# UCSanDiego Qualcomn <br> Al research <br> <br> Deductive Verification of Chain-of-Thought Reasoning <br> <br> Deductive Verification of Chain-of-Thought Reasoning <br> Zhan Ling ${ }^{1 *}$, Yunhao Fang ${ }^{1 *}$, Xuanlin Li $^{1}$, Zhiao Huang ${ }^{1}$, Mingu Lee ${ }^{2}$, Roland Memisevic ${ }^{2}$, Hao Su ${ }^{1}$ ${ }^{1}$ University of California, San Diego, ${ }^{2}$ Qualcomm AI Research 

## Motivation

- Chain-of-thought reasoning introduces hallucinations and accumulated errors which is limiting models' ability to solve complex reasoning tasks.
- However, humans can utilize careful deductive logical reasoning processes to solve tasks and ensure the trustworthiness of their reasoning process through self-verification
- Verifying the validity of an entire vanilla CoT reasoning chain is challenging, even with advanced models like ChatGPT


Zero-shot and two-shot verification accuracy of GPT-3.5-turbo for 100 generated CoT reasoning chains: 50 valid and 50 with mistakes.


## Results and Limitations

| Verification Method $\mid$ Reasoning Correctness | GSM8k | AQuA | MATH | AddSub | Date | Last Letters | Overall |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CoT | Correct | $98 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $92 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
|  | Incorrect | $2 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
|  | (Average) | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $52 \%$ |
| Natural Program | Correct | $84 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $85 \%$ |
|  | Incorrect | $84 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
|  | (Average) | $\mathbf{8 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 \%}$ | $51 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 9 \%}$ |


| Methods | Arithmetic |  |  |  | Commonsense |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GSM8K | AQuA | MATH* | AddSub | Date | Last Letters |
| CoT + Voting | 87.62\% | 70.18\% | 35.93\% | 92.36\% | 69.97\% | 81.60\% |
| Faithful CoT + Voting | 75.80\% | 61.80\% | 31.78\% ${ }^{1}$ | 88.35\% ${ }^{1}$ | 73.50\% | - |
| Ours (Natural Program (NP), No Verification) | 87.05\% | 70.34\% | 36.75\% | 93.67\% | 72.49\% | 92.98\% |
| Ours (NP + Deductive Verification + UPV) | 86.01\% | 69.49\% | 36.48\% | 93.54\% | 71.45\% | 92.60\% |

Question: In March it rained 0.81 inches. It rained 0.35 inches less in April than in March.
How much did it rain in April?
Ground Truth: It rained $0.81-0.35=0.46$ inches.
GPT-3.5-turbo (ChatGPT):
Question-related premises:
Question-related premises:
\#1. It rained 0.81 inches in March.
\#1. It rained 0.81 inches in March.
\#2. It rained 0.35 inches less in April than in March.
\#3. How much did it rain in April?
The first reasoning step:
\#4. (by \#2) Step 1: Calculate how much it rained in April by subtracting the difference of 0.35 inches from
the amount in March.
Amount of rain in April: $0.81-0.35=0.46$ inches

