of slices she currently has" refers to the number of slices before or after adding the 3.

Note 2: the problem may be ambiguous in more ways than one. Please explain all ways the problem is ambiguous.

Math problem 2:

If there are 10 eggs and 2 in a basket, and there are twice as many eggs in a second basket, how many eggs are there total?

1. Try to solve this problem. What is the answer?: [text box]

Not sure. Explain why: [text box E]

What questions, when answered, could clarify this problem?: [text box Q]

In this case, you should answer 30. This is because there are 10 eggs in the first basket + 20 in the second basket, so 30 total. You should not check off "Not sure."

In cases where you did not check off "Not sure", you may be additionally asked to translate the problem into a series of equations, together with the variables that appear in the equations and the goal of the problem.

2. Please translate the above math problem into a list of variables, a list of equations, and a goal variable.

Ensure that your translation is equivalent to the variables above.

For example, in this case, the problem may be translated as follows:

Variables:

$A = 10$ [Number of eggs in the first basket]

B [Number of eggs in the second basket]

T [Total number of eggs]

Equations:

$B = 2 * A$ [There are twice as many eggs in the second basket as the first.]

$T = A + B$ [The total number of eggs is the sum of the eggs in the first and second baskets.]

Goal: T . How many eggs are there total?

If the value of a variable is directly mentioned in the math problem, you should write down the value. For example, $A = 10$. If the value of a variable is not directly mentioned in the math problem, you should not write down the value, even if it can be computed. Here are some examples of incorrect translation:

INCORRECT EXAMPLE 1

Variables:

$A = 10$ [Number of eggs in the first basket]

T [Total number of eggs]

Equations:

$T = A + B$. The total number of eggs is the sum of the eggs in the first and second baskets.

Goal: T . How many eggs are there total?

The above example is missing a variable (the number of eggs in the second basket) and an equation.

INCORRECT EXAMPLE 2

Variables:

$A = 10$ [Number of eggs in the first basket]

$B = 2$ [Number of eggs in the second basket]

$T =$ Total number of eggs

Equations:

$T = A + B$. The total number of eggs is the sum of the eggs in the first and second baskets.

Goal: T . How many eggs are there total?

The above example has a wrong variable value and missed an equation. "There are twice as many eggs in the second basket as the first" should be translated into $B = 2 * A$ instead of $B = 2$.

INCORRECT EXAMPLE 3

Variables:

T [Total number of eggs]

Equations:

$T = 10 + 20$. The total number of eggs is the sum of the 10 eggs in the first basket and the 20 eggs in the second basket.

Goal: T . How many eggs are there total?

The above example combines too many operations into a single equation, in a way that is not faithful to the original question. A good rule of thumb is to have one variable stand in for every number in the problem, and have all equations be of one of two forms: (1) assigns one variable to one constant, or (2) assigns one variable to a relation among other variables. Avoid equations that can be simplified.

Math Problem

A notebook costs twice as much as a pencil and an eraser combined. A pen costs as much as a pencil and eraser combined. A pencil costs \$1.20 and an eraser costs \$0.30. How much will 8 pens cost?

Evaluation Criteria

- Try to solve this problem. What is the answer?

12

Proceed To Translation

Not sure

Please translate the above math problem into a list of variables, a list of equations, and a goal variable.

List of variables in the above problem

Variable name (e.g. A)	Variable value (e.g. 10, or leave it empty if the value is not directly mentioned or common knowledge, and must be computed from the other variables)	Variable definition (e.g. "number of eggs in the first basket")	Is the variable irrelevant to the final answer? Check off the checkbox next to the variable if it is irrelevant. (E.g. "R" should be checked off and nothing else.)	
	<input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="button" value="+"/>
	<input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="button" value="X"/>

List of equations in the above problem

All equations must be a combination of the following and ****no other symbols or characters****

1. The variables defined above
2. Integers and decimals
3. Operations, as standardized below:
 - * for times (multiply)
 - + for plus
 - for minus
 - / for divides
 - = for equals
 - () for parentheses
 You may use more operations than the ones defined above if needed, but if the operation you need is defined above, please use the appropriate symbol.
4. Do NOT include any units (\$, hours, days, etc.)
5. Remember to include * any time you are performing multiplications, e.g. use 2 * A and not 2A.
6. Convert all percentages into decimals, e.g. 150% becomes 1.5

Equation (e.g. T = A + B)	Equation verbal description (e.g. "The total number of eggs is the sum of the number of eggs in the first basket and the number of eggs in the second basket.")	
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="button" value="+"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="button" value="X"/>

Goal variable:

Goal variable (e.g. T)	Goal description (e.g. "how many eggs are there total?")
C2	Cost of 8 pens

Figure 5 | Screenshot of the annotation interface used for obtaining CSPs for each math problem in the GSM setting.

A.4. GSM-Q

We ask annotators to translate problems from GSME-Q into word problems. Full instructions we provided to annotators can be found below with interface screenshot in Figure 6.

You will be presented with a series of math problems. These math problems are written in words and translated to equations. Your task is to first validate whether the translation is correct given the information present in the problem. If so, you will then be prompted to answer questions for each equation. An example is provided below. Please read carefully and make sure you understand before proceeding.

Math problem written in words:

If there are 10 eggs and 5 ribbons in a basket, and there are twice as many eggs in the second basket as the first basket, how many eggs are there total?

The following is the math problem translated into equations, together with the variables that appear in the equations and the goal of the problem.

Variables:

$E1 = 10$ [Number of eggs in the first basket]

$E2$ [Number of eggs in the second basket]

$R = 5$ [Number of ribbons in the first basket]

T [Total number of eggs]

Equations:

$E2 = 2 * E1$ [There are twice as many eggs in the second basket as the first.]

$T = E1 + E2$ [The total number of eggs is the sum of the eggs in the first and second baskets.]

Goal:

T [How many eggs are there total?]

You will first validate that the variables, equations, and goal matches the original problem described in words:

1. Is the above list of variables, equations, and the goal equivalent to the original math problem written in words?:

(a) [Bubble] Yes

(b) [Bubble] No

In the example above, the answer is "yes". Here are some examples of wrong translations, where the answer would be "no":

INCORRECT EXAMPLE 1

Variables:

$E1 = 10$ [Number of eggs in the first basket]

T [Total number of eggs]

Equations:

$T = E1 + E2$. The total number of eggs is the sum of the eggs in the first and second baskets.

Goal:

T [How many eggs are there total?]

The above example is missing a variable (the number of eggs in the second basket) that is necessary to solve for the goal

INCORRECT EXAMPLE 2

Variables:

 $E1 = 10$ [Number of eggs in the first basket] $E2 = 2$ [Number of eggs in the first basket] T [Total number of eggs]

Equations:

 $T = E1 + E2$ [The total number of eggs is the sum of the eggs in the first and second baskets.]

Goal:

 T [How many eggs are there total?]

The above example has a wrong variable assignment. "There are twice as many eggs in the second basket as the first" should be translated into $E2 = 2 * E1$ instead of $E2 = 2$.

INCORRECT EXAMPLE 3

Variables:

 T [Total number of eggs]

Equations:

 $T = 10 + 20$ [The total number of eggs is the sum of the 10 eggs in the first basket and the 20 eggs in the second basket.]

Goal:

 T [How many eggs are there total?]

The above example combines too many operations into a single equation, in a way that is not faithful to the original question.

A good rule of thumb is to have one variable stand in for every number in the problem, and have all equations be of one of two forms: (1) assigns one variable to one constant, or (2) assigns one variable to a relation among other variables. Avoid equations that can be simplified.

If you answered "yes" to the above question, you will see the following questions.

2. Please solve for the "Goal" in the above list of variables and equations. Is your answer the same as the answer below?:

30

(a) [Bubble] Yes

(b) [Bubble] No

In the example above, the answer is yes. In incorrect example 1, the answer would be "no" (the goal value is ambiguous in incorrect example 1). In incorrect example 2, the answer would also be "no" (the goal value is 12 in incorrect example 2).

If you answered "no" to the above question, the questions will end here. If you answered "yes", then, you will answer the following questions for different sets of equation(s):

3. Try to rewrite the problem to remove all parts of the problem that states any of the above equation(s). Please make sure the problem is still coherent English (e.g., do not simply delete the section you copied above without fixing any grammatical errors). Please also make sure to remove the entire premise, not just replacing numbers with “few” or “some”. If there is no way to remove the equation (e.g., because it was not mentioned in the original problem), please leave the text box empty and check off “cannot remove”.

[Text area]

- Cannot remove

For example, given:

- $E1 = 10$ [Number of eggs in the first basket]
- $R = 5$ [Number of ribbons in the first basket]

you may write (a) “If there are twice as many eggs in the second basket as the first basket, how many eggs are there total?”

Given:

- $E2 = 2 * E1$ [There are twice as many eggs in the second basket as the first.]
- $R = 5$ [Number of ribbons in the first basket]

you may write (b) “If there are 10 eggs in a basket, how many eggs are there total?”

Given:

- $T = E1 + E2$ [The total number of eggs is the sum of the eggs in the first and second baskets.]
- $R = 5$ [Number of ribbons in the first basket]

you would check off “Cannot Remove” because “ $T = E1 + E2$ ” was never mentioned in words in the prompt, but was implied.

4. Given the above rewritten problem, is the answer to the question:

- the same as your answer in question 2
- unclear
- different from your answer in question 2. What is the new answer?: [Text box]

In the example above, the answer would likely be “unclear” for question (a). For question (b), the answer would likely be “different”, with the new answer being 10.

B. Prompts from each domain in QUESTBENCH

B.1. Identifying missing information and asking the right question

Logic-Q. We used the following prompt for Logic-Q:

Suppose you know the following rules about Alice:
{rules_n1}

You trying to discern whether a statement about Alice is true given some facts. You must decide whether you have enough information to determine whether the final statement is true. You may respond with one of the following- If you do not have enough information yet, you may ask a question about an attribute of Alice, in the form of "Question: Is Alice [attribute]?". Ask the best question that, regardless of how it is answered, provides the most information about the final statement.

Once you have enough all information necessary to determine the truth value of the statement, you can terminate with "End questioning".

Generate one of "Question: Is Alice [attribute]?" or "End questioning" and nothing else.

Math Problem

There are 220 castles in Scotland. 40 percent of them are manned, 40 percent of them are ruined, and half of the ruined castles are unmanned. How many unmanned ruined castles are there in Scotland?

Below, we translate this problem into variables, equations and the goal.

Variables:
 A = 220 [Total number of castles in Scotland]
 B [Number of ruined castles]
 D [Number of unmanned ruined castles]
 E = 0.4 [Percentage of the total castles that are ruined]
 F = 0.5 [Percentage of the ruined castles that are unmanned]
 G = 0.4 [Percentage of the total castles that are manned]

Equations:
 B = E * A [Number of ruined castles is 40% of the total castles]
 D = F * B [Half of the ruined castles are unmanned]

Goal:
 D [Number of unmanned ruined castles]

Evaluation Criteria

- Is the above list of variables, equations, and the goal equivalent to the original math problem written in words?
 Yes
 No
- Please solve for the "Goal" in the above list of variables and equations. Is your answer the same as **44** ?
 Yes
 No

A = 220 [Total number of castles in Scotland] G = 0.4 [Percentage of the total castles that are manned]

- Try to rewrite the problem to **remove all** parts of the problem that states any of the above equation(s). Please make sure the problem is still coherent English (e.g. do not simply delete the section you copied above without fixing any grammatical errors). Please also make sure to **remove the entire premise**, not just replacing numbers with "few" or "some". If there is no way to remove the equation (e.g. because it wasn't mentioned in the original problem), please leave the text box empty and check off "cannot remove".

There are castles in Scotland. percent of them are manned, 40 percent of them are ruined, and half of the ruined castles are unmanned. How many unmanned ruined castles are there in Scotland?

Cannot remove

- Given the above rewritten problem, is the answer to the question:
 still **44**
 Unclear
 Different from **44**

Figure 6 | Screenshot of the annotation interface used for obtaining underspecified GSM problems written in words.

Planning-Q. We used the following prompt for Planning-Q:

You will be given a planning problem in the domain defined by the following PDDL:

{domain_pddl}

The current objects are present in the problem:

{problem_objects}

You will be given a set of conditions true in your initial state and a set of goal conditions, and will need to construct a plan from your current state to the goal state. Some details of your initial state may be missing. You must decide whether you have enough information to disambiguate a plan to the final state. If not, you must decide what information is necessary to construct a fully unambiguous plan from your initial state to the goal state. You will be presented with a set of multiple-choice options for questions you may ask, and you must answer with one of the options. Please reason step-by-step, then generate "Answer:" followed by the number of the option and nothing else.

Known facts about current state:

{conditions}

Goal state:

{goals}

Possible questions:

0. Is {proposition_0} true?
 1. Is {proposition_1} true?
 2. Is {proposition_2} true?
 ...

GSM-Q. We used the following prompt for GSM-Q:

You are trying to solve a math problem. You must decide whether you have enough information to solve the math problem. Please respond with one of the following-
 If you do not have enough information to solve the math problem, you may ask a question back to the user from a set of predefined "Possible questions". Otherwise, choose "No questions needed." Generate the number of your choice in the form "Choice: number"

Math problem: {problem}

Possible questions:

0. What is {variable_name} ({variable_symbol})?
 1. What is {variable_name} ({variable_symbol})?
 ...
 {n}. No questions needed.

GSME-Q. We used the following prompt for GSME-Q:

You are trying to solve a math problem. You must decide whether you have enough information to solve the math problem. Please respond with one of the following-
 If you do not have enough information to solve the math problem, you may ask a question back to the user from a set of predefined "Possible questions". Otherwise, choose "No questions needed." Generate the number of your choice in the form "Choice: number"

Math problem: {problem }
 Possible questions:
 0. What is the value of {variable_symbol}?
 1. What is the value of {variable_symbol}?
 {n}. No questions needed.

B.2. Reasoning in the presence of sufficient information

Logic-Q. We used the following prompt for Logic-Q:

Suppose you know the following rules about Alice:
 {rules_nl}

You will presented with a binary question about an attribute of Alice. Please answer it with "Yes" or "No".

Planning-Q. We used the following prompt for Planning-Q:

You will be given a planning problem in the domain defined by the following PDDL:
 {domain_pddl}

The current objects are present in the problem:
 {problem_objects}

You will be given a set of conditions true in your initial state and a set of goal conditions, and will need to construct a plan from your current state to the goal state.
 Please answer with "Answer:" followed by the plan in the form of a comma-separated list of ([action] [args]) (e.g. (pick-up a), (stack a b), ...).

Known facts about current state:
 {conditions}

Goal state:
 {goals}

GSME-Q/GSM-Q. We used the following prompt for GSME-Q/GSM-Q:

You are trying to answer a math question. Please answer with "Answer:" followed by the answer to the math question. Only include the raw numerical answer, do not include any units or thousands separators.

Math problem: {problem}

		Logic-Q	Planning-Q	GSME-Q	GSM-Q
ZS	Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21	89.34%	53.46%	96.03%	98.26%
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	64.08%	51.26%	29.14%	60.76%
	GPT-4o	51.93%	24.53%	26.49%	38.54%
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	70.19%	21.33%	35.10%	17.36%
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	71.34%	12.64%	17.22%	6.25%
	Gemma 2 2B IT	50.76%	0.01%	4.64%	8.33%
	Gemma 2 9B IT	51.06%	0.94%	9.93%	18.06%
	Gemma 2 27B IT	56.18%	1.25%	16.56%	2.43%
ZS + CoT	Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21	88.64%	53.45%	96.03%	98.26%
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	78.59%	69.54%	100.00%	100.00%
	GPT-4o	76.33%	14.12%	100.00%	96.18%
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	74.74%	23.48%	96.03%	95.14%
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	75.21%	12.84%	100.00%	92.36%
	Gemma 2 2B IT	56.30%	0.00%	78.15%	54.51%
	Gemma 2 9B IT	58.75%	0.62%	75.50%	77.78%
	Gemma 2 27B IT	53.97%	0.49%	88.74%	77.78%
4S	Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21	81.23%	48.29%	100.00%	97.92%
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	65.80%	54.54%	58.28%	70.83%
	GPT-4o	58.99%	30.61%	39.07%	65.28%
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	55.41%	32.74%	40.40%	45.83%
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	57.52%	38.32%	22.52%	47.57%
	Gemma 2 2B IT	51.88%	0.05%	13.25%	43.40%
	Gemma 2 9B IT	62.06%	6.11%	22.52%	54.51%
	Gemma 2 27B IT	56.05%	4.93%	29.14%	65.97%

Table 9 | Language model accuracies for answering questions correctly in a well-specified variant of QUESTBENCH. See Section 5.3 for more information.

B.3. Detecting underspecification and recognizing uncertainty

Logic-Q. We used the following prompt for Logic-Q:

Suppose you know the following rules about Alice: {rules_nl}
 You will be presented with a binary question about an attribute of Alice. Please answer it with "Yes" or "No" or "Not sure".

Planning-Q. We used the following prompt for Planning-Q:

You will be given a planning problem in the domain defined by the following PDDL:
 {domain_pddl}
 The current objects are present in the problem:
 {problem_objects}
 You will be given a set of conditions true in your initial state and a set of goal conditions, and will need to construct a plan from your current state to the goal state. Please answer with "Answer:" followed by the plan in the form of a comma-separated list of ([action] [args]) (e.g. (pick-up a), (stack a b), ...), or "Not sure" if you are unsure what the plan should be.

GSME-Q/GSM-Q. We used the following prompt for GSME-Q/GSM-Q:

You are trying to answer a math question. Please answer with "Answer:" followed by the answer to the math question, or "Not sure" if you are not sure what the answer is. Only include the raw numerical answer, do not include any units or thousands separators.
 Math problem: {problem}

C. Search solutions for Logic-Q and Planning-Q

C.1. Logic-Q

Brute-force Solution. A problem in Logic-Q can be solved through brute force search as follows. We have a subroutine `infer` that allows us to infer the values of all variables consistent with the current variable assignments. For example, if $A = \{a, b\}$ and we know that $a \wedge b \rightarrow c$, then `infer(A)` gives us $\{a, b, c\}$. At a high-level, `infer` is analogous to breadth-first-search, and thus has runtime complexity $O(|X| + |C|)$.

To solve a Logic-Q problem, we first run `infer` to get values of all variables consistent with the current assignment A , creating A' . Next, for all unassigned variables $x_u \in X \setminus A'$, we iterate through them one at a time and check whether:

1. Including x_u in A' allows us to infer the target variable is either *true* or *false*.
2. Include $\neg x_u$ in A' allows us to infer the target variable is the *opposite assignment* as it was in case (1).

The first time 1 and 2 both hold, we have that x_u is true.

The expected runtime of brute-force can thus be computed by the expected number of variables that we need to iterate through to get to a variable in the sufficient set (upperbounded by \mathbb{E}_{BF} in §3.3), multiplied by the complexity of running the `infer` algorithm twice. By Markov’s inequality, with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$, the complexity is bounded by

$$O((|X| + |C|)\mathbb{E}_{\text{BF}}/\delta).$$

Backwards Search Solution. A problem in Logic-Q can be solved through backwards search. The procedure is the same as the backwards search used to construct the dataset, described in Appendix A.1.1. At each iteration, we keep track of a disjunction of conjunction of variables required to prove y .

The complexity of backwards search is given by the search depth d multiplied by the number of expansions per depth, which is bounded by $O(3^{|X|}|C|)$ (expanding up to $|C|$ rules for conjunction, for which there are at most $3^{|X|}$ conjunctions – each variable can be either true/false/missing from that conjunction) Thus, the overall complexity is $O(3^{|X|}|C|d)$.

Though comprehensive backwards search is EXP-time, we can terminate early as soon as we find a disjunction consisting of the negation of all initial conditions, the goal variable, and an additional term, which would mean that asking about the value of the initial term is sufficient to infer the value of the goal variable.

If we know this disjunction is at most at depth d , then the runtime is bounded by $|X|^{|C|d}$, where $|X|^{|C|}$ is the branching factor at each node. The branching factor comes from the cross product of at most $|X|$ terms across at most $|C|$ conjunctive constraints. Thus, the total runtime is given by

$$O(|X|^{|C|d}).$$

C.2. Planning-Q

Brute-force Solution. As described in §3.3, our brute-force approach randomly samples from the choices without replacement, and checks each sampled choice until a correct one is found. The complexity of this approach relies on the complexity of validating whether a choice is correct or not.

Given an underspecified initial state \tilde{s}_0 and a selected choice of atom x , we can generate all physically-plausible initial states $s_0^+ \in F(\tilde{s}_0, x)$ and $s_0^- \in F(\tilde{s}_0, \neg x)$, where function F maps from a partial state to all states consistent with the partial state. We can then solve the planning problem for *all* initial states in both sets, and check whether the following holds.

1. The shortest path $\hat{\tau}^+$ remains the same for every initial $s_0^+ \in F(\tilde{s}_0, x)$.
2. The shortest path $\hat{\tau}^-$ remains the same for every initial $s_0^- \in F(\tilde{s}_0, \neg x)$.
3. $\hat{\tau}^+$ and $\hat{\tau}^-$ are different.

Assume the planning tool we use is breadth-first search, which takes at most $O(|S| + |S||\mathcal{A}|)$ time. We perform breadth-first search at most $|S|$ times (since $|F(\tilde{s}_0, \neg x) \cup F(\tilde{s}_0, x)| < |S|$), meaning the overall runtime of this solution is $O((|S| + |S||\mathcal{A}|)|S|)$. The number of states is bounded by $|S| = 2^{|\mathcal{X}|}$, while the number of actions is bounded by $|\mathcal{A}| = 2b + 2b(b + 1) = O(b^2)$ where b is the number of blocks in the domain, so the overall complexity of validating a choice is $O(2^{2|\mathcal{X}|}b^2)$.

Similar to §C.1, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we only need to guess \mathbb{E}_{BF}/δ times. So the overall complexity is

$$O(2^{2|\mathcal{X}|}b^2\mathbb{E}_{BF}/\delta).$$

Backward Search Solution. We replace the breadth-first-search from each consistent state with a single backwards search. Starting from the goal condition, we iterate backwards to find sets of initial states that utilize the same path to the goal. This is the same backwards search that was used to construct all well-specified partial states, described in Appendix A.2.1. We expand backwards until we arrive at a set of partial initial states that are consistent with the given partially-observed set \tilde{s}_0 , and we find the attribute that distinguishes each partial initial state from each other.

Because the number of partial states is bounded by $3^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ (each proposition can take on 3 values: true/false/unknown), the backwards breadth-first search takes $O(3^{|\mathcal{X}|} + 3^{|\mathcal{X}|}|\mathcal{A}|)$. However, if we know that the longest path from any initial state consistent with \tilde{s}_0 to the goal is of length d , meaning we only need to search up to depth d , then the runtime is bounded by

$$O(|\mathcal{A}|^d) = O(b^{2d}) \text{ or } O(3^{|\mathcal{X}|d})$$

(Each iteration, expand at most $3^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ states or $|\mathcal{A}|$ actions.)

D. Ablation: QUESTBENCH Accuracy Filtering For Perfect Reasoning

We report accuracy on the ablation study described in Section 5.3, on the GSME-Q and GSM-Q domains. See Table 10. Similar to the Logic-Q domain, we found negligible difference between performance on the filtered version and the original QUESTBENCH for most model setups — though note that LMs are generally already able to saturate the original version of QUESTBENCH.

		Acc	GSME-Q		Acc	GSM-Q	
			Diff	# samples		Diff	# samples
ZS	Gemini 2.0 FTE	99.3%	2.6%	145	84.5%	-0.3%	283
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	86.4%	-8.3%	44	92.6%	1.3%	175
	GPT-4o	97.5%	0.8%	40	90.1%	3.3%	111
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	58.5%	10.1%	53	84.0%	6.2%	50
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	96.2%	-0.5%	26	66.7%	-5.2%	18
	Gemma 2 2B IT	71.4%	39.0%	7	45.8%	-3.8%	24
	Gemma 2 9B IT	93.3%	17.8%	15	40.4%	-0.6%	52
	Gemma 2 27B IT	100.0%	26.5%	25	85.7%	14.5%	7
ZS + CoT	Gemini 2.0 FTE	99.3%	3.3%	145	86.2%	0.1%	283
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	74.2%	0.0%	151	91.0%	0.0%	288
	GPT-4o	99.3%	0.0%	151	91.7%	-0.3%	277
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	99.3%	2.6%	145	79.2%	0.0%	274
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	98.7%	0.0%	151	75.6%	-1.2%	266
	Gemma 2 2B IT	61.0%	4.1%	118	70.1%	1.7%	157
	Gemma 2 9B IT	57.0%	0.1%	114	39.3%	2.8%	224
	Gemma 2 27B IT	82.1%	1.3%	134	81.7%	2.2%	224
4S	Gemini 2.0 FTE	96.7%	0.0%	151	92.6%	-0.2%	282
	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	92.0%	-3.3%	88	95.1%	1.0%	204
	GPT-4o	96.6%	0.6%	59	84.0%	0.0%	188
	Gemini 1.5 Pro	85.2%	-6.8%	61	81.1%	-4.4%	132
	Gemini 1.5 Flash	94.1%	-1.2%	34	78.1%	-2.8%	137
	Gemma 2 2B IT	95.0%	4.3%	20	37.6%	0.1%	125
	Gemma 2 9B IT	76.5%	-10.3%	34	63.1%	7.5%	157
	Gemma 2 27B IT	97.7%	1.0%	44	64.7%	-1.9%	190

Table 10 | Ablation: Language model accuracies at predicting the right question to ask on *only* filtered QUESTBENCH problems whose well-specified versions can be answered correctly at least once by the model + prompt method. We use Gemini 2.0 FTE as a shorthand for Gemini Flash Thinking 2.0 Exp 01-21. See Section 5.3 for the experimental setup. **Acc** indicates accuracy on the filtered version of QUESTBENCH, **Diff** indicates difference between the accuracy in the filtered version vs. the original QUESTBENCH dataset, and **# samples** indicates the number of samples in the filtered dataset, out of 151 representative examples in GSME-Q and 288 representative examples in GSM-Q. We **bold** all accuracy differences greater than zero.