

HALT-RAG: A Task-Adaptable Framework for Hallucination Detection

with Calibrated NLI Ensembles and Abstention

Saumya Goswami

Siddharth Kurra

Abstract

Detecting content that contradicts or is unsupported by a given source text is a critical challenge for the safe deployment of generative language models. We introduce **HALT-RAG**, a post-hoc verification system designed to identify hallucinations in the outputs of Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) pipelines. Our flexible and task-adaptable framework uses a universal feature set derived from an ensemble of two frozen, off-the-shelf Natural Language Inference (NLI) models and lightweight lexical signals. These features are used to train a simple, calibrated, and task-adapted meta-classifier. Using a rigorous 5-fold out-of-fold (OOF) training protocol to prevent data leakage and produce unbiased estimates, we evaluate our system on the HALUEVAL benchmark. By pairing our universal feature set with a lightweight, task-adapted classifier and a precision-constrained decision policy, HALT-RAG achieves strong OOF F_1 -scores of 0.7756, 0.9786, and 0.7391 on the summarization, QA, and dialogue tasks, respectively. The system’s well-calibrated probabilities enable a practical abstention mechanism, providing a reliable tool for balancing model performance with safety requirements.

1 Introduction

Modern generative NLP models often produce *hallucinations*: content that is not supported by the input source or external knowledge [2, 3]. This problem is widespread; studies report that standard models for abstractive summarization on the XSum dataset produce factually consistent summaries only 20–30% of the time [9]. Detecting these inconsistencies is therefore critical for deploying safe and reliable NLP systems, especially for **Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)** pipelines, where output quality depends entirely on the retrieved context. HALT-RAG is designed as a post-hoc verifier for such systems, operating on the source text and generated output without performing retrieval itself.

However, existing metrics for factual consistency have

clear limitations. Many are **task-specific**, such as NLI-based detectors like FactCC [6] and SummaC [7] for summarization. Others **rely on heuristic or synthetically generated training data** [6, 8], which can limit their applicability. Furthermore, many produce **uncalibrated confidence scores** that are hard to interpret [5], making them a poor fit for applications that need a “reject option” [1].

In this work, we present a principled framework for building and evaluating a reliable hallucination detector. Our system, **HALT-RAG**, is built on a universal feature set derived from a **dual-NLI predictor ensemble** and simple lexical signals. This combined signal is fed into a **calibrated meta-classifier**. By training with an **out-of-fold (OOF) strategy** and applying **post-hoc calibration** [10, 13], we obtain well-calibrated confidence estimates that enable precise, policy-driven decisions.

Our main contributions are:

1. We demonstrate that an ensemble of frozen, off-the-shelf NLI models, combined with simple lexical statistics, forms a powerful and efficient universal feature set. This serves as a strong input to a lightweight, task-adapted classifier, avoiding the need to fine-tune large language models.
2. We introduce a principled evaluation protocol using out-of-fold prediction and post-hoc calibration to produce reliable, unbiased performance estimates suitable for deploying safety-critical systems.
3. We show that our framework, pairing a universal feature set with a task-adapted classifier and a precision-constrained thresholding policy (Precision ≥ 0.70), achieves strong performance on the diverse tasks within the HALUEVAL benchmark.

2 Related Work

2.1 Hallucination in NLP Tasks

Hallucination is a well-documented problem across several NLP domains.




Figure 1: Performance of HALT-RAG on the **Summarization** task. The markers on the PR/ROC curves show the operating point at the chosen threshold ($t^* = 0.377$). The strong calibration (c) and graceful trade-off between precision/F1 and coverage (d) highlight the model’s reliability.

2.1.1 Abstractive Summarization

In abstractive summarization, models are highly prone to generating unfaithful content [2, 9]. Maynez et al. [9] reported that on the XSum dataset, over 70% of single-sentence summaries contain hallucinations. Early work to detect these inconsistencies involved NLI-based detectors like FactCC [6] and SummaC [7], which frame the problem as an entailment task. SummaC noted that prior models often failed because of a “mismatch in input granularity” between sentence-level NLI datasets and document-level consistency checking [7]. At the same time, QA-based metrics like QAGS [11] and FEQA [2] have shown stronger correlation with human judgments than simple lexical over-

lap.

2.1.2 Knowledge-Grounded Dialogue

In dialogue systems, a common failure is the production of “unsupported utterances,” or hallucinations [3]. Dziri et al. found that many conversational datasets contain hallucinations and introduced **FaithDial**, a benchmark designed to mitigate this issue [3]. FaithDial also provides training signals for hallucination critics, like FAITHCRITIC, to help discriminate utterance faithfulness. Honovich et al. [4] proposed **Q2**, a QA-inspired metric that compares answer spans using NLI instead of token matching, making it more robust to lexical variation.




Figure 2: Performance of HALT-RAG on the **Question Answering** task. The detector achieves near-perfect discrimination, with its chosen threshold ($t^* = 0.395$) operating at very high precision and recall. The extremely low ECE of 0.005 indicates excellent calibration.

2.1.3 Open-Domain Question Answering

In QA, models need to know “when to abstain from answering” to avoid providing incorrect information, especially under domain shift [5]. Kamath et al. [5] showed that policies based on simple softmax probabilities perform poorly because models are often **overconfident on out-of-domain inputs**, highlighting the need for robust calibration.

2.1.4 Hallucination Evaluation Benchmarks

HALUEVAL [8] is a key recent benchmark that includes a “large collection of generated and human-annotated hallucinated samples” for summarization, QA, and dialogue. Its

multi-task, human-annotated nature makes it an ideal platform for evaluating general-purpose detectors like HALT-RAG.

2.2 Contemporary Approaches to Hallucination in RAG

Recent work (late 2023-2024) has explored methods more deeply integrated into the RAG process itself. Some approaches perform real-time hallucination detection to dynamically alter the generation process, while others analyze the internal states of the generator model for consistency. Another line of research focuses on making RAG systems robust to the noisy or irrelevant context often re-




Figure 3: Performance of HALT-RAG on the **Dialogue** task. This task is the most challenging due to conversational nuances, but the model still maintains strong, well-calibrated performance at its chosen threshold ($t^* = 0.421$).

turned by the retriever module. In contrast to these more integrated approaches, HALT-RAG is designed as a complementary, retrieval-agnostic, **post-hoc verifier**. Its strength lies in its ability to serve as a robust final check in any RAG pipeline, regardless of the retrieval or generation strategy.

2.3 Factual Verification and Selective Answering

The "reject option" allows a model to abstain when its confidence is low [5]. This idea, formalized by Chow (1970), converts potential misclassifications into rejections [1]. For this to work well, models must provide **well-calibrated confidence estimates**. Post-hoc calibration methods [12, 13], such as Platt scaling for SVMs [10],

are crucial for turning raw model outputs into reliable probabilities that enable dependable abstention decisions.

3 Methodology

The HALT-RAG pipeline has three stages: feature extraction, meta-classification, and calibration.

3.1 Model Architecture

NLI and Lexical Features. We segment the source and generated text into premise-hypothesis pairs using a **non-overlapping window** of 320 tokens with a stride of 320. Each pair is scored by two

frozen NLI models: `roberta-large-mnli` and `microsoft/deberta-v3-large`. We chose this ensemble to leverage their architectural diversity. RoBERTa is a highly optimized BERT-style model, while DeBERTa’s disentangled attention mechanism separates content and position embeddings. We hypothesized that combining these distinct approaches would yield a more robust semantic signal, which was validated by our ablation study (Table 2). These windowed NLI probabilities are then summarized using **max and mean pooling** and concatenated with lightweight lexical features, including sequence lengths, length ratios, **ROUGE-L overlap**, and **Jaccard similarity**.

Meta-Classification. This combined feature vector is fed into a simple meta-classifier. While our feature set is designed to be task-agnostic, we found that optimal performance required adapting the classifier to the task. We use a **Logistic Regression** model with balanced class weights for the Summarization and Dialogue tasks. For the Question Answering (QA) task, which exhibited a more linearly separable feature space, a **Linear Support Vector Classifier (LinearSVC)** achieved superior performance. A LinearSVC optimizes a hinge loss to find a max-margin hyperplane, effective for clearly separated data, while Logistic Regression optimizes log-loss for probabilistic outputs. This finding is supported by a t-SNE visualization of the feature space in the Appendix. This task-adapted approach highlights that the nature of hallucination differs across tasks, and the choice of a simple classifier can be tailored to these differences without altering the underlying feature representation.

Calibration Protocol. We use a **5-fold out-of-fold (OOF) training protocol** to generate unbiased predictions for the entire training set. A final calibration model is fit on these OOF predictions. Our choice of method aligns with established best practices: for the QA task’s LinearSVC, we use **Platt scaling** [10], a parametric method well-suited for SVMs. For the other tasks, we use **isotonic regression**, a more powerful non-parametric method that benefits from larger datasets.

3.2 Thresholding and Abstention Strategy

Threshold Optimization. The threshold optimization objective is to find $t^* = \arg \max_t F_1(t)$ subject to $Precision(t) \geq \pi_0$. The final thresholds are $t_{\text{Summ}} = 0.377$, $t_{\text{QA}} = 0.395$, and $t_{\text{Dial}} = 0.421$.

Selective Prediction (Abstention). Because our probabilities are calibrated, we can use a robust abstention mechanism. A user can define a **coverage target (e.g.,**

90%) and apply a stricter threshold to reject predictions that fall into an uncertainty band, trading a small amount of coverage for a significant gain in precision.

4 Experiments and Analysis

4.1 Experimental Setup

We evaluate HALT-RAG on the **HALUEVAL** benchmark [8] for Summarization, QA, and Dialogue. All reported metrics are computed on the **out-of-fold predictions** from our 5-fold cross-validation setup, ensuring evaluation is performed on data unseen by each fold-specific model.

4.2 Main Results

As shown in Table 1, HALT-RAG performs well across the board. It is exceptionally strong on QA, with an F_1 -score of **0.9786**, and also robust on the more challenging Summarization and Dialogue tasks. The calibration plots (Figures 1 to 3) show a **low Expected Calibration Error (ECE)** across all tasks (0.011 for Summarization, 0.005 for QA, and 0.013 for Dialogue), which confirms the reliability of its confidence scores.

Table 1: Main performance metrics on the HaluEval benchmark (Out-of-Fold), optimized for F_1 with Precision ≥ 0.70 .

Task	Threshold	Precision	Recall	F_1 -Score	Accuracy
Summarization	0.377	0.7122	0.8514	0.7756	0.7537
QA	0.395	0.9838	0.9735	0.9786	0.9788
Dialogue	0.421	0.7059	0.7756	0.7391	0.7262

4.3 Ablation Studies

We ran ablation experiments on the Summarization development set (Table 2). The results show how much each component contributes:

- Removing the **contradiction or entailment signals** from the NLI models drops the F_1 -score by **2.1 and 4.5 points**, respectively.
- Removing the **lightweight lexical features** hurts performance by **1.3 points**.
- Using just a **single NLI model (DeBERTa)** reduces the F_1 -score by **1.8 points** compared to the full ensemble.

These results confirm that each component of our architecture is essential for its performance. The fact that removing the entailment signal has a greater impact suggests that positively identifying supporting evidence is a more

critical signal for factuality than merely detecting contradictions. However, this finding may also be an artifact of the HALUEVAL dataset itself, where it may be more common for models to generate plausible but unsupported statements (lacking entailment) than direct logical contradictions.

Table 2: Ablation experiments on the HaluEval Summarization development set.

Model Variant	Precision	Recall	F_1 -Score
Full HALT-RAG model	0.705	0.844	0.768
– without Contradiction Signal	0.673	0.839	0.747
– without Entailment Signal	0.651	0.810	0.723
– without Lexical Features	0.694	0.831	0.755
Single NLI (DeBERTa only)	0.691	0.820	0.750

4.4 Impact of Abstention

Our model’s calibration enables effective selective prediction. As shown in Table 3, by **abstaining on the 10% of examples with the lowest confidence**, we can significantly increase precision with only a minor dip in the F_1 -score. For Summarization, precision jumps by **8.6 points** (from 0.712 to 0.798); for Dialogue, by **7.7 points** (from 0.706 to 0.783); and for QA, it improves from 0.984 to **0.998**. This shows the practical value of the reject option for high-stakes applications.

5 Discussion and Future Work

Failure Analysis. The model’s near-perfect performance on QA is likely due to the task’s nature: QA pairs are often short, self-contained, and have low semantic ambiguity. In contrast, the Dialogue task is the most challenging (F_1 of **0.7391**). This performance gap can be directly attributed to the limitations of our fixed-windowing approach. While a 320-token window is sufficient for self-contained QA pairs, it is inherently incapable of capturing the long-range context, coreferences, and pragmatic effects required to verify factuality in multi-turn dialogue.

Limitations. Our study has several limitations that provide clear avenues for future work. First, while our feature set is shared across tasks, optimal performance required task-adapted meta-classifiers and decision thresholds, indicating the final system is task-adapted rather than universally generalizable. Second, our feature extraction relies on non-overlapping 320-token windows, which cannot detect inconsistencies that span window boundaries. Third, our validation is confined to the HALUEVAL benchmark. More critically, we identify two further limitations:

- **Computational Cost and Latency:** We do not analyze the computational overhead of HALT-RAG. Running two large transformer models across multiple windows can introduce significant latency, a trade-off for accuracy that could be a consideration for real-time applications.
- **Robustness to Noisy Retrieval:** Our system was evaluated on HALUEVAL’s clean, relevant source documents. Its performance against noisy or irrelevant retrieved context—a primary challenge in real-world RAG—is an important and unevaluated area for future work.

Ethical Considerations. For sensitive applications, we recommend using **conservative decision thresholds** and keeping a **human-in-the-loop** for low-confidence predictions.

Future Work. Future research could incorporate more sophisticated semantic features, such as **entity linking and relation extraction**, to better ground the detector in real-world facts. A critical next step for this line of work is to integrate and evaluate detectors like HALT-RAG within a live RAG pipeline to measure its resilience to **noisy or irrelevant retrieved context**, which is a key challenge in production systems.

6 Conclusion

We presented HALT-RAG, a **task-adaptable framework for hallucination detection** that combines a dual-NLI ensemble, lexical features, and a calibrated meta-classifier. Our approach delivers high-precision, reliable performance on the HALUEVAL benchmark. Through a principled thresholding strategy and an effective abstention mechanism, HALT-RAG provides a practical tool for improving the factuality and safety of modern generative NLP systems. All artifacts are released to ensure reproducibility.

References

- [1] C. K. Chow. 1970. [On optimum recognition error and reject tradeoff](#). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 16(1):41–46.
- [2] Esin Durmus, He He, and Mona Diab. 2020. [FEQA: A question answering evaluation framework for faithfulness assessment in abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5055–5070, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Table 3: Performance with and without abstention. At $\sim 90\%$ coverage, precision is substantially improved.

Task	Setting	Coverage (%)	Precision	F_1 -Score
Summarization	Standard	100.0	0.7122	0.7756
	Selective	89.4	0.7980	0.7820
QA	Standard	100.0	0.9838	0.9786
	Selective	90.6	0.9980	0.9800
Dialogue	Standard	100.0	0.7059	0.7391
	Selective	90.2	0.7830	0.7240

- [3] Nouha Dziri, Ehsan Kamalloo, Sivan Milton, Omar Zaiane, Mo Yu, Edoardo M. Ponti, and Siva Reddy. 2022. [FaithDial: A Faithful Benchmark for Information-Seeking Dialogue](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:1473–1490.
- [4] Or Honovich, Leshem Choshen, Roei Aharoni, Elad Neeman, Idan Szpektor, and Omri Abend. 2021. [Q²: Evaluating factual consistency in knowledge-grounded dialogues via question generation and question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7856–7870, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [5] Amita Kamath, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. 2020. [Selective question answering under domain shift](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5674–5688, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [6] Wojciech Kryściński, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2020. [Evaluating the factual consistency of abstractive text summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9334–9346, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [7] Philippe Laban, Tobias Schnabel, Paul N. Bennett, and Marti A. Hearst. 2022. [SummaC: Re-Visiting NLI-based Models for Inconsistency Detection in Summarization](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:163–177.
- [8] Junyi Li, Xiaoxue Cheng, Xin Zhao, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. [HaluEval: A large-scale hallucination evaluation benchmark for large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6494–6512, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [9] Joshua Maynez, Shashi Narayan, Bernd Bohnet, and Ryan McDonald. 2020. [On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1906–1919, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [10] John C. Platt. 1999. Probabilistic outputs for support vector machines and comparisons to regularized likelihood methods. Technical report, Microsoft Research. Published in *Advances in Large Margin Classifiers*.
- [11] Alex Wang, Kyunghyun Cho, and Mike Lewis. 2020. [Asking and answering questions to evaluate the factual consistency of summaries](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5008–5020, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [12] Bianca Zadrozny and Charles Elkan. 2001. Obtaining calibrated probability estimates from decision trees and naive bayesian classifiers. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 609–616.
- [13] Bianca Zadrozny and Charles Elkan. 2002. [Transforming classifier scores into accurate multiclass probability estimates](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 694–699.

A Reproducibility

All code, data processing scripts, and evaluation logic required to reproduce the results in this paper are available in the public GitHub repository: <https://github.com/sgoswami06/halt-rag/>. The following sections provide detailed instructions and specifications.

A.1 Execution Commands

Assuming the repository has been cloned and all dependencies from ‘requirements.txt’ have been installed in a suitable Python environment, the main results reported in Table 1 can be reproduced by executing the top-level Makefile targets. Each command runs the full pipeline: feature extraction, OOF training, calibration, and evaluation for the specified task.

```
# To reproduce Summarization results
make eval-summarization

# To reproduce Question Answering results
make eval-qa

# To reproduce Dialogue results
make eval-dialogue
```

A.2 Hyperparameters

The meta-classifiers were implemented using `scikit-learn`. Key hyperparameters for each task are detailed in Table 4. The regularization strength was left at the library’s default value of $C = 1.0$ for all models.

Table 4: Meta-classifier hyperparameters for each task.

Hyperparameter	Summarization	QA	Dialogue
Model Type	Logistic Regression	LinearSVC	Logistic Regression
Regularization (C)	1.0	1.0	1.0
Class Weight	‘balanced’	‘balanced’	‘balanced’
Calibration	Isotonic Regression	Platt Scaling	Isotonic Regression

A.3 Artifact Inventory

The execution of each make command generates a set of artifacts in the `evaluation_results/<task_name>/` directory. The key output files are:

- `_oof_calibrated_pred.jsonl`: Contains the full set of out-of-fold predictions. Each line is a JSON object with keys such as `id`, `raw_score` (from the base model), `calibrated_prob` (the final probability), and `label`.
- `_oof_meta.json`: A summary file containing the final aggregate metrics. The values for Precision, Recall, F_1 -Score, and the optimized Threshold reported in Table 1 are located in this file under keys like `precision_at_prec_ge_0.70` and `f1_at_prec_ge_0.70`.
- `plots/`: A directory containing all figures shown in the paper, including Precision-Recall, ROC, Calibration, and Risk-Coverage curves.

A.4 Sanity Checks

- **Data Purity:** The out of fold protocol is implemented using `sklearn.model_selection.KFold`. Critically the entire feature generation process is completed *before* the cross-validation loop begins. This design choice is the primary safeguard against data leakage, as it ensures that each fold’s model is trained on a completely disjoint set of indices from its validation set, with no possibility of information from the validation data influencing feature creation.
- **Class Balance:** The HaluEval dataset provides reasonably balanced classes for each task, making metrics like Accuracy and F_1 -score appropriate for evaluation.
- **Calibration Monotonicity:** The generated calibration plots (Figures 1 to 3) confirm that the isotonic and Platt scaling steps produce monotonically increasing functions, mapping raw scores to well-behaved probabilities as expected.