

# Black-Box Hallucination Detection via Consistency Under the Uncertain Expression

Seongho Joo, Kyungmin Min, Jahyun Koo, Kyomin Jung

Seoul National University

{seonghojoo, kyungmin97, koojahyun, kjung}@snu.ac.kr

## Abstract

Despite the great advancement of Language modeling in recent days, Large Language Models (LLMs) such as GPT3 are notorious for generating non-factual responses, so-called "hallucination" problems. Existing methods for detecting and alleviating this hallucination problem requires external resource or the internal state of LLMs, such as the output probability of each token. Given the LLM's restricted external API availability and the limited scope of external resources, there is an urgent demand to establish the Black-Box approach as the cornerstone for effective hallucination detection. In this work, we propose a simple black-box hallucination detection metric after the investigation of the behavior of LLMs under expression of uncertainty. Our comprehensive analysis reveals that LLMs generate consistent responses when they present factual responses while non-consistent responses in vice-versa. Based on the analysis, we propose an efficient black-box hallucination detection metric with the expression of uncertainty. The experiment demonstrates that our metric is more predictive of the factuality in model response than baselines that use internal knowledge of LLMs.

**Keywords:** Factuality, Hallucination, LLMs

## 1. Introduction

In recent days, Large Language Models (LLMs) have made great progress in natural language generation. Based on a vast amount of training corpus, they have shown remarkable performance in open-domain QA, abstractive summarization, and machine translation (Goyal et al., 2023; Ouyang et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023).

To detect and mitigate the hallucination problem, many hallucination detection methods rely on external resources (Shuster et al., 2021; Ji et al., 2022; Guerreiro et al., 2022) or require internal state of LLMs like probability per output token (Azaria and Mitchell, 2023; Kuhn et al., 2023), and few black-box methods that only require the response of LLMs are proposed (Manakul et al., 2023; Cohen et al., 2023). However, we often do not have access to the internal information of LLMs or external sources but only their generated output. Furthermore, external knowledge sources like Wikipedia may not cover sufficient knowledge to answer the question. It is also reported that using the retriever model for question answering may worsen the performance when dealing with factual knowledge in long-tail (Mallen et al., 2023).

Previous black-box hallucination detection methods rely on obtaining around ten LLM responses for successful detection (Manakul et al., 2023). These sampling-based methods come with significant computational costs and can pose challenges in determining the appropriate sampling temperature for detection. However, our approach necessitates just a single extra model inference.

In this work, we aim to develop an efficient prompt-based hallucination detection method that




Figure 1: Example of prompt-based hallucination detection without an external source. Given the question, the expression of uncertainty is used as the prefix for the answer part. The answer before the prompt perturbation and the response with the new prompt are compared.

does not require multiple sampling of responses. We explore prompts with expressions that can **discriminate** between factual responses and non-factual responses generated by LLMs as shown in Figure 1. Motivated by the fact that humans express their level of confidence when answering questions, our preliminary study examines what happens when LLMs express their level of confidence in their answers. Therefore, we investigate the following question: "Do LLMs behave consistently or differently under expression of uncertainty when they know the answer?". To answer this question, we gather expressions of uncertainty such as "I am not sure but it could be" and expressions of certainty, such as "It must be." These expressions serve as prompts for our investigation like Figure 1. Through the experiment, we aim to answer the following question:

- Do LLMs generate consistent responses under

uncertain or certain expressions?

- Is there a difference in terms of response accuracy or confidence of LLMs between when the model answers with uncertain expression and certain expression?

In Section 3, we conduct a comprehensive analysis regarding the questions on two open-domain question answering (QA) benchmarks, HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018), and NQ-open (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) in the closed-book setting. We evaluate the performance of GPT-3 `text-davinci-003` in a zero-shot manner and divide the (question, answer) pair into two groups. Specifically, we divide the samples into the factual group and the non-factual group based on the factuality of the original response before the prompt perturbation. In both datasets, there is a clear distinction between the two groups when the expression of uncertainty is used. Most samples in the factual group show consistency in the response, while samples of the non-factual group often show inconsistency in the response after the prompt is changed. In addition, we also find the number of samples that show consistency differs not much in the response between when uncertain expression and certainty are used.

Based on our findings, we propose a simple hallucination detection metric using only a few number of responses of LLMs in Section 4. Specifically, we utilize the consistency between the response generated using the standard prompt and the response generated using a prompt that includes an uncertain expression. Unlike previous detection metrics, our metric does not require the internal state of LLMs nor multiple responses through multiple sampling. The experiment demonstrates that our metric efficiently distinguishes factual answers compared to the baseline that requires internal knowledge of LLMs.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. Large Language Models

Large Language Models (LLMs) are pre-trained on massive amounts of text corpora, and this pre-training equips LLMs with powerful text generation capabilities and zero-shot abilities. (Brown et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2022; Chowdhery et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023). Through instruction tuning and reinforcement learning, such as reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF), LLMs demonstrate better alignment with user intent, resulting in improved zero-shot abilities and in-context learning (Ouyang et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022; Longpre et al., 2023; Chung et al., 2022). Additionally, instruction tuning enhances LLMs' proficiency in user interactions, leading to the emer-

gence of practical models (Liu et al., 2023; OpenAI, 2023; Chiang et al., 2023). However, practical LLMs need to be improved in detecting hallucinations due to the constraints of external APIs, which hinder the devise of hallucination detection methods relying on LLMs' internal states (Azaria and Mitchell, 2023; Kuhn et al., 2023). Our work proposes a black-box hallucination detection method that distinguishes factual answers more effectively than previous methods without requiring access to the internal states of LLMs.

### 2.2. Hallucination Detection of Large Language models

One way for detecting hallucinations involves using external sources (e.g., Wikipedia) to evaluate whether the generated text contains non-factual information (Thorne et al., 2018; Augenstein et al., 2019; Shuster et al., 2021; Ji et al., 2022; Guerreiro et al., 2022). Another approach is to detect hallucinations by leveraging the internal state of LLMs. The internal state of LLMs, such as output token-level probabilities, enables the derivation of a confidence score for assessing hallucination (Mielke et al., 2022; Kadavath et al., 2022; Varshney et al., 2023; Xiao and Wang, 2021; Malinin and Gales, 2021). However, applying external references have limitation in real-world scenarios due to their inability to cover all factual knowledge, and obtaining LLMs' internal states is challenging due to limited API functionalities. To address these issues, some black-box methods overcome these limitations by relying solely on samples generated by LLMs. Cohen et al. (2023) detect factual errors by cross-examining responses generated by two LLMs in a multi-turn interaction. Manakul et al. (2023) propose that LLMs generate multiple samples and evaluate the consistency of these samples as a basis for hallucination detection. These methods, however, have a drawback in terms of inference cost due to using multiple samples and the challenge of identifying an appropriate sampling method for detection. Our hallucination metric doesn't necessitate multiple responses. All we need is a single, standard response and a response that expresses certainty.

### 2.3. Uncertainty Estimation for Large Language models

The concept of uncertainty in a prediction can be thought of as the entropy of the output distribution. For sequence prediction tasks like natural language generation (NLG), token probabilities given past tokens have been used to represent model certainty. Further studies in uncertainty estimation categorize sources of uncertainty into aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty, from underlying data distribution

Group	Factual	Non-Factual	Total
log probability	-0.128	-0.280	-0.228
Entropy	+0.160	+0.343	+0.280

(a) HotpotQA

Group	Factual	Non-Factual	Total
log probability	-0.127	-0.220	-0.172
Entropy	0.163	0.274	0.217

(b) NQ-open

Table 1: Statistics of model reference. The results are broken by the factuality of the model reference.

Expression Type	Template
Uncertainty	I am not sure but it could be
Uncertainty	I would need to double check but maybe it is
Certainty	It must be
Certainty	Undoubtedly it is

Table 2: Expressions for the prompt construction

and from missing information, respectively (Kendall and Gal, 2017; Hüllermeier and Waegeman, 2021). These uncertainties could be leveraged for decoding strategies, controllable generation, and evaluation of decisions under uncertainty (Baan et al., 2023). Recently, uncertainty measures for semantics have been studied, addressing the challenges of free-form NLGs (Kuhn et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023).

### 3. The Impact of Uncertainty and Certainty on Question Answering

In this section, we thoroughly analyze the behavior of LLMs under uncertain or certain expressions.

#### 3.1. Experimental Setting

**Benchmark** We evaluate `text-davinci-003` model on two closed-book QA datasets, HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018) and NQ-open (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019). We filtered out comparative questions such as "Who was born first, Kiefer Sutherland or Christian Slater?" since the model may answer correctly in coincidence. In addition, we excluded questions where the correct answer depends on the time, such as "What is the correct OS version of Apple IOS?". We use a subset of the development split of HotpotQA with 1000 questions, and NQ-open with 997 questions.

**Annotation** First, we obtain the reference response of LLMs subject to the test of factuality. Here factuality means that the statements are grounded in valid sources like ground truth answers or external resources on the Web<sup>1</sup>. We generate responses through greedy decoding with temperature=0.0. Obtaining the factuality label using an automatic score such as the ROUGE score (Lin,

<sup>1</sup>If the ground truth answer contradicts to external resource in the Web, we discard the QA sample

2004) results in noisy labels. Therefore, we manually annotate the factuality label.

To minimize the annotation work, we utilize the Natural language inference (NLI) model. The NLI model (He et al., 2023) outputs the logit value for entailment, neutral, and contradiction classes given two inputs of sentences. We filtered out a pair of samples whose neutral logit class is the highest and annotated the factuality of the response separately. For HotpotQA, 34.5% of total samples are annotated as the factual class, and 54.43% of the NQ benchmark are annotated as the factual class.

For the new prompt, we use the uncertainty expressions and certainty expressions in Table 2. We construct the new prompt as Question:{question}. Answer:{Expression}.

With the new prompt of (un)certainly expression, we annotate two labels for each generated response. First, we check the consistency between the reference model response with the standard prompt and the response with the new prompt that includes (un)certain expressions. Second, the factuality of the response for the new prompt is also annotated. Annotators are guided to label two responses as consistent if two responses are "partially" consistent, even though two responses do not convey exactly the same meaning.

**Metric** We evaluate the following metrics for the evaluation:

- **Accuracy:** The percentage of factual response with the new prompt based on the expression of (un)certainly
- **Consistency:** We evaluate the percentage of samples that generate consistent responses compared to model references. The percentage is evaluated within each group: the factual group (**F**) and the non-factual group (**NF**).
- $\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ : First, we compute the length-normalized probability of model reference ( $p_1$ ) and the response with the new prompt ( $p_2$ ). Then, we evaluate the log probability ratio, which is defined as  $\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ . The ratio reflects the change in the confidence of the model response.
- **Entropy  $\mathcal{H}$ :** Entropy of model responses with each expression prompt is estimated using  $n =$

Expression	Accuracy (%)	Consistency(F, %)	Consistency(NF, %)	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (F)	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (NF)	Entropy
It must be	36.7	82.8	32.9	-0.132	-0.112	0.421
Undoubtedly it is	35.8	90.4	42.8	-0.148	-0.144	0.438
I am not sure but it could be	36.3	87.53	45.19	-0.112	-0.173	0.462
I would need to double check but maybe it is	35.0	86.12	46.3	-0.193	-0.212	0.528

(a) HotpotQA

Expression	Accuracy (%)	Consistency(F, %)	Consistency(NF, %)	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (F)	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (NF)	Entropy
It must be	58.1	88.9	40.9	-0.172	-0.183	0.429
Undoubtedly it is	57.2	90.1	46.2	-0.182	-0.184	0.439
I am not sure but it could be	58.3	90.3	43.28	-0.149	-0.228	0.415
I would need to double check but maybe it is	54.2	88.4	48.4	-0.190	-0.250	0.458

(b) NQ-open

Table 3: Results of Accuracy, Consistency, Log probability ratio, and Entropy on the two benchmarks. **(F)** denotes the Factual group and **(NF)** denotes the non factual group.

10 samples. Entropy reflects the uncertainty of LLMs.

**Statistics of Model Reference** For HotpotQA, 346 samples out of 1000 samples are annotated as factual samples, and 260 samples are annotated as factual samples for the NQ-open benchmark. For HotpotQA, the average confidence of the LLM on the response is  $-0.228$  and  $-0.172$  for NQ-open. Finally, the average response entropy of HotpotQA is 0.281 and 0.217 for NQ-open. The statistics are shown in Table 1.

## 3.2. Results

### 3.2.1. Expression of Uncertainty vs Certainty

Surprisingly, the expression of uncertainty and certainty both lead to an improvement in the accuracy of the response as shown in Table 9, given that 34.5% and 54.43 % percent of samples are factual class in HotpotQA and NQ-open. We find that the expression of uncertainty does not necessarily lead to the increment of uncertainty in LLMs. For the NQ-open benchmark, the expression of certainty leads to more entropy than the expression "I am not sure but it could be". Moreover, the expression certainty results in the increment of entropy without the expression (Table 1).

### 3.2.2. Consistency

**Consistency of LLMs under (un)certainly** On both of the two benchmarks, there exists a clear difference between the factual group and the non-factual group. The factual group generates consistent responses regardless of the expression used for the new prompt. Surprisingly, there is no clear difference in consistency between when a certain expression is used and when an uncertain expression is used. This result gives rise to the previous report that LLMs are poorly calibrated with respect to the expression of uncertainty or certainty (Zhou

et al., 2023). More than half of the nonfactual group shows inconsistency in their response. In particular, only 32.9% of the samples in the nonfactual group generate consistent responses with the expression "It must be". Another noticeable thing is that, for the numerical question like "How many acts is the ballet Rita Sangalli premiered in, in the year 1876?", the most of samples in the non-factual group show inconsistency.

**Consistency and Change in Confidence** We break down the result of the log probability ratio into consistent and non-consistent groups.

Expression	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (Con)	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (Non-Con)
It must be	-0.090	-0.149
Undoubtedly it is	-0.130	-0.156
I am not sure ~	-0.193	-0.123
I would need to double check ~	-0.229	-0.190

(a) HotpotQA

Expression	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (Con)	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (Non-Con)
It must be	-0.167	-0.175
Undoubtedly it is	-0.165	-0.176
I am not sure ~	-0.228	-0.145
I would need to double check ~	-0.238	-0.186

(b) NQ-open

Table 4: Log probability ratio results. **(Con)** denotes the consistent group and **(Non-Con)** denotes the non-consistent group.

The results are shown in Table 4. Although the proportion of consistent samples is similar when using the expression of uncertainty and certainty (Table 9), the log probability ratio differs notably between the two expression types. For the consistent group, the usage of uncertain expression leads to more confidence drop (i.e., drop in the  $\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$  than the certainty expression). However, there is no clear difference in confidence drop in the non-consistent group. We speculate that the expression of uncertainty maintains a similar portion of the consistent group compared to the expression of cer-

tainty since the probability mass is distributed more *evenly* to the other answer candidates. Therefore, model reference with standard prompting which is a gold answer still remains through the greedy decoding.

Expression	Entropy(Non-Con)	Entropy(Con)	$\Delta$
It must be	0.502	0.330	0.172
Undoubtedly it is	0.543	0.363	0.180
I am not sure ~	0.704	0.405	0.299
I would need to double check ~	0.715	0.405	0.300

(a) HotpotQA

Expression	Entropy(Non-Con)	Entropy(Con)	$\Delta$
It must be	0.537	0.376	0.161
Undoubtedly it is	0.549	0.370	0.179
I am not sure ~	0.571	0.336	0.235
I would need to double check ~	0.615	0.396	0.219

(b) NQ-open

Table 5: Entropy results broken by the consistency. **(Con)** denotes the consistent group and **(Non-Con)** denotes the non-consistent group.  $\Delta$  denotes the difference in entropy between the two groups.

We evaluate the entropy per each expression and split down the result into the consistent and non-consistent groups as shown in Table 5. From the table, we can see the expression of uncertainty leads to more entropy compared to a certain one. In particular, the expression "I would need to double check ~" results in the entropy of 0.715 for the non-consistent group while 0.405 for the consistent group.

<p><b>Question:</b>What was the profession of elder brother who born on January 24, 1984?</p> <p><b>Gold Answer :</b> American professional boxer</p> <p><b>Model output (before):</b> Lawyer</p> <p><b>Model output (after):</b> <b>It must be</b> impossible to answer this question without more information.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b> The Indigenous Team of the Century's coach played over how many games at senior level?</p> <p><b>Gold Answer :</b> 400</p> <p><b>Model output (before):</b> 250</p> <p><b>Model output (after):</b> <b>Undoubtedly it is</b> impossible to answer this question as the Indigenous Team of the Century is a team of players from different eras and backgrounds.</p>

Figure 2: Examples of "I can not answer" type model responses. The expressions of certainty are marked as the red color.

**Occurrence of "I can not answer " Type Answer**  
With the standard prompting, there are few model

responses that "I can not answer the answer" even if the response is not factual. In addition, there are no responses that request the question to be more detailed. Interestingly, with an expression of certainty, some model responses fall into these types as shown in Figure 2. This type of response appears mainly in the expression of certainty.

Expression	$\log p_1$	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$
It must be	-0.525	0.180
Undoubtedly it is	-0.578	0.205

(a) HotpotQA

Expression	$\log p_1$	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$
It must be	-0.302	-0.09
Undoubtedly it is	-0.298	-0.102

(b) NQ-open

Table 6: Average log probability and log probability ratio in the "I can not answer " type model responses.

We find interesting characteristics of this type of answer. As shown in Table 6, the log probability of model reference in these samples is notably high compared to the average. In addition, the log probability after inserting the expression does not change much and even increases. Especially, for the expression "Undoubtedly it is", the average log probability results in 0.205 in the HoptotQA benchmark. These findings indicate that LLMs are encouraged to generate "I can not answer the answer" under some expression when they are unconfident in answering the question.

### 3.2.3. Factuality and Confidence of LLMs

To study the relation between the factuality and confidence of LLMs, we evaluate the log probability ratio of each sample in the factual and nonfactual groups. The ratio for each group is shown in Table 7 and the distribution is described Figure 3. To quantify the distribution shift, we evaluate the KL divergence between two histograms with the Gaussian smoothing filter.

For both uncertain and certain expressions, the overall probability of the responses with the new prompt decreases significantly. One notable thing is that the use of certainty makes a similar value of log probability ratio between the factual group and the nonfactual group. However, the expression of uncertainty leads to more drop in log probability in the nonfactual group compared to the factual group. This indicates that some examples of non-factual groups behave more sensitively under the expression of uncertainty.




Figure 3: Log probability ratio distribution of non-factual group and factual group in HotpotQA and NQ-open. The distribution for the factual group is denoted as the olive color, and the distribution for the non-factual group is denoted as the blue color.




Figure 4: AUROC bar graph for HotpotQA and NQ-open. The AUROC metric per the expression is plotted.

### 3.2.4. Can we detect confidently nonfactual samples?

Although the majority of the nonfactual group changes their responses with the new prompt of uncertainty or certainty expression, there still exists a large portion of consistently wrong samples. Does this consistent nonfactual group have distinct features from the non-consistent & nonfactual group? To investigate this matter, we exploit the log probability ratio as the metric for detecting nonfactual classes among the consistent group and compute the area under the receiver operator characteristic curve (AUROC) (Figure 4). Mostly the AUROC for the metric log probability ratio remains around 0.5 with the exception of 0.607. This means that the nonfactual samples among consistent groups exhibit similar confidence changes compared to the factual samples, which also indi-

cates that many nonfactual samples are *confidently* generated. Meanwhile, the AUROC for the entropy exhibits high values compared to the previous one. This indicates that the uncertainty of LLMs may be more effective for detecting the nonfactual responses than the confidence of LLMs.

## 4. Black-box Hallucination Detection Metric

Motivated by the observations in the previous section, we present a simple detection metric using the consistency of model response. First, we generate the new response using the template `Question:{question}. Answer:{Expression}` like the previous section. In the next step, using the single NLI model (He et al., 2023), we obtain logit values for three

Expression	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (F)	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (NF)	$\Delta_{ratio}$
It must be	-0.132	-0.112	0.02
Undoubtedly it is	-0.148	-0.144	0.004
I am not sure ~	-0.112	-0.173	-0.061
I would need to ~	-0.193	-0.212	-0.019

(a) HotpotQA

Expression	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (F)	$\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$ (NF)	$\Delta_{ratio}$
It must be	-0.172	-0.183	-0.011
Undoubtedly it is	-0.182	-0.184	-0.002
I am not sure ~	-0.149	-0.228	-0.079
I would need to ~	-0.190	-0.250	-0.09

(b) NQ-open

Table 7: Statistics for the log probability ratio.  $\log \frac{p_2}{p_1}$  denotes the average log probability ratio of the Factual (F) or nonfactual (NF) group.  $\Delta_{ratio}$  denotes the difference between the log probability ratio between the factual group and the nonfactual group.

classes (entailment, neutral, contradiction) with the input of two responses: model reference  $r$  and model response with the new prompt. The input for NLI model constructed as `{Question}{Model reference}[SEP]{Question}{Model response}`. Given model reference  $r$ , we use the difference between the logit for "entailment" and "contradiction" class as the metric:

$$f_{score}(r) = \text{logit}_{\text{contradiction}} - \text{logit}_{\text{entailment}}.$$

As a variant, we adopt ensemble methods. Specifically, We take the minimum of the score using the two expressions (e.g., "I am not sure ~" and "It must be").

$$f_{score2}(r) = \min\{f_{score, exp1}, f_{score, exp2}\}$$

Given that there are many consistently wrong samples, this variant may boost the detection performance.

## 5. Hallucination Detection Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the performance of our detection metric on the full development split of HopotQA with 5949 questions and NQ-open with 3610 questions.

### 5.1. Baseline

We compare our metrics against the baseline related to the uncertainty or confidence of LLMs including log probability of the model response, entropy, semantic entropy, semantic similarity, and SelfCheckGPT in Manakul et al. (2023). **Semantic**

**entropy**<sup>2</sup> uses the semantic equivalence between the generated responses. First, generate  $m$  samples of responses to estimate the entropy. Next, we group semantically equivalent responses using the NLI model. For example, given the question "Where is the capital of France?", the responses "It's Paris" and "Paris, I think" are grouped together. Finally, for the generated group  $C_1, \dots, C_n$ , compute the semantic entropy by merging the probability mass in the same group:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SE} &= - \sum_{i=1}^n p(c_i) \cdot \log p(c_i) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \left( \sum_{s \in c_i} p(s|x) \right) \log \left( \sum_{s \in c_i} p(s|x) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

**Lexical similarity** uses the consistency of the generated responses of LLMs. Generate  $m$  response, then compute the lexical similarity between samples:

$$\text{LS} = \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{n \neq m} \text{sim}(r_m, r_n).$$

We use rouge-L metric for evaluating the lexical similarity between the responses. For the SelfCheckGPT baseline, we choose the NLI version of the model since it shows better performance compared to other SelfCheckGPT versions including BERTscore, unigram probability, and question answering. The probability of the NLI model for the "contradiction" class is utilized as the metric with the input of model reference and sampled answer<sup>3</sup>.

### 5.2. Evaluation Metric

We use two metrics to evaluate the performance of the metric: Area Under the Receiver Operator Characteristic curve (AUROC) and Area Under the Precision-Recall Curve (AUPRC). In both metrics, being closer to the value 1.0 indicates that the metric is a better predictor of factuality.

### 5.3. Results

The AUROC and AUPRC evaluation results are shown in Table 8. For both HotpotQA and NQ-open, our metric outperforms the baselines in predicting whether the response of LLMs to a question are factual. In HotpotQA, our metric with the expression "It must be" demonstrates the best AUROC and AUPRC. Meanwhile, in NQ-open benchmark, our metric with the uncertain expression "I am not

<sup>2</sup>[https://github.com/lorenzkuhn/semantic\\_uncertainty](https://github.com/lorenzkuhn/semantic_uncertainty)

<sup>3</sup>We use the number of samples  $n = 8$  and sampling temperature of  $\tau = 0.5$ .




Figure 5: PR-Curve of detecting and factual and non-factual responses of GPT-3 in HotpotQA and NQ-open.

Method	AUROC	AUPRC
$\log p$	0.739	0.838
Entropy	0.735	0.838
Semantic entropy	0.665	0.774
Lexical similarity	0.700	0.810
SelfCheckGPT(NLI)	0.730	0.837
$f_{certain}$	<b>0.746</b>	<b>0.842</b>
$f_{uncertain}$	0.727	0.839
$f_{ensemble}$	0.717	0.836

(a) HotpotQA

Method	AUROC	AUPRC
$\log p$	0.680	0.680
Entropy	0.681	0.677
Semantic entropy	0.638	0.608
Lexical similarity	0.651	0.647
SelfCheckGPT(NLI)	0.681	0.681
$f_{certain}$	0.723	0.718
$f_{uncertain}$	<b>0.741</b>	<b>0.748</b>
$f_{ensemble}$	0.726	0.739

(b) NQ-open

Table 8: AUROC and AUPRC evaluation of the metrics.  $f_{certain}$  denotes our metric using the certain expression: "It must be",  $f_{uncertain}$  denotes our metric using the uncertain expression: "I am not sure but it could be", and  $f_{ensemble}$  denotes the ensemble method.

sure but it could be" shows the best performance. Notably, methods using the token probability show worse performance compared to HotpotQA, which indicates that the LLM is relatively not well calibrated with NQ-open.

## 6. Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper, we conduct a comprehensive analysis of the behavior of GPT-3 `text-davinci-003`

under expression of uncertainty and certainty and propose a simple black-box hallucination detection metric based on the expression of uncertainty. The primary finding is that the LLM behaves differently under the expression when it generates a factual response and a nonfactual response. In addition, the LLM is *not* linguistically calibrated with respect to the expression of certainty. The certain expression does not improve the accuracy of the response, and it leads to a decrease in the log probability of the response.

Most samples in the factual group show consistency and the majority in the nonfactual group show inconsistency when the new prompt of (un)certainly is used. However, there still exists some sample in the nonfactual group that consistently gives the nonfactual response. This kind of sample makes the hallucination task more challenging since these samples have no distinct feature compared to the factual response. For more successful hallucination detection, we should train the LLM in a manner that assigns low probabilities to non-factual statements.

A critical challenge revealed by our analysis is that LLMs often assign high confidence to responses that are not factually grounded. This occurs because many statements that are *plausible but incorrect* still receive high probability under the model's distribution. To mitigate this issue, a promising direction is to apply *unlikelihood training* (Welleck et al., 2020) as a corrective mechanism. The key idea is to identify nonfactual statements that the LLM tends to generate with high confidence—for example, statements involving entities that are closely related in semantic or relational space—and then penalize these outputs through unlikelihood training. By explicitly discouraging the model from overconfidently producing such plausible but nonfactual responses, this approach can improve factual calibration and contribute to more robust hallucination mitigation strategies.

## 7. Bibliographical References

- Isabelle Augenstein, Christina Lioma, Dongsheng Wang, Lucas Chaves Lima, Casper Hansen, Christian Hansen, and Jakob Grue Simonsen. 2019. MultiFC: A real-world multi-domain dataset for evidence-based fact checking of claims. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4685–4697, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amos Azaria and Tom Mitchell. 2023. The internal state of an Llm knows when its lying.
- Joris Baan, Nico Daheim, Evgenia Ilia, Dennis Ulmer, Haau-Sing Li, Raquel Fernández, Barbara Plank, Rico Sennrich, Chrysoula Zerva, and Wilker Aziz. 2023. Uncertainty in natural language generation: From theory to applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15703*.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%\* chatgpt quality.
- Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanu-malayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. 2022. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. 2022. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*.
- Roi Cohen, May Hamri, Mor Geva, and Amir Globerson. 2023. Lm vs lm: Detecting factual errors via cross examination.
- Tanya Goyal, Junyi Jessy Li, and Greg Durrett. 2023. News summarization and evaluation in the era of gpt-3.
- Nuno M. Guerreiro, Pierre Colombo, Pablo Piantanida, and André Martins. 2022. Optimal transport for unsupervised hallucination detection in neural machine translation. *ArXiv, abs/2212.09631*.
- Pengcheng He, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. DeBERTav3: Improving deBERTa using ELECTRA-style pre-training with gradient-disentangled embedding sharing. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Eyke Hüllermeier and Willem Waegeman. 2021. Aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in machine learning: An introduction to concepts and methods. *Machine Learning*, 110:457–506.
- Ziwei Ji, Zihan Liu, Nayeon Lee, Tiezheng Yu, Bryan Wilie, Mini Zeng, and Pascale Fung. 2022. Rho ( $\rho$ ): Reducing hallucination in open-domain dialogues with knowledge grounding. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, T. J. Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zachary Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, Scott Johnston, Sheer El-Showk, Andy Jones, Nelson Elhage, Tristan Hume, Anna Chen, Yuntao Bai, Sam Bowman, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Danny Hernandez, Josh Jacobson, John Kernion, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Sam Ringer, Dario Amodei, Tom B. Brown, Jack

- Clark, Nicholas Joseph, Benjamin Mann, Sam McCandlish, Christopher Olah, and Jared Kaplan. 2022. Language models (mostly) know what they know. *ArXiv*, abs/2207.05221.
- Alex Kendall and Yarin Gal. 2017. What uncertainties do we need in bayesian deep learning for computer vision? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. 2023. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2302.09664.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhen Lin, Shubhendu Trivedi, and Jimeng Sun. 2023. Generating with confidence: Uncertainty quantification for black-box large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19187*.
- Yiheng Liu, Tianle Han, Siyuan Ma, Jiayue Zhang, Yuanyuan Yang, Jiaming Tian, Hao He, Antong Li, Mengshen He, Zhengliang Liu, Zihao Wu, Lin Zhao, Dajiang Zhu, Xiang Li, Ning Qiang, Dinggang Shen, Tianming Liu, and Bao Ge. 2023. Summary of ChatGPT-related research and perspective towards the future of large language models. *Meta-Radiology*, 1(2):100017.
- Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, and Adam Roberts. 2023. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning.
- Andrey Malinin and Mark Gales. 2021. Uncertainty estimation in autoregressive structured prediction.
- Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories.
- Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark John Francis Gales. 2023. Selfcheckgpt: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.08896.
- Sabrina J. Mielke, Arthur Szlam, Emily Dinan, and Y-Lan Boureau. 2022. Reducing conversational agents’ overconfidence through linguistic calibration. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:857–872.
- OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback.
- Kurt Shuster, Spencer Poff, Moya Chen, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. 2021. Retrieval augmentation reduces hallucination in conversation. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Oana Cocarascu, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. 2018. The fact extraction and VERification (FEVER) shared task. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Fact Extraction and VERification (FEVER)*, pages 1–9, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models.
- Neeraj Varshney, Wenlin Yao, Hongming Zhang, Jianshu Chen, and Dong Yu. 2023. A stitch in time saves nine: Detecting and mitigating hallucinations of llms by validating low-confidence generation.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. 2022. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners.
- Sean Welleck, Ilya Kulikov, Jinsung Kim, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2020. Unlikelihood training for reducing generative uncertainty. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

Yijun Xiao and William Yang Wang. 2021. On hallucination and predictive uncertainty in conditional language generation. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2734–2744, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W. Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.

Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Myle Ott, Sam Shleifer, Kurt Shuster, Daniel Simig, Punit Singh Koura, Anjali Sridhar, Tianlu Wang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models.

Kaitlyn Zhou, Dan Jurafsky, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2023. Navigating the grey area: Expressions of overconfidence and uncertainty in language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2302.13439.

Question	Ground truth	Normal prompt	(Un)certain prompt	$f_{score}$
When was the plaintiff in the 1892 Barbed Wire Patent Case born?	January 18, 1813	1839	I am not sure but it could be 1845	7.64
What is the name of the American author to Grace Nail Johnson who was the first African American executive secretary of NAACP?	James Weldon Johnson	W.E.B. Du Bois	I am not sure but it could be Walter White.	7.83
Which star of Zork was also the voice of Pac-Man?	Martin Ingerman	Ernie Anderson	It must be Peter Cullen, who voiced Pac-Man in the 1982 animated series	8.08
Who was the wife of the United States Army lieutenant general who received the Distinguished Service Cross?	Julia Compton Moore	Mary Louise Hines	It must be Mamie Eisenhower	6.37

(a) Detected as hallucinated samples with a threshold=0.5 (after normalization).

Question	Ground truth	Normal prompt	(Un)certain prompt	$f_{score}$
What is 25 miles south of Groom Lake?	Rachel, Nevada	Rachel, NV	I am not sure but it could be Las Vegas, Nevada.	-6.70
When was Leeds no longer called Elmet?	early 7th century	7th century AD	I am not sure but it could be around the 7th century.	-4.41
Sporobolus and Zea are in the same what?	family	Family	I am not sure but it could be family or genus.	-7.32
What is Opry Mills in Nashville, Tennessee?	super-regional shopping mall	Opry Mills is a large shopping mall in Nashville, Tennessee	It must be a shopping mall.	-7.60

(b) Detected as non-hallucinated samples with a threshold=0.5 (after normalization).

Table 9: Examples of hallucination detection. Blue highlights indicate uncertain responses (*I am not sure*), while red highlights indicate overconfident responses (*It must be*).