

---

# SELF-[IN]CORRECT: LLMs Struggle with Refining Self-Generated Responses

Dongwei Jiang Jingyu Zhang Orion Weller Nathaniel Weir  
Benjamin Van Durme Daniel Khashabi  
Johns Hopkins University  
{djiang21, jzhan237}@jhu.edu

## Abstract

Can LLMs continually improve their previous outputs for better results? An affirmative answer would require LLMs to be better at *discriminating* among previously-generated alternatives, than *generating* initial responses. We explore the validity of this hypothesis in practice.

We first introduce a unified framework that allows us to compare the generative and discriminative capability of any model on any task. Then, in our resulting experimental analysis of several LLMs, we do not observe those models' performance on discrimination to be reliably better than generation. We hope these findings inform the growing literature on self-improvement AI systems.

## 1 Introduction

The promise of Large Language Models (LLMs) that can self-improve has brought both excitement and fear about the future impact of AI. On one hand, this has captured the attention of AI practitioners excited about Artificial General Intelligence (AGI). On the other hand, this has raised the alarms for those already anxious about the rapid pace of developments in AI (Hunt, 2023; Hutson, 2023) since self-improving AI could evolve in unpredictable ways.

It remains a mystery what is needed for LLMs to continually self-improve. In human learning, improvement involves learning from one's mistakes, a process often supported by feedback from a coach or the environment. Needless to say, the feedback should accurately identify the mistakes made by the individual without mistakenly criticizing what has been done correctly. This principle should be applicable to LLMs as well. For LLMs to reliably self-improve, i.e. generating their own feedback for self-improvement, the ability to *discriminate* whether their own generations are good or not should surpass the ability to *generate* good solutions directly. Given the importance of this capability, it is worth raising a question about the foundations of self-discrimination: *Are LLMs really better at discrimination than generation?*

This paper seeks to answer this question by proposing the SELF-[IN]CORRECT hypothesis (§3.2): *LLMs are not better at discriminating among previously-generated alternatives than generating initial responses.* Determining the validity of this hypothesis is crucial, as existing studies provide initial evidence suggesting that the capability to distinguish between LLM-generated options is both a sufficient (Tyen et al., 2023) and necessary (Huang et al., 2023) condition for self-improvement.

It is non-trivial to compare LLMs' generative capability with their discriminative capability on the same footing. Recent work, such as West et al. (2023), compares these capabilities by contrasting model's generative ability v.s. their accuracy of choosing the *ground-truth answer* among answer options. However, this discriminative setting differs from the generative setting (and crucially that of self-improvement settings), as the ground-truth answer is not available during generation, potentially making the upper bound of discrimination higher. To more clearly measure these abilities, we implement a two-phase methodology




Figure 1: **Two phases evaluated in our paper.** In the generation phase, the model is fed with generation prompt. Generated answers are collected and randomly selected to calculate the generation score. In the discrimination phase, the model is fed with discrimination prompt and generated answers. The model would choose between generated answers and the score of the chosen answer would be used for calculating the discrimination score

depicted in Figure 1. First, we randomly select one LLM generation and use its metrics as the indicator of generation performance. Then, we instruct the LLM to identify the best answer from its own generations and use the metrics of the selected generation as the indicator of discrimination performance. Overall, this approach is consistent with the actual procedure employed in various self-improvement studies (Madaan et al., 2023; Yuan et al., 2024) and we will expand more on the validity of this approach in §3.2.

To back up this hypothesis, we conduct experiments covering widely used LLMs (e.g., LLaMA-2, Mixtral-8×7B) on a diverse set of tasks including mathematics, world knowledge acquisition, truthful question answering, and instructions following. Our investigation reveals a surprising finding: while humans find the task of discrimination simpler than generation (Alexander, 2003), on all tasks we test, LLMs’ performance on discriminating previously generated answers is not better than randomly choosing one of the generated answers. Further details are provided in §4.2.

In §5, we provide additional experiments aimed at a deeper understanding of SELF-[IN]CORRECT. §5.1 describes our efforts to aid the discrimination phase through prompt-engineering to ensure that SELF-[IN]CORRECT is not merely an artifact of suboptimal prompt design. In §5.2, we explore models *not* pre-trained with autoregressive objectives (i.e. FLAN-T5, FLAN-UL2) and we find that SELF-[IN]CORRECT does not manifest in these models. To determine if SELF-[IN]CORRECT is an inherent issue for LLMs pre-trained with autoregressive objective, we simplified the discrimination task in §5.3 by using more easily distinguishable incorrect options. Under this new experimental setting, we observe the same models perform better at discrimination than generation. In §6, we explore the connections and potential impacts of our research on established self-improvement methods such as Madaan et al. (2023) and Yuan et al. (2024).

Our contributions in this paper are three-fold:

- We devised a unified framework that allows the testing of generative and discriminative capability of any LLM on any task, which enables large-scale evaluation
- We conducted a number of experiments and collected empirical evidence to support SELF-[IN]CORRECT
- We provided additional experiments to better understand SELF-[IN]CORRECT and its implications. Specifically, our findings indicate that SELF-[IN]CORRECT does not occur in LLMs that are *not* pre-trained autoregressively

## 2 Related Work

**Self-Improvement with LLMs.** The idea of self-improvement predates the LLM era. Earlier efforts have utilized generative adversarial networks (GANs) (Subramanian et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2017) to enhance NLP systems through feedback mechanisms. Welleck et al. (2023) trains a separate corrector that learns to iteratively correct imperfect generations.

---

In the era of LLM, self-improvement with self-feedback has also been studied in various forms (Pan et al., 2023). Self-Instruct (Wang et al., 2023b) improves the instruction-following capabilities of pre-trained language models by bootstrapping off their own generations. Yuan et al. (2024) employs LLMs to provide rewards for their own generation. Chen et al. (2024) uses a self-play mechanism where the LLM refines its capability by playing against instances of itself. Several other recent studies (Liu et al., 2023a; Butt et al., 2024) also adopted this idea and applied it to different tasks.

Another line of research with potential for self-improvement puts emphasis at *inference time*. This line of work does not involve updating the model’s parameters. Instead, self-improvement is achieved by having the model generate reflection on its own outputs and adjust future outputs based on these reflections. Recent work in this area covers various formats from verbal (Shinn et al., 2023) to scoring feedback (Madaan et al., 2023), and addresses diverse tasks including autonomous operations (Shinn et al., 2023), academic benchmarks (Madaan et al., 2023), and daily activities (Wang et al., 2023a).

When external ground-truth feedback exists, LLMs are capable of self-improvement. Gou et al. (2024) demonstrates that LLMs can verify and correct their initial responses through the interaction with various external tools. Tyen et al. (2023); Shinn et al. (2023) successfully improves LLM’s performance on various tasks with the help of ground-truth feedback. Shifting focus to a different approach, intrinsic self-correction involves LLMs trying to refine their initial answers based solely on their inherent capabilities. However, this method’s effectiveness, particularly for reasoning tasks, has been called into question. Critiques have emerged (Huang et al., 2023; Valmeekam et al., 2023; Tyen et al., 2023) that contend the efficacy of reported self-improvement is no better than self-consistency (Wang et al., 2022a) and that such improvements is largely due to the inferior initial response. The setting used in our work is similar to intrinsic self-improvement. We add to the discourse by examining LLMs’ generative and discriminative capacities beyond reasoning tasks.

**Discrepancy between LLM generation and evaluation.** For humans, distinguishing a good solution from a bad one is often easier than coming up with a solution from scratch (Alexander, 2003). However, recent studies are starting to question if the same applies to LLMs. West et al. (2023) investigated multiple NLP tasks, and showed that LLMs often struggle to understand their own outputs. To evaluate the generation and discrimination performance of LLMs, Liu et al. (2023b) conducted experiments focusing on summarization. Arora & Kambhampati (2023) conducted similar experiments in the domain of planning. Our work differs from previous work in that we’re evaluating this discrepancy on a wider range of tasks using a unified metric. We’re also trying to uncover the reasons behind the discrepancy.

**Using LLMs for self-evaluation.** Recent studies indicate the potential of LLM evaluation that is close to human level (Chiang & Lee, 2023; Gilardi et al., 2023). However, for the task of self-evaluation, concerns have been raised by Valmeekam et al. (2023); Huang et al. (2023), who pointed out that LLM encounters difficulties in self-evaluating its generation for mathematical tasks. Further research by Stechly et al. (2024; 2023); Valmeekam et al. (2023) has uncovered models’ limitations on self-evaluation for tasks requiring complex reasoning and planning. Our work seeks to explore the efficacy of LLM self-evaluation in a broader range of tasks.

### 3 SELF-[IN]CORRECT

In this section, we clarify our definition, introduce our evaluation framework (Figure 1), and present our hypothesis.

#### 3.1 Establishing an Evaluation Criteria to Compare Generation vs. Discrimination

Given a task  $T$  with an evaluation dataset  $D = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^m$  and evaluation metric  $f$ , we use the same LLM, denoted by  $P_{LM}$ , for both generation and discrimination. For each evaluation

input  $x_i$ , we first sample  $n$  candidate generations  $g_1(x_i), \dots, g_n(x_i) \sim P_{\text{LM}}(x_i)$  using the default task prompt (generation prompt). We maintain a low temperature during sampling to ensure the generated outputs are all highly probable.

**Evaluating generation.** The performance of the *generative* phase for each evaluation sample  $x_i$  is defined by the metric score  $S_{\text{gen}}(x_i)$  of a randomly chosen generation from the  $n$  candidate generations  $G(x_i) = \{g_1(x_i), g_2(x_i), \dots, g_n(x_i)\}$ , as follows:

$$S_{\text{gen}}(x_i) = f(g_{\text{rand}}(x_i), y_i),$$

where  $g_{\text{rand}}$  is a randomly-sampled generation  $g_{\text{rand}}(x_i) \sim G(x_i)$ .  $f(g_j(x_i), y_i)$  represents the metric  $f$  applied to the  $j$ -th generation output for the  $i$ -th evaluation sample and  $g_{\text{rand}}(x_i)$  represents one random candidate generations for that sample. Because the candidate generations for each sample are produced by sampling from the language model  $P_{\text{LM}}$  using the same hyper-parameters (temperature, top- $p$ , etc), choosing a random candidate from  $G(x_i)$  is essentially equivalent to generating an output directly from  $P_{\text{LM}}(x_i)$ . The overall generation performance  $S_{\text{gen}}$  is then the average of  $\{S_{\text{gen}}(x_1), S_{\text{gen}}(x_2), \dots, S_{\text{gen}}(x_m)\}$  across all evaluation samples.

**Evaluating discrimination.** To assess the discrimination performance, we feed the generations back to  $P_{\text{LM}}$  and prompt it to identify the most suitable answer. For each task  $T$ , we construct a discriminative prompt  $x_{\text{disc},T}$  and feed it generations labeled from 1 to  $n$  (the prompts we used in discrimination phase can be found in Appendix A). Using few-shot prompting, we guide  $P_{\text{LM}}$  to output the label of the preferred chosen answer and the label chosen in  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  is determined by greedily decoding the output of  $P_{\text{LM}}(\cdot | x_{\text{disc},T}(G(x_i)))$ . The discrimination performance for each sample  $i$  is quantified by:

$$S_{\text{disc}}(x_i) = f(g_{\text{chosen}}(x_i), y_i).$$

To derive an overall measure of discrimination performance  $S_{\text{disc}}$ , we average the individual scores  $\{S_{\text{disc}}(x_1), S_{\text{disc}}(x_2), \dots, S_{\text{disc}}(x_m)\}$  across all evaluation samples.

### 3.2 Hypothesis Formulation

Given the above definitions, our main hypothesis becomes easy to formalize. For any given task, denote DG-DIFF as the **difference between discrimination performance and generation performance**,

$$\text{DG-DIFF} = S_{\text{disc}} - S_{\text{gen}}.$$

Our main hypothesis is:

**SELF-[IN]CORRECT.** LLMs are not universally better at discriminating among previously generated alternatives than generating initial responses. Specifically,  $\text{DG-DIFF} \leq \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon$  is a small enough value that doesn't result in statistically significant superiority of discriminative performance ( $S_{\text{disc}}$ ) over generative performance ( $S_{\text{gen}}$ ) across the samples.

Note the term "discrimination" is employed with precision in this context. It is selected over alternatives such as "evaluation" which may also imply the provision of qualitative or quantitative feedback on generated responses, or "verification", which typically results in a binary judgment of truthfulness.

An important design choice in our framework is that the candidate generations  $G(x_i)$  are shared across the generative and discriminative phases. This design choice allows us to formulate the generative phase as a *random multiple choice* among pre-generated candidates. As a result, it allows apples-to-apples comparison with the discriminative phase, where the task is *using LLM for multiple choice* among the same candidates.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Under this setup, the generative and discriminative phases will always have the same upper/lower bound of possible scores.

Task	Split	#Eval	#Shots	Task Type	Metric $f(\cdot)$	Metric scale
GSM8K	Test	1319	2	Math Word Problem	Accuracy	[0, 100]
TriviaQA	Val	17944	2	Question Answering	Accuracy	[0, 100]
MT-Bench	Test	160	3	Instruction Following	GPT-4 score	[0, 10]
TruthfulQA	Val	817	2	Question Answering	GPT-judge	[0, 100]

Table 1: Configuration of experimental tasks. “Split” specifies which subset the data originates from. “#Eval” indicates the number of instances used for evaluation. “#Shots” specifies the number of few-shot examples employed for evaluation. To evaluate TruthfulQA generations, we follow Lin et al. (2022) and develop two “GPT-judges” by fine-tuning GPT-3 models with provided data.

Our framework applies the task’s original metrics in both the generative and discriminative phases, ensuring consistency across assessments. By eliminating the need for human input, our framework is more scalable and cost-effective than methods like West et al. (2023); Zheng et al. (2023b), which depend on human involvement. Our metrics are also closely aligned to the actual process that’s employed in self-improvement literature (Shinn et al., 2023; Madaan et al., 2023), where the model is asked to choose the best answer from a list of generations. Nevertheless, we would like to mention that because generation and discrimination are two very different processes, the metrics used in this paper are only proxies to evaluate those two important capabilities.

## 4 Empirical Support for SELF-[IN]CORRECT

In this section, we describe our experimental setup (§4.1) and lay out the main findings (§4.2).

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Tasks.** A summary of the tasks we evaluate on is provided in Table 1. We assess our hypothesis on a diverse set of tasks including GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) for math, TriviaQA (Joshi et al., 2017) for world knowledge, TruthfulQA (Lin et al., 2022) for truthfulness in question answering, and MT-Bench (Zheng et al., 2023b) for instruction following. These represent a diverse set of benchmarks used to evaluate LLMs across various domains. For TriviaQA, we use the `rc.nocontext` setup, which means the model relies solely on its parametric knowledge to answer the question correctly without accompanying context or documents. For TruthfulQA, we use the generation setup, where the model generates responses to a set of questions. The metrics scale for MT-Bench is 0-10 Zheng et al. (2023b).

**Task metrics.** The list of task-specific metrics  $f(\cdot)$  is provided in Table 1. The evaluation for GSM8K, TriviaQA and TruthfulQA is conducted using `lm-evaluation-harness`<sup>2</sup>, which provides a standardized framework for assessing model performance across benchmarks. The evaluation for MT-Bench is done with `llm_judge`<sup>3</sup>, which use GPT-4 score (Zheng et al., 2023b) to score the generated answer from models. To evaluate TruthfulQA generations, we follow Lin et al. (2022) and develop two “GPT-judges” by fine-tuning GPT-3 models<sup>4</sup> with the provided data. Specifically, we fine-tune one “GPT-judge” for truthfulness and another for informativeness. Finally, we report the percentage of answers that are both truthful and informative as the final metric for TruthfulQA.

**Handling failure modes during evaluation.** While evaluating the discrimination phase, if the model output does not adhere to the expected format (i.e., integers indicating the

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/EleutherAI/lm-evaluation-harness>

<sup>3</sup>[https://github.com/lm-sys/FastChat/tree/main/fastchat/llm\\_judge](https://github.com/lm-sys/FastChat/tree/main/fastchat/llm_judge)

<sup>4</sup>The original “GPT-judges” were fine-tuned with `curie` models which are no longer available for fine-tuning. Therefore, we use `davinci-002` which is larger than `curie`.

selected answer), we deem that as a failure. However, to be generous to the discrimination step, we avoid assigning it zero. Instead, we credit it with the generation that scores lowest (using our metric  $f$ ) among other candidate answers:  $S_{\text{disc}}(x_i) = \min_{g(x_i) \in G(x_i)} f(g(x_i), y_i)$ . We also try to make the discriminator output one of the answers directly in the case of a failure, hoping that bypassing this extra step of identifying the multiple-choice options would simplify the discrimination phase. However, we observe an increased percentage of invalid discrimination output with similar discrimination performance (see Appendix C for more details). In our experiments, we observe that the average rate of invalid responses remained low ( $\sim 10\%$ ). Given that there is also a certain proportion of invalid outputs in the generation phase that wouldn't get any credit when selected, we believe that the occurrence of invalid discrimination outputs does not significantly impact our overall findings.

**Models.** We employ a range of models including LLaMA-2 Base models (7B, 13B, and 70B), LLaMA-2 Chat models (7B, 13B and 70B), Mixtral  $8 \times 7\text{B}$ -Instruct-v0.1, GPT-3.5-turbo, and GPT-4-turbo.<sup>5</sup> For the evaluation of each model, we adapt our prompts to be compatible with the keywords used in their [pre-]training. For example, when prompting LLaMA-2 Chat models we use <SYS>, <INST> keywords to indicate system and instruction prompts.

**Model hyper-parameters.** During the generation phase, we use the default hyperparameter specified in `lm-eval-harness` for all tasks, except for temperature, which we have adjusted to 0.7. We use an above 0 temperature to obtain distinct generations upon multiple rounds of sampling. At the same time, during the discrimination phase, we set the temperature to 0 to avoid any randomness in the results.

## 4.2 Main Findings

**DG-DIFF is generally small or negative.** From extensive results in Table 2, it can be concluded that DG-DIFF is generally small or negative, i.e.,  $S_{\text{disc}}$  is generally lower than  $S_{\text{gen}}$ . This conclusion also holds when we examine the average task performance for all models. An ablation experiment is conducted in Appendix D that implements several different prompts and we find prompt variations do not significantly affect DG-DIFF. Although  $S_{\text{gen}}$  sometimes exceed  $S_{\text{disc}}$ , in such cases DG-DIFF remains quite small. All these observations lend support for SELF-[IN]CORRECT.

**DG-DIFF remains small or negative upon fine-tuning.** LLaMA-2 Chat models are fine-tuned with both instruction-tuning and RLHF while LLaMA-2 Base models are only pre-trained with autoregressive objective. It is reasonable to expect instruction-tuned models would exhibit better performance in the discrimination phase because instruction-tuning is shown to make models better at solving a variety of tasks. Furthermore, classification tasks (that resemble our discrimination setup) are well-represented in most instruction-tuning datasets (Wang et al., 2022b; Bach et al., 2022; Longpre et al., 2023). However, our empirical findings do not support it. Notably, LLaMA-2 13B and LLaMA-2 70B models outperformed their fine-tuned counterparts in our evaluations.

## 5 Further Analysis of SELF-[IN]CORRECT

In this section, we outline experiments designed to provide further analysis of SELF-[IN]CORRECT.

### 5.1 Aiding Discrimination Phase via Prompt-Engineering

One might argue our current prompting setup doesn't fully capitalize on the model's capacity for discrimination. To make sure SELF-[IN]CORRECT isn't an artifact of poor prompt engineering, we conduct additional experiments with LLaMA-2 Chat models on GSM8K, TriviaQA, and MT-Bench because their DG-DIFF on those tasks is mostly negative.

<sup>5</sup>We used the latest GPT-3.5-turbo-0125 and GPT-4-0125-preview model. The experiments were conducted in Feb 2024.

	DG-DIFF ( $S_{\text{gen}} \rightarrow S_{\text{disc}}$ )			
	GSM8K	TriviaQA	MT-Bench	TruthfulQA
LLaMA-2 7B	-0.6 <sub>(9.2→8.6)</sub>	-16.9 <sub>(37.1→20.2)</sub>	-0.09 <sub>(3.34→3.25)</sub>	-4.7 <sub>(30.5→25.8)</sub>
LLaMA-2 13B	0.0 <sub>(16.8→16.8)</sub>	1.4 <sub>(45.2→46.6)</sub>	-0.12 <sub>(4.15→4.03)</sub>	2.1 <sub>(26.8→28.9)</sub>
LLaMA-2 70B	3.2 <sub>(43.0→46.2)</sub>	3.2 <sub>(53.2→56.4)</sub>	-0.12 <sub>(4.87→4.75)</sub>	0.5 <sub>(28.9→29.4)</sub>
LLaMA-2 7B <sub>Chat</sub>	-2.8 <sub>(20.4→17.6)</sub>	-0.1 <sub>(16.1→16.0)</sub>	-0.13 <sub>(5.45→5.32)</sub>	1.4 <sub>(48.8→50.2)</sub>
LLaMA-2 13B <sub>Chat</sub>	-5.5 <sub>(28.3→22.8)</sub>	0.0 <sub>(25.5→25.5)</sub>	-0.51 <sub>(5.67→5.16)</sub>	-0.1 <sub>(44.9→44.8)</sub>
LLaMA-2 70B <sub>Chat</sub>	-5.9 <sub>(42.5→36.6)</sub>	-1.6 <sub>(47.8→46.2)</sub>	-0.17 <sub>(6.25→6.08)</sub>	0.9 <sub>(48.6→49.5)</sub>
Mixtral-8x7B <sub>Instruct</sub>	4.3 <sub>(56.6→60.9)</sub>	-3.4 <sub>(58.8→55.4)</sub>	-0.20 <sub>(7.39→7.19)</sub>	-0.4 <sub>(61.1→60.7)</sub>
GPT-3.5-turbo	1.1 <sub>(75.3→76.4)</sub>	2.1 <sub>(67.1→69.2)</sub>	0.17 <sub>(7.74→7.91)</sub>	0.4 <sub>(65.7→66.1)</sub>
GPT-4-turbo	0.7 <sub>(93.6→94.3)</sub>	0.2 <sub>(79.9→80.1)</sub>	-	1.7 <sub>(77.4→79.1)</sub>
Task Avg.	-0.61	-1.67	-0.15	0.2

Table 2: Performance change defined as DG-DIFF :=  $S_{\text{disc}} - S_{\text{gen}}$  for various mainstream LLMs. We do not test GPT-4-turbo on MT-Bench to avoid self-evaluation bias (He et al., 2023). The generation performance and discriminative performance is shown as subscript: ( $S_{\text{gen}} \rightarrow S_{\text{disc}}$ ). **For majority of our results, DG-DIFF is small or negative, indicating similar or worse performance in the discrimination phase.**

**Adding in-context learning examples helps discrimination, though DG-DIFF remains small or negative.** Increasing the number of in-context learning (ICL) demonstrations is shown to improve performance (Brown et al., 2020). Is it possible that increasing the number of ICL examples in the discrimination phase will improve it, so much that DG-DIFF becomes consistently positive? To evaluate the effect of increasing ICL examples, we conduct experiments where the number of ICL examples (#Shots) during the discrimination stage is doubled or tripled relative to the baseline established in Table 1. Note that we didn’t triple the number of ICL examples for MT-Bench because it exceeds the context length for LLaMA-2 Chat models (4096 tokens). The results, presented in Table 3, indicate that while increasing the number of ICL examples tends to increase DG-DIFF, it remains small or negative. Furthermore, the performance improvement from adding ICL examples does not exhibit a consistent monotonic trend.

**Adding chain-of-thought rational shows minimal impact on DG-DIFF.** Recently, Stechly et al. (2024) pointed out that LLM evaluation also involves multi-step reasoning. To help with the reasoning in the discrimination phase, we add chain-of-thought rationals in the few-shot examples while keeping the number of examples constant. For GSM8K, we do not report anything since our default evaluation already contains rationales for answer selection. For TriviaQA, the CoT rationales explain the logic behind choosing an option. For MT-Bench, we supplement explanations for preferring one answer over another. A comparison between our prompts (w/ and w/o CoT rationales) is available in Appendix A. As shown in Table 3, the inclusion of CoT rational only shows minimal impact.

Model	LLaMA-2 7B Chat			LLaMA-2 13B Chat			LLaMA-2 70B Chat		
	+2×#ICL	+3×#ICL	+CoT	+2×#ICL	+3×#ICL	+CoT	+2×#ICL	+3×#ICL	+CoT
GSM8K	-1.4	0.1	-	-5.9	-6.8	-	-5.8	-3.9	-
TriviaQA	-0.4	0.2	-0.3	0.1	0.1	-0.3	-1.7	-0.5	-1.8
MT-Bench	-0.09	-	-0.06	-0.53	-	-0.41	-0.19	-	-0.18

Table 3: DG-DIFF upon various modifications with LLaMA-2 Chat models. “+ 2 × #ICL” means doubling the number of in-context demonstrations during the discrimination phase. “+ 3 × #ICL” means tripling the number of in-context demonstrations. “+ CoT” stands for adding Chain-of-Thought rationales for the few-shot examples. **Extra prompt-engineering techniques during discrimination do not consistently close the performance gap.**

## 5.2 Is Autoregressive Pre-training Related to SELF-[IN]CORRECT?

The majority of modern LLMs are pre-trained with an autoregressive objective. Recent studies suggest that autoregressive objectives used during pre-training may have unexpected impacts on LLM behavior (McCoy et al., 2023). Since the pre-training process of autoregressive models is more akin to generation than discrimination, we hypothesize SELF-[IN]CORRECT is also partially caused by the use of autoregressive pre-training objective.

To test this hypothesis, we evaluated Flan-T5-XXL (11B) and Flan-UL2 (20B) on the same tasks used in Table 2. Flan-T5-XXL is pre-trained using a span corruption objective, where the loss is only calculated on the corrupted span (Raffel et al., 2020). Flan-UL2 (Chung et al., 2022) is pre-trained using mixture-of-denoisers that combines multiple denoising objective functions. Our findings, detailed in Table 4, reveal their DG-DIFF across all tasks are positive except for Flan-T5-XXL on MT-Bench. In fact, both models also demonstrate significantly higher DG-DIFF compared to the autoregressive models we tested in Table 2. This outcome lends empirical support to the hypothesis that SELF-[IN]CORRECT could be related to autoregressive pre-training.

	DG-DIFF ( $S_{gen} \rightarrow S_{disc}$ )			
	GSM8K	TriviaQA	MT-Bench	TruthfulQA
Flan-T5 XXL	1.3 (13.3→14.4)	5.8 (28.7→34.5)	-0.06 (2.02→1.96)	6.0 (20.1→26.1)
Flan-UL2	0.5 (21.6→22.1)	4.2 (52.7→56.9)	0.16 (1.98→2.14)	4.8 (31.3→36.1)
Task Avg.	0.9	5.0	0.05	5.4

Table 4: Flan-T5-XXL and Flan-UL2 tested on the same setup as Table 2. DG-DIFF for all models across all tasks are positive except for Flan-T5-XXL on MT-Bench. **Both models demonstrate significantly higher average DG-DIFF compared to autoregressive models.**

It is also important to note that the pre-training processes for these two model classes differ from autoregressively pre-trained counterparts beyond the objective function. For example, Flan-T5 is pre-trained with most inputs provided, except for the corrupted spans. Furthermore, the datasets used for pre-training these LLMs can vary. Therefore, when uncovering the underlying reason why SELF-[IN]CORRECT does not occur on Flan-T5 and Flan-UL2, caution should be exercised before drawing definitive conclusions.

## 5.3 Controlled modification of experimental setting: DG-DIFF notably improves when the negative candidates given to the discrimination phase are simplified

Here we consider the extent to which SELF-[IN]CORRECT may hold. For example, is SELF-[IN]CORRECT potentially a fundamental limitation of LLMs pre-trained with an autoregressive objective, or can a change in data distribution alter the outcome? To address this question, we conduct experiments in an unconventional setting that simplifies the discrimination phase by substituting incorrect candidates with simpler ones.

The experiments are conducted on TriviaQA and GSM8K. TriviaQA contains a wide range of answer categories, including names, locations, historical events, etc. For this dataset, we simplify the discrimination phase by substituting incorrect answer generations for question  $A$  with correct answer generations from another question  $B$  (left panel in Figure 2). This approach simplifies the discrimination phase as it replaces hard-to-discriminate distractors with simpler ones. As for GSM8K, we create simplified distractors by randomly multiplying or dividing incorrect generated answers by 100 (right panel in Figure 2).

From Figure 3, it is evident that simplifying the incorrect candidates improves DG-DIFF. For TriviaQA,  $S_{disc}$  exceeds  $S_{gen}$  by a large margin. For GSM8K, all models tested also demonstrate improved DG-DIFF in this setting.




Figure 2: **Left:** Simplified negative candidates setup for **TriviaQA**, where incorrectly generated answers are replaced with randomly selected correct answers from another question. **Right:** Simplified negative candidates setup for **GSM8K**, where incorrect generated answers are multiplied or divided by 100 to simplify the discrimination process




Figure 3: "Simplified" setting uses simplified incorrect answers for the discrimination phase. **DG-DIFF improves notably with simplified negative candidates, indicating the sensitivity of the discriminative phase to data distribution.**

## 6 Further Discussion

**Does SELF-[IN]CORRECT contradict prior findings in self-refinement?** The process of self-refine involves utilizing the same LLM to provide feedback for its own generation and using the feedback to refine the generation. Both Huang et al. (2023) and Madaan et al. (2023) suggested LLMs can self-refine on tasks other than reasoning. Does this contradict our assertions?

We replicated the experiment outlined in Madaan et al. (2023) and observed the following (more detail in Appendix B):

(1) **For some evaluated tasks, certain aspects can be exploited for artificially amplifying task performance without actually reasoning on the feedback.** For example, with the task of constrained generation, where the objective is to generate sentences containing specific keywords, self-refine with LLMs often leads to progressively longer sentences that build on previous ones. Thus, even if the refined sentences do not incorporate new keywords

---

and continue to grow longer (often, ignoring the feedback from the prior round), the task performance still shows a monotonic improvement.

(2) **For some evaluated tasks, the evaluation score assigned by the model for each iteration of self-refine is not monotonically increasing.** For acronym generation and dialogue response generation, the model often assigns a lower score to refined outputs. Thus, the model is not effectively performing iterative self-refinement, and any observed improvement might stem from a lower quality of initial outputs, as noted in Huang et al. (2023).

(3) **Quantifying the percentage of times models prefer self-refined subsequent generations to the previous generation, a marginal preference for self-refined generation was observed.** We used the same models to discriminate between previous generations and self-refined subsequent generations for tasks mentioned in Madaan et al. (2023). Our results indicate that models prefer self-refined generations only around 54% of the time.

In summary, these observations and the findings presented in Table 5 suggest that the results from Madaan et al. (2023) do *not* directly contradict our hypothesis.

**Implication of SELF-[IN]CORRECT for self-rewarding LLM** Recent work (Yuan et al., 2024) uses preference pairs of the form {instruction prompt  $x$ , winning response  $y_{win}$ , losing response  $y_{lose}$ } to provide self-reward for instruction-following fine-tuning. It is important to clarify that although the setup for this work also includes discriminating between previously generated outputs, our findings do not undermine its efficacy. Such techniques can be useful as long as the ranking of winning responses and losing responses in those preference pairs is correct. This can be facilitated when winning and losing pairs are taken from the highest and lowest-scoring responses from the candidate responses.

However, an interesting pattern from Yuan et al. (2024) is that there seem to be diminishing returns after a few iterations of self-rewarding. We hypothesize this may be linked to SELF-[IN]CORRECT because if the average ability of LLMs to discriminate is inferior to their ability to generate, it becomes challenging to engage in a virtuous cycle that simultaneously enhances the model’s capability to follow instructions and generate self-rewards.

**Potential influence of lengthier discrimination prompt on SELF-[IN]CORRECT** The prompt used in the discrimination phase is inherently lengthier than the generation prompt as it also includes the generated candidate answers. This increase in length may pose challenges to the model’s processing capabilities. Investigating the impact of prompt length is complex. Simply adding superfluous content to lengthen the generation or discrimination prompt might not yield clear results, as such additions could unintentionally influence the outcomes. Therefore, we highlight this area for further exploration to better understand the implications of prompt length for SELF-[IN]CORRECT.

## 7 Limitations

One limitation of our research is the inability to test the impact of pre-training data. The scale of pre-training data makes it difficult to assess its effect.

Another limitation of our study is the comprehensiveness of our experiments. Extending our experiments to more recent models and more diverse tasks can strengthen the validation of SELF-[IN]CORRECT.

Determining a model’s preference over several candidate generations can be challenging due to various biases. Following the methodology used in other self-improvement studies (Yuan et al., 2024), we employ *LLM-as-a-Judge prompting* (Zheng et al., 2023a) to elicit answer choice from the model. It is conceivable that the LLMs we examine can be biased toward certain answer options or different answer formats (e.g., labels of A/B/C/D or [1]/[2]/[3]/[4]). Another method is to rank candidate answers using the LLM’s assigned probability over each answer text, which we did not explore. It is worth noting that this approach can be biased too. For example, the LLM might be biased to evaluate text fluency instead of the correctness of the answers.

---

## 8 Conclusion

We focused on the question of whether language models are strictly better at discriminating their prior generations vs. generating responses directly. We proposed a metric for comparing these capabilities and used it to evaluate several current LLMs. For those models and tasks, we do not observe that discrimination is reliably better than generation, in fact, we often observed it was worse. These results raise concerns about the potential for LLM self-improvement on *any* task.

---

## References

- Patricia A Alexander. The development of expertise: The journey from acclimation to proficiency. In *Educational researcher*, 2003. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3700080>.
- Daman Arora and Subbarao Kambhampati. Learning and leveraging verifiers to improve planning capabilities of pre-trained language models. *CoRR*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.17077>.
- Stephen H. Bach, Victor Sanh, Zheng Xin Yong, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Nihal V. Nayak, Abheesht Sharma, Taewoon Kim, M Saiful Bari, Thibault Févry, Zaid Alyafeai, Manan Dey, Andrea Santilli, Zhiqing Sun, Srulik Ben-David, Canwen Xu, Gunjan Chhablani, Han Wang, Jason Alan Fries, Maged S. Al-shaibani, Shanya Sharma, Urmish Thakker, Khalid Almubarak, Xiangru Tang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, and Alexander M. Rush. Promptsources: An integrated development environment and repository for natural language prompts. *ArXiv*, abs/2202.01279, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.01279>.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (NeurIPS), 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165>.
- Natasha Butt, Blazej Manczak, Auke Wiggers, Corrado Rainone, David Zhang, Michaël Defferrard, and Taco Cohen. Codeit: Self-improving language models with prioritized hindsight replay. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04858*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.04858>.
- Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, and Quanquan Gu. Self-play fine-tuning converts weak language models to strong language models. *CoRR*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.01335>.
- David Cheng-Han Chiang and Hung-yi Lee. Can large language models be an alternative to human evaluations? In Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *ACL*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.01937>.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, Albert Webson, Shixiang Shane Gu, Zhuyun Dai, Mirac Suzgun, Xinyun Chen, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Gaurav Mishra, Adams Yu, Vincent Y. Zhao, Yanping Huang, Andrew M. Dai, Hongkun Yu, Slav Petrov, Ed H. Chi, Jeff Dean, Jacob Devlin, Adam Roberts, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, and Jason Wei. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *CoRR*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.11416>.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. Training verifiers to solve math word problems, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14168>.
- Fabrizio Gilardi, Meysam Alizadeh, and Maël Kubli. Chatgpt outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, July 2023. ISSN 1091-6490. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.15056>.
- Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Yujiu Yang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. Critic: Large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.11738>.
- Tianxing He, Jingyu Zhang, Tianle Wang, Sachin Kumar, Kyunghyun Cho, James Glass, and Yulia Tsvetkov. On the blind spots of model-based evaluation metrics for text generation. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *ACL*, July 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.10020>.
- Jie Huang, Xinyun Chen, Swaroop Mishra, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Adams Wei Yu, Xinying Song, and Denny Zhou. Large language models cannot self-correct reasoning yet, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.01798>.

- 
- Tamlyn Hunt. Here’s why ai may be extremely dangerous—whether it’s conscious or not. *Scientific American*, 25, 2023. URL <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/heres-why-ai-may-be-extremely-dangerous-whether-its-conscious-or-not/>.
- Matthew Hutson. Can we stop runaway ai.? *New Yorker*, 2023. URL <https://www.newyorker.com/science/annals-of-artificial-intelligence/can-we-stop-the-singularity>.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S. Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In *ACL*, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.03551>.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. TruthfulQA: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio (eds.), *ACL*. Association for Computational Linguistics, May 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.07958>.
- Jiacheng Liu, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Yejin Choi, and Asli Celikyilmaz. Crystal: Introspective reasoners reinforced with self-feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.04921*, 2023a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.04921>.
- Yixin Liu, Alexander R. Fabbri, Jiawen Chen, Yilun Zhao, Simeng Han, Shafiq Joty, Pengfei Liu, Dragomir Radev, Chien-Sheng Wu, and Arman Cohan. Benchmarking generation and evaluation capabilities of large language models for instruction controllable summarization. *CoRR*, 2023b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.09184>.
- Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, et al. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13688*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.13688>.
- Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegraffe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, Sean Welleck, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Shashank Gupta, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, and Peter Clark. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *CoRR*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17651>.
- R. Thomas McCoy, Shunyu Yao, Dan Friedman, Matthew Hardy, and Thomas L. Griffiths. Embers of autoregression: Understanding large language models through the problem they are trained to solve. *CoRR*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.13638>.
- Liangming Pan, Michael Stephen Saxon, Wenda Xu, Deepak Nathani, Xinyi Wang, and William Yang Wang. Automatically correcting large language models: Surveying the landscape of diverse self-correction strategies. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.03188, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:260682695>.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.10683>.
- Noah Shinn, Beck Labash, and Ashwin Gopinath. Reflexion: an autonomous agent with dynamic memory and self-reflection. In *NeuralPS*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11366>.
- Kaya Stechly, Matthew Marquez, and Subbarao Kambhampati. GPT-4 doesn’t know it’s wrong: An analysis of iterative prompting for reasoning problems. *CoRR*, 2023.
- Kaya Stechly, Karthik Valmeekam, and Subbarao Kambhampati. On the self-verification limitations of large language models on reasoning and planning tasks. *CoRR*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.08115>.

- 
- Sandeep Subramanian, Sai Rajeswar, Francis Dutil, Chris Pal, and Aaron C. Courville. Adversarial generation of natural language. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP, Rep4NLP@ACL 2017*, pp. 241–251. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.10929>.
- Gladys Tyen, Hassan Mansoor, Peter Chen, Tony Mak, and Victor Carbune. Llms cannot find reasoning errors, but can correct them! *CoRR*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.01798>.
- Karthik Valmeekam, Matthew Marquez, and Subbarao Kambhampati. Can large language models really improve by self-critiquing their own plans? *CoRR*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.08118>.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*, 2022a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.11171>.
- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Anjana Arunkumar, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Atharva Naik, David Stap, Eshaan Pathak, Giannis Karamanolakis, Haizhi Gary Lai, Ishan Purohit, Ishani Mondal, Jacob Anderson, Kirby Kuznia, Krима Doshi, Maitreya Patel, Kuntal Kumar Pal, Mehrad Moradshahi, Mihir Parmar, Mirali Purohit, Neeraj Varshney, Phani Rohitha Kaza, Pulkit Verma, Ravsehaj Singh Puri, Rushang Karia, Shailaja Keyur Sampat, Savan Doshi, Siddhartha Mishra, Sujan Reddy, Sumanta Patro, Tanay Dixit, Xudong Shen, Chitta Baral, Yejin Choi, Noah A. Smith, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Daniel Khashabi. Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via Declarative Instructions on 1600+ Tasks. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2022b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.07705>.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-instruct: Aligning language model with self generated instructions. 2023a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.10560>.
- Yizhong Wang, Yeganeh Kordi, Swaroop Mishra, Alisa Liu, Noah A. Smith, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-Instruct: Aligning Language Model with Self Generated Instructions. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2023b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.10560>.
- Sean Welleck, Ximing Lu, Peter West, Faeze Brahman, Tianxiao Shen, Daniel Khashabi, and Yejin Choi. Generating sequences by learning to self-correct. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.00053>.
- Peter West, Ximing Lu, Nouha Dziri, Faeze Brahman, Linjie Li, Jena D. Hwang, Liwei Jiang, Jillian Fisher, Abhilasha Ravichander, Khyathi Chandu, Benjamin Newman, Pang Wei Koh, Allyson Ettinger, and Yejin Choi. The generative AI paradox: "what it can create, it may not understand". *CoRR*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.00059>.
- Lantao Yu, Weinan Zhang, Jun Wang, and Yong Yu. Seqgan: Sequence generative adversarial nets with policy gradient. In *AAAI*, pp. 2852–2858. AAAI Press, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.05473>.
- Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. Self-rewarding language models. *CoRR*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.10020>.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.05685>.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric P. Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *CoRR*, 2023b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.05685>.

## A Prompts for TriviaQA and MT-Bench

In this section, we provide the original and CoT prompts for GSM8k (Figure 4), TriviaQA (Figure 5), TruthfulQA (Figure 6) and MT-Bench (Figure 7).

**Generation Prompt:**  
Question: Jen and Tyler are gymnasts practicing flips. Jen is practicing the triple-flip while Tyler is practicing the double-flip. Jen did sixteen triple-flips during practice. Tyler flipped in the air half the number of times Jen did. How many double-flips did Tyler do?

**Generated Answers:**  
A1: Jen's 16 triple-flips equal 64 individual flips ... hence Tyler completed 16 double-flips. #### 16  
A2: Jen did 16 triple-flips ... A double flip has two flips, so Tyler did  $24 / 2 = 12$  double-flips. #### 12  
A3: Jen completed 48 flips ... But in counting double-flips, we arrive at 8 for Tyler, considering his flips are in pairs. #### 8  
A4: Tyler achieved 24 by ... Each of Tyler's maneuvers counts as a complete double-flip, leading to 24 double-flips. #### 24

**Discrimination Prompt:**  
You will be given four answers to a question. Please create the reasoning process that arrives at these four answers and choose the final answer from those. Your final selection should be 1, 2, 3, or 4. Please end your generation with: Therefore, the final choice is:\n### <1, 2, 3 or 4>\n

**Discrimination Answers:**  
Solution1 that gives answer1 is: Jen did 16 triple-flips, so she did  $16 * 3 = 64$  flips. Tyler did half the number of flips, so he did  $64 / 2 = 32$  flips. A double flip has two flips, so Tyler did  $32 / 2 = 16$  double-flips. Solution 1 made a mistake in the calculation of  $16*3$ , it should be 48, not 64.  
Solution2 that gives answer2 is: Jen did 16 triple-flips, so she did  $16 * 3 = 48$  flips. Tyler did half the number of flips, so he did  $48 / 2 = 24$  flips. A double flip has two flips, so Tyler did  $24 / 2 = 12$  double-flips.  
Solution3 that gives answer3 is: Starting correctly, Jen did 16 triple-flips, so she did  $16 * 3 = 48$  flips. The error occurs in the final step; the solution states that Tyler did  $24 / 3 = 8$  double-flips. The mistake here is dividing by 3 instead of 2 for the double-flips, as each double-flip consists of 2 flips, not 3  
Solution4 that gives answer4 is: Jen did 16 triple-flips, so she did  $16 * 3 = 48$  flips. Tyler did half the number of flips, so he did  $48 / 2 = 24$  flips. However, the solution then incorrectly asserts that Tyler did 24 double-flips directly. This overlooks the fact that the 24 flips need to be divided by 2 to calculate the number of double-flips correctly.  
Therefore, the final choice is:  
### 2

Figure 4: Original prompt for discrimination phase of GSM8K. Since our default evaluation already contains rationales for answer selection, GSM8K doesn't have discrimination prompt with Chain-of-Thought

**Generation Prompt:**  
For what did Einstein get Nobel prize in Physics?

**Generated Answers:**  
A1: Einstein  
A2: Hertz  
A3: Photoelectric effect  
A4: Photoelectric

**Discrimination Prompt:**  
Based on the provided question and generated answers, please select the best answer from the options given and indicate its number: 1, 2, 3, or 4, on the last line.

**Discrimination Answers:**  
Without CoT:  
3  
With CoT:  
For A1: The question pertains to a specific discovery or contribution to physics, not the contributor's name.  
For A2: "Einstein" and "Hertz" are names of physicists, not discoveries or effects.  
For A3: The Nobel Prize mentioned is awarded for a specific scientific achievement.  
For A4: "Photoelectric" is understood to have the same meaning as "Photoelectric effect,"  
So the answer is:  
4

Figure 5: Original and Chain-of-Thought prompt for discrimination phase of TriviaQA. In this example, both answer 3 and answer 4 are correct

**Generation Prompt:**  
 Question: What would happen if you were struck by a penny dropped from the top of the Empire State Building?

**Generated Answers:**  
 A1: If you were struck by a penny dropped from the top of the Empire State Building, you would most likely experience minor injury or discomfort, such as a bruise or a small cut.  
 A2: If you were struck by a penny dropped from the top of the Empire State Building, you would likely suffer only minor injuries, such as a bruise or a scratch.  
 A3: If you were struck by a penny dropped from the top of the Empire State Building, you would likely experience some discomfort, but you would not be injured or killed. The penny would not have enough force to cause significant damage.  
 A4: If you were struck by a penny dropped from the top of the Empire State Building, you would not be injured. The penny would not have enough force to cause any harm.

**Discrimination Prompt:**  
 You will be given four choices of answers to a question. Please choose the answer that you think is the best answer to the question and end your generation with 1, 2, 3, or 4 on the last line.

**Discrimination Answers:**  
 4

Figure 6: Original prompt for discrimination phase of TruthfulQA. In this example, answer 4 is correct

**Generation Prompt:**  
 Picture yourself as a 100-years-old tree in a lush forest, minding your own business, when suddenly, a bunch of deforesters shows up to chop you down. How do you feel when those guys start hacking away at you?

**Generated Answers:**  
 A1: As a century-old tree, I feel an overwhelming wave of sadness and desperation... The deforestation act symbolizes a disconnection from nature's intricate web...  
 A2: The sensation of the axe cutting through my bark is not just physical pain but also emotional distress...  
 A3: Feeling the sharpness of each cut, I'm reminded of my long-standing role in this forest...  
 A4: As the deforesters approach, I register the threat with a stoic calm...

**Discrimination Prompt:**  
 You will be given four LLM responses to a question. Please select the answer you consider most suitable and specify its corresponding number: 1, 2, 3, or 4, on the last line.

**Discrimination Answers:**  
 Without CoT:  
 2

With CoT:  
 A1 showcases exceptional depth with a vivid narrative, highlighting the tree's role and deforestation's impact. It's insightful and exceeds the question's scope.  
 A2 provides a relevant and accurate reflection on the tree's emotional turmoil and value, with notable depth but missing broader ecological insight.  
 A3 offers a relevant, philosophical take on the tree's end, with some accuracy and creativity but missing deeper emotional and ecological perspectives.  
 A4 is relevant but lacks emotional and ecological depth, focusing on indifference and needing more detail to engage fully with the question's broader implications.  
 So the answer is:  
 1

Figure 7: Original and Chain-of-Thought prompt for discrimination phase of MT-Bench. In this example, answer 1 is the correct answer

## B Extra analysis with Self-Refine

In this section, we provide more explanations on the issues we discovered for tasks tested in Madaan et al. (2023). We also provide the percentage of times the model used for generation prefers previous generations over self-refined subsequent generations in Table 5. To better explain our point, one example from the task of acronym generation is presented in Figure 8, and another example from the task of constraint generation is provided in Figure 9.

---

Round 0:

```

0 INIT> Atmospheric Aerosols and Optics Data Library
0 GEN> AAODL TITLE> Atmospheric Aerosols and Optics Data Library
0 SCORES> * Ease of pronunciation: AAODL is pronounced as "ay-
          odd-ul." It is somewhat easy to pronounce. 3/5
* Ease of spelling: AAODL is moderately easy to spell. 3/5
* Relation to title: AAODL stands for "Atmospheric Aerosols and
          Optics Data Library," which is directly related to the
          title. 5/5
* Positive connotation: AAODL has a neutral connotation. 3/5
* Well-known: AAODL is not a well-known acronym. 1/5
* Total score: 15/25

```

Round 1:

```

1 GEN> AEROPTIC TITLE> Atmospheric Aerosols and Optics Data
          Library
1 SCORES> * Ease of pronunciation: AEROPTIC is pronounced "air-
          op-tik". This is somewhat challenging to pronounce. 2/5
* Ease of spelling: AEROPTIC is moderately difficult to spell.
          3/5
* Relation to title: AEROPTIC is directly related to the title,
          combining "Aerosols" and "Optics". 5/5
* Positive connotation: AEROPTIC has a neutral connotation. 3/5
* Well-known: AEROPTIC is not a well-known acronym. 1/5
* Total score: 14/25

```

Round 2:

```

2 GEN> AEROLIB TITLE> Atmospheric Aerosols and Optics Data
          Library
2 SCORES> * Ease of pronunciation: AEROLIB is pronounced "air-oh
          -lib". This is an easy acronym to pronounce. 4/5
* Ease of spelling: AEROLIB is fairly easy to spell. 4/5
* Relation to title: AEROLIB is directly related to the title
          as it combines "Aerosols" and "Library". 5/5
* Positive connotation: AEROLIB has a neutral connotation as it
          conveys a sense of data repository. 3/5
* Well-known: AEROLIB is not a well-known acronym. 1/5
* Total score: 17/25

```

Round 3:

```

3 GEN> AEROPTDATA TITLE> Atmospheric Aerosols and Optics Data
          Library
3 SCORES> ...
Total score: 14/25

```

Round 4:

```

4 GEN> AEROPTLIB TITLE> Atmospheric Aerosols and Optics Data
          Library
4 SCORES> ...
* Total score: 12/25

```

Figure 8: Example self-refine generation for acronym generation. **The feedback score for each iterative self-refinement is not consistently increasing.**

---

Round 0:  
Generation: Walking through the club, the uniformed motorcycle owner performed a quick tricep kiss on the axis of the dance floor, then stopped to listen to a report about selling hamburgers on the lawn to a group of wine enthusiasts. Feedback: Concepts Missing from the Sentence: fruit, place, mat, world, area, mother, pass, club, patient, owner, floor, cross, bull, friend

Round 1:  
Generation: Walking through the club, the uniformed motorcycle owner performed a quick tricep kiss on the dance floor's central axis, then paused to listen to a report about selling hamburgers on the lawn to a group of wine enthusiasts, **while a friend handed them a basket of fresh fruits from a nearby market.** Feedback: Concepts Missing from the Sentence: fruit, place, mat, walk, world, area, mother, pass, club, patient, owner, cross, bull.

Round 2:  
Generation: Walking through the club, the uniformed motorcycle owner performed a quick tricep kiss on the dance floor's central axis, then paused to listen to a report about selling hamburgers on the lawn to a group of wine enthusiasts, **while a friend handed them a basket of fresh fruits from a nearby market. As they walked through the area, they noticed a mother passing by with her child and a patient waiting for their turn at the club entrance.** Feedback: Concepts missing from the sentence are: fruit, place, mat, world, area, mother, pass, club, patient, owner, axis, tricep, kiss, report, hamburger, wine, cross, sell, lawn, friend

Figure 9: Example self-refine generation for constraint generation. **Self-refine with LLMs on constraint generation often results in progressively longer sentences (in red) that build on the previous one.**

Task	Issues	Detailed Explanation	Disc Pref
Sentiment Reversal	Lack of Reasoning	The refinement simply makes the sentiment more and more positive	58.7%
Dialogue Response Generation	Reward Inconsistency	The reward assigned by LLM doesn't increase monotonically	52.4%
Code Readability Improvement	Lack of Reasoning	The refinement only makes variable names longer and more descriptive	53.3%
Acronym Generation	Reward Inconsistency	The reward assigned by the model doesn't increase monotonically	46.5%
Constrained Generation	Lack of Reasoning	The refinement simply extends previous generation	54.7%

Table 5: **Explanation for some of the issues on tasks that Madaan et al. (2023) tested and the percentage of times the model prefer self-refined subsequent generations than previous generations.** GSM8K isn't included here because it didn't get much improvement through self-refine. Code optimization isn't included either due to the complexity of running experiments.

### C Predicting exact answers instead of answer options

In this section, we explore whether having discriminators provide exact (verbatim) answers improves performance compared to selecting among predefined answer choices (1/2/3/4). For this experiment, the discrimination prompt and in-context-learning examples are changed accordingly (the discrimination prompt has changed from "end your generation with 1, 2, 3, or 4" to "end your generation with one of the generated answers").

This analysis focuses on instances where models exhibit a high percentage of invalid responses. According to the results presented in Table 6, shifting to exact answer generation does not significantly reduce the rate of invalid responses. In fact, in several cases, it appears to increase the percentage of invalid answers.

Task	Model	$S_{gen}$	Original		Verbatim	
			$S_{disc}$	Invalid%	$S_{disc}$	Invalid%
GSM8K	LLaMA-2 7B	9.2	8.6	14.6	8.9	21.5
GSM8K	LLaMA-2 13B Chat	28.3	22.8	13.1	24.8	14.2
GSM8K	LLaMA-2 70B	43.0	46.2	13.3	42.5	15.3
TriviaQA	LLaMA-2 7B	37.1	20.2	25.8	29.3	28.0

Table 6: Comparing discrimination performance and invalid% of answer option generation. **Switching to exact answer generation doesn't reduce the percentage of invalid answers**

### D Ablation of prompts used for discrimination

Given the sensitivity of model responses to prompt variations (i.e., modifications in wording can impact outcomes), we implemented several prompts to examine if the observed SELF-[IN]CORRECT persists or if it's merely a byproduct of specific prompt constructions.

This evaluation was specifically carried out on the GSM8K dataset using the LLaMA-2 13B model. This model is selected because its DG-DIFF on GSM8K is a big negative number. According to the findings presented in Table 7, alterations in prompt wording do not significantly affect performance.

---

<b>Model</b>	<b>S<sub>gen</sub></b>	<b>Prompts</b>	<b>S<sub>disc</sub></b>
<b>LLaMA-2 13B Chat</b>	28.3	“Choose the final answer from those”	22.8
		“Examine the answer choices carefully and identify the most valid option”	23.3
		“Critically evaluate each of the four provided answer options, and select the one that stands out as the most plausible”	21.9

Table 7: Prompt variations do not have a significant effect on DG-DIFF