

Efficient MAP Estimation of LLM Judgment Performance with Prior Transfer

Huaizhi Qu¹ Inyoung Choi² Zhen Tan³ Song Wang⁴ Sukwon Yun¹ Qi Long² Faizan Siddiqui⁵
Kwonjoon Lee⁵ Tianlong Chen¹

Abstract

LLM ensembles are widely used for LLM judges. However, how to estimate their accuracy, especially in an efficient way, is unknown. In this paper, we present a principled *maximum a posteriori* (MAP) framework for an economical and precise estimation of the performance of LLM ensemble judgment. We first propose a mixture of Beta-Binomial distributions to model the judgment distribution, revising from the vanilla Binomial distribution. Next, we introduce a conformal prediction-driven approach that enables adaptive stopping during iterative sampling to balance accuracy with efficiency. Furthermore, we design a prior transfer mechanism that utilizes learned distributions on open-source datasets to improve estimation on a target dataset when only scarce annotations are available. Finally, we present BetaConform, a framework that integrates our distribution assumption, adaptive stopping, and the prior transfer mechanism to deliver a theoretically guaranteed distribution estimation of LLM ensemble judgment with minimum labeled samples. BetaConform is also validated empirically. For instance, with only 10 samples from the TruthfulQA dataset, for a Llama ensemble judge, BetaConform gauges its performance with error margin as small as 3.37%.

1. Introduction

With the improving performance of large language models (LLMs), there is a proliferation of adopting LLMs as judges for various tasks (Liang et al., 2023; Yuan et al., 2024b; Zhang et al., 2025). In applications of LLM judge ensembles, the judgment distribution is critical to the service quality (Chen et al., 2024; Schoenegger et al., 2024; Qiu et al., 2025). Many datasets (Zheng et al., 2023; Zeng et al., 2023; Yuan et al., 2024a) have been employed to

¹The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill ²University of Pennsylvania ³Arizona State University ⁴University of Virginia ⁵Honda Research Institute USA. Correspondence to: Tianlong Chen <tianlong@cs.unc.edu>, Kwonjoon Lee <kwonjoon.lee@honda-ri.com>.




Figure 1. In this paper, we aim to answer (1) how to estimate the judgment distribution of LLM ensemble on a dataset, and (2) how to achieve efficient estimation to reduce annotation effort.

evaluate the performance of LLM judges. However, these datasets rely on human annotations, which are impractical at large scale due to the substantial time and financial costs of annotating. This challenge highlights the need of *how to estimate the LLM ensemble judging performance efficiently*.

In this work, we consider judgment distribution estimation:

$$\mathbb{P}(\# \text{ correct judgments} = n \mid k \text{ LLMs judge sample } x).$$

We propose an efficient method for MAP estimation of the distribution of LLM ensemble judgment to answer two research questions shown in Figure 1.

- RQ1:** How to estimate the judgment distribution?
- RQ2:** How many samples are needed for estimation?

Given a small number of samples, one intuitive estimation is to directly adopt the distribution of the samples as the judgment distribution on the entire dataset. However, this is susceptible to the sampling bias. To avoid this, one common practice is to first calculate the single LLM accuracy on the samples and then model the distribution on the full dataset as Binomial. We first posit that the judgment distribution is not Binomial. Theoretically, a Binomial distribution implies increasing accuracy in majority voting as the ensemble size grows (De Condorcet et al., 2014; Austen-Smith & Banks, 1996). However, this is unrealistic since the accuracy of LLM ensembles remains bounded even with a large number of judges. To testify to this, we start by observing the distribution of LLM ensemble judges on various benchmarks. We find marked deviations from the Binomial distribution and show a stratification between questions that can be classified

as “easy” and “hard”. To this end, we propose to model the judgment distribution with a mixture of Beta-Binomial distributions to reflect the stratification. We show that under this assumption, by utilizing an expectation maximization (EM) estimation method, it can achieve accurate judgment distribution estimation with high data efficiency.

To rigorously guide the sampling process and determine how many samples to use for the estimation, we draw inspiration from the conformal prediction (CP) (Shafer & Vovk, 2008; Fontana et al., 2023) that can efficiently estimate the sampling deviation. Based on this, we propose a novel adaptive stopping strategy for iterative sampling, designed to meet a pre-defined deviation threshold. Our experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of this method for limiting the sample amount while maintaining high estimation precision.

Moreover, we hypothesize that the prior knowledge of judgment distribution on open-source datasets can benefit the estimation of a new dataset when only a few samples are available. To achieve this, we propose a text similarity-based distribution prior transfer mechanism. This method embeds text inputs from both source and target datasets and calculates embedding similarities to determine the transfer weight. Our design greatly improves the estimation accuracy when transferring from similar datasets and avoids performance degradation when the datasets are distinct. Notably, this method relies solely on the text inputs, making it practical for application to vast amounts of unlabeled data.

Our contribution can be summarized as follows:

- We present pioneering work in judgment distribution estimation. We point out that the Binomial assumption of judgment distribution is inaccurate. By replacing it with a mixture of Beta-Binomial distributions, we could achieve efficient and accurate estimation.
- We design a rigorous conformal prediction-based adaptive stopping strategy during iterative sampling when the sampling deviation is sufficiently low.
- We introduce a distribution prior transfer mechanism that leverages judgment distributions on open-source datasets to improve few-sample estimations.
- Extensive experiments show BetaConform’s high estimation efficiency. For example, using only 10 samples could result in an average of 10.84% error margin.

2. Related Works

LLMs for Judgment. Reliable model evaluation is a critical problem. Traditional human evaluations remain the gold standard, but their scalability is a significant bottleneck in large-scale applications. Thus, recent works have proposed leveraging LLMs to evaluate the text quality, ranking outputs, and ensuring alignment with human preferences (Zheng et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023; Dubois et al., 2024).




Figure 2. Overview of BetaConform. Given a target dataset, adaptive stopping is adopted to determine the sample amount (b, Section 5). During iterative sampling, the sampling deviation is monitored by using conformal prediction. The sampling process stops when the deviation is sufficiently low. Next, the estimation of the small number of samples from the previous step is further enhanced by transferring distribution priors from source datasets (c, Section 6). The transfer mechanism will assign a larger weight to the dataset that is textually closer to the target dataset.

While initially focused on text generation evaluation, the use of LLMs as judges has expanded to diverse applications including model alignment and safety assessment (Lee et al., 2024), code quality evaluation (Zhao et al., 2024b), and knowledge verification (Min et al., 2023), etc.

Challenges and Limitations. The reliability of such frameworks is not without concerns. Studies have found that even advanced models like GPT-4 often exhibit systematic biases such as position bias and egocentric bias (Zeng et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023), overconfidence in their judgments (Koo et al., 2024), and self-preference effects (Panickssery et al., 2024). Moreover, many studies employing LLM annotations do not explicitly measure the alignment between LLMs and humans, thus further raising questions about their dependability (Calderon et al., 2025). While researchers have proposed various solutions, including dynamic evaluation pipelines (Yu et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024a; Moniri et al., 2024), self-reflection mechanisms (Wu et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023b; Wang et al., 2024), and specialized benchmarks for assessing judge performance (Zheng et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2024; Park et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024b; Zhao et al., 2024b; Li et al., 2024a), these methods often fall short in offering rigorous guarantees of their outcomes.

Statistical Approaches. Another direction of research focuses on providing statistical guarantees for LLM performance. Researchers have explored conformal methods (Angelopoulos et al., 2023) to ensure correctness and factuality (Mohri & Hashimoto, 2024) and to determine when LLMs should abstain from responding (Yadkori et al., 2024).

While these methods provide some statistical rigor, there is still a need for a unified framework that establishes reliable, theoretically grounded approaches for assessing LLM performance across diverse applications.

3. Problem Setup

We consider the task of using an LLM ensemble to evaluate and judge samples by discerning, choosing, or scoring. Let:

- n : Total number of samples in the dataset.
- k : Number of LLMs in an ensemble.
- S : The random variable of correct judgments.
- r : Number of samples to estimate S .
- D : A dataset to estimate the judgment distribution.

Definition 3.1 (LLM Ensemble Judgment). Let $\mathcal{J} = \{J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k\}$ be an ensemble of k LLM judges. For a given input x , each LLM J_i generates an output $o_i = J_i(x)$, producing all judgments as $\mathcal{O} = \{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_k\}$. In this paper, we focus on binary and scoring judgment.

Definition 3.2 (LLM Ensemble Correct Judgment). For an ensemble of k LLMs, the random variable

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^k \text{Match}(o_i, y) \quad (1)$$

denotes the number of correct judgments, where y is the ground truth and $\text{Match}(\cdot)$ is the criteria for correct judgment. The ensemble’s decision is correct if $S \geq \lceil k/2 \rceil$. To avoid the situation of a tie when k is an even number and $S = \lceil k/2 \rceil$, we only consider an odd number of k .

4. Mixture of Beta-Binomial Distribution

4.1. Examination of Binomial Distribution

We start by examining the common assumption of S follows a Binomial distribution, i.e. the probability of having s correct judgments when a single judge accuracy \hat{p} is,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{Bin}}(S = s) = \text{Bin}(s | k, \hat{p}) = \binom{k}{s} \hat{p}^s (1 - \hat{p})^{k-s}. \quad (2)$$

The error rate \tilde{P}_{Bin} of ensemble judgment is:

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{Bin}} = \mathbb{P}_{\text{Bin}}(S < \lceil k/2 \rceil) = \sum_{s=0}^{\lceil k/2 \rceil - 1} \binom{k}{s} \hat{p}^s (1 - \hat{p})^{k-s}. \quad (3)$$

We first examine the common assumption that S follows a Binomial distribution in Equation (2). Specifically, we ❶ evaluate individual LLMs on datasets across domains and ❷ use the single LLM accuracy p in Equation (2) and (3) to estimate both the distribution of LLM ensembles on these datasets and the majority voting error rate for different

numbers k of LLMs. Specifically, we evaluate GPT-4 (OpenAI et al., 2024) and Llama-3.3-70B (Dubey et al., 2024) on hallucination detection (HaluEval, Li et al., 2023a) and Human alignment (JudgeBench, Tan et al., 2024) datasets. Results are shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

The results in Figure 3 and Figure 4 demonstrate the large deviation of Binomial distribution to the real distribution. On both datasets, the real distributions of LLM ensemble judgments consistently show two peaks centering at the two ends, while Binomial distribution results in a single peak with a large shift to either of the two peaks. Notably, in Figure 4, the assumption of a Binomial distribution leads to an always decreasing majority voting error rate, which is in sharp contrast with the actual error rate that remains at the same level when the ensemble becomes larger.

4.2. Mixture of Beta-Binomial Distributions

Assumption 4.1 (Mixture of Beta-Binomial Distributions).

$$S \sim w\text{BB}(k, \alpha_1, \beta_1) + (1 - w)\text{BB}(k, \alpha_2, \beta_2), \quad (4)$$

where $\text{BB}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ is the Beta-Binomial distribution, k is the number of judges in the ensemble, $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2$ are parameters of the two distributions, and w is the mixture weight.

Corollary 4.2 (Mixture Distribution Error Rate). *The error rate of the mixture of Beta-Binomial distributions is*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_{\text{BB}} = & w \sum_{s=0}^{\lceil k/2 \rceil - 1} \binom{k}{s} \frac{\text{B}(s + \alpha_1, k - s + \beta_1)}{\text{B}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)} \\ & + (1 - w) \sum_{s=0}^{\lceil k/2 \rceil - 1} \binom{k}{s} \frac{\text{B}(s + \alpha_2, k - s + \beta_2)}{\text{B}(\alpha_2, \beta_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\text{B}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Beta function.

After examining the common Binomial distribution assumption in Figure 3 and Figure 4, we notice that the real distribution keeps showing two peaks centering near all wrong and all correct. Motivated by this observation, in Assumption 4.1 we model the distribution as a mixture of two Beta-Binomial distributions, where one distribution models the LLM ensemble judgments on simple questions and the other one for hard problems. To derive all the parameters, we utilize labeled samples from the dataset and design a distribution-tailored expectation maximization (EM) algorithm.

4.3. Expectation Maximization

Samples as Distribution Evidence. Given r samples, each containing judgments from k LLMs, S_i is the number of correct judgments in the i -th sample and $p_i = S_i/k$ as the estimated probability of success for the i -th sample.

For the i -th sample, considering the first Beta-Binomial distribution, a responsibility γ_1^i is assigned to it




Figure 3. Comparison of judgment distributions among actual, Binomial, and ours. Llama-3.3-70B and GPT-4 ensembles of 11 models are tested on HaluEval and JudgeBench, respectively. The Binomial distribution is estimated by using single judge accuracy p . Our mixture distribution is estimated with 100 samples and scaled to the full dataset. **Our distribution is consistently closer to the actual one.**




Figure 4. Majority voting error rate of actual, Binomial, and our mixture distribution. Binomial uses single judge accuracy p . Our distribution is estimated with 100 random samples and tested for 3 times. The line denotes the average error rate and the shadow represents the standard variance. Binomial shows decreasing error rate, while **our distribution captures the actual trend.**

$$\gamma_1^i = \frac{w\text{Beta}(p_i | \alpha_1, \beta_1)}{w\text{Beta}(p_i | \alpha_1, \beta_1) + (1-w)\text{Beta}(p_i | \alpha_2, \beta_2)}, \quad (6)$$

where $\text{Beta}(p_i | \alpha, \beta)$ is the probability density of Beta distribution at p_i for the i -th sample under the corresponding Beta component. γ_1^i represents the probability that the i -th sample belongs to the first Beta component, and $\gamma_2^i = 1 - \gamma_1^i$ is the probability for the second component.

Parameters Update. The parameters are updated based on the weighted contributions of samples. The parameters of two distributions $j = \{1, 2\}$ are updated as

$$\alpha'_j = \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_1^i \cdot S_i, \quad \beta'_j = \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_1^i \cdot (k - S_i), \quad w' = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_1^i \quad (7)$$

We verify our distribution assumption by first sampling $r = 100$ judgments made by two models on two datasets and apply our distribution-tailored EM algorithm to estimate the parameters. Our method is evaluated in two scenarios: ① In Figure 3, we fix the ensemble size $k = 11$ and compare the estimated distribution against the real distribution and Binomial distribution, and ② in Figure 4 we estimate the error rate of majority voting with different ensemble sizes.

In Figure 3, the mixture of Beta-Binomial distributions is significantly closer to the real distribution compared to the

Binomial, with clear two-peak patterns that are analogous to the observation. In Figure 4 it shows that our distribution is consistently close to the real majority voting error rate across all ensemble sizes. Contrary to the Binomial distribution that produced a decreasing error rate when the ensemble becomes larger. Additionally, the narrow confidence interval demonstrates the high stability of our method.

5. Guide Sampling via Conformal Prediction

In the experiments above, we used a fixed number of samples. However, in practical settings where datasets are unannotated and being labeled, it is essential to determine when the number of annotated samples is sufficient for accurate estimation. Inspired by conformal prediction (CP), which does not rely on prior knowledge of the dataset distribution and can rigorously estimate the sampling deviation, we propose leveraging its principles to address this challenge.

5.1. Conformal Prediction for Adaptive Stopping

CP provides a principled approach to dynamically evaluate the sampling deviation in the distribution of the number of correct judgments S , which can be used as guidance.

Nonconformity Scores. A major part of CP is the non-conformity score, which measures how a test sample differs from the rest of the data. In our implementation, we set the

nonconformity score as

$$\text{score}(S_i) = |S_i - \mathbb{E}[S]|, \quad (8)$$

which quantifies the deviation of each observed value of S from the expected value.

Calibration Data and Quantile Computation. Suppose r samples have been used to test the LLM ensemble with S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r correct judgments, the CP sampling computes the nonconformity scores for all calibration data as $s_i = \text{score}(S_i)$ and these scores are sorted in ascending order as $s_1 < \dots < s_r$. For a desired estimation confidence $1 - \epsilon$, the $(1 - \epsilon)$ -quantile with r samples $q_{1-\epsilon}^r$ is

$$q_{1-\epsilon}^r = s_{\lceil (1-\epsilon) \cdot (r+1) \rceil}. \quad (9)$$

Adaptive Stopping Criteria. Adaptive stopping is achieved by monitoring the variation of the conformal prediction quantile. After r samples, the $(1 - \epsilon)$ -quantile is recomputed and compared with the one from $r - 1$ samples. The sampling process stops when the quantile satisfies

$$|q_{1-\epsilon}^r - q_{1-\epsilon}^{r-1}| \leq \xi \quad (10)$$

where ξ is a predefined threshold.

Proposition 5.1 (Sample Amount with Adaptive Stopping). *For a given sampling deviation threshold ξ and a scale τ , the sample amount r should satisfy*

$$\tau \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r-1}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \right) \leq \xi, \quad (11)$$

This proposition offers an estimation of the sample amount under the threshold ξ .

Proposition 5.2 (Error Rate with Adaptive Stopping). *Under the sampling threshold ξ , the majority voting error rate of the mixture distribution becomes*

$$(1 - \min(\xi, \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{r}})) \tilde{P}_{\text{BB}} < \tilde{P}_{\text{adapt}} < (1 + \min(\xi, \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{r}})) \tilde{P}_{\text{BB}} \quad (12)$$

This proposition provides a theoretical error bound for estimation under adaptive stopping, suggesting the mild degradation of estimation performance.

We leave the proofs of Proposition 5.1 and 5.2 in Appendix A.1 and A.2, respectively. In our experiments, we set $\xi = 0.03$, and $\tau = 25$, which leads to $r \geq 56$.

6. Text Similarity for Distribution Prior Transfer

To further improve the data efficiency when only a few samples are available and enhance estimation accuracy, we

propose to incorporate prior knowledge about the LLM ensemble on other open-source datasets and transfer the estimated judgment distributions to the target dataset. However, one challenge is that the prior transfer could bring performance degradation if the distributions of the source datasets and the target dataset are very different. To resolve this challenge, we design text similarity-based distribution prior transfer, which leverages the strong text embedding capability of the recent models to understand and measure the textual difference among datasets.

Text Embedding. To embed the text inputs of the LLM ensemble, we use NV-Embed-V2 (Lee et al., 2025). Given sets of samples $\{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_m\}$ from m source datasets, the embedding model $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ is utilized to transform the sets of samples to sets of embeddings for the source datasets

$$\{E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m\} = \{\mathcal{E}(D_1), \mathcal{E}(D_2), \dots, \mathcal{E}(D_m)\}. \quad (13)$$

The average embedding $\bar{E}_i = \frac{1}{r_i} \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} E_i^j$ of the i -th dataset is used to represent it.

Distribution Prior Transfer. To transfer the distribution from source datasets to the target dataset D_0 , the process starts by embedding the target dataset $E_0 = \mathcal{E}(D_0)$ and acquiring its average embedding \bar{E}_0 . For the dataset D_i , its transfer weight is

$$\lambda_i = \log(r_i) \cdot \sigma(\alpha \cdot (\text{CosSim}(\bar{E}_0, \bar{E}_i) - \beta)), \quad (14)$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid function, r_i is the number of samples and α and β are hyperparameters. We adopt this design to avoid the degradation of estimation caused by transferring datasets with dissimilar text inputs. This is achieved by setting a threshold and applying the sigmoid function to suppress the weight when the similarity is low. $\log(r_i)$ is included as datasets with more samples could produce a more accurate estimation and thus should have a higher impact on the transfer. The transfer is performed as

$$w_0^{tr} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^m \lambda_i \cdot w_i}{\sum_{i=0}^m \lambda_i}, \alpha_{0,j}^{tr} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^m \lambda_i \cdot \alpha_{i,j}}{\sum_{i=0}^m \lambda_i}, \quad (15)$$

$$\beta_{0,j}^{tr} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^m \lambda_i \cdot \beta_{i,j}}{\sum_{i=0}^m \lambda_i}, \quad j \in \{1, 2\}.$$

In Equation (15), $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $\beta_{i,j}$ are the j -th parameter in the mixture distribution of i -th dataset. The parameters in the weighted sum with index 0 denote direct estimation using the limited samples of the target dataset.

Examples. To verify our distribution design, we evaluate the distribution within splits of HaluEval (Li et al., 2023a) and TruthfulQA (Lin et al., 2021) datasets. For HaluEval, we use Dialogue and Summarization splits as source datasets and transfer to QA split; for TruthfulQA, we transfer from topics of Health and Law to Misconceptions. As




Figure 5. Examples of distribution prior transfer. Splits from HaluEval form distinct clusters in the embedding space, and transfer does not degrade performance compared to only using target dataset samples. In contrast, topics in TruthfulQA exhibit closer proximity, where transfer leads to significant performance improvements compared to solely using the limited samples of the target dataset.

shown in Figure 5, the embeddings form distant clusters in HaluEval, as the text inputs of the three splits have different hallucination detection requirements, and embeddings from TruthfulQA overlap due to the similarity of judgment format. When clusters are separated, our method will not bring performance degradation compared to solely using samples from the target dataset, while when clusters are overlapping, our method brings a significantly lower estimation error rate margin compared to only using target dataset samples. This supports the effectiveness of our distribution transfer design.

7. BetaConform

In this section, we present BetaConform, the framework for efficient estimation of judgment distribution, as shown in Figure 2 and Algorithm 1. When only limited samples on the target dataset are available, it transfers distribution priors from source datasets. Given more samples, it employs adaptive stopping during iterative sampling to balance sample efficiency with estimation accuracy.

Algorithm 1 BetaConform

- 1: **Input:** target dataset D_0 , source datasets D_1, \dots, D_m , judges $\mathcal{J} = \{J_1, \dots, J_k\}$, EM algorithm $\text{EM}(\cdot)$
- 2: **Output:** distribution parameters Ω on the target dataset
- 3: **if** limited samples in D_0 **then**
- 4: Compute distribution parameters on D_0
- 5: Compute parameters of distributions on D_1, \dots, D_m
- 6: Compute transfer weights by Equation (14)
- 7: $\Omega \leftarrow$ Compute transferred parameters by Eq. (15)
- 8: **else**
- 9: Initial $D \leftarrow \{\}$, $q_{1-\epsilon}^0 \leftarrow -\infty$
- 10: **while** Equation (10) is not satisfied **do**
- 11: Add a sample from D_0 to D and update $q_{1-\epsilon}^{|D|}$
- 12: **end while**
- 13: $\Omega \leftarrow$ Compute distribution parameters on samples D
- 14: **end if**
- 15: **return** Ω

8. Experiments

We evaluate LLM ensembles of up to 11 models, including popular *close-source* models (GPT-3.5, Brown et al.,

2020; GPT-4, OpenAI et al., 2024) and *open-source* models (Llama-3.3-70B, Dubey et al., 2024; Qwen-2.5-72B, Yang et al., 2024; InternLM-2.5-20B, Cai et al., 2024). We choose domains of *hallucination detection* (HaluEval, Li et al., 2023a; TruthfulQA, Lin et al., 2021; HalluDial, Luo et al., 2024), *reasoning* (PRM800K, Lightman et al., 2023; BIG-bench, Srivastava et al., 2022; TRAM, Wang & Zhao, 2023), *scoring* (ICE-Score, Zhuo, 2023; Comp-Analysis, Zhang et al., 2024) and *alignment* (JudgeBench, Tan et al., 2024; RewardBench, Lambert et al., 2024; LLMBench, Zeng et al., 2023). Across experiments, we set the adaptive stopping threshold to $\xi = 0.01$, which requires at least $r \geq 51$ samples to meet the stopping criteria. The sampling and estimation process is conducted for 30 times on each dataset.

8.1. Estimation Accuracy

We begin by evaluating BetaConform with adaptive stopping on datasets to verify its accuracy. We choose Binomial distribution and a single Beta-Binomial distribution as baselines and compare the error margin, which is the absolute difference between the estimation error rate and the actual value. The results of the error margin and sample numbers are reported in Table 1 and Table 4.

From the results, the following observations can be drawn: ① Compared to the Binomial distribution, BetaConform achieves consistently lower error margin, with 32.4% ~ 54.1% improvements of average error margin of all models. This demonstrates an effective answer to **RQ1** by modeling judgment distribution as a mixture of Beta-Binomial distributions. ② The number of samples is close to the theoretical estimation. The average sample amount of models on all datasets exhibit a slight deviation of the estimated value 56 by 3.14 ~ 12.86 samples. This validates our design of using the distribution-free CP for adaptive stopping, which effectively solved **RQ2**.

8.2. Distribution Prior Transfer

We then verify our text similarity-based distribution prior transfer when only limited samples are available. We constrain to 10 samples from the target dataset and assume the full source datasets are accessible. Transfer is compared

Table 1. The comparison of error margins between our mixture of Beta-Binomial distributions and Binomial distribution. The **Err. Margin** and **# Samples** answer **RQ1** and **RQ2**, respectively. The error margin is calculated as the absolute difference between the actual error rate and the estimation. Estimations using both distributions are done on samples obtained through iterative sampling with adaptive stopping. For each run, the error margin is computed from $k = 1$ to 11, and the average margin of ensemble sizes is used as the result for that run. We conduct 30 runs and report the average and standard deviation. The average number of samples across runs is also reported.

Dataset	Method	Llama-3.3-70B		Qwen-2.5-72B		InternLM-2.5-20B		GPT-3.5		GPT-4	
		Err. Margin (\downarrow)	# Samples (\downarrow)	Err. Margin (\downarrow)	# Samples (\downarrow)	Err. Margin (\downarrow)	# Samples (\downarrow)	Err. Margin (\downarrow)	# Samples (\downarrow)	Err. Margin (\downarrow)	# Samples (\downarrow)
Hallucination Detection Datasets											
HaluEval	Binomial	17.62 \pm 0.73	49.47	12.45 \pm 1.04	61.02	16.67 \pm 0.38	50.67	5.78 \pm 0.08	34.80	9.16 \pm 0.18	40.58
	Ours	6.68 \pm 0.53		4.72 \pm 0.38		5.48 \pm 0.41		5.10 \pm 0.24		6.28 \pm 0.39	
TruthfulQA	Binomial	14.00 \pm 0.65	54.13	19.86 \pm 0.40	53.56	19.55 \pm 0.65	55.56	14.44 \pm 0.40	47.64	15.20 \pm 0.55	57.07
	Ours	7.53 \pm 0.55		7.18 \pm 0.44		6.24 \pm 0.59		6.75 \pm 0.58		6.73 \pm 0.38	
HaluDial	Binomial	13.10 \pm 0.37	46.58	13.42 \pm 0.54	55.78	14.84 \pm 0.42	51.87	8.79 \pm 0.21	41.51	9.25 \pm 0.27	42.31
	Ours	7.94 \pm 0.68		6.96 \pm 0.47		6.43 \pm 0.50		6.27 \pm 0.36		5.22 \pm 0.59	
Reasoning Datasets											
PRM800K	Binomial	10.11 \pm 0.29	43.33	9.14 \pm 0.17	42.89	9.12 \pm 0.20	46.13	8.83 \pm 0.25	51.38	14.52 \pm 0.73	54.67
	Ours	9.37 \pm 0.64		7.82 \pm 0.69		4.52 \pm 0.50		8.46 \pm 0.51		6.17 \pm 0.48	
BIG-bench	Binomial	13.29 \pm 0.78	51.51	14.17 \pm 0.40	47.82	14.68 \pm 0.24	48.40	14.83 \pm 0.53	46.13	12.15 \pm 0.74	46.09
	Ours	11.15 \pm 0.60		6.97 \pm 0.58		5.54 \pm 0.51		12.59 \pm 0.48		8.02 \pm 0.59	
TRAM	Binomial	14.79 \pm 0.82	55.87	13.13 \pm 0.64	57.16	13.06 \pm 0.77	57.78	4.99 \pm 0.13	39.07	5.14 \pm 0.11	38.53
	Ours	8.39 \pm 0.63		6.20 \pm 0.34		6.10 \pm 0.58		3.94 \pm 0.17		4.81 \pm 0.23	
Human Alignment Datasets											
JudgeBench	Binomial	12.06 \pm 0.78	60.58	13.45 \pm 0.54	58.40	10.31 \pm 1.03	57.16	8.85 \pm 0.33	41.07	10.98 \pm 0.32	46.58
	Ours	6.98 \pm 0.56		5.39 \pm 0.39		5.26 \pm 0.39		7.03 \pm 0.61		6.45 \pm 0.53	
RewardBench	Binomial	8.40 \pm 0.19	40.22	8.93 \pm 0.22	45.20	17.36 \pm 1.41	52.04	11.42 \pm 0.33	42.27	13.98 \pm 0.29	48.22
	Ours	11.30 \pm 0.62		4.68 \pm 0.56		6.58 \pm 0.40		6.90 \pm 0.45		7.65 \pm 0.51	
LLMBar	Binomial	13.61 \pm 0.58	50.18	14.63 \pm 0.51	51.07	13.66 \pm 1.14	51.29	13.19 \pm 0.55	44.40	10.36 \pm 0.33	44.40
	Ours	10.18 \pm 0.71		7.52 \pm 0.63		6.38 \pm 0.53		13.71 \pm 0.54		8.16 \pm 0.50	
Scoring Datasets											
ICE-Score	Binomial	8.91 \pm 0.25	41.29	9.27 \pm 0.23	43.73	22.24 \pm 1.02	53.42	3.61 \pm 0.06	39.87	3.66 \pm 0.07	38.93
	Ours	8.97 \pm 0.45		6.91 \pm 0.59		18.19 \pm 0.37		3.39 \pm 0.32		5.78 \pm 0.08	
COMP-Analysis	Binomial	14.45 \pm 0.71	53.91	15.88 \pm 0.72	53.33	13.28 \pm 0.73	57.11	12.87 \pm 0.32	46.40	15.64 \pm 0.68	53.82
	Ours	6.50 \pm 0.63		6.95 \pm 0.50		4.86 \pm 0.48		6.66 \pm 0.38		7.07 \pm 0.48	
Average											
Average	Binomial	12.76 \pm 0.56	49.73	13.12 \pm 0.49	51.81	14.98 \pm 0.73	52.86	9.78 \pm 0.29	43.14	10.91 \pm 0.39	46.47
	Ours	8.63 \pm 0.60		6.48 \pm 0.51		6.87 \pm 0.48		7.35 \pm 0.42		6.38 \pm 0.44	




Figure 6. The actual number of samples under various thresholds ξ versus the theoretical value from Equation (11). **The actual sample numbers match with the theoretical bound.**

with estimating only on the target dataset samples (w/o Transfer). Error margins are shown in Table 2.

From the results, we observe that by transferring from other datasets in the same category (e.g., from TruthfulQA and HalluDial to HaluEval), the average error margin across all datasets is reduced by 5.0% \sim 25.0% and is consistently lower compared to no transfer, suggesting the effectiveness of our design that using prior knowledge of the judgment distributions on open-source datasets can benefit estimation.

8.3. More Research Questions

RQ3: Is sampling with adaptive stopping consistent to the theory? We examine our adaptive stopping to see if




Figure 7. The actual number of samples from different datasets under three ξ values. **Our sampling with adaptive stopping shows consistent results on all datasets.**

Equation (11) matches the real sampling amount. We set a series of ξ while keeping $\tau = 25$ and sample with adaptive stopping from judgment samples produced by Llama, Qwen, and GPT-4, and compare with the theoretical value of Equation (11). The actual sample amounts under different thresholds in Figure 6 match closely with the theoretical estimation, which proves the effectiveness of quantifying sampling deviation through CP and the Proposition 5.1.

RQ4: Is adaptive stopping really distribution-free? One benefit of adopting CP to quantify sampling deviation is distribution irrelevance. To testify to this, we consider sampling with various thresholds on all datasets to see if the sample amount remains consistent. The results in Figure

Table 2. The comparison of error margins with and without distribution prior transfer. Estimations are performed using the mixture of Beta-Binomial distributions, with 10 samples randomly drawn for evaluation. In experiments, each dataset is chosen as the target dataset, and the left datasets in the same domain are used as source datasets. **Bold** numbers denote lower mean margin. Scores are in percent (%).

Dataset	Method	Llama-3.3-70B	Qwen-2.5-72B	InternLM-2.5-20B	GPT-3.5	GPT-4
Hallucination Detection Datasets						
HaluEval	w/o Transfer	12.43 ± 0.87	12.50 ± 0.92	10.09 ± 0.64	14.07 ± 0.75	12.85 ± 0.83
	w/ Transfer	8.82 ± 0.42	9.19 ± 0.75	8.60 ± 0.64	8.88 ± 0.71	8.88 ± 0.86
TruthfulQA	w/o Transfer	15.30 ± 0.81	13.88 ± 0.85	13.17 ± 1.11	12.54 ± 0.70	13.21 ± 1.03
	w/ Transfer	3.37 ± 0.10	8.55 ± 0.07	10.18 ± 0.10	10.18 ± 0.82	9.66 ± 0.70
HalluDial	w/o Transfer	17.53 ± 0.81	16.15 ± 0.60	11.35 ± 0.83	16.62 ± 0.70	14.64 ± 0.85
	w/ Transfer	12.89 ± 0.77	13.42 ± 0.53	8.72 ± 0.54	23.79 ± 0.84	18.77 ± 0.92
Reasoning Datasets						
PRM800K	w/o Transfer	15.02 ± 0.78	12.85 ± 0.88	8.22 ± 0.58	9.27 ± 0.84	9.97 ± 0.53
	w/ Transfer	15.11 ± 0.62	10.96 ± 0.99	8.46 ± 0.60	10.55 ± 0.84	9.71 ± 1.00
BIG-bench	w/o Transfer	15.22 ± 0.74	13.81 ± 0.82	9.44 ± 0.53	14.39 ± 0.74	13.31 ± 1.15
	w/ Transfer	12.69 ± 0.74	14.28 ± 0.79	10.00 ± 0.62	9.98 ± 0.67	13.22 ± 0.69
TRAM	w/o Transfer	14.77 ± 0.84	12.27 ± 0.69	11.67 ± 0.76	13.52 ± 0.81	12.69 ± 1.26
	w/ Transfer	12.52 ± 0.92	11.03 ± 1.04	10.85 ± 0.97	11.81 ± 1.00	11.25 ± 0.57
Alignment Datasets						
JudgeBench	w/o Transfer	14.05 ± 0.88	12.41 ± 0.66	11.37 ± 0.79	8.23 ± 0.75	12.32 ± 0.69
	w/ Transfer	9.45 ± 0.59	8.19 ± 0.66	8.03 ± 0.54	14.36 ± 0.68	15.30 ± 1.19
RewardBench	w/o Transfer	12.73 ± 0.68	9.47 ± 1.07	10.34 ± 0.67	15.17 ± 0.92	13.30 ± 0.77
	w/ Transfer	12.72 ± 0.30	12.84 ± 0.48	16.35 ± 0.36	18.12 ± 0.34	12.57 ± 0.38
LLMBar	w/o Transfer	16.97 ± 1.10	15.91 ± 0.70	10.03 ± 0.88	17.00 ± 0.64	12.90 ± 0.97
	w/ Transfer	8.03 ± 0.39	9.95 ± 0.30	8.61 ± 0.41	21.94 ± 0.42	17.70 ± 0.40
Scoring Datasets						
ICE-Score	w/o Transfer	14.08 ± 0.53	11.90 ± 1.05	19.59 ± 0.78	12.11 ± 0.82	13.98 ± 0.88
	w/ Transfer	11.32 ± 0.66	11.99 ± 0.76	19.25 ± 1.05	10.63 ± 0.66	12.30 ± 0.67
COMP-Analysis	w/o Transfer	14.85 ± 1.45	10.83 ± 0.60	10.29 ± 0.60	10.22 ± 0.53	16.18 ± 1.00
	w/ Transfer	15.29 ± 0.91	12.28 ± 1.38	10.23 ± 0.72	9.62 ± 0.53	14.97 ± 0.82
Average						
Average	w/o Transfer	14.81 ± 0.86	12.91 ± 0.80	11.41 ± 0.74	13.01 ± 0.75	13.21 ± 0.91
	w/ Transfer	11.11 ± 0.58	11.15 ± 0.70	10.84 ± 0.60	13.62 ± 0.68	13.12 ± 0.74

7 show only a slight variance of sampling amounts across datasets, demonstrating superior stability. This verifies that our adaptive stopping is truly distribution-free, offering identical sampling guidance on diverse datasets.

RQ5: Is CP-based Adaptive Stopping efficient? To validate the effectiveness of our CP-based adaptive stopping, we compare it against variance-based stopping. Specifically, we calculate the variance of sampling as

$$\text{Var}(\text{sampling}) = \frac{\alpha_r \beta_r}{(\alpha_r + \beta_r)^2 (\alpha_r + \beta_r + 1)}, \quad (16)$$

where α_r is the number of correct judgments in r samples, and $\beta_r = r - \alpha_r$ is the number of wrong samples.

As shown in Table 3, CP consistently provides more effective guidance for adaptive stopping under the same deviation threshold ξ , which results in a reduced number of samples and achieves a reduction of up to 46.3%.

9. Conclusion

We present BetaConform, a framework for efficient estimation of LLM ensemble judge distribution. As part of our framework, we propose a mixture of Beta-Binomial

Table 3. Comparison of variance-based adaptive stopping and our CP stopping. We compare the sample amount of both methods under the same threshold. **Bold** denotes less samples.

Threshold ξ	Methods	HaluEval	JudgeBench	PRM800K	ICE-Score
		# Samples (\downarrow)			
$\xi=0.06$	Variance	36.87	36.87	26.00	24.77
	Ours	35.37	36.37	30.47	31.53
$\xi=0.03$	Variance	82.09	74.43	79.76	81.47
	Ours	54.72	53.90	43.32	45.27
$\xi=0.01$	Variance	194.72	198.56	147.22	151.44
	Ours	109.06	106.56	101.28	96.50

distributions to model the judgment distribution after examining the inaccuracy of the Binomial assumption. We design conformal prediction-based adaptive stopping for sampling, which monitors the sampling deviation and effectively determines the sample amount for estimation. When only limited samples are available, we incorporate a text similarity-based distribution prior transfer mechanism to improve the estimation accuracy. As shown by experiments, the conformal prediction-based adaptive stopping effectively guided the sampling. Our mixture of Beta-Binomial distributions significantly outperforms the common Binomial assumption. With the transfer mechanism, BetaConform can achieve high estimation precision with as few as 10 samples.

Acknowledgement

This project is supported by the Honda Research Institute USA. We extend our gratitude to Behzad Dariush for the insightful discussions. We also thank Zhaobo Zheng and David Isele for their valuable feedback and helpful suggestions.

References

- Angelopoulos, A. N., Bates, S., Fisch, A., Lei, L., and Schuster, T. Conformal risk control, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.02814>.
- Austen-Smith, D. and Banks, J. S. Information aggregation, rationality, and the condorcet jury theorem. *American political science review*, 90(1):34–45, 1996.
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 1877–1901, 2020.
- Cai, Z., Cao, M., Chen, H., Chen, K., Chen, K., Chen, X., Chen, X., Chen, Z., Chen, Z., Chu, P., et al. Internlm2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17297*, 2024.
- Calderon, N., Reichart, R., and Dror, R. The alternative annotator test for llm-as-a-judge: How to statistically justify replacing human annotators with llms, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.10970>.
- Chen, B., Wang, X., Peng, S., Litschko, R., Korhonen, A., and Plank, B. "seeing the big through the small": Can llms approximate human judgment distributions on nli from a few explanations? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17600*, 2024.
- De Condorcet, N. et al. *Essai sur l'application de l'analyse à la probabilité des décisions rendues à la pluralité des voix*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Dubey, A., Jauhri, A., Pandey, A., Kadian, A., Al-Dahle, A., Letman, A., Mathur, A., Schelten, A., Yang, A., Fan, A., et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- Dubois, Y., Galambosi, B., Liang, P., and Hashimoto, T. B. Length-controlled alpacaeval: A simple way to debias automatic evaluators, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.04475>.
- Fontana, M., Zeni, G., and Vantini, S. Conformal prediction: a unified review of theory and new challenges. *Bernoulli*, 29(1):1–23, 2023.
- Koo, R., Lee, M., Raheja, V., Park, J. I., Kim, Z. M., and Kang, D. Benchmarking cognitive biases in large language models as evaluators, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.17012>.
- Lambert, N., Pyatkin, V., Morrison, J., Miranda, L., Lin, B. Y., Chandu, K., Dziri, N., Kumar, S., Zick, T., Choi, Y., et al. Rewardbench: Evaluating reward models for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13787*, 2024.
- Lee, C., Roy, R., Xu, M., Raiman, J., Shoeybi, M., Catanzaro, B., and Ping, W. Nv-embed: Improved techniques for training llms as generalist embedding models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.17428>.
- Lee, H., Phatale, S., Mansoor, H., Mesnard, T., Ferret, J., Lu, K., Bishop, C., Hall, E., Carbune, V., Rastogi, A., and Prakash, S. Rlaif vs. rlhf: Scaling reinforcement learning from human feedback with ai feedback, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.00267>.
- Li, D., Jiang, B., Huang, L., Beigi, A., Zhao, C., Tan, Z., Bhattacharjee, A., Jiang, Y., Chen, C., Wu, T., et al. From generation to judgment: Opportunities and challenges of llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.16594*, 2024a.
- Li, J., Cheng, X., Zhao, W. X., Nie, J.-Y., and Wen, J.-R. Halueval: A large-scale hallucination evaluation benchmark for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11747*, 2023a.
- Li, L., Wei, Y., Xie, Z., Yang, X., Song, Y., Wang, P., An, C., Liu, T., Li, S., Lin, B. Y., Kong, L., and Liu, Q. Vrewardbench: A challenging benchmark for vision-language generative reward models, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.17451>.
- Li, Y., Wei, F., Zhao, J., Zhang, C., and Zhang, H. Rain: Your language models can align themselves without fine-tuning, 2023b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.07124>.
- Liang, T., He, Z., Jiao, W., Wang, X., Wang, Y., Wang, R., Yang, Y., Shi, S., and Tu, Z. Encouraging divergent thinking in large language models through multi-agent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19118*, 2023.
- Lightman, H., Kosaraju, V., Burda, Y., Edwards, H., Baker, B., Lee, T., Leike, J., Schulman, J., Sutskever, I., and Cobbe, K. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*, 2023.
- Lin, S., Hilton, J., and Evans, O. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07958*, 2021.

- Liu, Y., Iter, D., Xu, Y., Wang, S., Xu, R., and Zhu, C. G-eval: NLG evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment. In Bouamor, H., Pino, J., and Bali, K. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 2511–2522, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.153. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.153/>.
- Luo, W., Shen, T., Li, W., Peng, G., Xuan, R., Wang, H., and Yang, X. Halludial: A large-scale benchmark for automatic dialogue-level hallucination evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07070*, 2024.
- Min, S., Krishna, K., Lyu, X., Lewis, M., Yih, W.-t., Koh, P., Iyyer, M., Zettlemoyer, L., and Hajishirzi, H. FActScore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation. In Bouamor, H., Pino, J., and Bali, K. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 12076–12100, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.741. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.741/>.
- Mohri, C. and Hashimoto, T. Language models with conformal factuality guarantees, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.10978>.
- Moniri, B., Hassani, H., and Dobriban, E. Evaluating the performance of large language models via debates, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11044>.
- OpenAI, Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., Avila, R., Babuschkin, I., Balaji, S., Balcom, V., Baltescu, P., Bao, H., Bavarian, M., Belgum, J., Bello, I., Berdine, J., Bernadett-Shapiro, G., Berner, C., Bogdonoff, L., Boiko, O., Boyd, M., Brakman, A.-L., Brockman, G., Brooks, T., Brundage, M., Button, K., Cai, T., Campbell, R., Cann, A., Carey, B., Carlson, C., Carmichael, R., Chan, B., Chang, C., Chantzis, F., Chen, D., Chen, S., Chen, R., Chen, J., Chen, M., Chess, B., Cho, C., Chu, C., Chung, H. W., Cummings, D., Currier, J., Dai, Y., Decareaux, C., Degry, T., Deutsch, N., Deville, D., Dhar, A., Dohan, D., Dowling, S., Dunning, S., Ecoffet, A., Eleti, A., Eloundou, T., Farhi, D., Fedus, L., Felix, N., Fishman, S. P., Forte, J., Fulford, I., Gao, L., Georges, E., Gibson, C., Goel, V., Gogineni, T., Goh, G., Gontijo-Lopes, R., Gordon, J., Grafstein, M., Gray, S., Greene, R., Gross, J., Gu, S. S., Guo, Y., Hallacy, C., Han, J., Harris, J., He, Y., Heaton, M., Heidecke, J., Hesse, C., Hickey, A., Hickey, W., Hoeschele, P., Houghton, B., Hsu, K., Hu, S., Hu, X., Huizinga, J., Jain, S., Jain, S., Jang, J., Jiang, A., Jiang, R., Jin, H., Jin, D., Jomoto, S., Jonn, B., Jun, H., Kaftan, T., Łukasz Kaiser, Kamali, A., Kanitscheider, I., Keskar, N. S., Khan, T., Kilpatrick, L., Kim, J. W., Kim, C., Kim, Y., Kirchner, J. H., Kiros, J., Knight, M., Kokotajlo, D., Łukasz Kondraciuk, Kondrich, A., Konstantinidis, A., Kosic, K., Krueger, G., Kuo, V., Lampe, M., Lan, I., Lee, T., Leike, J., Leung, J., Levy, D., Li, C. M., Lim, R., Lin, M., Lin, S., Litwin, M., Lopez, T., Lowe, R., Lue, P., Makanju, A., Malfacini, K., Manning, S., Markov, T., Markovski, Y., Martin, B., Mayer, K., Mayne, A., McGrew, B., McKinney, S. M., McLeavey, C., McMillan, P., McNeil, J., Medina, D., Mehta, A., Menick, J., Metz, L., Mishchenko, A., Mishkin, P., Monaco, V., Morikawa, E., Mossing, D., Mu, T., Murati, M., Murk, O., Mély, D., Nair, A., Nakano, R., Nayak, R., Neelakantan, A., Ngo, R., Noh, H., Ouyang, L., O’Keefe, C., Pachocki, J., Paino, A., Palermo, J., Pantuliano, A., Parascandolo, G., Parish, J., Parparita, E., Passos, A., Pavlov, M., Peng, A., Perelman, A., de Avila Belbute Peres, F., Petrov, M., de Oliveira Pinto, H. P., Michael, Pokornyy, Pokrass, M., Pong, V. H., Powell, T., Power, A., Power, B., Proehl, E., Puri, R., Radford, A., Rae, J., Ramesh, A., Raymond, C., Real, F., Rimbach, K., Ross, C., Rotsted, B., Roussez, H., Ryder, N., Saltarelli, M., Sanders, T., Santurkar, S., Sastry, G., Schmidt, H., Schnurr, D., Schulman, J., Selsam, D., Sheppard, K., Sherbakov, T., Shieh, J., Shoker, S., Shyam, P., Sidor, S., Sigler, E., Simens, M., Sitkin, J., Slama, K., Sohl, I., Sokolowsky, B., Song, Y., Staudacher, N., Such, F. P., Summers, N., Sutskever, I., Tang, J., Tezak, N., Thompson, M. B., Tillet, P., Tootoonchian, A., Tseng, E., Tuggle, P., Turley, N., Tworek, J., Uribe, J. F. C., Vallone, A., Vijayvergiya, A., Voss, C., Wainwright, C., Wang, J. J., Wang, A., Wang, B., Ward, J., Wei, J., Weinmann, C., Welihinda, A., Welinder, P., Weng, J., Weng, L., Wiethoff, M., Willner, D., Winter, C., Wolrich, S., Wong, H., Workman, L., Wu, S., Wu, J., Wu, M., Xiao, K., Xu, T., Yoo, S., Yu, K., Yuan, Q., Zaremba, W., Zellers, R., Zhang, C., Zhang, M., Zhao, S., Zheng, T., Zhuang, J., Zhuk, W., and Zoph, B. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>.
- Panickssery, A., Bowman, S. R., and Feng, S. Llm evaluators recognize and favor their own generations, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.13076>.
- Park, J., Jwa, S., Ren, M., Kim, D., and Choi, S. Offsetbias: Leveraging debiased data for tuning evaluators, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.06551>.
- Qiu, J., Guo, D., Natalie, P., Noelle, P., Cheri, L., and Henry, T. R. Ensemble of large language models for curated labeling and rating of free-text data, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.08413>.
- Schoenegger, P., Tuminauskaite, I., Park, P. S., and Tetlock, P. E. Wisdom of the silicon crowd: Llm ensemble predic-

- tion capabilities rival human crowd accuracy, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.19379>.
- Shafer, G. and Vovk, V. A tutorial on conformal prediction. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(3), 2008.
- Srivastava, A., Rastogi, A., Rao, A., Shoeb, A. A. M., Abid, A., Fisch, A., Brown, A. R., Santoro, A., Gupta, A., Garriga-Alonso, A., et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04615*, 2022.
- Tan, S., Zhuang, S., Montgomery, K., Tang, W. Y., Cuadron, A., Wang, C., Popa, R. A., and Stoica, I. Judgebench: A benchmark for evaluating llm-based judges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12784*, 2024.
- Wang, P., Li, L., Chen, L., Cai, Z., Zhu, D., Lin, B., Cao, Y., Liu, Q., Liu, T., and Sui, Z. Large language models are not fair evaluators, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.17926>.
- Wang, T., Kulikov, I., Golovneva, O., Yu, P., Yuan, W., Dwivedi-Yu, J., Pang, R. Y., Fazel-Zarandi, M., Weston, J., and Li, X. Self-taught evaluators, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.02666>.
- Wang, Y. and Zhao, Y. Tram: Benchmarking temporal reasoning for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00835*, 2023.
- Wu, T., Yuan, W., Golovneva, O., Xu, J., Tian, Y., Jiao, J., Weston, J., and Sukhbaatar, S. Meta-rewarding language models: Self-improving alignment with llm-as-a-meta-judge, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.19594>.
- Yadkori, Y. A., Kuzborskij, I., Stutz, D., György, A., Fisch, A., Doucet, A., Beloshapka, I., Weng, W.-H., Yang, Y.-Y., Szepesvári, C., Cemgil, A. T., and Tomasev, N. Mitigating llm hallucinations via conformal abstention, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.01563>.
- Yang, A., Yang, B., Zhang, B., Hui, B., Zheng, B., Yu, B., Li, C., Liu, D., Huang, F., Wei, H., et al. Qwen2. 5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024.
- Yu, Z., Gao, C., Yao, W., Wang, Y., Ye, W., Wang, J., Xie, X., Zhang, Y., and Zhang, S. Kieval: A knowledge-grounded interactive evaluation framework for large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.15043>.
- Yuan, T., He, Z., Dong, L., Wang, Y., Zhao, R., Xia, T., Xu, L., Zhou, B., Li, F., Zhang, Z., et al. R-judge: Benchmarking safety risk awareness for llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10019*, 2024a.
- Yuan, W., Pang, R. Y., Cho, K., Sukhbaatar, S., Xu, J., and Weston, J. Self-rewarding language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10020*, 2024b.
- Zeng, Z., Yu, J., Gao, T., Meng, Y., Goyal, T., and Chen, D. Evaluating large language models at evaluating instruction following. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07641*, 2023.
- Zhang, C., D’Haro, L. F., Chen, Y., Zhang, M., and Li, H. A comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness of large language models as automatic dialogue evaluators. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pp. 19515–19524, 2024.
- Zhang, Z., Zheng, C., Wu, Y., Zhang, B., Lin, R., Yu, B., Liu, D., Zhou, J., and Lin, J. The lessons of developing process reward models in mathematical reasoning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.07301>.
- Zhao, R., Zhang, W., Chia, Y. K., Xu, W., Zhao, D., and Bing, L. Auto-arena: Automating llm evaluations with agent peer battles and committee discussions, 2024a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.20267>.
- Zhao, Y., Luo, Z., Tian, Y., Lin, H., Yan, W., Li, A., and Ma, J. Codejudge-eval: Can large language models be good judges in code understanding?, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.10718>.
- Zheng, L., Chiang, W.-L., Sheng, Y., Zhuang, S., Wu, Z., Zhuang, Y., Lin, Z., Li, Z., Li, D., Xing, E., et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36: 46595–46623, 2023.
- Zhuo, T. Y. Ice-score: Instructing large language models to evaluate code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14317*, 2023.

A. Proofs

A.1. Determination of Sample Amount.

To derive a theoretical estimation of the sample amount for the adaptive stopping criteria above, we utilize the fundamental statistical properties of variance reduction with increasing sample size. Specifically, for i.i.d samples, the variance of the quantile decreases as:

$$\text{Var}(q_{1-\epsilon}^r) \propto \frac{1}{r \cdot f(q_{1-\epsilon})^2}, \quad (17)$$

where $f(q_{1-\epsilon})$ is the density function at the quantile. The standard deviation of the estimator, which determines the variability of the quantile estimate, thus decays as:

$$\text{StdDev}(q_{1-\epsilon}^r) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}. \quad (18)$$

By the asymptotic theory of quantile estimation, for a large enough number of samples r , the empirical quantile $q_{1-\epsilon}^r$ converges to the quantile on the whole dataset $q_{1-\epsilon}$ with a known distribution based on Bahadur's representation:

$$\sqrt{r} (q_{1-\epsilon}^r - q_{1-\epsilon}) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}{f(q_{1-\epsilon})^2}\right), \quad (19)$$

This implies:

$$q_{1-\epsilon}^r = q_{1-\epsilon} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}\right), \quad (20)$$

where $O_p(\cdot)$ denotes the order in probability. Thus, we can determine that the quantile itself decays as:

$$q_{1-\epsilon}^r - q_{1-\epsilon} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}\right). \quad (21)$$

This decay behavior shows that as r increases, the estimated quantile approaches the theoretical quantile $q_{1-\epsilon}$, reflecting decreasing sampling deviation by using more samples. We will use this property to derive the relationship between the stopping criteria and the sample size r . From the stopping criteria in Equation (10),

$$|q_{1-\epsilon}^r - q_{1-\epsilon}^{r-1}| \leq \xi. \quad (22)$$

According to the calculations in Equation (21), we can rewrite the bound for $q_{1-\epsilon}^{r-1}$ as

$$q_{1-\epsilon}^{r-1} - q_{1-\epsilon} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r-1}}\right). \quad (23)$$

Thus we have

$$|q_{1-\epsilon}^r - q_{1-\epsilon}^{r-1}| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r-1}}\right). \quad (24)$$

This suggests to meet Equation (10), it requires

$$\tau \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r-1}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \right) < \xi, \quad (25)$$

which proves Equation (11).

A.2. Error Rate with Adaptive Sampling

In this section we develop a theoretical estimation of the error bound for adaptive sampling. We first consider the base case and as shown in Equation (5), we know that the mixture distribution error rate is:

$$\tilde{F}_{\text{BB}} = w \sum_{s=0}^{\lceil k/2 \rceil - 1} \binom{k}{s} \frac{\text{B}(s + \alpha_1, k - s + \beta_1)}{\text{B}(\alpha_1, \beta_1)} + (1 - w) \sum_{s=0}^{\lceil k/2 \rceil - 1} \binom{k}{s} \frac{\text{B}(s + \alpha_2, k - s + \beta_2)}{\text{B}(\alpha_2, \beta_2)} \quad (26)$$

The adaptive stopping criterion is given by Equation (10):

$$|q_{1-\epsilon}^r - q_{1-\epsilon}^{r-1}| \leq \xi. \quad (27)$$

The sample size requirement is given by Equation (11):

$$\tau \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r-1}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \right) \leq \xi. \quad (28)$$

Based on the two equations and large number theory, we know that the difference between the quantile on samples $q_{1-\epsilon}^r$ and the quantile on the whole dataset $q_{1-\epsilon}$ decays proportionally to $\frac{\tau}{\sqrt{r}}$. In addition, the non-conformity score s_i is defined in Equation (8):

$$s_i = \text{score}(S_i) = |S_i - \mathbb{E}[S]|, \quad (29)$$

where S_i is the number of correct judgments in the i -th sample. As the $(1-\epsilon)$ -quantile of the sorted scores $s_1 < \dots < s_r$ at stopping time with r samples is:

$$q_{1-\epsilon}^r = s_{\lceil (1-\epsilon) \cdot (r+1) \rceil}. \quad (30)$$

When the stopping criterion is met, this implies the confidence region for $\mathbb{E}[S]$ has stabilized and the following holds:

$$\mathbb{P}(|S_i - \mathbb{E}[S]| \leq q_{1-\epsilon}^r) = 1 - \epsilon. \quad (31)$$

For the Beta-Binomial mixture model, $\mathbb{E}[S]$ relates to the error rate via:

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{BB}} = \mathbb{P}(S < \lceil k/2 \rceil). \quad (32)$$

We will use the quantile stability argument as follows. For a sequence of independent samples $\{S_1, \dots, S_r\}$, let s_i be the non-conformity score defined as:

$$s_i = \text{score}(S_i) = |S_i - \mathbb{E}[S]|, \quad (33)$$

where S_i is the number of correct judgments in the i -th sample. By the theory of quantile estimation, for a large enough number of samples r , the empirical quantile $q_{1-\epsilon}^r$ converges to the population quantile $q_{1-\epsilon}$ with a known distribution:

$$\sqrt{r}(q_{1-\epsilon}^r - q_{1-\epsilon}) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}{f(q_{1-\epsilon})^2}\right), \quad (34)$$

where $f(\cdot)$ is the density function. This implies:

$$q_{1-\epsilon}^r = q_{1-\epsilon} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}\right), \quad (35)$$

where $O_p(\cdot)$ denotes the order in probability. As the $(1-\epsilon)$ -quantile of the sorted scores $s_1 < \dots < s_r$ at stopping time with r samples is:

$$q_{1-\epsilon}^r = s_{\lceil (1-\epsilon) \cdot (r+1) \rceil}. \quad (36)$$

When the stopping criterion is met, this implies the confidence region for $\mathbb{E}[S]$ has stabilized and the following holds:

$$\mathbb{P}(|S_i - \mathbb{E}[S]| \leq q_{1-\epsilon}^r) = 1 - \epsilon. \quad (37)$$

For the Beta-Binomial mixture model, $\mathbb{E}[S]$ relates to the error rate via:

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{BB}} = \mathbb{P}(S < \lceil k/2 \rceil). \quad (38)$$

By the quantile stability argument above, we have the bound:

$$(1 - \min(\xi, \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{r}}))\mathbb{E}[S]_{\text{BB}} < \mathbb{E}[S]_{\text{adapt}} < (1 + \min(\xi, \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{r}}))\mathbb{E}[S]_{\text{BB}} \quad (39)$$

The error probability of \tilde{P}_{BB} is defined using the Beta-Binomial cumulative distribution function:

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{BB}} = \mathbb{P}(S < \lceil k/2 \rceil) = F_{\text{BB}}(\lceil k/2 \rceil - 1), \quad (40)$$

where F_{BB} is the Beta-Binomial cumulative distribution function. Since F_{BB} is monotonically increasing, the error probability \tilde{P}_{adapt} follows the same proportional bound.

$$(1 - \min(\xi, \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{r}}))\tilde{P}_{\text{BB}} < \tilde{P}_{\text{adapt}} < (1 + \min(\xi, \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{r}}))\tilde{P}_{\text{BB}}. \quad (41)$$

Therefore, we have:

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{adapt}} = (1 \pm \min(\xi, \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{r}}))\tilde{P}_{\text{BB}}. \quad (42)$$

B. Implementation Details

In this section, we elaborate on the implementation details of BetaConform.

We evaluate LLM ensembles of $k \in \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11\}$ models, including GPT-3.5 (Brown et al., 2020), GPT-4 (OpenAI et al., 2024), Llama-3.3-70B (Dubey et al., 2024), Qwen-2.5-72B (Yang et al., 2024) and InternLM-2.5-20B (Cai et al., 2024). We choose domains of *hallucination detection* (HaluEval, Li et al., 2023a; TruthfulQA, Lin et al., 2021; HalluDial, Luo et al., 2024), *reasoning* (PRM800K, Lightman et al., 2023; BIG-bench, Srivastava et al., 2022; TRAM, Wang & Zhao, 2023), *scoring* (ICE-Score, Zhuo, 2023; Comp-Analysis, Zhang et al., 2024) and *alignment* (JudgeBench, Tan et al., 2024; RewardBench, Lambert et al., 2024; LLMBBar, Zeng et al., 2023).

Throughout all the experiments, the sampling temperature of all LLMs is set to 1. We do not set random seeds for all experiments. All experiments are run for 30 times to calculate the mean and standard deviation of the error margin.

C. Additional Experiments

In this section, we conduct additional experiments. Specifically, in Table 4, we compare BetaConform with a single Beta-Binomial distribution. Results demonstrate that we achieve superior performance due to the incorporation of a mixture of Beta-Binomial distributions. In Table 5, we conduct ablation studies on our distribution transfer design. Compared to ablated variants, our full design achieves the smallest error margin, indicating that our transfer design is effective.

Table 4. The comparison of error margins between our **mixture of Beta-Binomial** distributions and a **single Beta-Binomial** distribution. The error margin is calculated as the absolute difference between the actual error rate and the estimation. Estimations using both distributions are done on samples obtained by BetaConform through iterative sampling with adaptive stopping. For each run, the error margin is computed from $k = 1$ to 11, and the average margin of ensemble sizes is used as the result for that run. We conduct 30 runs and report the average and standard deviation. The average number of samples across runs is also reported.

Dataset	Method	Llama-3.3-70B		Qwen-2.5-72B		InternLM-20B	
		Error Margin (\downarrow)	# Samples (\downarrow)	Error Margin (\downarrow)	# Samples (\downarrow)	Error Margin (\downarrow)	# Samples (\downarrow)
Hallucination Detection							
HaluEval	Beta-Binomial	14.46 \pm 0.16	49.47	5.14 \pm 0.21	61.02	15.92 \pm 0.11	50.67
	Ours	6.68 \pm 0.53		4.72 \pm 0.38		5.48 \pm 0.41	
TruthfulQA	Beta-Binomial	8.83 \pm 1.02	54.13	7.84 \pm 0.26	53.56	6.79 \pm 0.25	55.56
	Ours	7.53 \pm 0.55		7.18 \pm 0.44		6.24 \pm 0.59	
HalluDial	Beta-Binomial	11.33 \pm 0.64	46.58	16.75 \pm 0.90	55.78	7.95 \pm 0.34	51.87
	Ours	7.94 \pm 0.68		6.96 \pm 0.47		6.43 \pm 0.50	
Reasoning							
PRM800K	Beta-Binomial	16.45 \pm 1.35	43.33	10.30 \pm 0.60	42.89	9.81 \pm 0.61	46.13
	Ours	9.37 \pm 0.64		7.82 \pm 0.69		4.52 \pm 0.50	
BIG-bench	Beta-Binomial	13.15 \pm 0.68	51.51	12.32 \pm 0.60	47.82	9.51 \pm 0.56	48.40
	Ours	11.15 \pm 0.60		6.97 \pm 0.58		5.54 \pm 0.51	
TRAM	Beta-Binomial	11.75 \pm 0.74	55.87	5.72 \pm 0.39	57.16	6.01 \pm 0.44	57.78
	Ours	8.39 \pm 0.63		6.20 \pm 0.34		6.10 \pm 0.58	
Alignment							
JudgeBench	Beta-Binomial	7.60 \pm 0.37	60.58	7.64 \pm 0.54	58.40	5.11 \pm 0.24	57.16
	Ours	6.98 \pm 0.56		5.39 \pm 0.39		5.26 \pm 0.39	
RewardBench	Beta-Binomial	16.29 \pm 1.39	40.22	11.40 \pm 1.20	45.20	6.15 \pm 0.27	52.04
	Ours	11.30 \pm 0.62		4.68 \pm 0.56		6.58 \pm 0.40	
LLMBar	Beta-Binomial	14.21 \pm 0.67	50.18	7.97 \pm 0.58	51.07	5.46 \pm 0.30	51.29
	Ours	10.18 \pm 0.71		7.52 \pm 0.63		6.38 \pm 0.53	
Scoring							
ICE-Score	Beta-Binomial	16.71 \pm 1.11	41.29	9.24 \pm 0.59	43.73	10.97 \pm 0.27	53.42
	Ours	8.97 \pm 0.45		6.91 \pm 0.59		18.19 \pm 0.37	
COMP-Analysis	Beta-Binomial	8.56 \pm 0.66	53.91	6.93 \pm 0.34	53.33	4.61 \pm 0.27	57.11
	Ours	6.50 \pm 0.63		6.95 \pm 0.50		4.86 \pm 0.48	
Average							
Average	Beta-Binomial	12.67 \pm 0.80	49.73	9.20 \pm 0.56	51.81	8.03 \pm 0.33	52.86
	Ours	8.63 \pm 0.60		6.48 \pm 0.51		6.87 \pm 0.48	

Table 5. The ablation study of BetaConform distribution prior transfer. ❶ $\log(r_i) \rightarrow r_i$ means the first term $\log(r_i)$ in Eq. 14 is replaced with r_i to still assign a larger dataset higher weight while not considering source datasets could be magnitudes larger. ❷ $\text{CosSim}(\bar{E}_0, \bar{E}_i) \rightarrow \frac{1}{|\bar{E}_0 - \bar{E}_i|_2}$ refers to replacing the cosine similarity to measure the source datasets and the target dataset with the reciprocal of the Euclidean distance between the embeddings of the two datasets. This still assigns more similar datasets higher weights. ❸ No $\sigma(\cdot)$ means the transfer weight is computed as $\lambda_i = \log(r_i) \cdot \text{CosSim}(\bar{E}_0, \bar{E}_i)$, without using the sigmoid function $\sigma(\cdot)$ to reduce the weight of low similarity datasets

Dataset	Ablation	Llama-3.3-70B	Qwen-2.5-72B	InternLM-20B
		Error Margin	Error Margin	Error Margin
HaluEval	$\log(r_i) \rightarrow r_i$	10.94 \pm 0.57	9.53 \pm 0.70	11.16 \pm 0.75
	$\text{CosSim}(\bar{E}_0, \bar{E}_i) \rightarrow \frac{1}{ \bar{E}_0 - \bar{E}_i _2}$	11.90 \pm 0.85	13.17 \pm 0.68	10.29 \pm 0.80
	No $\sigma(\cdot)$	10.04 \pm 0.23	23.03 \pm 0.12	8.45 \pm 0.10
	Ours	8.82 \pm 0.42	9.19 \pm 0.75	8.60 \pm 0.64
TruthfulQA	$\log(r_i) \rightarrow r_i$	13.47 \pm 0.66	11.17 \pm 1.15	10.65 \pm 0.89
	$\text{CosSim}(\bar{E}_0, \bar{E}_i) \rightarrow \frac{1}{ \bar{E}_0 - \bar{E}_i _2}$	15.13 \pm 0.71	13.14 \pm 0.96	11.03 \pm 0.80
	No $\sigma(\cdot)$	6.87 \pm 0.01	16.52 \pm 0.03	12.47 \pm 0.06
	Ours	3.37 \pm 0.10	8.55 \pm 0.07	10.18 \pm 0.10
HalluDial	$\log(r_i) \rightarrow r_i$	13.55 \pm 0.58	15.43 \pm 0.86	10.42 \pm 1.00
	$\text{CosSim}(\bar{E}_0, \bar{E}_i) \rightarrow \frac{1}{ \bar{E}_0 - \bar{E}_i _2}$	15.54 \pm 0.59	15.89 \pm 0.65	10.47 \pm 0.67j
	No $\sigma(\cdot)$	12.39 \pm 0.00	16.61 \pm 0.09	13.00 \pm 0.07
	Ours	12.89 \pm 0.77	13.42 \pm 0.53	8.72 \pm 0.54
JudgeBench	$\log(r_i) \rightarrow r_i$	25.97 \pm 0.03	21.23 \pm 0.04	15.46 \pm 0.06
	$\text{CosSim}(\bar{E}_0, \bar{E}_i) \rightarrow \frac{1}{ \bar{E}_0 - \bar{E}_i _2}$	14.43 \pm 1.12	11.26 \pm 0.99	11.47 \pm 0.74
	No $\sigma(\cdot)$	24.57 \pm 0.44	19.26 \pm 0.13	10.42 \pm 0.08
	Ours	9.45 \pm 0.59	8.19 \pm 0.66	8.03 \pm 0.54
RewardBench	$\log(r_i) \rightarrow r_i$	15.00 \pm 0.01	17.33 \pm 0.02	20.32 \pm 0.01
	$\text{CosSim}(\bar{E}_0, \bar{E}_i) \rightarrow \frac{1}{ \bar{E}_0 - \bar{E}_i _2}$	13.29 \pm 0.87	14.48 \pm 0.45	16.75 \pm 0.34
	No $\sigma(\cdot)$	12.88 \pm 0.59	13.74 \pm 0.48	16.45 \pm 0.26
	Ours	12.72 \pm 0.30	12.84 \pm 0.48	16.35 \pm 0.36
LLMBar	$\log(r_i) \rightarrow r_i$	13.88 \pm 0.01	15.88 \pm 0.01	15.45 \pm 0.01
	$\text{CosSim}(\bar{E}_0, \bar{E}_i) \rightarrow \frac{1}{ \bar{E}_0 - \bar{E}_i _2}$	16.27 \pm 0.81	15.55 \pm 0.83	11.90 \pm 1.07
	No $\sigma(\cdot)$	9.53 \pm 0.11	13.65 \pm 0.01	12.58 \pm 0.01
	Ours	8.03 \pm 0.39	9.95 \pm 0.30	8.61 \pm 0.41