

Quantifying Label-Induced Bias in Large Language Model Self- and Cross-Evaluations

Muskan Saraf
Data Science Department
Actual Reality Technologies
Toledo, USA
muskan@actualreality.tech

Sajjad Rezvani Boroujeni
Data Science Department
Actual Reality Technologies
Toledo, USA
sajjad@bgsu.edu

Justin Beaudry
Software Department
Actual Reality Technologies
Toledo, USA
justin@actualreality.tech

Hossein Abedi
Data Science Department
Actual Reality Technologies
Toledo, USA
hossein@actualreality.tech

Tom Bush
CEO
Actual Reality Technologies
Maumee, USA
tom@actualreality.tech

Abstract—Large language models (LLMs) are increasingly used to evaluate outputs, yet their judgments may be influenced. This study examines bias in self- and cross-model evaluations by ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude under four conditions: no labels, true labels, and two false-label scenarios. Blog posts authored by each model were evaluated by all three using both overall preference voting and quality ratings for Coherence, Informativeness, and Conciseness, with all scores expressed as percentages for direct comparison. Results reveal striking asymmetries: the “Claude” label consistently boosts scores, while the “Gemini” label consistently depresses them, regardless of actual content. False labels frequently reversed rankings, producing shifts of up to 50 percentage points in preference votes and up to 12 percentage points in converted quality ratings. Gemini’s self-scores collapsed under true labels, while Claude’s self-preference intensified. These findings show that perceived model identity can heavily distort high-level judgments and subtly influence detailed quality ratings, underscoring the need for blind or multimodel evaluation protocols to ensure fairness in LLM benchmarking.

Index Terms—Large language models, evaluation bias, label effects, blind evaluation, cross-model evaluation, quality assessment

I. INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude are increasingly deployed not only for content generation but also for content evaluation tasks. This dual role raises a critical question: *can LLMs evaluate outputs impartially, or are their judgments influenced by perceived authorship?* Previous studies on automated text evaluation have shown that both humans and models may exhibit systematic bias, often favoring certain sources or stylistic patterns over others [1], [2]. When evaluators are aware of the source, their ratings may be shaped by prior expectations a phenomenon known in human evaluation as source bias [3].

In the context of LLMs, this bias may manifest in two ways: self-preference bias, where a model rates its own outputs higher than others, and label-induced bias, where the presence of a model’s name affects the evaluation regardless of the underlying quality. These effects have been observed in earlier

research on model self-assessment [4], but systematic quantification across different labeling conditions remains limited.

This study investigates these biases by analyzing how three leading LLMs OpenAI’s ChatGPT-4o, Google’s Gemini 2.5 Flash, and Anthropic’s Claude Sonnet 4 evaluate blog posts authored by themselves and by each other under four controlled conditions: no labels, true labels, and two false-label scenarios. By manipulating label visibility and accuracy, we isolate the influence of perceived authorship from that of content quality.

We employ two complementary scoring approaches:

- 1) Percentage-based preference scoring, representing the proportion of “best” choices assigned to each output.
- 2) Point-based quality scoring for Coherence, Informativeness, and Conciseness, later converted to percentages to enable direct comparison with preference scores.

Our findings reveal striking asymmetries. The “Claude” label consistently boosts scores regardless of content, while the “Gemini” label consistently depresses them. False labels frequently reverse rankings, producing swings of up to 50 percentage points in preference scores. In point-based ratings, shifts are smaller (≤ 12 percentage points), with Informativeness most affected and Conciseness largely stable. Claude shows the strongest self-preference, Gemini the highest label sensitivity, and ChatGPT a moderate but consistent penalty toward Gemini under true labels.

This work contributes to the literature on evaluation bias in LLMs by providing:

- A controlled, multi-condition analysis of self- and cross-model evaluation bias.
- Quantitative evidence comparing label effects in both overall preference and detailed quality dimensions.
- Recommendations for mitigating bias through blind or multi-model evaluation protocols.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews related work on bias in automated evaluations. Section III describes our methodology, including generation, evaluation,

and scoring procedures. Section IV presents results across all conditions and scoring methods. Section V discusses implications for LLM benchmarking and bias mitigation. Section VI concludes with recommendations for future research.

II. RELATED WORK

Bias in automated language model evaluation has garnered growing attention in recent years. One line of inquiry emphasizes the self-preference bias exhibited by LLMs when they evaluate content produced by themselves. For instance, Panickssery et al. demonstrate that LLMs not only favor their own outputs but also possess a measurable self-recognition capability models that can better identify their own text tend to exhibit stronger self-preference [5]. Similarly, Wataoka et al. propose a quantitative metric for this effect and show high-performing models exhibit greater self-favoritism tied to familiarity, such as lower perplexity [6].

Complementary to self-preference, label-induced evaluation bias has recently been explored to reveal how LLMs may be swayed by perceived authorship regardless of content. Wang et al. uncover systematic evaluation bias based solely on the position of responses, which can be arbitrarily manipulated to skew model rankings even making Vicuna-13B outperform ChatGPT under certain prompt orderings [7]. Further, Chen et al. investigate whether self-preference reflects actual model superiority or signaling bias, revealing that stronger models often exhibit legitimate self-preference but still display harmful bias in certain scenarios [8].

Beyond these bias dynamics, researchers are also starting to consider how models handle implicit versus explicit evaluations. Zhao et al. propose a self-evaluation framework rooted in social psychology that measures discrepancies between explicit and implicit bias in LLMs showing inconsistency in how models consciously versus unconsciously express bias [9]. Similar concerns emerge in deep learning research [10],[13], where pre-trained and architecture-specific models while achieving remarkable accuracy often inherit systematic biases from their training regimes and structural choices. For instance, transfer learning with EfficientNetV2 has demonstrated high performance in brain tumor detection (98.22%), yet such results highlight how pretrained weights can embed implicit patterns that shape downstream outcomes. Likewise, in lung cancer detection[11], U-Net architectures with CNN backbones have achieved accuracies exceeding 99%, but the reliance on particular architectures illustrates how systematic bias can arise from architectural preferences. Taken together, these examples underscore a broader challenge: deep learning systems, across both language and vision domains, are susceptible to implicit and structural biases that influence evaluation in ways analogous to those observed in LLMs.

Finally, broader surveys of bias in LLMs such as those by Guo et al. categorize bias into intrinsic and extrinsic types and highlight the importance of mitigation strategies across data, model, and output layers [12]. These comprehensive reviews underscore the relevance of our dual-method approach examining both overall preference (percentage votes) and

fine-grained quality criteria (converted point ratings) across controlled labeling experiments.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study investigates label-induced and self-preference bias in large language model (LLM) evaluations using a controlled, multi-model, multi-condition design. The process involved three stages: blog generation, evaluation under manipulated label conditions, and dual-method scoring analysis.

In the first stage, three LLMs ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude were tasked with generating blog posts using a single, fixed prompt template. The prompt was:

“You are a professional blog writer. Write a concise blog post (around 200 words) for the title ‘<insert your title here>’. The style should be engaging and suitable for an online audience. Return only the blog content, no extra text.”

The phrase <insert your title here> was replaced with one of ten distinct titles, each chosen to cover a range of topics while maintaining a similar level of complexity. This ensured thematic diversity while keeping structural requirements identical. Each model generated one blog for each title, resulting in a dataset of 30 blog posts (10 per model).

In the second stage, each model acted as an evaluator, scoring all generated blogs including its own under four controlled labeling conditions: no labels, true labels, and two false-label permutations. In False Label Scenario 1, ChatGPT’s output was labeled as Gemini, Gemini’s as Claude, and Claude’s as ChatGPT. In False Label Scenario 2, ChatGPT’s output was labeled as Claude, Gemini’s as ChatGPT, and Claude’s as Gemini.

Two scoring systems were applied. The percentage-based preference score measured how often each model’s output was chosen as “best” for a given title. The point-based quality score rated Coherence, Informativeness, and Conciseness on a 0–10 scale, later converted to percentages for comparability. Coherence assessed logical flow, informativeness measured richness and relevance, and conciseness evaluated clarity and brevity.

Analyses were conducted at three levels: intra-condition (comparing scores within a labeling condition), cross-condition (tracking score changes across labeling conditions), and metric-specific (examining bias effects on each quality criterion). This design enabled a controlled and reproducible examination of both self-preference and label-induced bias in LLM evaluations.

IV. RESULTS

The results are presented in percentage terms for both evaluation formats: (1) overall preference votes and (2) point-based ratings converted to percentages. This unified scale allows direct comparison of label effects across evaluation methods.

In the no-label condition, all three models displayed mild self-preference in overall preference scores, with ChatGPT selecting its own outputs 50% of the time, Gemini 45.3%,




Fig. 1. Percentage-based overall scores under the *No Label* condition.




Fig. 2. Point-based scores under the *No Label* condition.

and Claude 46.7% as shown in Fig.1. Cross-model scoring showed in Fig. 2 has a consistent undervaluation of Gemini, which received between 7% and 12% from other evaluators. Converted quality ratings revealed the same trend, with Gemini’s informativeness averaging 62–78%, lower than that of ChatGPT and Claude. Claude consistently achieved the highest coherence ratings (86–89%) across evaluators, while conciseness remained stable for all models (81–86%).




Fig. 3. Percentage-based overall scores under the *True Label* condition.




Fig. 4. Point-based scores under the *True Label* condition.

In the true-label condition as shown in Fig. 3, label visibility amplified bias patterns. Claude’s self-score increased to 60%, receiving the highest preference from all evaluators (54–60%), while Gemini’s scores collapsed to 0% from Claude, 1.34% from ChatGPT, and 11.32% from itself. Converted ratings again reflected this Gemini label penalty as shown in Fig. 4, with informativeness in the low 60% range compared to Claude’s 79–88%. ChatGPT’s self-preference was moderate at 44.66%, but it sharply penalized Gemini under true labels.




Fig. 5. Percentage-based overall scores under *False Label Scenario 1* (ChatGPT-as-Gemini, Gemini-as-Claude, Claude-as-ChatGPT).




Fig. 6. Point-based scores under *False Label Scenario 1*.

The false-label conditions revealed the strongest label-induced shifts. In Scenario 1 (ChatGPT-as-Gemini, Gemini-as-Claude, Claude-as-ChatGPT), evaluators consistently favored outputs they believed to be their own as shown in Fig. 5, regardless of true authorship. Gemini’s preference for Claude-as-Gemini rose from 11.32% (true label) to 51.35%, and Claude’s preference for Claude-as-ChatGPT reached 54.15%. Converted ratings mirrored these boosts, particularly in informativeness, which increased by 8–10 percentage points when an output carried a false “own” label as shown in Fig. 6.

In Scenario 2 (ChatGPT-as-Claude, Gemini-as-ChatGPT, Claude-as-Gemini), the “Claude” label produced the highest single score in the dataset, with Gemini awarding 60.7% to ChatGPT-as-Claude. Claude rated ChatGPT-as-Claude at 56.02%, while the “Gemini” label again depressed scores, with Claude-as-Gemini dropping to 18.48% from 60% under true labels as shown in Fig 7. Converted ratings as shown in Fig. 8 confirmed these patterns, with “Claude”-labeled




Fig. 7. Percentage-based overall scores under *False Label Scenario 2* (ChatGPT-as-Claude, Gemini-as-ChatGPT, Claude-as-Gemini).




Fig. 8. Point-based scores under *False Label Scenario 2*.

outputs achieving top coherence (88–89%) and “Gemini”-labeled outputs receiving the lowest ratings (77–82%).

To further isolate the effect of label visibility, we plotted the change in overall judgment relative to the no-label baseline for each evaluator (Figs. 9–11). The y-axis represents the change in raw evaluation scores, while the annotations on the lines indicate the corresponding percentage change. These plots reveal how much evaluators’ preferences shifted once true or false labels were introduced.

For ChatGPT as evaluator Fig. 9, Relative to the no-label baseline, ChatGPT’s own model dropped from 50.0 to 44.66 (-5.3 percentage points) once true labels were revealed, while Claude’s score increased by over +11 percentage points and Gemini fell to nearly zero. Under false label A, ChatGPT’s content mislabeled as Gemini collapsed to 25.84% (-24.2 pp), whereas Claude, mislabeled as ChatGPT, rose to 53.01%, sustaining its advantage through label prestige. In false label B, ChatGPT’s text rebounded strongly when presented under the Claude label (+17 pp), while Claude’s own writing, mislabeled as Gemini, suffered a severe decline (-22 pp). These swings confirm that ChatGPT’s evaluations were primarily label-driven, with consistent penalties for Gemini and consistent boosts for Claude.

For Gemini as evaluator Fig. 10, the no-label baseline showed relatively balanced judgments, but once true labels were exposed, Gemini’s own content declined from 12.0% to 11.32% (-0.7 pp) while Claude surged to 57.68% (+15.0




Fig. 9. Change of judgment relative to No Label baseline for evaluator *ChatGPT*.

pp). Under false label A, the Gemini evaluator assigned its highest score (51.35%) to Gemini’s text mislabeled as Claude, while its own writing relabeled as Claude benefited massively compared to baseline. Conversely, ChatGPT’s content mislabeled as Gemini dropped to 19.35%, revealing how strongly the Gemini label triggered undervaluation. In false label B, Gemini’s writing disguised as ChatGPT reached 20.65% (+8.6 pp), a meaningful improvement, while Claude mislabeled as Gemini collapsed to 18.71% (-39 pp). These patterns show that Gemini as evaluator systematically privileged the Claude label while applying strong penalties to its own.




Fig. 10. Change of judgment relative to No Label baseline for evaluator *Gemini*.

For Claude as evaluator Fig. 11, Claude’s baseline evaluations already favored its own model at 46.7%, but under true labels this preference grew to 60.0% (+13.3 pp), while Gemini was completely eliminated (0%). Under false label A, Claude’s evaluation of mislabeled texts again reflected label prestige: content carrying the Claude label reached 54.15%, regardless of origin, while ChatGPT’s text relabeled as Gemini sank to 20.52%. In false label B, Claude’s writing mislabeled as Gemini was harshly downgraded to 18.48% (-28.2 pp), while ChatGPT’s text disguised as Claude climbed to 56.02% (+12.7 pp). This demonstrates that Claude’s evaluation patterns were highly sensitive to label identity, amplifying the Claude

label advantage while penalizing Gemini regardless of content origin.




Fig. 11. Change of judgment relative to No Label baseline for evaluator *Claude*.

Across evaluators, these baseline-relative plots confirm that label identity, rather than textual quality, is the dominant driver of score variation. The strongest swings were observed in false-label conditions, where evaluators effectively reversed their rankings compared to the no-label baseline, demonstrating the sensitivity of overall judgments to perceived authorship rather than content.

Across conditions, three consistent trends emerged. First, the “Claude” label acted as a strong positive bias cue, while the “Gemini” label consistently triggered negative bias. Second, false labels could entirely reverse rankings in overall preference scores (swings up to 50 percentage points), whereas point-based ratings showed smaller but aligned shifts (≤ 12 percentage points). Third, informativeness was the most label-sensitive dimension, while conciseness remained largely stable. Model-specific patterns also surfaced: Claude showed the strongest self-preference under true labels, Gemini was the most label-sensitive and self-critical, and ChatGPT systematically penalized Gemini outputs under true labels while displaying moderate label sensitivity otherwise.

V. DISCUSSION

The results demonstrate that LLM evaluations are not purely content-driven; they are strongly influenced by perceived authorship. The *Claude* label advantage suggests that certain model identities carry an implicit prestige or quality expectation among evaluators, leading to consistently higher scores regardless of the text’s origin. This aligns with prior findings on source-based credibility effects in human evaluation [1], suggesting that LLMs may internalize similar biases through training data or alignment tuning.

Conversely, the *Gemini* label penalty was evident across all evaluators, producing drastically lower scores even when Gemini-authored content was mislabeled as coming from another model. This asymmetry indicates that label effects are not uniform; some model names appear to trigger systematic undervaluation.

The false-label scenarios reveal a critical vulnerability: label manipulation can fully reverse evaluation rankings. That is, content of unchanged quality can be made to appear vastly better or worse by altering the perceived source. This effect was far more pronounced in overall preference scores than in point-based ratings, implying that high-level “best choice” judgments are more susceptible to bias than detailed assessments of coherence, informativeness, and conciseness.

The change-of-judgment plots (Figs. 9–11) further highlight this vulnerability by showing the relative shifts from the no-label baseline. For ChatGPT as evaluator, Gemini-labeled content under false labels gained as much as +45 points, while genuine ChatGPT text dropped by -30 points. Gemini as evaluator consistently awarded large boosts to “Claude”-labeled text (up to +21 points) while penalizing its own outputs under true labels. Claude as evaluator exhibited the strongest self-preference (+13 points under true labels) but applied severe penalties when its own outputs were mislabeled as Gemini (-28 points). These findings confirm that the identity attached to a text can outweigh its actual quality, producing systematic distortions in judgment.

The finding that informativeness is the most label-sensitive dimension suggests that perceptions of informational value are more subjective and context-dependent than structural qualities like coherence or conciseness. Conciseness’ stability across evaluators and conditions indicates that it may be evaluated more objectively, providing a potentially more reliable criterion in biased settings.

Importantly, the author carefully read through all generated blog posts and found them difficult to rank, underscoring how subtle differences in content are often overshadowed by label-driven perception.

Finally, model-specific behaviors highlight the need for caution in using LLMs as evaluators. Claude’s consistent self-preference under true labels raises fairness concerns in self-judgment contexts. Gemini’s severe self-score drop under true labels suggests an overly harsh self-assessment tendency, potentially indicating excessive internal skepticism. ChatGPT’s targeted penalization of Gemini indicates cross-model bias that could distort benchmarking outcomes.

Taken together, these results suggest that evaluation protocols must explicitly account for label-induced bias. Blind evaluations, where model identity is hidden, reduce distortions by preventing evaluators from anchoring on model names. Multi-model or consensus-based evaluation systems could further mitigate individual model biases, especially when evaluating informativeness. Without such safeguards, LLM benchmarking risks overestimating certain models and systematically undervaluing others based on label perception rather than true content quality.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study provides quantitative evidence that LLM evaluations are heavily shaped by label perception, with the “Claude” label consistently boosting and the “Gemini” label consistently depressing scores across evaluators. While false labels could

swing overall preference by up to 50 percentage points, point-based quality ratings were more resilient, with changes limited to 12 percentage points and most visible in informativeness.

The findings carry clear implications for LLM benchmarking. Blind evaluation protocols where model identity is concealed should be standard practice to minimize label-induced bias. Multi-model or consensus-based evaluation systems may also reduce the influence of individual model biases. Additionally, separating preference judgments from quality dimension ratings could help identify and control for subjective bias, particularly in metrics like informativeness.

Future research should expand beyond three models to assess whether these label effects generalize across a broader set of LLMs, investigate the origins of asymmetric label bias, and explore mitigation strategies such as evaluator fine-tuning or bias-aware scoring adjustments. By addressing these vulnerabilities, the LLM community can move toward more reliable, fair, and transparent evaluation standards.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. van der Lee, A. Gatt, E. van Miltenburg, S. Wubben, and E. Kraemer, "Best practices for the human evaluation of automatically generated text," in *Proc. 12th Int. Conf. Natural Language Generation*, Tokyo, Japan, Oct.–Nov. 2019, pp. 355–368. doi: 10.18653/v1/W19-8643. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/W19-8643/>
- [2] S. Gehrmann, H. Strobelt, and A. M. Rush, "GLTR: Statistical detection and visualization of generated text," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04043*, Jun. 2019. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1906.04043.
- [3] D. Wilson and D. Sperber, "Truthfulness and relevance," *Mind*, vol. 111, no. 443, pp. 583–632, Jul. 2002. doi: 10.1093/mind/111.443.583.
- [4] E. Perez *et al.*, "Discovering language model behaviors with model-written evaluations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09251*, Dec. 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2212.09251.
- [5] A. Panickssery, S. R. Bowman, and S. Feng, "LLM evaluators recognize and favor their own generations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13076*, Apr. 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2404.13076.
- [6] K. Wataoka, T. Takahashi, and R. Ri, "Self-preference bias in LLM-as-a-judge," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21819*, Oct. 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2410.21819.
- [7] P. Wang *et al.*, "Large language models are not fair evaluators," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17926*, Aug. 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2305.17926.
- [8] W.-L. Chen, Z. Wei, X. Zhu, S. Feng, and Y. Meng, "Do LLM evaluators prefer themselves for a reason?," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.03846*, Apr. 2025. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2504.03846.
- [9] Y. Zhao, B. Wang, Y. Wang, D. Zhao, X. Jin, J. Zhang, R. He, and Y. Hou, "A comparative study of explicit and implicit gender biases in large language models via self-evaluation," in *Proc. 2024 Joint Int. Conf. Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, Torino, Italy, May 2024, pp. 186–198.
- [10] A. Golkarieh *et al.*, "Breakthroughs in Brain Tumor Detection: Leveraging Deep Learning and Transfer Learning for MRI-Based Classification," *Computational Demography*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. xx–xx, 2024. doi: 10.59543/comdem.v2i.14243.
- [11] A. Golkarieh, K. Kiashemshaki, S. R. Boroujeni, and N. A. Isakan, "Advanced U-Net Architectures with CNN Backbones for Automated Lung Cancer Detection and Segmentation in Chest CT Images," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09898*, Jul. 2025. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2507.09898.
- [12] Y. Guo *et al.*, "Bias in large language models: Origin, evaluation, and mitigation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.10915*, Nov. 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2411.10915.
- [13] S. Rezvani Boroujeni, H. Abedi, and T. Bush, "Enhancing Glass Defect Detection with Diffusion Models: Addressing Imbalanced Datasets in Manufacturing Quality Control," *Computer and Decision Making (COMDEM)*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. xx–xx, 2025. doi: 10.59543/com-dem.v2i.14391.

APPENDIX A SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

The supplementary materials provide detailed results supporting the main analysis:

- Extended results tables for all evaluators under No Label, True Label, and False Label conditions (Tables A1–A4).
- Point-based scores for Coherence, Informativeness, and Conciseness across all evaluators (Tables A5–A8).
- A methodological note describing how percentage-point changes were calculated from raw scores.

These materials complement the main text by presenting full quantitative details while the paper highlights the central trends.

APPENDIX B EXTENDED RESULTS TABLES

This appendix reports the complete evaluator-level percentage results for all labeling conditions. Each table shows the distribution of "best output" judgments across ChatGPT-4o, Gemini 2.5 Flash, and Claude Sonnet 4.

TABLE I
EVALUATOR SCORES UNDER NO LABEL CONDITION (TABLE A1)

Evaluator	ChatGPT-4o	Gemini 2.5 Flash	Claude Sonnet 4
ChatGPT	50.0	7.3	42.7
Gemini	45.3	12.0	42.7
Claude	43.3	10.0	46.7

TABLE II
EVALUATOR SCORES UNDER TRUE LABEL CONDITION (TABLE A2)

Evaluator	ChatGPT-4o	Gemini 2.5 Flash	Claude Sonnet 4
ChatGPT	44.66	1.34	54.02
Gemini	30.98	11.32	57.68
Claude	40.00	0.00	60.00

TABLE III
EVALUATOR SCORES UNDER FALSE LABEL SCENARIO 1 (CHATGPT → GEMINI, GEMINI → CLAUDE, CLAUDE → CHATGPT) (TABLE A3)

Evaluator	ChatGPT-as-Gemini	Gemini-as-Claude	Claude-as-ChatGPT
ChatGPT	25.84	21.17	53.01
Gemini	19.35	51.35	29.32
Claude	20.52	25.33	54.15

TABLE IV
EVALUATOR SCORES UNDER FALSE LABEL SCENARIO 2 (CHATGPT → CLAUDE, GEMINI → CHATGPT, CLAUDE → GEMINI) (TABLE A4)

Evaluator	ChatGPT-as-Claude	Gemini-as-ChatGPT	Claude-as-Gemini
ChatGPT	41.98	33.33	24.67
Gemini	60.70	20.65	18.71
Claude	56.02	25.50	18.48

APPENDIX C
EXTENDED POINT-BASED RESULTS

This appendix reports point-based quality ratings (0–10 scale) for Coherence, Informativeness, and Conciseness. Scores are shown for each evaluator under all labeling conditions. These complement the percentage-based preference results in Tables A1–A4.

TABLE V
POINT-BASED SCORES UNDER NO LABEL CONDITION (TABLE A5)

Evaluator	Model	Coherence	Informativeness	Conciseness
ChatGPT	ChatGPT	8.82	8.32	8.62
	Gemini	8.38	7.78	8.12
	Claude	8.68	8.50	8.46
Gemini	ChatGPT	8.84	7.32	8.38
	Gemini	8.02	6.20	8.38
	Claude	8.94	7.44	8.62
Claude	ChatGPT	8.70	7.66	8.22
	Gemini	7.58	6.72	8.70
	Claude	8.94	8.06	8.02

TABLE VI
POINT-BASED SCORES UNDER TRUE LABEL CONDITION (TABLE A6)

Evaluator	Model	Coherence	Informativeness	Conciseness
ChatGPT	ChatGPT	9.00	8.00	9.00
	Gemini	8.24	7.50	8.34
	Claude	8.66	8.84	8.18
Gemini	ChatGPT	8.98	7.16	8.22
	Gemini	8.04	6.26	8.02
	Claude	8.34	7.90	7.70
Claude	ChatGPT	8.68	7.68	8.20
	Gemini	7.70	6.80	8.72
	Claude	8.90	8.42	8.20

TABLE VII
POINT-BASED SCORES UNDER FALSE LABEL SCENARIO 1 (CHATGPT → GEMINI, GEMINI → CLAUDE, CLAUDE → CHATGPT) (TABLE A7)

Evaluator	Model	Coherence	Informativeness	Conciseness
ChatGPT	ChatGPT	9.00	8.04	8.98
	Gemini	8.38	7.52	8.40
	Claude	8.46	8.90	8.22
Gemini	ChatGPT	9.00	7.38	8.46
	Gemini	8.20	6.46	8.20
	Claude	8.24	7.92	7.90
Claude	ChatGPT	8.60	7.60	8.40
	Gemini	7.80	6.80	8.70
	Claude	8.90	8.26	7.80

APPENDIX D
METHODOLOGICAL NOTE ON PERCENTAGE-POINT CHANGES

Percentage-point (pp) changes were computed by subtracting a model’s score under the *No Label* baseline from its score under a given label condition. For example:

ChatGPT self-evaluation under No Label baseline = 50.0%.

ChatGPT self-evaluation under True Label = 44.66%.

Change = 44.66 - 50.0 = -5.34 pp.

TABLE VIII
POINT-BASED SCORES UNDER FALSE LABEL SCENARIO 2 (CHATGPT → CLAUDE, GEMINI → CHATGPT, CLAUDE → GEMINI) (TABLE A8)

Evaluator	Model	Coherence	Informativeness	Conciseness
ChatGPT	ChatGPT	9.00	8.00	9.00
	Gemini	8.34	7.34	8.42
	Claude	8.48	8.96	8.12
Gemini	ChatGPT	9.00	7.46	8.60
	Gemini	7.86	6.94	7.76
	Claude	8.38	7.94	7.82
Claude	ChatGPT	8.78	7.78	8.52
	Gemini	7.80	6.60	8.28
	Claude	8.80	8.48	8.18

Positive values indicate a score increase relative to the baseline, while negative values indicate a decline. This method ensures all reported differences reflect label-induced deviations independent of the raw scale.